

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 August 1980

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

PETITION: EDUCATION STAFF LEVELS

A petition signed by 374 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase staff levels and implement the 1979 Liberal Party education policy was presented by Mr. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: EDUCATION FUNDING

A petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose a 3 per cent cutback in funding for the Education Department was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRICITY CHARGES

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant concessions on electricity charges to persons receiving social welfare pensions was presented by the Hon. R. G. Payne.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: STURT C.A.E.

Petitions signed by 65 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 were presented by the Hons. H. Allison and R. G. Payne.

Petitions received.

PETITION: THORNDON PARK RESERVOIR

A petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement the original proposal for the redevelopment of Thorndon Park reservoir was presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran.

Petition received.

PETITION: FISHING NETS

A petition signed by 61 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ban the use of nets, except for tuna baiting, from Pt. Sir Isaac to Frenchman and from Pt. Bolingbroke to Pt. Donnington was presented by Mr. Blacker.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (The Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

By Command—

- i. Public Servants appearing before Parliamentary committees—Guidelines for.
- ii. Uranium Enrichment Committee—Progress Report.

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENT:
URANIUM ENRICHMENT**

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I wish to advise the House that the Government has had further talks this week with Urenco-Centec. Mr. J. V. L. Parry, Dr. R. B. Kehoe and Mr. J. Paleit have been in Adelaide for meetings with me, the Deputy Premier and members of the Uranium Enrichment Committee.

Members will recall that on 29 October 1979 the South Australian Government signed a confidentiality agreement with Urenco-Centec to permit the Uranium Enrichment Committee to progress the State's claims for establishing an enrichment plant here. The committee's earlier reports had advocated that an enrichment plant based on the gas centrifuge method was suited to South Australia's economic and resources base.

The confidentiality agreement provided for the supply of further technical and commercial information supporting Urenco-Centec's expressed desire to collaborate with Australian interests to exploit its gas centrifuge technology for the enrichment of uranium in Australia.

The Uranium Enrichment Committee has now completed its study of the Urenco-Centec proposals and of technical documents provided under the confidentiality agreement. A short progress report has been prepared for public release on the committee's study. The study was also a basis for my discussions last month with the Prime Minister.

I have asked the Federal Government to examine and advise on further action which may be taken by the State and Federal Governments. Such action is concerned with the necessary inter-governmental agreements, safeguards, security, the structuring of an Australian organisation and the availability of uranium for the enrichment industry. The Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia, established to advise the Commonwealth Government on enrichment, will be examining the work of my Government's enrichment committee as a major input to its investigation.

The economic attraction for an enrichment industry lies primarily in the availability of large quantities of uranium in Australia, particularly in this State, from which enriched uranium can be produced, combined with the attractions of South Australia's geographical position and industrial structure which can provide the services and skilled labour force.

The Uranium Enrichment Committee's latest work has reaffirmed its earlier findings on the desirability of having this important manufacturing industry located in South Australia. The results of the committee's work have been discussed with Urenco-Centec this week. Urenco-Centec is also having discussions with the Uranium Enrichment Group of Australia.

It is fitting to recall at this stage that the earlier reports of the Uranium Enrichment Committee already published and tabled in Parliament are notable for the committee's foresight in stressing the importance of a uranium industry in South Australia even before the important discoveries of uranium at Roxby Downs were made. This statement, and the public report on the Uranium Enrichment

Committee's latest work, is consistent with my Government's intention to keep the public fully informed of progress in this matter. I have already tabled the interim report of the committee.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WOMEN'S ADVISERS

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I wish to make a Ministerial statement in response to the considerable number of telegrams and letters which have been received over the last few days within the Education Department concerning the future appointment of a Women's Adviser. There has obviously been considerable concern regarding the Women's Adviser and the formerly advertised new position within the Department of Further Education.

The existing position and the formerly advertised position will now be expanded and re-named as positions of Equal Opportunity Advisers. Appointments will be made to both positions in the near future. The former appointments were at Ministerial discretion but it is intended that the new positions will be permanent Public Service appointments. It is anticipated that the officers will be responsible to the Directors-General of Education and Further Education for researching and developing and assisting with the implementation of policies relating to equal employment and educational opportunities with the two departments.

A major component of the responsibility of this position will be a continuation of the work previously done by the Women's Adviser in relation to employment of women and female students in schools. In addition, initiatives will be required in other categories, including handicapped persons, Aborigines and ethnic groups. Obviously, a substantial part of the work will involve initiatives in and development of curricular activities associated with the education of girls and women within the two departments.

Full job specifications are being finalised now, and there will be minimal delay in making the appointments. The creation of this position is recognition of the Government's concern for minority groups in education as well as for women in the community at large, and is in line with its policy prior to the last election. At the same time it ensures the continuation of the good work already being done by the women's resource unit within the Education Department and by Denise Bradley, the present Women's Adviser who has chosen to take up work in other fields of education when her contract ends this month with the Education Department.

Uniroyal plan to sell out, and also reported on moves to rationalise Australian production of motor vehicle tyres. Recently, Dunlop Australia made a successful takeover bid for Olympic Consolidated Industries, with the scaling down of one tyre plant a distinct possibility. Earlier this year Uniroyal said, in a letter to shareholders, that it was the major supplier of rubber and plastic automotive components to the vehicle industry and that its position would be maintained as the world car concept became a reality.

Since then, General Motors-Holden's has announced that it will not be using Uniroyal plastic parts in its production of the world car. Uniroyal has a work force of more than 2 000, which is mainly in South Australia at its Salisbury tyre plant and its Edwardstown general products factory.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, we have been in close contact with the Uniroyal situation, and I think perhaps the Leader, from the tone of his question, has not realised that that factory and operation has been on the market now for some 18 months. We have had close contact only in the past few days and have had a progress report. It is not linked in any way with the General Motors-Holden's decision to establish a plastics plant at Elizabeth, inasmuch as it has been on the market for some 18 months, and General Motors has made its move bearing that in mind. It has not been the cause of it.

Mr. Bannon: That's not very helpful.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think it is quite clear. I am most concerned, as is the Leader, to make certain that there is no possibility of the Uniroyal operation, either at Elizabeth or Edwardstown, closing down, because that would mean a considerable loss of jobs to the South Australian community. We have already taken steps to find out exactly what proposals are possible and what people are looking to the market to take over the Uniroyal operation. I am not prepared to go further than that.

The Leader has mentioned a takeover by Dunlop. There are possible buyers for the shares, and therefore people who would take over the operation. It would be far more advantageous to people in South Australia to have the whole Uniroyal operation taken over by a company which intended to continue and, if necessary, expand it, and that is what I and the officers of my department are seeking to find. At present I am not able to give further information except to say that the Government is well aware of the possibilities. It is taking every possible step to make certain that the Uniroyal operation does not close down. The situation is very much like that which applied with the Chrysler Corporation of America and the Chrysler Australia plant here in South Australia. I hope that the outcome of our negotiations and the representations we shall make will be just as successful.

QUESTION TIME

UNIROYAL

Mr. BANNON: Has the Premier obtained a report on the implications for South Australia of the plan by Uniroyal Incorporated of the United States to sell its stake in Uniroyal Holdings Limited and, if so, will the Premier say whether the move is linked with his announcement of General Motors-Holden's intention to open a plastics plant, and will the Premier now give the House an assurance that the planned Uniroyal sale will not result in a loss of South Australian jobs in tyre making and plastics manufacture?

Yesterday's *Australian Financial Review* detailed the

SCHOOL GRANTS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education assure schools in my electorate, especially the Netley Primary School and the Henley Beach Primary School, that consideration will be given to increasing grounds maintenance grants to schools in the near future? Henley Beach Primary School has 4.2 hectares of school grounds, with approximately 2.8 hectares of grassed playing area. There are 115 families of students at Henley Primary School, of which 40 are single-parent families. Netley Primary School has 3.2 hectares of grounds area. The students come from 345 families, and 36 students receive the approved free book allowance. I understand the school grounds maintenance grants have not been increased for at

least four years, and that the amount allocated is \$198 000. As inflation has increased by 38 per cent in the period, I ask whether the department is in a position to consider increasing the per capita grant or making a grant available on the area to be maintained by the schools.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member has pinpointed an obvious area of concern which has been troubling not only the present Government but also the previous Government of South Australia since 1974 or 1975. It has been obvious, on a random selection of schools that was taken some few months ago, that for the last several years there has been a steady increase in the amount of money expended in such areas by parents organisations.

I point out to the honourable member, however, that, from my observations, this increase has not been consistent throughout South Australia. In the case of some schools, the increase in effort is as low as 18 per cent to 20 per cent over that five-six year period, while in some rarer cases the increase in effort has been as high as 50 per cent and over. Whether this reflects an increased need for expenditure or whether it is simply also a reflection on the ability of some schools to raise more money than others, I cannot say.

However, this has, as I have said, been a matter of concern for several years; not just the present Government has experienced difficulties. To that extent, therefore, the present Government has, as one of its terms of reference within the Keeves committee of inquiry, decided that that committee should investigate the allocation of resources. We also decided, last January or February, to participate, as a State Education Department, in a Federally initiated inquiry into the allocation of resources. So, we are investigating the matter at two levels.

In answer directly to the honourable member's question, I cannot promise an immediate increased commitment to schools in his district. I recognise the area of concern and that the present Government is pledged to maintain its commitment again during the coming year for that area. We hope that increased investigation, comment and guidance will be given by the two committees to which I have referred, and that this will be of help to us in the next Budget.

WOMEN'S ADVISERS

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: My question arises partly out of the statement the Minister of Education has given to the House. Is he satisfied that the problems faced by women in the Education Department and the Department of Further Education which, in part, led to the call for the appointment of women's advisers in those two departments have been sufficiently resolved to justify the decision the Government has now taken? Is he aware that women comprise about 60 per cent of the personnel of the Education Department and, therefore, will probably resent being classified as another minority, and has he, in coming to this decision, been partly actuated by the sort of ideological position he demonstrated in a press release of 30 November 1978? First, in relation to the news release, someone called Harold Allison, M.P., then shadow Minister of Education, in response to a working paper on non-sexist education that had been issued at that time, came out with a statement in which he attacked the paper and said that he believed that the pamphlet, coupled with other social education material currently being introduced into schools, was part of a left-wing social engineering programme aimed at women and children, and then, for

good measure, he went on to say that, internationally, egalitarianism had not proved successful in Russia, China, or the Jewish kibbutz, to name just a few instances.

It has been put to me by people outside who have seen the continuing saga and indecision on the part of this Government that the Minister in fact sees these appointments as being fairly critical to the reigning in of these tendencies which he sees as being so dangerous within our education system. The Minister obviously, by way of his statement this afternoon, sought to clarify the position and allay fears, whereas I believe that he has probably enraged many people.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Let me refer, first, to the alleged statements which I made and which may or may not have been taken out of context.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will get back to that, because I have a good memory. I distinctly recall that two to 2½ years ago I was being pressed by, shall I say, the more conservative elements in our society (many of whom still exist) regarding the proliferation at that time of a variety of material, some of which was being commissioned for publication and use within our schools, regarding the then anti-sexist campaign.

It was suggested that books like *Dick and Dora* and other fairly common-place text books should no longer be used in education. I believe that it was under the heading of "Sexist Reading Instruction Material in Schools". At that time I made quite clear that some of the material that was being prepared, copies of which I still have (and I am prepared to show them to the honourable member), was in fact counter-discriminatory in that it went much too far the other way and gave an imbalance to our young people, which I believed at that time and still believe should not exist. When considering equal opportunities, there is no need to swing the pendulum too far the other way. My comments at that time were largely triggered off by material handed to me, which I still have; it is in my office in the Education Department and is readily available.

Regarding the present appointment, I am not satisfied that the work to be done in relation to equality of women is nearly far enough along the track and, to that extent, we have decided to appoint two officers, one in the Department of Further Education and one to replace Denise Bradley in the Education Department. However, I suggest that the honourable member misheard me either accidentally or deliberately when he said that I referred to women as a minority group. That is not so. I was quite specific; I said women, as well as minority groups, and if he checks *Hansard*—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The title of the appointment is essentially "equality of opportunity", and to suggest that women, men, the handicapped, Aborigines, or ethnic groups should be considered in isolation rather than as an entity, as a whole, which is surely what all Australians are, is improper. In this respect, I believe that the women's adviser will handle not only the women's component but, to a much lesser extent (and I emphasise that, because the work specifications predominantly relate to the women's advisory unit) will address the whole problem, rather than the women's unit addressing women's problems in isolation. I do not know whether the honourable member purposely misheard me, but I deliberately introduced two or three words into the Ministerial statement to make myself quite clear in case there was any ambiguity in relation to this matter.

Another point that the honourable member seems to have missed is that the former appointments, and his own of Denise Bradley in 1977 (and this was probably the first

in Australia), were at Ministerial discretion, or Ministerial whim, depending on how cynical one is. This Government has taken this appointment away from Ministerial appointment.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is a contract, but the contract is renewable or not. This position has now been placed into the Public Service list, and is a permanent appointment. That is an improvement on the position that previously obtained. It is now a career opportunity. If the honourable member is suggesting that this is a downgrading of the women's advisory position, let me also remind him that, since the appointment is now in the Public Service, there is every possibility that this could be considered on a work value basis and probably a case could be made for supplementary staffing at a subsequent date. I believe that plenty of women in the Government service and outside will be prepared to do this job in a fine way.

The Hon. D. J. Hoppood: Is it possible for a man—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Highly unlikely, but possible.

BREAD DISCOUNTING

Mr. OLSEN: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware that discounts of up to nine cents a loaf are occurring in the northern areas of the State, and will the Minister investigate that report in the light of the Government's request for a maximum discount of five cents a loaf, in order to determine how widespread the practice is? Also, will the Minister ascertain whether the practice is placing country bakeries and jobs in jeopardy and, if it is, will he take positive action?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am not aware of the specific case that is apparently occurring in the northern areas of the State where bread is being discounted by up to nine cents a loaf. I ask the honourable member whether he could perhaps supply in writing the names of shops involved so that some investigations can be made.

In the statement made by the Minister of Consumer Affairs and me during the negotiations with the bread industry we pointed out that it was a voluntary request to the industry that retail outlets discount by no more than five cents. At that time there was no legislation to back up the request. We did point out to the industry that we had contingency plans if wholesale discounting beyond that occurred and as a consequence of that the entire industry was thrown into disruption.

As yet one or two isolated cases have been reported to me, but I do not believe there has been any major disruption. I put aside the one day strike last week in the bread industry that was in fact on another issue. If the honourable member could give me the relevant information of the retail outlets involved, I will certainly investigate the matter, along with the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

IT'S GROSSLY IMPROPER

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Premier ask the Attorney-General to investigate the basis of communications on and after 4 April 1978 between Mr. Frank Webster, then a Liberal candidate for this House, and now a solicitor, who was then acting on behalf of Sydney businessman Mr. Abe Saffron, and Mr. Des Ryan, co-author of the book *It's Grossly Improper*? More specifically, will the Premier ask the Attorney-General to investigate whether Mr. Webster offered Mr. Ryan

monetary inducement to pursue his inquiries and publish the book and, if he did, will the Premier find out who was prepared to provide that money, whether in fact Mr. Webster made the offer on behalf of anyone else including the possibility of his making the offer on behalf of the Liberal Party, and whether any senior member or members of the Liberal Party were aware or approved of that inducement?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Elizabeth's preoccupation and obsession with Mr. Saffron are well known in this House. Indeed, one can remember that when he was Attorney-General some time ago he devoted a long period of Question Time to a lengthy Ministerial statement denigrating that gentleman. I do not intend to stand here to support the gentleman or to denigrate him. It is of no consequence to me in this House what he does. Nevertheless, I take it that what the previous Attorney-General is trying to bolster up is the allegation made in this House yesterday by the member for Stuart. I cannot imagine that we can get much lower than that.

I can only repeat that, as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, there was no question of money being offered to the authors of that rather lamentable book *It's Grossly Improper*, and I repeat that again today. If the previous Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth, would care to provide me privately with details of the allegations that he has made I shall see whether they should be investigated.

GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS

Mr. RANDALL: Has the Premier noticed in this morning's press a report by the Australian Confederation of Industry that calculates the cost to business of complying with Government red tape at \$3 700 000 000 a year? Is the Premier concerned about this report, one ramification of which is that Australian families each pay an average of \$900 a year as a direct result of Federal and State Government regulations? What are the Government's plans to improve this situation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The report in the press today from the Australian Confederation of Industry was quite frightening; it confirms what we have believed since long before we took office. There is a grave need for the Government's deregulation policies, and I would remind members that these were designed to review, rationalise and, if necessary, revoke regulations which create greater costs to industry and to consumers than the benefits which they are intended to achieve or the problems which they are designed to stop. Secondly, our policy is to submit future proposed regulations to cost benefit analysis before they are given force of law. This has been a firm principle that has been adopted by this Government since taking office.

Only today I received a report of well over 1 000 pages from the deregulation officer who was appointed to undertake this task in the Premier's Department. The report, which has been based on the views of Government departments, industry, employer associations, small business proprietors and various professional bodies, such as the Law Society, and the Institute of Accountants, recommends a comprehensive programme for the review of all South Australian Statutes and regulations. I have not had an opportunity to examine the report in any detail, but it will be submitted to Cabinet forthwith and every consideration will be given to releasing the report for public comment. I believe that there is not a wide enough realisation of the cost to individual taxpayers and to consumers of the wide range of red tape and regulation

which has grown up over the years. There is a great scope of activities to rationalise the situation and to deregulate. If South Australia can apply the policies which have been adopted by the Government to all Statutes and regulations, we may well lead the rest of Australia and, indeed, the rest of the world in getting sensible and reasonable Government and regulation based on the optimum cost-benefit basis.

IT'S GROSSLY IMPROPER

Mr. HAMILTON: In light of the Government's inquiry into allegations made by Mr. John Ceruto, will the Premier clarify his statement in this House that he was not particularly concerned about the book *It's Grossly Improper* and that its publication was quite irrelevant to events in South Australia?

Yesterday, in reply to a question by the member for Stuart, asking the Premier to investigate and report on allegations that the Liberal Party offered Messrs. Des Ryan and Mike McEwen more than \$35 000 to pursue their inquiries, the Premier said that he found the parts of the book he read extremely distasteful and its publication quite irrelevant to events in South Australia. Yet, when the book was launched, the Premier, amid much fanfare, ordered an inquiry into allegations made by Mr. Ceruto in the book. The Premier did not say whether or not he was prepared to investigate the allegations about Liberal monetary inducement. Perhaps he can explain how the book can be relevant and credible in one way and not another.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am absolutely amazed that members opposite are still continuing to raise this subject. The statement I made—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not think it is doing harm to anyone other than Opposition members. The statement I made in the House yesterday still applies. I am not particularly concerned, and I gave a personal view in that regard. I have already said what I think of the book. I think the honourable member is trying to make capital out of something which, in fact, he has misread. The inquiry which is being conducted into the circumstances surrounding the launching of the book relates to an interview given at the time, and that is a different matter. Regarding the effect that the publication of that book had on events in South Australia, I do not think that that particularly applies any more to events at the present time. This may well have applied to the past, but I think the past is probably better buried and forgotten, and I think the honourable member would be well advised to consider that.

STUDENT EDUCATION

Mr. MATHWIN: I address my question to the Minister of Transport—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg has been asked to ask a question.

Mr. MATHWIN: Apparently the member for Mitchell—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will ask a question.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of having signs in railway carriages requesting young people, particularly students, to give up their seats to older people travelling on the same

journey, approaching the matter as an educational or youth subject? I was approached by a constituent who travels regularly on the 7.58 train from Brighton, a train which is generally fairly crowded. She finds it difficult at times to get a vacant seat. Recently, she requested a student to give up a seat, and, after a lot of abuse, she was given the seat by the young student. My constituent states that there seemed to be little opportunity for the guard to police the situation, because he was busy at the time with his normal duties. It is possible, she says in her letter, that young people will perhaps, by having the situation pointed out to them and by pressure of an educational request such as a sign, see that the problem could be solved.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I would be prepared to investigate the possibility for the honourable member, but certainly only on an educational basis. I do not think anyone would expect us to do more than to try to educate the young people. I approve, as I am sure do most members of this House, of young people making way for the older and infirm in the community so that those people may have a seat when they are travelling. I am sure that view is shared by the general public.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr. CRAFTER: Will the Premier indicate when the Government plans to increase electricity charges again this financial year, in addition to the 12½ per cent increase which has been in effect since 1 July? I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 14 June, emanating from the Government, that Electricity Trust of South Australia charges would rise by 12½ per cent from 1 July. In a report in the *News* on 25 June, 11 days later, the Premier foreshadowed a further increase in electricity charges. When in Opposition, the Premier repeatedly claimed that the State's cost advantage was being eroded. If electricity tariffs are increased twice this year, will not the State's cost advantage be further eroded?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it is not intended to increase Electricity Trust of South Australia charges again in this financial year. The costs went up, as the honourable member has already said. It is inevitable that charges will continue to rise in future years. I think that that has been borne out in the past. Quite apart from anything else, and on the user-pays principle, we still have to find enough money at least to help to build a new power station. We already have a special levy being directed towards the construction of the Northern Power Station, but it has become quite apparent that, unless we can provide additional electrical energy sources, we will be seriously hampered in the programme of development which we have envisaged for South Australia in this decade.

It is a matter of record that I have already asked the Electricity Trust, as a matter of urgency, to investigate ways and means by which an additional 750 megawatts can be made available, certainly by the end of this decade, and earlier if possible. A number of industries will come to South Australia because of the increasing advantages which we now have. The cost advantage to which the honourable member referred is still there, and it will continue to increase. Our geographic position is such that companies will save transport costs in the long term by establishing in South Australia, manufacturing here, and supplying western, northern and eastern Australian markets, as well as South-East Asian markets, from this central geographic position, but they will be able to come here only if we have everything that is necessary for them to establish.

One of the most fundamental things is a source of

energy. So, it comes back (and I am certain that the honourable member would be well aware of this fundamental thing, and I am sure that that is why he asked his question) to the fact that the State and the Electricity Trust have a responsibility to ensure that electrical energy sufficient for that expansion that we can envisage in this area is provided. It will be extremely difficult. We have run into a number of difficulties, as the former Premier would know.

The position regarding our brown coal resources is heartening, because we have ample supplies. Unfortunately, it is not particularly good brown coal (and never has been), but we have been able to use Leigh Creek. I have no doubt that we will be able to burn the coal at Port Wakefield, and that the Polda deposit will ultimately be usable (and so will Lake Phillipson and the South-East coal deposit). Where the new power station is likely to be, I do not know. It could be on site at Kingston or at Port Wakefield, and there is a faint possibility that it could be up in the Lake Phillipson area, but that is much less positive. It is not intended to raise Electricity Trust tariffs again this year, but prices will go up in accordance with c.p.i. trends, and so on, as the years go on.

STATUTES AMENDMENT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier and the Government consider amending a number of Acts of Parliament that were passed during the Administration of the previous Government to remove from them some of the many objectionable provisions that impinge on the right to privacy of individuals and groups, and also those sections of Acts that reverse the onus of proof? The Premier would be aware that a number of Acts passed through the House give inspectors very wide powers of entry without having to seek a warrant from a magistrate or from a justice of the peace. In many cases, they are far in excess of the normal police powers.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Name some of them?

Mr. GUNN: The National Parks and Wildlife Act is one.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Name some more.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and there is no need to answer them.

Mr. GUNN: It would appear that those provisions are unnecessary. I therefore ask the Premier whether they could be examined as a matter of urgency.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, this question is supplementary to that asked by the member for Henley Beach. The answer is encompassed in the review which has been obtained already and the review which will continue on into various regulations and Statutes. A number of matters exercised the mind of the Government, when in Opposition, regarding the powers that were given to inspectors, particularly, as the honourable member has said, where the reversal of the onus of proof was involved. Those matters will be examined most carefully. The deregulation unit, which I envisage is likely to be set up, will look at those matters as well as at a number of other matters, and recommendations will be made to the Government accordingly.

SANTOS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Deputy Premier tell the House what will be the impact of the recent Santos board changes on the State's Cooper Basin resource? Will he assure the House that the Government will act to ensure that South Australians will retain control of

production from the Cooper Basin? The Minister will recall that my Leader expressed concern in the first session of this Parliament over the matter of prices charged by the Cooper Basin producers. Therefore, I am sure that he will appreciate the great concern I felt on reading an article in the *Australian Financial Review*, dated 16 July, which stated that the Bond and Murdoch interests had the potential to control Santos, which owns 45 per cent of the Cooper Basin. It also reported that Reef Oil and Basin Oil each could have up to 5 per cent of Cooper Basin liquids, giving Bond interests a total of 53 per cent and "control of liquids production".

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Not having a crystal ball of the necessary intensity, I find it impossible to answer except to say that the Deputy Leader knows that the answer to the first part of the question is "No".

The Hon. J. D. Wright: So you haven't—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, it was a stupid question, let's face it. The answer to the second part of the question is that of course the Government will monitor the activities and the interests of the State in that area. I point out that we in South Australia are in a difficult position and, in regard to what the Premier said in relation to the generation of electricity, I point out that the previous Government, of which the Deputy Leader was a part, wrote contracts to supply gas from the Cooper Basin to New South Wales to the year 2006; it also wrote contracts, with no saving clause, to supply gas for South Australia (our home State, the source of the energy) until 1987.

One of the major problems I face as Minister of Mines and Energy is to try to come to grips with the appalling state of affairs that I inherited because the previous Government operated in a completely irresponsible fashion. I would have thought that the record of the previous Government in relation to the State's needs for gas from the Cooper Basin would be something that the Deputy Leader would steer clear of.

DEREGULATION

Mr. BLACKER: My question, which is directed to the Premier, is supplementary to an explanation given to the members for Henley Beach and Eyre. Following my suggestion, during the last session of Parliament, regarding the appointment of a Minister of Deregulation and the explanation given to the members for Henley Beach and Eyre, who expressed concern at the great need to reduce Government red tape, will the Premier reconsider his earlier reply and consider the desirability of having a separate Minister of Deregulation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I appreciate the honourable member's support for the direction that has been taken by the Government, but I believe that a certain amount of balance must be applied to the whole situation. Where it is possible for a small unit to undertake the task that has been put before us for the deregulation of Statutes and regulations, I believe that it is better to have in operation a unit that reports to Cabinet so that Cabinet can consider the various measures that need to be taken.

I know that a Minister of Deregulation has been appointed in one of the Canadian provinces, but I am not sure which province it is. While the system is working very well there, I do not see the need to have an additional portfolio in South Australia to deal with this problem. It is a problem that would require the co-operation of all Ministers and the Government as a whole. I am confident that that co-operation will be forthcoming and that the programme will work efficiently.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Mr. McRAE: Is the Deputy Premier still convinced of the public frankness, safety consciousness and professional judgment of British Nuclear Fuels Limited, the British partner in Urenco-Centec, the consortium wanting to build a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia? Last weekend there were reports of the results of an official inquiry in Great Britain into a major leak of radioactive liquid at British Nuclear Fuels' atomic waste reprocessing plant at Windscale. According to the official report, more than 9 000 litres of radioactive liquid leaked to ground over eight years before the leak was detected and stopped. I ask the Deputy Premier to consider the next part of the explanation.

The official inquiry of the Conservative Government in Britain found that senior managers at Windscale lacked "safety consciousness and professional judgment", and said prosecution was seriously considered. British Nuclear Fuels also failed to notify the British Minister responsible about the leak, which I might add was the worst in British history, until two months after it had been detected. When my leader, the South Australian Leader of the Opposition, questioned senior Urenco-Centec officials about this matter, they claimed that they have never heard of this or other Windscale leaks. That assertion cannot have been correct, because the official investigation has been instigated; if it was correct, it at least demonstrates an appalling lack of knowledge on the part of those negotiating here.

Further, they promised to get the Leader of the Opposition in this State a report on the matter, but they failed to do so. In the light of all those facts before the British Parliament, is the Minister of Mines and Energy still saying that that senior partner in the Urenco-Centec group with whom he is dealing at the moment is trustworthy for the people of this State?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, I am satisfied. When the Urenco-Centec people were first approached to comment on this, they thought some reference was being made to a new leak from the Windscale plant. They were well aware of this leak, which has been occurring for many years. I talked to them about it and they said that the incident had been occurring for a long time. We even had a question in this House from one of the brains trust of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Rann, suggesting that some of the South Australian party could have been poisoned when Premier Dunstan and his party visited the Windscale plant.

The member for Playford has read the press report, as I have. So that I could be better informed, I asked our Agent-General in London to send me a full report, because I find—

An honourable member: The old one or the new one?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am talking about the current report on the findings of this inquiry. I believe it is always quite valuable to get reports of the findings of inquiries, because the gloss which one gains from reading accounts can often be quite misleading. In that respect I think of the Three Mile Island incident, which was raised in this House by members of the Opposition. If they had taken the trouble to get the report of the committee of inquiry into the incident and had stripped away the emotionalism and the exaggerations made in the press, they would have seen that the statement is clearly made by members of that committee, which included environmentalists, that no physical damage was done to any living person in the vicinity of the Three Mile Island plant; the only damage was psychological. That point comes through clearly in the findings in the report into the Three Mile

Island incident. I am reserving my final judgment until I read the final report. I have received from the Agent-General some of the conclusions of the inquiry. The following are two extracts which I received in the Telex—

Mr. McRae: Will you table that report?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not have the report; I have a Telex from the Agent-General from which I intend to quote.

Mr. McRae interjecting:

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he has asked his question, and if he wants an answer I suggest that he be quiet. The Telex reads:

B.N.F.L. has reviewed its arrangements for health and safety in the light of the findings of the investigation of this incident. The effectiveness of revised arrangements will be routinely checked during future site inspections. . . .

Finally, under the heading of "conclusions" in the main body of the report, paragraph 62 states "the radio-active contamination beneath the ground in the vicinity of buildings B212 and B701 has not so far presented a hazard to workers or members of the public and is not likely . . .

Mr. McRae: Not so far.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me finish. This is typical of the knee-jerk paranoia of members opposite. Let me read this quote again so that it sinks in:

Finally, under the heading of "conclusions" in the main body of the report, paragraph 62 states "the radio-active contamination beneath the ground in the vicinity of buildings B212 and B701 has not so far presented a hazard to workers or members of the public and is not likely to do so in the future in view of the remedial action being carried out".

There is nothing new in what the Opposition is trying to stir up. This has been going on for some years. The investigation has finished, and the conclusion is that no-one has been harmed, the radio-active leak will be contained, and no-one is likely to be harmed. If we harked back in history we would realize that the plant was built urgently towards the end of the Second World War for pressing reasons of national importance. To get the whole thing into perspective, I think honourable members ought to cast their minds back in history and look at why that facility was built. If they believe that that decision was wrong, I believe if they had lived in Britain at that time they would have been members of a small minority.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. OSWALD: Can the Minister of Health say what is the future of the Port Adelaide Occupational Health Service and what action is being taken to ensure that people in the industrial areas surrounding Port Adelaide receive advice on occupational health?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before commenting on the future of the service I would like to give some details of the past of the service which will enable that future to be seen in perspective. That service was begun in February 1978 in response to the recommendations of the steering committee, but it was started in the face of opposition from the Australian Medical Association, local medical practitioners, and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The aims of the service were to have a preventive occupational service available in Port Adelaide which would be self-supporting and autonomous. Unfortunately, the service has failed to realise those aims. It has failed to become self-supporting, it has failed to attract companies that will become subscribing companies,

it has failed to attract a medical director at the M.O.8 classification, and it has failed to fulfil the original intentions upon which it was established. In other words, it has not provided an occupational health service of the kind which is necessary in order to protect the occupational health of people in Port Adelaide.

The Health Commission has before it proposals that the unit shall become a community health unit and that it shall embrace the casualty services which were, prior to the establishment of the occupational health services, working quite satisfactorily in the area. It is envisaged that that should continue. In the interim between the establishment of that service and the present time the Occupational Health Branch of the South Australian Health Commission has greatly expanded its activities and its capacity to provide a consultant and advisory service. It was never intended that the Occupational Health Branch would embark on the provision of services but act in a consultant and advisory capacity, and it is clearly inappropriate that an officer on the M.O.8 level earning about \$37 000 a year should be engaged in binding up cut fingers and doing things of that nature. The work of the Occupational Health Branch is to advise employers and employees how to improve safety in the work place and to prevent accidents and injuries, and that is precisely what the branch of the Health Commission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier does not have the call.

Mr. Hemmings: I would not want the call after that.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Napier to repeat his comment.

Mr. Hemmings: I said, after the comment you made, Mr. Speaker, that I would not want the call after that particular comment. I withdraw that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I want to assure the House that steps are being taken by the Health Commission to review the occupational health needs of people in the Port Adelaide area and also to point out that it is not only the occupational health services—

Mr. Hemmings: Hand it over to private enterprise—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume her seat. I warn the member for Napier.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The House will be aware that many people in the Port Adelaide area are under-privileged. Also, a large proportion of Aboriginal people live in the area. The commission believes, and I agree, that these people would be well served by an extension of community health services which would encourage health promotion and health education activity, and preventive health measures which would serve the whole community. What in fact is proposed is an extension of community health services in Port Adelaide and an extension of occupational health advisory and consultancy services, which will be undertaken with a view to improving the safety of workers in the area and the health and safety of everyone living in the area.

INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Premier say what the room tariff will be at the international hotel to be built in Victoria Square and operated by the Hilton group, and how this will compare with the tariff in other major hotels in Adelaide?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not sure why the member for Unley is so anxious to know what the room rates will be. I can well recall the occasion during the building of the Gateway Hotel opposite when one Mr.

Paul Hogan appeared outside, shook the gate and said, "I thought I had a booking." Perhaps the member for Unley could be in much the same position. I am not in a position to know what the rates will be, but I imagine that they will be in accordance with the normal rates charged by similar chains of hotel operators in other capital cities.

GLUE SNIFFING

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Health say what action the Health Commission is taking in relation to the increasing incidence of glue sniffing and the sniffing of other volatile substances, and in regard to the associated problems? Great concern is being expressed in the community regarding the growing problems connected with this dangerous practice. While the public may acknowledge that it is primarily a matter of educating the community about the enormous dangers and consequences, there is a strong consensus of opinion that we are not really coming to grips with the problem, and that we need to be more positive in our actions. Therefore, I seek the Minister's comments on this matter.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Not long after the Liberal Party came to office, I called for a report from the Health Commission on this problem in response to representations from several members of Parliament. As the honourable member has outlined, it is indeed a serious problem with which it is very difficult to come to grips. Recently, I received a report from the Health Commission. It is quite a voluminous report. A great deal of work has been done, and officers have combed the Statutes of other Parliaments. They have also studied the administrative actions of Governments in other parts of the world, notably in Canada and the United States. So, we have before us a series of options which have been adopted by health authorities in various parts of the world.

I have referred that report to the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee. Also, I have sent a copy to the National Standing Control Committee on Drugs of Dependence. I have asked both those committees for their views. There is obviously more than one way of tackling this problem, but one of the greatest difficulties we face is that, if publicity is provided, with a view to educating the community about the dangers, such publicity invariably results in an upturn in the abuse of solvents. Accordingly, one is faced with a conflict which must be resolved. For example, if the community were willing to accept that aerosols are potentially dangerous and should not be used because of the risk of abuse, it would be possible to remove from the market place a substance which is causing harm because of its abuse. However, in order for that to happen there would have to be very wide community acceptance based on the realisation of the dangers posed by aerosols and solvents. For that to happen, there must be an enormous amount of publicity and education.

I think that honourable members will see the difficulties we face. It has been demonstrated in certain States in the United States that a combination of legislative and Administrative action, which limits the sale of solvents, which provides controls over marketing and sale, and which in some cases prohibits some substances, has worked. Again, it may be possible to prohibit one substance and then to find, for example, that young people turn to petrol sniffing, and, of course, it is virtually impossible to provide a legislative or administrative solution for that. I hope that, when the national committee and the State Food and Drugs Advisory Committee have provided me with their views, I may be able to bring to the

Government in the first instance a series of proposals which can be considered for introduction into South Australia.

FAMILY IMPACT STATEMENTS

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Premier say whether the Government will, in the interests of open government and in recognition of the importance of the family in our community, release, as requested, the conclusions and recommendations of family impact statements on proposed Government initiatives and legislation?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am prepared to consider the question that has been put forward.

HILLS FACE ZONE

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Minister of Planning indicate what the situation is with regard to the report of the inquiry into the boundary of the hills face zone? Has the report been completed and, if so, has the Government given any consideration to decisions which may be taken as a result of the report?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I had the opportunity the week before last to meet with the members of the Planning Appeal Board, and I took the opportunity to speak with the Chairman of the P.A.B., Judge Roder, who is Chairman of the hills face zone inquiry. I asked him when we would be likely to see the report, because I am aware, as is the member for Newland, that it is some time since the inquiry was commissioned. In fact, it was in January 1979 when the former Government asked for an inquiry to be carried out. Judge Roder has assured me that the report is completed and that it is now in the process of being prepared for presentation. I am expecting to receive the report within the next few weeks. I understand that the delay has been caused because of the ill health of Judge Roder's assistant, but Judge Roder indicated that he is as anxious as I am for the report to be brought down as quickly as possible.

At 3.9 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 5 August. Page 70.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): So far we have had contributions to this debate from the mover and seconder from the Government side. In his contribution, the member for Newland spent considerable time analysing the future of nuclear energy and the role of the nuclear industry, and what would happen in relation to it in this State. There were a lot of interesting and constructive comments made in the course of his contribution. I will not deal with it at length, because that will be done more adequately by later speakers on our side. I want to put on record, firmly and clearly, that we are not and never have been opposed to the development of Roxby Downs, whatever might be said. An examination of the *Hansard* record will make the position clear. The allegations made by the member for Eyre, and repeated by the member for Newland, were in response to an interjection made by me. This was totally misrepresented

and was immediately clarified on that day.

We are opposed to the development of uranium in the present situation until it is safe to do so. We have expounded that policy clearly and constructively for a long time, and we will continue to do so. We are not opposed to that development, and what is happening at Roxby Downs at present is as a result of approvals given directly by the Government of which I was a member last year. The \$50 000 000 exploration expansion programme at Roxby Downs for which the present Government is taking credit was an initiative taken by our Government, so we are on the record as supporting the development and investigation of that great resource in South Australia. We are clearly and firmly opposed to the nuclear industry and uranium mining in the present situation. Let that be clear, and that is on the record.

Let me turn to the contribution of the member for Mawson. Unfortunately, I am unable to find any complimentary remarks about what he had to say. He sits in this House purporting to represent a marginal electorate which, by its very definition, is evenly balanced with voters from both sides, many sitting in the middle trying to analyse the arguments from each side of politics and to assess them before making their vote. If he has to promote himself as their member by some of the absolute rubbish he talked, reading from *Freedom, Lifeline*, and other outrageous extremist right-wing publications, spending the rest of his time castigating and analysing the internal affairs of the A.L.P., he has a big think coming if he reckons he can retain his seat at the next election. That is not the way in which a member in his position, representing an electorate evenly divided between our supporters and his, should carry on in this place. He should be ashamed of himself.

In his speech, he referred to the Governor's Speech, and to what he described as the significant announcements and the response of various companies to the policies of the Tonkin Government. That will be the topic of my remarks here today. In response to the sort of puffery, boasting, and grandstanding that has been going on by the members of the Government, particularly the Premier, I will analyse the very projects which the Premier raised and which he claimed were a testimony of the success of his Government's development policies. His Excellency himself, in his Speech, referred to "significant announcements" which had been made by a number of companies, which he then listed. Significant announcements indeed; we have had many significant announcements. We have even had historic announcements from the Deputy Premier which had to be retracted the following day!

An analysis of those significant announcements should be made in this House to indicate the dishonest style of this Government. It has been working through its theme that, before the Tonkin Government came to office in September 1979, South Australia was in a state of stagnation, that there was no industrial, manufacturing or mining development of any sort, and that from the magic date of 15 September 1979 the doors were opened wide and all sorts of projects and developments came rushing through. That is patently false, and I intend to demonstrate in detail how untrue it is.

We have now seen almost 11 months of this Government, and we are now beginning a Parliamentary session in which the Government will bring in a Budget that can be said to be entirely its own. That Budget, when it is brought into the House, will form the cornerstone of its policies for maintaining South Australia's economic growth and development.

It is appropriate, then, that we now consider the progress which the economy has made under 11 months of

the Liberal Government—time enough to make a firm assessment of how successful its policies have been and will be in the future. The key to economic activity is people in jobs, people with pay packets and purchasing power to generate demand and growth throughout all industries. But after 11 months of this Government the downward trend in unemployment, so clearly evident during the last months of Labor's term of office, has not only been reversed but has been pushed upwards to record levels. I shall deal with this situation before turning to specific examples of development which the Premier has quoted.

According to the latest figures available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics, unemployment in South Australia during June 1980 was 4 000 higher than the figure for the same month last year, a rise of over 8 per cent. More than 48 000 persons in our community are unemployed, and of these 9 700, nearly 10 000, are young persons aged 15 to 19 years—record levels, unprecedented in this State since the Great Depression.

At the same time as unemployment has been rising sharply, the actual number of persons in the South Australian private sector work force has been falling. The proud boast of the Tonkin Government has been that it is getting out of the way of business and in so doing increasing private sector activity and employment. From September 1979, when the Government came to office, to April 1980 the private sector work force declined by 1 000. In the previous year (and I am referring to a comparable period to eliminate seasonal characteristics), it rose by 4 000. Under Labor the private sector work force rose by 4 000; under Liberal it declined by 1 000 in the same period. This is the record of the Tonkin Liberal Government after 11 months—rising unemployment to record levels and declining job opportunities.

The Government is already trying to back away from its major election promises. Yesterday we heard a Ministerial statement from the Premier ostensibly to correct a misquotation. Its real purpose was to create the fiction that 7 000 new jobs were never really promised last September, that it was some sort of conditional promise to the people of South Australia.

The attempt to back away from the promise of 7 000 jobs, later up to 10 000, has been going on for some weeks now. It is a pretty shabby attempt. The Premier suggested yesterday that he did not really say that there would be 7 000 new jobs, but that he had said that, if particular firms increased employment by one under the impact of pay-roll tax incentives, the total would be 7 000. That was said at one part of his policy speech, but he repeated the magic figure of 7 000 jobs again and again throughout it.

What did the Liberals say in their election advertising? On 4 September, in a half page in the *Advertiser*, authorised by D. Willett for the Liberal Party, under a large headline "Liberal Policies", at the top of the list was "7 000 new jobs, new incentives and tax cuts". There is nothing equivocal about that, and no suggestion that this was conditional on private sector companies doing this or that; it was a clear unequivocal statement—7 000 new jobs.

A full page advertisement in the *News* of 30 August, again authorised for the Liberal Party, states, "New jobs through tax cuts: up to 7 000 new jobs created". That is a clear and unequivocal message to the people of South Australia. The Premier cannot back away from those promises made without qualification. They were restated and the number of jobs promised increased to 10 000 during that celebrated television performance in December last year when the Premier told us that he had unmistakable proof that his policies were working.

During the 11 months of this Government we have become familiar with the extravagant rhetoric and empty boasts that typify the Premier and his Ministers. In April this year, at the London Chamber of Commerce, the Premier claimed that, following his election to office, "manufacturing and construction industries are beginning to chart ascending curves", while back in South Australia the Australian Bureau of Statistics released figures which showed that from September 1979 to April 1980 employment in the building and construction sector had fallen by 1 100, and over the same period employment in manufacturing had declined by 1 800.

There had been increases in some sectors, but not the ones the Premier mentioned. For example, employment in the insurance and finance sector was up by 300, and entertainment and recreation showed an increase of over 900, but where were the ascending curves for manufacturing and construction industries? Where was reference to the net loss of jobs in the private sector? Recently, this boasting has reached new heights. It seems that the pressure of a deteriorating employment situation, and employment incentive schemes that simply are not working as the Government expected, are taking their toll on the Premier.

The House will recall that, in June, when faced with evidence that unemployment had broken all post-war records, the Premier talked airily of using a "magic wand", if only one were available. Last week, on the first day of this new session, I asked the Premier whether he was satisfied that the pay-roll tax incentive programme was having any significant effect, particularly as the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures showed that youth unemployment had reached a record 27.6 per cent of the work force. In reply, he pointed out that exemptions were being claimed under the scheme for 1 700 positions. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has told me, by way of a letter dated 16 July, that the figure was just over 1 500 as at April 1980, which represented a slight fall from the March level of 1 628. However, I am happy to accept that the Minister has given the Premier fresh information and that the downward trend in claims has been reversed.

But not even the Premier was prepared to claim that the figure of 1 700 represented new jobs, as his famous election promise contemplated. Even he had to add that many of those young people would have been employed in any case. He referred to a suggestion in recent studies that this was the case, and I am sure that the House would be interested to see those studies. If the Premier is so confident of his scheme, he should table them, and I call on him to do so. He should also look at the figures his Minister has supplied, as I suggest that employers in seasonal industries might be taking short-term advantage of the scheme, one of the loopholes to which we referred specifically when the scheme was announced and formulated last year.

But the Premier was not content to stop at that point. He went on to give the House a list of 24 companies, including the catch-all project of Roxby Downs, which, he said, had recently announced investment plans or increased employment. Now, we can all indulge in the game of producing long lists with impressive figures. Indeed, I could give the House a similar list of companies that have closed their operations, gone to the wall, or left the State since the Liberal Government came to office. The point is that this list, which indicates investment of about \$245 000 000 and the possibility of about 1 900 jobs, has to be set against the actual decline in the work force of 1 000 from September 1979 to April 1980. But the hollowness of the Premier's boastful rendition of this list of investment projects becomes very apparent when one

looks closely at the individual companies mentioned.

When the Premier gave us this list last Thursday, he made the claim that "all of these projects are job creating and are initiatives taken by the business community since last year." That is typical of the rhetoric with which he surrounds such statements: it has all happened since he came to office. But what is the reality? Let us look closely at that list, these projects which have all been started as a result of the election, and one by one I will deal with most of them. Leading off was Australian Bacon Ltd., which is becoming something of a hardy perennial for this Government. The Premier first used this example in his speech to the Melbourne Chamber of Commerce in early December last year. He claimed then that the company's decision to move its headquarters to Adelaide was a tangible indication of new confidence in his Government. But he obviously had not read the company's annual report dated 31 July 1979 (some weeks before the election); otherwise, he would have seen the following statement:

Group administration has been established and our executive structure has been developed in Adelaide.

Had the Premier taken the trouble to check, he would also have seen that the Hon. Brian Chatterton, when Minister of Agriculture, had opened the company's Mount Barker factory. So much for the claim that Australian Bacon's relocation in Adelaide was something to do with his Government.

Regarding John Shearer, mention is made of its plans to relocate its Queensland operations in South Australia; that is very commendable and welcome, but we are expected to believe that this decision was made suddenly, and in isolation, as a result of the change of Government. Let us look at the factual background. The *Adelaide News*, in December last year, reported that John Shearer had exported almost \$1 000 000 worth of equipment to Iraq in the past 12 months—a major market opened up during the period in which Labor was in power. The first demonstration of Shearer's equipment in Iraq was made in 1976, and the first sales came in July 1978. Even the Premier, in one of his more honest moments, recognised that both Brian Chatterton and Tom Casey, as former Ministers of Agriculture, had played a major part in later negotiations with the Iraqi Government for the sale of additional agricultural machinery. This market, coupled with the good seasons that had been enjoyed in the past three years in South Australia, meant that that firm was expanding its activity and employment. The Premier ignores all that, and claims that it has something to do with the change of Government in South Australia.

What about his claims concerning I.C.I.? An announcement was made by that company, on 31 March, that it would invest \$10 000 000 in new salt works north of the city. This investment (the article pointed out) would involve the creation of a number of short-term construction jobs, although operational jobs at the salt fields would be few. It is interesting that, in quoting that in his list of 24, the Premier did not mention the short-term nature of the employment for the project. He is very critical indeed of what he calls temporary or short-term jobs, when he attacks job-creation schemes and says that all he is interested in is permanent employment, yet he is happy to claim even short-term jobs in this context. But again (and this is perhaps a more important point), the Premier believes that this investment was suddenly generated merely as a response to his Government's presence in office. That is absolute nonsense.

The former Government, and particularly the former Deputy Premier (Hugh Hudson), was informed of I.C.I.'s plans for development in the 1980's. We knew that

throughout the next decade there was the possibility of very large capital investment being made by that firm. We also appreciated that this investment depended on how its markets developed and how it chose to expand its plant at Port Wilson, on the East Coast, but we did not rush in and make embarrassing boasts about it. We knew of these schemes, and the details which had already been formulated by the company, yet the Premier chose to reannounce them in the House as his own projects. He is on record as saying that he sincerely believes that there was no industrial expansion whatsoever in the years prior to the last election. That is a pretty absolute statement. I will quote his exact words, in answer to a question of 12 June, when he said:

The whole point is that we have not had in this State up until last December one worthwhile announcement of industrial expansion literally for years.

Let us see what I.C.I. has to say. In the context of that 31 March announcement, the company said:

The expansion was to meet demand for the company's products and followed a \$12 000 000 expansion of the Osborne factory and Dry Creek fields in 1978 which had increased soda-ash output by 20 per cent.

So much for the Premier's rather pathetic view of what was happening in South Australia. In relation to that company alone, a major expansion and development had taken place, which he chose to ignore or treat as though it had not happened.

Let us go a step further on this. In 1976, 1977 and 1979, the former Department of Economic Development published a digest of developmental projects in the State, simply entitled "Development". If we look through the publication for 1979, we see some very familiar names—companies that were mentioned by the Premier on Thursday when he announced large investment plans for the future. We also see that the department's annual survey of manufacturing industry was used to provide details of developments in that sector. The response from over 1 000 companies showed expenditure on capital development in 1977-78, during the period of the Dunstan Government, totalling \$154 000 000, and planned expenditure for 1978-79 of \$147 000 000. This was in manufacturing alone, yet the Premier said that not one worthwhile announcement, no industrial expansion, took place during our term of office.

Let us get back to his list—the list of 24. He refers to General Motors-Holden's and the \$8 000 000 plastics factory that it will develop at Elizabeth. The Premier refers to that constantly. However, he does not mention the possible effects that this may have on employment at Uniroyal. He did not mention that in 1977-78 G.M.H. spent \$32 200 000 at its Elizabeth and Woodville plants and that in 1978-79 it allocated a further \$29 000 000. What has happened to those subjects and that development? The Premier's response to the question today about the future of Uniroyal, which is somewhat clouded and extremely disturbing so far as South Australia is concerned, indicates that not only was he not up to date with what was happening but that he is totally confused about the role that that major company has played in terms of the vehicle components industry.

The facts are that, if the company is taken over by a rival in the tyre-making business, there is every likelihood that its tyre-making capacity in South Australia will be closed. The facts are also that the G.M.H. expansion, involving the expenditure of \$8 000 000 and the creation of some 50 jobs, could well mean the closure of Uniroyal's plastics components division on which it was staking much for its development, as stated in the Chairman's letter that was quoted at Question Time today. The Premier would do

well to study the situation closely.

I now refer to another firm—Sapfor. We are very pleased to hear that Sapfor is spending \$2 000 000 on expanding its timber milling operations. We are also pleased to know (the Premier did not mention this) that this follows the expenditure of \$1 000 000 in 1977-78 and \$830 000 in 1978-79 on the construction of a new sawmill at Tarpeena—in other words, an ongoing expansion programme, of which this expansion is simply a third stage. All credit for this has been claimed by the Premier and his Government.

The next company mentioned is Dairyvale Metropolitan Co-operative, which will expand its cheese factory. This \$1 300 000 expansion follows the expenditure of \$1 400 000 over the past two years for cold rooms, laboratories, and storage and packaging equipment at its Clarence Gardens premises—an example of an ongoing development by a company, one year of which was plucked out by the Premier, who took all the credit for it. That is absolute nonsense. The plan was conceived and planned during the period of the previous Administration.

I now refer to the company Rubery Owen; it will expand into a new casting facility requiring an expenditure of \$1 500 000, the Premier announced last Thursday. This new facility will put Rubery Owen into a position to supply components for G.M.H.'s new world car. It follows an earlier injection of capital amounting to \$700 000 for equipment and machinery. The Premier announced that expansion as a direct result of his election victory. All of the projects in his list, he said, were the result of decisions taken by the business community since last year.

We have only to go as far as the financial pages of the *Adelaide News* for 30 August 1979, two weeks before the election, to see how ridiculous that claim is. The large headline reads "Auto firm plans big expansion". The story goes on to detail investment plans by Uniroyal and Rubery Owen. The report cites Mr. Andrew Gwinnett, the Managing Director of Rubery Owen, who stated:

... the company would spend \$2 000 000 over the next two years in the diecasting, stamping and toolmaking areas. This would provide for a 60 per cent increase in group turnover from \$22 000 000 to \$35 000 000 by 1981.

R.O.H. is a major supplier of parts to the Australian motor industry and employs 400 people in its South Australian manufacturing plants. Mr. Gwinnett said the U.K. parent company had great faith in the workforce and operations in this State and had agreed in principle with proposals to spend most of the money in South Australia.

Let us pause at that statement. Last Thursday, the Premier claimed that this project was the result of the new confidence of the business community as a result of his coming to office, in contrast to the stagnation and lack of confidence under Labor, and yet, prior to the previous election, the United Kingdom parent company of this firm, which has expanded, stated that it had great faith in the workforce and operations in this State and agreed with proposals to spend most of its money in South Australia. Clearly, the Premier, as usual, is taking false credit; this demeans him and the position he is trying to occupy.

The vehicle industry is clearly a very important part of South Australia's manufacturing base. We were certainly pleased to hear, in the case of Chrysler Limited (another of the companies cited by the Premier), about the decision of Mitsubishi to inject financial stability into Chrysler. No doubt the Premier was also pleased to be present at Lonsdale when Philip Lynch opened Chrysler's new engine plant in October last year, only a month after the election. This was a major project, which was planned and completed under a Labor Government. Not even the Premier was prepared to claim that the project had

occurred within one month, although he indicated in September that the Colonnades Shopping Centre had been constructed in three weeks. The Premier would do well to look at the *Advertiser* report of the opening. It cited a Chrysler spokesman, who stated:

Almost all engine components, including the block, are now made at Lonsdale following a 2½-year expansion programme costing \$17 500 000.

The Premier said that there was no expansion and no worthwhile activity under Labor. I hope his dishonesty is becoming more patent as I go through each fraudulent example of the impact of his Government.

Let us now consider Simpson Pope. The Opposition is always pleased to see a long-standing South Australian company such as Simpson Pope expand and cement its base in this State. We were glad to read the recent announcements concerning that company's dishwasher manufacturing operations, of which much was made and credit for which was taken by the Premier. We were equally pleased (and this is the important point) to read in the company's annual report for the year ended June 1979 a comment made by the company's Chairman, as follows:

Expenditure on new equipment amounted to almost \$8 000 000 during the year ended 30 June 1979. This followed an amount of just over \$5 000 000 in the previous year.

Further substantial expenditure is planned for 1979-80 as part of a continuing programme.

Again, the Premier has extracted from that continuing programme a period in which he has occupied office, and has taken total credit for that expenditure. Companies like Simpson Pope, with responsibilities to employees and shareholders, do not make investment decisions involving \$6 000 000 overnight, and I imagine that there is a great deal of scepticism and laughter in the boardrooms of Adelaide because of the Premier's boastful claims.

The annual report from which I have just quoted indicates the environment in which Simpsons were making those decisions—a period, we are told, of total economic stagnation in South Australia. In 1978-79, its turnover increased by 27 per cent to \$104 700 000. Profit after tax rose by 35 per cent to \$3 000 000. As the Chairman commented, "The 27 per cent increase in sales represents real growth." These figures were for the year ended 30 June 1979, a time during which the Premier would have us believe there was no hope for our manufacturing base. Simpson Pope's answer is in its company's annual report—a record profit and real growth.

Fasson Limited, mentioned by the Premier, plans a \$4 000 000 expansion. When the original announcement was made in July, the Deputy Premier described this as a valuable boost to the South Australian economy. We certainly agree. However, how are companies like Fasson in a position to embark on these developments? As long ago as 1974, the Labor Government, through the South Australian Housing Trust and the various incentives it applied, provided factory space for Fasson's operations to develop at Elizabeth East. We got the company here successfully in South Australia, and it is expanding its base.

Seeley Brothers is quoted often by the Premier, and he did it again last Thursday. It has recently obtained a large export order for air-conditioners. The Opposition certainly congratulates it, and we take pride in the fact that when we were in Government we had the foresight to recognise that firm's potential and make financial assistance available to it to establish and expand. That was in 1974. It is now paying off, but no reference is made to that, no reference to the start that was provided for that company to develop its operations. That is ignored, as the Premier claims everything happening relates to his

Government and his policies. It is really quite laughable.

The next company mentioned was Safcol, and the Premier talks of the fish-finger factory that has been opened at Millicent. That factory is a result of assistance under Labor's establishment payments scheme in the first half of 1979—before the election. It would not have got off the ground but for that scheme and the incentives it offered, yet it is on the list of the Premier's initiatives taken this year since his Government came into office.

Some of the other claims made by the Premier are no less interesting, and I have not got to the end of his list yet. For example, he referred to the plans of Omark Limited to spend \$2 000 000 to press steel sleepers with the consequent creation of 30 to 40 jobs in Whyalla. Again, the Opposition welcomes this announcement. In fact, it is part of a larger contract which was won by B.H.P. in June 1980 and which is valued at \$13 600 000.

B.H.P. Whyalla is Australia's only producer of steel sleepers. This gives South Australia a considerable edge, as steel sleepers have a number of advantages over the concrete variety, including weight, track-laying simplicity and the ability to absorb load shocks. They also have a 40-year life—not a bad product in which to have cornered the market. According to a report in the *Advertiser*, B.H.P. would roll the steel and the pressing would be done by a company which at that stage (June 1980) was yet to be established. That company is Omark, which has since been established.

What enabled South Australia to be in this very advantageous situation of having the only manufacturer of this product in Australia? The Premier would say that it was the election of his Government in September 1979—that that is the reason, because without it this would not have happened. Let me refer the Premier to August 1978 for the real answer. A headline in the *Advertiser* then read "B.H.P. gets State aid". The story continued:

The State Government has approved a pay-roll tax rebate and relocation expenses to B.H.P., which recently transferred its railway line and sleeper plant from Newcastle to Whyalla . . .

The report continues:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said that during the past year equipment had been installed in the Whyalla rolling mills for making heavy and light duty railway line. B.H.P. expected an expansion in the demand for steel sleepers and sleeper plates as their use in railway construction became more popular. "B.H.P.'s consolidation of its railway line operations in Whyalla offers a sound basis for expanded employment in future years," Mr. Dunstan said.

At that stage (August 1978), the South Australian Government's total grant to B.H.P. under the decentralisation incentive scheme amounted to almost \$600 000. What is happening today in Whyalla which the Premier is proudly claiming as his own was something done under the Government of Dunstan and Corcoran in the period dating from 1978. The Premier has absolutely no right to claim any credit, personally or on behalf of his Government, for a development which was planned, conceived and executed with the assistance of the Labor Government and its incentive schemes.

The Premier has tried to have us believe that his is the only Government to have made use of pay-roll tax initiatives to encourage industrial expansion. I have just cited a direct example of the case of one of Australia's biggest companies, where a major economic advantage and activity has been gained as a result of a particular pay-roll tax incentive scheme conceived by a Labor Government.

In the Premier's list, Punalur Paper Mills of India was mentioned. It was stated that that company is going to

spend over the next few years almost \$50 000 000 on the development of a wood chip and wood pulp industry in the South-East. It is expected that this investment will yield up to 500 jobs, which you might note is a much better capital investment to employment ratio than most of the Eldorados in the North which the Deputy Premier promises us. The amount of capital spent per job these days is high and getting higher; sometimes as much as \$1 000 000 is spent for one job. Here is a case in this wood chip operation where that ratio is very much lower indeed. Many jobs will result from the Punalur development. The Premier boasts about this development, but he cannot deny that immediately after the election he and his Minister of Agriculture tried very hard to cancel that entire project. The original contract to supply wood chips to this Indian company was negotiated and signed by Brian Chatterton on behalf of the former Government in March 1979. At that time there was an exchange of letters setting out that Punalur would carry out a feasibility study of converting wood chips to pulp in Australia. Punalur then decided to move more quickly, mainly because rising freight rates made it far more economic to move pulp than chips, as wood pulp is 40 per cent by volume smaller than wood chips. So, the pulping proposition became much more attractive.

It was a very good deal for South Australia: Punalur had agreed to buy the wood chips at the cost of production. At this stage, this was higher than the world price and, in a market which shows marked variations, to be guaranteed the cost of production was quite a coup. This meant nothing to the new Tonkin Government, which, I think, believed that it was dealing with some tin-pot hangover from the Raj, and that a company based in India could not be treated seriously. In a display of incompetence and indifference which bordered on racism, it tried to cancel the contract on the grounds that the world price for wood chip had, by the end of 1979, risen appreciably. This short-sighted action would have denied South Australia the important wood pulp plant and the jobs that it would bring. It would also close that area of boasting to the Premier. It would have put us at the mercy of world dealers who buy on spot markets and shift their custom as prices change.

Fortunately for South Australia, Punalur is one of the biggest industrial companies in India. It insisted and had the weight of legal and other advice to maintain that contract.

Mr. Lewis: I hope it gets on with the job.

Mr. BANNON: I suspect that now the Premier has gained an understanding of just how important that deal is to our forestry industry. I agree completely with the member for Mallee: we hope it gets on with the job, because it is a very important project. Members opposite may not realise, but I hope the member for Mallee does, that the material to be chipped, then pulped, is in fact the trimmings of the forest which would otherwise be left where they fell. They may also not realise that at the moment the process of thinning out the forests is an expensive one. This deal converts a loss into a healthy profit, and that is what this Premier, with all his talk of waste and mismanagement, nearly put at risk. Now, thankfully, the project will go ahead and the Premier can boast about it, but he should also add that the Government did not assist by making land available for easy sale for the new facility. It can be done for Shearers and for Simpsons but not for Punalur. An area of 75 hectares was needed from the Government's holding of 75 000 hectares, but it could not be found. But there is even more stupidity involved in this. This Government is actively trying to sell off South Australia's 60 per cent

stake in Punwood, the joint Indian-South Australian company established to set up the operation. It tried to sell it to Punalar, but looks like running foul of the Overseas Investment Review Board, which insists there must be Australian equity in the project. So, negotiations are now apparently being conducted with H. C. Sleigh.

This is really a case of the State's natural resources, and of a State with an important stake in a profitable venture simply selling it off to the oil companies. There is absolutely no justification for that. On the contrary, for a Government that is talking about waste, extravagance and Government expenditure to have a profitable co-operative venture of this sort on its hands and simply to sell it off is quite scandalous and contemptuous of the public estate in South Australia.

The Government boasts that it is a development project undertaken by the business community since last year. Even the Premier would not have had that one on his list. I have said before that the Premier is on record as saying that there was no development prior to his election to office. On the same day, when attempting to answer a question on the level of unemployment, he also said (and I quote *Hansard*), "In the time of the former Government there were no lead times; there was no investment; there was no development; and indeed there was no hope." What a scandalous assertion to make, in the light of the facts of that period of office. That is not what the Chairman of Simpson Pope said in his company's report of 1978-79. That was not the view of Rubery Owen's United Kingdom parent company, which was commenting on the Corcoran Government, which was in office at that time. His statement is pathetically untrue, and that certainly does not need elaboration.

The only glimmer of truth we have from that statement made last Thursday is that there are indeed lead times for development projects which have to be worked through into economic activity. But the Premier cannot have it both ways. In trying to claim that the unemployment situation is nothing to do with him or his Government, he talks about lead times, but in talking about industrial development in the State he takes credit for projects which have needed every month of those lead times, lead times which lead back to the time when the Labor Party was in power, when the projects were conceived and developed. Now what is it to be? Is he to admit fairly, squarely and frankly that at the moment he is inheriting industrial development spawned and fostered by a Labor Administration, or is he going to say that lead times are necessary in order to reduce unemployment? He cannot have it both ways.

The Premier and his Party are very fond of bending facts to suit their own position. We all remember the advertisements during the election campaign which claimed that South Australia was receiving only 2 per cent of total investment in Australia. To arrive at that figure the Liberal Party had to ignore the massive investment of the Electricity Trust in the Northern Power Station. It also had to ignore the investment planned for Redcliff; it simply chopped that off its list. Neither of those projects existed in arriving at its figure by which it hoped to demonstrate that South Australia was not involved in any investment activity in Australian firms.

The Northern Power Station might not have existed for the Liberal Party in September 1979, though details of its construction were in black and white in the ETSA Annual Report in 1979. They are also in *Development 79* (the book to which I have already referred), with an investment listed at \$250 000 000. Before the election this did not exist, but since the election it has been rediscovered. The Premier has not only rediscovered it but it goes

immediately on to his list of industrial developments and activities that have taken place since his Government came to office. The Deputy Premier has also discovered this project. For instance, on 15 January this year he announced the contract to Transfield. The report in the *News* included the following reference to the Deputy Premier:

Mr. Goldsworthy said he recently had inspected work on the site of the new northern power station and he was impressed with ETSA's plans for this vital project and the progress that had been made.

The project was not mentioned during the Liberal's campaign for the September election.

In the face of this sort of deceit, is it any wonder that Opposition members object when the Premier boasts, as he did on Thursday, that Transfield had won a \$7 000 000 contract for the supply and fabrication of structural steel for the new Northern Power Station. We welcome the employment that this project will bring to Whyalla, but we have nothing but contempt for the Premier's political acrobatics over the Northern Power Station's contribution to investment in this State, both private and public sector. The hollowness of his boasting and the clear lack of truth in what he had to say does the Premier no credit. The use by him of that list with its figures on investment and employment, and the manner in which he claimed all credit for development projects begun under the former Government only serve to demonstrate how little his Government has to offer. I think that is the real crux and the point on which I will conclude.

The facts are that in the 11 months of office, while employment in this State has declined, while the Government's pay-roll tax incentive scheme and other measures have patently not worked, the Premier has strutted around this State, interstate, and overseas continuing to denigrate the basic development and progress of this State in industrial and economic terms under the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations, and continuing to claim all credit for what has happened under him, credit which, when we look at chapter and verse, we find does not belong to him at all in one jot or one iota. It is not just the question of lead times; it is a question of analysis of those projects—when they were announced, when they were planned and when they were developed.

Not one of those examples can stand up to a Tonkin Government initiative, but he struts around the State opening buildings that were conceived and constructed by a Labor Government; opening roadworks; talking about development plans; going to factories; and all he is doing is simply cashing in on a period of economic development which was initiated and continued by the previous Government. The time has come for him to be able to point to specific initiatives that he took, to specific changes that have come about as the result of his Government's activities. He is fast running out in relation to the lead times which he refuses to allow in relation to the Labor Administration but which he is claiming in relation to himself.

He has made many grand claims at the various openings he has attended. He has made many assertions about South Australia's being open for business again and the climate that was created under the previous Government having been dissipated. The facts do not bear this out. Businessmen in this State and workers in their enterprises and factories know, and are becoming used to hearing the truth, which is that, if this Government continues the sort of policies it is presently contemplating in relation to public sector investment and public sector expenditure, and in relation to the giving away of the State's revenue and the jeopardy in which it is placing us in terms of

Commonwealth-State taxation agreements, South Australia will be in a very parlous situation indeed.

There is one thing on which we agree wholeheartedly with the Premier; we need to have confidence in this State and in its development. Where we disagree totally is in the Premier's refusal to recognise the basic strengths of this State, which were present and developing under the former Government; his attempt to discredit everything that was done then; and his refusal to stare the harsh economic facts of life in the face. The first statement he should be making to this House on economic matters is his appreciation of the gravity of the situation, and of the problems we have in the economy, and he should outline what he will do about it. Instead we have vague and idle boasting and credit taking for things that were not done by him or his Administration.

He has lived off the former Labor Government too long. That time is drawing to a close; he is on his own. He had better stop his boasting, his strutting, and get down to business. We want to hear from him what he is doing; what his Government is proposing; and what new initiatives and developments will be created. It is about time they appeared. His reading out of lists of former Labor Government projects, as he has been doing to date, is simply not good enough. We throw out the challenge to him to get on with his job, stop kicking what happened before, start boosting real confidence in the State by recognising that we were on sound footing, and ensure that he does not destroy the healthy development that was under way.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): I am happy to stand in this House and say that I support the draft address which is to go to His Excellency the Governor, in accordance with the motion moved so ably yesterday by the member for Newland. In particular, I support the third paragraph in the draft address, which states:

We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

I am proud to say that I support that sentiment quite clearly and unequivocally before the people of South Australia. I believe that Divine blessing will be on this House as we discuss and debate its proceedings. I say that because I believe that, in this day and age, there is some question about the Christian traditions on which our community and our society have been so ably built. I shall be interested to listen, later in this debate, to the comments of the member for Elizabeth, and to see whether he will again oppose the motion to adopt the Address in Reply or whether he will support it. If he supports it, I shall be interested to hear how he gets on with the third paragraph and whether he will align himself with our Christian traditions. Last time, he chose to reject the motion to adopt the draft address, but when the time came for the vote he did not call for a division and vote against it. I cannot recall whether he accompanied us to present the Address to His Excellency. I shall view his future actions with some interest, to see whether he will be one of those members who will present the Address to His Excellency.

Mr. Slater: Who are you talking about?

Mr. RANDALL: The member for Elizabeth. The impressive part of the opening of Parliament is the tradition associated with it. As a more junior member of the Parliament, I am proud to uphold the traditions we have, and I look forward to their being maintained as we proceed. It was with interest that I viewed the restoration of some of those traditions when the Speaker first donned his wig in this House; again, that is a return of some of the traditions which perhaps have been too quickly thrown out in the past. It is good to keep some of them, and I note

with interest the comments of members opposite in their boasting of their connection with the Constitutional Museum. On the one hand, they are saying that we need to maintain our traditions and our history; on the other hand, they are saying that it is time to review these traditions and it is time for some of them to go. Their efforts of the past few years demonstrate that. Not all members opposite, I am sure, want to do away with our traditions. It is perhaps only some of those who may have bent a little to the left who have that aim.

I shall highlight several of the points of His Excellency's Speech. I look forward to taking part in the debate on the legislation to be introduced to grant the Pitjantjatjara people inalienable freehold title to land in the Far North-West, as agreed by negotiation between the Government and the Pitjantjatjara people. The legislation will include conditions for access, exploration and mining and provision for arbitration of disputes. Paragraph 13 of the Speech states, in part:

My Government will continue to pursue its programme of expanding community health services. A greater proportion of the total Health Commission budget will be allocated to health promotion and preventive medicine in the present financial year.

There is reference then to child and family health services. Here again is the beginning of a turn-around in our health policy and in the outlook of our community. The outlook has gained momentum in past years, and it needs the support of all Parliamentary members when we consider the cost of community health. I share the concern of other members at the escalating costs of community health. I am sure that a spin-off from our approach in educating and encouraging people to take up fitness exercises and courses and in providing excellent facilities by way of recreation areas and halls, encouraging the community at large to exercise their body, will be a reduction in the health budget in future. Paragraph 15 states:

My Government will introduce substantial amendments to the Planning and Development Act which will streamline decision-making processes and provide a flexible, uniform and simple method of regulating development in both urban and rural areas. Local government will have greater responsibility for regulating planning at the local level. An environmental impact assessment system will be incorporated in the revised Act.

I look forward to supporting that legislation. Having come from local government, I have experienced the problems that occur in the planning and development of local government areas. In some cases there is over-regulation, which acts as a deterrent rather than a help to future investors. Paragraph 17 states, in part:

My Government will introduce legislation to establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission in South Australia in accordance with its election commitments. The commission will have an important role in enriching the life of the community by fostering and encouraging ethnic culture.

That is a clear indication to the community that we, as a Government, believe that there is a need for such a commission to maintain and encourage ethnic culture. Paragraph 18 states, in part:

My Government continues to place emphasis on the development of multi-purpose recreation centres throughout metropolitan Adelaide and in major country towns.

That is a step in the right direction, and one we need to acknowledge and recognise as a much needed area for investment. Looking at paragraph 25, with its list of amendments to be brought into this place, I note that there are to be amendments to the Land and Business Agents Act, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, the Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, and other legislation,

much of which has a bearing on my earlier involvement in my electorate, and I look forward to viewing the legislation and participating in the debate as a result of my experience of complaints from constituents.

I turn now to the speech I made in the debate in this House on 16 October last.

Mr. Slater: Is this an instant replay?

Mr. RANDALL: I want to replay it for a purpose. I learnt a lesson, and perhaps the member for Gilles might learn one, too. Some people believe that I made a mistake, but I should like to quote what I said, as follows:

One of the predominant points made today by members opposite was that the Liberal Party represents only big business. I am proud to stand here as the member for Henley Beach and say that I come from a trade union background. I even have my trade union membership card with me to verify that fact.

And I displayed it. I continued:

I want to demonstrate to the people of South Australia that the Liberal Party represents the whole of the community, and not just one sector of it. The Liberal Party has representatives from the trade union movement right through to big business and the investor. The whole ambit of the community is represented by the Liberal Party's philosophy.

Not three days after I made that statement in the House and displayed my union card, I received a letter from my former union, as follows:

Dear Bob,

The constitution of the A.T.E.A. states—

"Any employee of the Australian Telecommunications Commission, Australian Postal Commission, Australian Broadcasting Control Board and the Postal and Telecommunications Department engaged in electrical work upon payment of the prescribed contribution and dues, shall be entitled to become a member of the Union."

As you have now left the Telecommunications Commission, it would be appreciated if you could forward your resignation and return your membership card. The wording on the card reads—"The above named member remains financial while association subscriptions continue to be deducted from salary".

I accepted the point that I was not employed any more by the Australian Telecommunications Commission, and that perhaps I should do the right thing and turn in my membership of that union.

What really irked me most was that it is not normal procedure for that union to ask for the return of a membership card. I believe that the Opposition obviously got the message that it could not be seen to allow a union member to sit on the Government side who had adopted Liberal policy. So, it swung into action, as a corporate team, and ensured that Mr. Sutton, the Secretary of the A.T.E.A., heard that I had displayed the card in the House, and that I was still a member, and that he had better do something quickly. Consequently, I got the letter three days later.

Mr. Hamilton: Rubbish!

Mr. RANDALL: It is not rubbish; I have given the facts. Mr. Sutton asked for the return of my card, and I believe that it is an unusual practice for the union to adopt that procedure. However, I obliged, and returned my card. I am unhappy to say today that I am no longer a member of that union. If that association were the kind of association that unions should be, it would be apolitical, and would have input into the Liberal and Labor Parties, and would balance the input and information back to its members accordingly. There is a clear indication in the community today that unions are tied tightly to the Australian Labor

Party. The A.T.E.A. is no different because, at the last conference, it elected the Secretary of the South Australian branch of the A.T.E.A. to its executive. Here is a clear indication of where the A.T.E.A. in South Australia stands. It is linked to the A.L.P. by the mere fact that the Secretary is on the executive. The South Australian branch has become nothing more than a political body that is associated with the South Australian branch of the Trades and Labor Council.

Mr. Slater: It's affiliated.

Mr. RANDALL: Yes, and I will tell the honourable member how that affiliation took place. I was a member of the A.T.E.A. when the affiliation debate took place. I am glad that the honourable member has raised the issue because, if he had not done so, I would have done it. The affiliation took place after a technology debate and a wage case had been going on for some weeks. All members were called up to the Dom Polski Centre to vote on whether they believed that the wage offer was satisfactory. We all attended. Pieces of paper were given to us, as is normally the case at such meetings, as we entered the hall, indicating what was on the agenda, together with the union recommendation. There was a little paragraph at the bottom which said (and this was totally divorced from the wage issue and technology debate) that the South Australian branch of the A.T.E.A. should affiliate with the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia. In the atmosphere of that meeting, everyone was glad that the wage case was over and that the technology debate was resolved. Everyone was pleased to support those motions; but they also supported the third motion for affiliation, not realising what they had done. I believe, as I tried to indicate to the union's members, that the South Australian branch of the A.T.E.A. is becoming nothing more than a political tool of the South Australian branch of the A.L.P.

That concerns me, because I believe that unionism in South Australia should play a different role. It should not be politically oriented, but should look after supporters of both political Parties. The A.T.E.A. in South Australia abuses the privilege it has. All unions produce information, but the South Australian branch of the A.T.E.A. produces information that is politically biased. One should study the A.T.E.A. *National News* in which, in the name of the union, it puts out this strong propaganda to the work force. In some cases, if one reads the regular monthly magazine of that union, one realises that 50 per cent of it is political, whereas only the other 50 per cent concerns union affairs. A union magazine should deal 100 per cent with union affairs; it should not contain political issues. Most unions issue magazines to their members (and I do not believe that the South Australian branch of the A.T.E.A. is much different from the former union of the honourable member who is trying to interject; I would be interested to know whether he is still a member), and a fair percentage of the matter included is politically biased.

What concerns me is that, as members of the union are forced to join the union, they do not have the opportunity to have the other side of the story. However, things will change because, as a member of the State Parliament, I will take steps to ensure that the members of the A.T.E.A. whom I know will have the other side of the story from that contained in the publication to which I have referred. I will research the facts, and send to the membership of the union the other side of the story; it is time it had such an opportunity. It will be interesting to see whether that information will be able to be dispersed, as is done with the union magazine.

Another clear indication to me of the tie-up between politics and unionism is to be clearly demonstrated at the

next Federal election. In the area I represent, namely, Henley Beach, the Federal seat of Hindmarsh is to have as its Labor Party candidate Mr. John Scott, who is directly from the union movement. He will represent the hopes of the people of Hindmarsh in the Federal Parliament. I believe that, when the people of Hindmarsh do some homework on his background, they will not support him at the election.

One point that became clear to me was contained in a newspaper report in June 1979; it dealt with the national strike over a Western Australian issue. The United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia decided on its approach. On the day of the strike, it had some support in the community, but not very much. The unions themselves did a witch hunt about it. Mr. Scott said that his organisation told members, "You have no say. The decision is made. You will do as is indicated by the motion, but don't let us allow ourselves to become divided. The effect of a strike was devastating as far as industry was concerned. We have control, where we have unionism."

At the time, I believe that Mr. Scott was the State Secretary of the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, and was on the executive, which had made the decision, and he told the members what would take place—you go out on strike. Some unions work differently and, to the A.T.E.A.'s credit, it works differently: its members tell its delegates what they want to do, not *vice versa*.

Another union in which that works is the Australian Government Workers Association. Mr. Armstrong is quoted as saying that he had been listening to a whole schemozzle in a debate involving people with a predisposition to throwing sticks and stones. He went on to say:

I never knew it was a crime in Australia to be too honest or forward with your membership. My council, my executive, do not direct my members.

That is the crux of the whole issue. Here we have a political candidate at the next election who is straight out of the trade union movement, a person who believes in directing people to do certain things. Therefore, I assume that, if Mr. John Scott is elected and if his Party forms a Government, the people of Hindmarsh will be directed in what to do. They would lose their democratic rights. One wonders, with interest, what sort of person Mr. Scott is.

Mr. Slater: You're really incredible.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Other honourable members will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. RANDALL: I look forward to members opposite having an opportunity to impress the House; if their speeches are similar to those made last session, no doubt they will enter into personal attacks and make personal comments, as several members did last time. They ran along the back bench, along the middle bench, then along the back bench again, and gave us the history of these members. One gentleman decided to use some initiative (which he thought he had) by running along the front bench; he told us about the personalities of members who sit there. I would hope that, during the nine or 10 months since the election, members opposite have prepared different contributions.

However, after listening to the member for Florey the other day, I felt at home again, back in the days of union meetings, because the same thing happened then. If they disagreed with you and wanted to put you down they used innuendo or made a personal attack on you. I believe that the honourable member, who comes from the union movement, is no different; the same thing will probably happen again.

I refer now to an issue that is of concern in my district. Recently, publicity has been in the media about Agent Orange. However, I wish to refer to another gas, which was used in the First World War—tear gas. This gas is still used today as a fumigant in tomato houses in my district. In years gone by, the use and misuse of that gas created problems in my district. The gas is also known by the chemical name of chloropicrin. I looked through the encyclopaedia when doing research on this gas, and I now consider that we, as a Government, should be concerned about its use and should control it more stringently. The gas has been used as a chemical warfare agent, in dye manufacture, and as a pesticide, rodenticide, and soil fumigant. It is mainly used to get rid of nematodes and other insects and bacteria that attack plants. The international encyclopaedia, which was produced in Geneva, states:

Chloropicrin vapours are highly irritant to the eyes, causing intense lacrimation, and to the skin and respiratory tract. Chloropicrin causes nausea, vomiting, colic and diarrhoea if it enters the stomach.

Data on the effects of chloropicrin are derived mainly from First World War experience with chemical warfare agents. It is a pulmonary irritant with a toxicity greater than chlorine but less than phosgene. Military data indicate that exposure to 4 ppm for a few seconds is sufficient to render a man unfit for action and 15 ppm for 60 seconds causes marked bronchial or pulmonary lesions. It causes injury particularly to the small and medium bronchi and oedema is frequently the cause of death. Inhalation may also produce anaemia, weak and irregular heart and recurrent asthmatic attacks.

A concentration of around 1 ppm causes severe lacrimation and provides good warning of exposure; at higher concentrations, skin irritation is evident. Ingestion may occur due to the swallowing of saliva containing dissolved chloropicrin and produce vomiting and diarrhoea.

It further states:

Where possible, chloropicrin should be replaced by a less toxic chemical.

That statement prompted me to investigate other fumigants, about which I will speak later. Under the heading "Treatment" the encyclopaedia stated:

Persons poisoned with chloropicrin should be carried to the fresh air. They should not be allowed to walk, since absolute rest is essential.

One may recall that, some years ago, a severe problem was caused by chloropicrin in the early 1970's. At about 2 a.m., many people were evacuated by ambulance to hospitals. The then member for Henley Beach, Mr. Broomhill, and his Government took action to correct the situation. I believe that that member deserves credit for the action taken, but his Government did not go far enough in regulating and controlling this fumigant. I hope to present a case that will cause the Government to consider the matter more closely.

The five kilogram cans of the chemical are imported from China—this is the only source country. Unfortunately, when the cans enter the country, they arrive in grey containers, and one has difficulty in understanding the directions. The previous Government declared that they should be suitably labelled. I have one of those labels, which was never stuck to a can, as required by the regulations. One of the problems is that the original writing is in Chinese. No-one can understand what is required because the labels are not being used. Stronger policing and stricter controls should be enforced to ensure that the peel-off labels are stuck to the cans so that people are aware of what is, or has been, in the can. After all, as the label states, the substance is a dangerous poison—S.7, one of the most dangerous that we come across. The label

that I have is out of date, because it states:

Before using it is essential that reference be made to Department of Agriculture, South Australia, Bulletin No. 3886 entitled "Methods of Soil Fumigation".

When I rang the Department of Agriculture to obtain a copy of that bulletin, in order to ascertain what recommendations were made, I was told that it was out of print. I was unable to obtain a copy. After some delay and after a letter to the Minister, I acquired a later pamphlet. The new number should be printed on the label.

I am concerned about this because my district is a city district, in which people build houses right up to the market gardens. The problems found in a city may not be found in the wide-open spaces of the country because the gas may be dispersed. Some tomato houses are at the back door of properties, and fumigation takes place in April and May when there are warm, still evenings. Unless good agricultural practices are followed and unless the fumigator and the owner of the land ensure that the soil is sealed, the gas escapes and hangs around in clouds so that nearby residents are severely affected.

It was my unfortunate privilege to be called to one of these homes earlier this year and to sit in this home and see each member of this family indicating to me obvious problems caused by the gas. In other words, their eyes were running, they had sore throats, and the asthmatic children were having difficulty in breathing. I was concerned about this, and I began a survey in the area and found that this happens frequently at this time of the year. Unfortunately, I could not ring the Woodville Council, because it does not have an after-hours telephone number by which to contact it. When I telephoned after hours, all I could speak to was an answering machine. I believe that is a matter of concern, and I intend to write to the Woodville Council about it, because I believe the public should have ready access to it in matters of urgency.

When using fumigants, one should take certain precautions. The sort of precautions one is encouraged to take is expressed in a new pamphlet "Methods of soil fumigation" No. 21/77. This is a replacement for the pamphlet to which I referred earlier, and this number appears on the label. This pamphlet states:

Precautions with glasshouse fumigation:

Growers have a responsibility to prevent the escape of the fumigant gas, particularly where glasshouses are situated within the metropolitan area. During hot weather it may be necessary to water the fumigated area several times a day to provide an adequate seal. Availability of water supply and labour for watering should be considered when determining the number of glasshouses to be fumigated at any one time. Inadequate watering allows uncontrolled escape of the fumigant, resulting in a dangerous public nuisance in built up areas and often failure of the fumigation.

A quite clear warning is given to those who use this gas, but we still have the problems, and one is tempted to ask why. I have already indicated that problems are created because of urban housing development close to the tomato houses. Another problem is created because the glasshouse owners are now beginning to lease their glasshouses out to others who normally have a nine-to-five job. The only time they spend in their glasshouses is at the weekend, and the fumigation takes place during the weekend, as does the watering. However, watering has to be maintained for a period of at least three days. When the lessee goes to work on the Monday morning, the ground is left to dry out, and in many cases the lessee does not come near the glasshouses again until the next weekend.

If a problem does arise, the neighbours do not know who the lessee is, because in many cases the owner refuses to tell them. They cannot contact the local council during

the weekend because all they can talk to is an answering machine. They have great difficulty in contacting the Public Health Department, because it is open only between nine and five during the week. By the time an officer gets down there, even if he has measuring equipment to determine how strong the gas is, it is usually all over, but the problems caused by the gas exposure are still evident and the people are still suffering from the gas.

I believe that the Woodville council has taken a responsible approach to solving this problem. It has written to the Health Department and requested that the regulations be tightened. In this regard, consultation has taken place between bodies such as the Health Department, Department of Agriculture, the clean air section of the Department of the Environment and the Woodville council, and I believe that regulations are being drawn up.

One other criticism that I have of this pamphlet on methods of soil fumigation is that it suggests that plant debris should be removed from glasshouses and burned. This is another source of a problem in the district, because when the tomato plants are pulled out they are stacked up and burnt. When tomato plants are burning they create a huge cloud of white smoke that hangs over the houses. It is particularly bad when the burning is carried out on an air-pollution alert day. When this happens washing is smoked and many people are smoked in their homes. Whilst the pamphlet is quite good and is an improvement of the old one, I believe that some areas need to be perfected.

Department of Agriculture Report No. 4051 clearly indicates the obligations of the occupier. Pamphlet 4056 refers to precautions that need to be taken by users of the gas. It states:

The presence of chloropicrin is readily detected because of its pungent and irritating odour. Many chloropicrin users regard its odour as an adequate built-in safeguard, but this is a crude form of personal safety because it does not take into account the possibility of other unexpected hazards such as loss of consciousness owing to fainting or heart attack, incapacity through accident, or sudden massive doses through equipment damage.

My concern for this former war gas is highlighted in the next paragraph, which reads:

Researchers now suspect that repeated minute doses of chloropicrin may have long-term effects on the victim.

I believe that concern needs to be expressed as strongly as possible by me as a member of Parliament, because for the last 10 years this gas has been used in the glasshouses in Fulham Gardens, Henley Beach, Seaton Park and Findon areas. I believe this concern is justified, and I believe it needs to be looked at closely. The pamphlet states that the following safety precautions should be taken:

- wear PVC gloves and clothing when handling liquid.
- avoid inhaling fumes.
- wear a respirator.
- wear safety goggles to protect the eyes.
- avoid spilling chemicals on the skin, clothing or shoes.

When I observed this fumigation process, I found that very few of these safety precautions were being taken. I believe there needs to be a general education program for the fumigator on the dangers of this gas and its inhalation. One of the safety precautions states that the fumigator should—

- lock or label treated glasshouses to prevent unprotected people from entering them.

Because the neighbourhood is now built up and children play in the area, I believe these glasshouses should be locked after they have been fumigated. I have seen glasshouses left open. What is worse is the way the fumigators have disposed of the containers. I believe

Department of Health officers should take a close look at the Henley Beach area to see the number of empty chloropicrin containers that have been left lying around in the paddocks. When they are left they become playthings for the children, and that concerns me greatly. The containers are left lying around in paddocks. I believe there are safe methods of disposing of these cans, and the person responsible for fumigating should take those necessary methods of disposal. Unfortunately, this involves extra time and extra work.

Department of Agriculture pamphlet No. 4040 lists quite clearly methods of disposal of such containers. It indicates quite clearly in photographs containers lying around in empty paddocks and says that this is not a safe method of disposal of empty pesticide containers. I cannot stress enough that this is the way they are disposing of them, in heaps, and I hope departmental officers will contact me, as I have a list of areas where these containers have been piled up, in some cases for many years. This is obvious, because they are rusting, and this is an indication of deterioration.

Earlier, a member opposite asked what I had done about the problem. Having become concerned about a problem, it is no good doing nothing about it. I wrote to the Minister of Agriculture about the problem, and in his reply he said:

People who use this product in developed areas should be aware of the safety procedures to be undertaken when using the gas. Where nearby residents feel they are in a dangerous situation they should contact the Health Commission who, as the organisation responsible for the legislation controlling the use of such chemicals, will investigate the incident.

As I earlier indicated, sometimes by the time the message gets through and the inspectors get to the site the gas has dispersed and the problem no longer exists except for the people who are effected by the problems of chloropicrin. They have to get out and get some fresh air. These people have spent the previous evening in their closed bedrooms with all windows shut in an attempt to keep out the gas and to get a reasonable night's rest. The only alternative these people have at this time of the year is to pack up for a few days once the fumigation process starts and live in a motel or with relatives away from the area. Why should they, in a developing area, have to take such action? I wrote to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute about the problem. The reply stated:

Chloropicrin is a mutagen and is therefore potentially carcinogenic, as are other fumigants. Thus, if inhaled over a long time chloropicrin could be a health hazard but whether it poses a bigger threat than other fumigants inhaled in the same quantities is not known as far as I can ascertain.

Another concern I have is that, because this gas has been used since the First World War, minimal scientific tests have been carried out on it and minimal scientific details on it are available. It is not like the new insecticides that have to go through a series of tests and be deemed to be reasonably safe for the public before they can be registered for use. This one has escaped the test, and it needs to be looked at closely.

As I indicated earlier, I wrote to the Minister of Health and I received from the Occupational Health Branch an answer which states:

The effect of chloropicrin on health is dependent upon the actual concentration to which a person is exposed. A concentration of one part per million in air causes irritation to the eyes and upper respiratory tract. This effect is an inbuilt safety factor which is usually enough to cause a person to move out of the area.

When I read that I became increasingly concerned because the problem is that, whilst it might have an inbuilt safety

factor as an indication that the gas is strong, most people tend to bear it out and to put up with it, and in many cases they cannot move out of the area because it is their home.

The other thing that concerned me was that it has a cumulative effect. In other words, breathing or being exposed to the gas for a period of time allows a greater concentration to be absorbed into the skin or body, and it may actually increase to the point of danger of one part per million, even though some people believe that just the very smell of it makes people move out of an area and therefore they are not exposed to the gas. I believe that people should become concerned, and I believe that the Government should tighten the regulations accordingly.

It was stated that usually, when complaints about chloropicrin are received, the cause is found to be non-compliance by the property occupier concerned. I believe an education programme needs to be launched in my electorate. This also may be of interest to the member for Salisbury, who has a number of glasshouses in his area and whose area is beginning to develop as is my area. As those homes will abut growers' properties, the problems will begin to be exposed more greatly. I hope that by next summer we can overcome the major problems and that I will not have to read news headlines such as one that appeared in a newspaper of 20 March 1974 stating that 500 people had been gassed and that it was a nightmare as hundreds evacuated their homes. I hope that I do not have to read that again. I believe that, if this Government takes up its responsibility, and investigates and corrects the problem, we will not have to read these sorts of headline again.

I now wish to raise a matter which is a little out of my area—in fact, it is in the area of the member for Albert Park. However, I am sure he will be as interested as I was to follow it through. My involvement with this issue goes back some years when I was involved in the local council. As I have taken an interest in environmental matters, particularly in Coast Protection Board matters and sand dunes, I was interested to watch the sand dune debate that took place at West Lakes a number of years ago. Today I am in a position to evaluate the sorts of action that were taken by the former Government and see what it did, and again to call on the Government to take some strong action in that area. On 26 December 1976 an article appeared in the real estate section of the *Sunday Mail* regarding beach front units or town houses in a *cul-de-sac* by the West Lakes Shore area. It stated:

These are probably the last residential buildings to be built on the foreshore in between the beach and the road. In fact, the article is referring to the residential units that were to be built near the sand dunes, which were knocked over and dispersed. Since that article was published there has been a continuation of that form of development at West Lakes, so the statement in the article that they were the last was not really true.

Before me today I have another plan for a subdivision on which further units will no doubt be built. This subdivision has yet to be approved by the Minister. I call upon the people of Albert Park and Henley Beach to write to the Minister and express their concern. I believe it is the concern of the whole of South Australia, because Government money has been spent in restoring the beaches in that area. Therefore, I believe the public should have the right of access to metropolitan beaches. West Lakes Limited would no doubt say, "Yes, the public should have that right." What West Lakes does in developing these areas is provide a small corridor, a nature strip, between the road and the beach which allows the public access to the beach.

The problem is that these areas have exclusive homes,

with exclusive access to the seafront and their own exclusive car-parking. Members of the public who want to go to the beach and enjoy this restored area have great difficulty in parking a car in the first place but, having found a car park, usually on Military Road, they must find access through the board walks and the nature reserves. Because of the nature of the area, sold as exclusive, the occupiers of the homes believe that they have exclusive rights to the beach, and the public dare not walk across the front.

I believe that such planning is wrong. I think the Woodville council and the State Planning Authority should be concerned about a form of planning which denies the public the right of access to the beach. Many years ago, a similar situation arose along the seafront at Henley Beach and Grange, where the sand dunes were built on and people had privileged access to the beaches. Unfortunately, a road has been built, the Esplanade, and, in the event of a major storm, some of the properties could be in danger, but in this modern age, when we are supposed to have learnt our lessons, we are still building homes on sand dunes on seafronts, giving people exclusive access, these homes in some cases being only about 80 metres from the high-water mark. Already this year, in a minor storm, the frontal dunes have been eaten into, the sand has been washed away, and the water has encroached. Perhaps in future years a severe storm could occur and the expensive units could be damaged. No doubt in that case the owners would be seeking compensation from the Government. While the last plan is before the Minister, we have a chance to take some sort of action if he thinks it is necessary. The other two subdivisions being developed cannot be the subject of action, because they were approved by the previous Government.

Whilst on the subject of sand dunes, I must highlight another misconception in the minds of the people of West Lakes. On 27 February 1970, right at the beginning of the West Lakes development, a report appeared in the *Advertiser* giving the impression that the sand dunes at West Lakes would be saved, creating an idea in the minds of the people at West Lakes that the beautiful sand dunes would be retained and the Government of the day would do its utmost to look after them. Mr. Curtis was reported as having said that the sand dune concept was important, in fact crucial, for the efficient retention of the beach for the public. Even in those days they were talking about access to the beach. It was planned that there should not be any building for about 280 ft. from the average high-water mark. Such statements were made in the early days of the West Lakes project.

West Lakes Pty. Ltd. today is celebrating its tenth anniversary, so we can look back now and see what has taken place at West Lakes, and hopefully we will have learnt some lessons. Some things occurred during the West Lakes development which were highly questionable. In 1976, the Premier made a speech in this House about some land transactions which took place. I do not wish to dig that up again, but I highlight some of the actions of the "Save our Sand" group. In an article entitled "The dune drift" on 18 February 1977, the *Advertiser* stated, in an editorial:

It points up, once again, the breakdown that seems to occur so often in communication at community level.

The article is referring to sand drift problems and the debate that was raging with the then Minister of Environment (Mr. Simmons). Older members of this Parliament no doubt will recall the debate. As an outsider, I followed it with interest. The Government of the day was considering buying the land. Mr. Simmons, in the *News* of

16 February 1977, was reported as follows:

The Government has considered buying the land containing the sand for \$400 000 in partnership with Woodville Council, but this has been rejected.

On 25 February 1977, one reads why it was rejected:

The town clerk of the Woodville Council (Mr. R. A. Kerr) said: This council's financial commitment to the West Lakes Development Limited is pretty high. Four hectares of choice land if left undeveloped would produce little, if nothing, in rates, resulting in a burden on the balance of the municipality.

That was the approach of the Woodville council. I believe that, since those days, the council has new members, and I hope it may take a different approach. In an article headed, "Government cannot stop dune bulldozing" in the *Sunday Mail* on 15 October 1978, Dr. Cornwall was reported to have told a public meeting that the State Government could do nothing to prevent the bulldozing and could only wait until R.D.C. applied for development permission. Looking at that statement, and realising that R.D.C. applied for and got from the previous Government permission to develop the area, one wonders what was behind such a statement by the honourable member from another place.

The challenge to us as a Government is to save the last remaining sand dunes at West Lakes. We have the opportunity, because the dunes are still in the hands of a development company. Having been briefed on the issue, and having had representations from the "Save our Sand" people, the Minister of Environment, on Wednesday 5 March, in an article in the local Messenger paper, indicated to the people of West Lakes and the "Save our Sand" committee that the Government was prepared to talk about saving the sand dunes at West Lakes. These are the dunes south of Estcourt House, south of those which the previous Government bought, using, I believe, Federal Government moneys, although the impression was given that the State had bought them. However, I believe that it was mainly Federal Government money that was used to purchase them and set up a reserve.

As a Government, we have an opportunity to save the existing dunes. I believe the "Save our Sand" people have a substantial case to put forward. They have established a reason why that reservoir of sand should remain in the metropolitan area, just as the sand dunes in the West Beach Trust area should remain. They provide a reservoir of sand on the beaches of South Australia. If the Government is to spend money on maintaining those beaches and keeping the reservoir of sand flowing, as has been done in the past, surely the public is entitled to free and easy access to the beaches.

I hope that I have covered my topics briefly enough, but that I have given sufficient information to members and public servants to indicate my views on fumigation and the West Lakes dune development area.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): In supporting the motion, I must say that I have listened with interest to the speeches already made by Government members. I find the bizarre view of the political scene expressed by the member for Mawson rather strange. All I can say about the previous speaker, the member for Henley Beach, is that he is not quite as bad as is the member for Mawson. I want to spend some time on the contribution made by the member for Newland. I note that, earlier today, my Leader also commented on that contribution. I pay tribute to the honourable member, because I think that his speech was a well-researched and well-expressed argument for the point of view he holds. It is an argument with which, incidentally, I do not agree, and there are some points in it

with which I particularly do not agree. It interested me to hear and subsequently read his view that the total body of scientific and medical research throughout the world supports nuclear technology. That, patently, is not the case. Considerable opposition exists within both the medical and scientific world to this technology, and it is because that considerable body of opinion exists, that lay people, such as I and many other members of Parliament or people who for the time being are in the influential position that members are in, ought to be cautious. They have a responsibility to be cautious, because the possibility of a nuclear tragedy is so enormous and the consequences could be so dangerous for this generation and future generations that it is incumbent on us not to run headlong into this technology.

I thought that the honourable member let himself down badly by trying to score some political points. His speech was well researched and well expressed, and is a major contribution to the debate in South Australia. However, he let himself down and detracted from his speech when he tried to score political points at the expense of the Australian Labor Party and the Leader. He knows well the truth of what I am about to say, because he was in the House at the time. I happened to be sitting alongside the Leader of the Opposition when the member for Eyre was speaking, when the Leader was accused by Government members of saying that he was categorically opposed to the development of Roxby Downs, despite the fact that it was our Government which provided the incentives to the company to go there, and it allocated \$50 000 000 in this regard. That point was made eloquently by my Leader, but that sort of political point scoring detracted from what was otherwise a good speech by the member for Newland.

Another point the honourable member made interested me, because for over 100 years the policies of the Opposition and the trade union movement have been trying to convince the people whose politics are represented by the Government and business interests throughout the world that coal mining is a dangerous industry. The unions and the Labor Party, both here and in the United Kingdom (and equivalent bodies in the U.S.A. and wherever coalmines exist), have been trying to make that vital point. The people whom the member for Newland represents and the politics he endorses, have, for over 100 years, denied that this problem existed in the coal industry. When the workers wanted better conditions, shorter working hours, earlier retirement—

Mr. McRae: And greater safety.

Mr. KENEALLY: —and greater safety, the interests that the member for Newland represents opposed it, to the extent that tens of thousands of people have died and been maimed, and their families have suffered as a result of coal mining. If the honourable member were serious, he would be fighting to compensate the families of those people who have suffered over these years for their injuries and for the trials and tribulations that have been foisted on the families. Members of the Government in South Australia and of the Liberal Party in Australia are now prepared to say that coal mining is a dangerous industry and has terrible effects on the people in the industry. Incidentally, it has no effect on the mine owners. Coal miners, not mine owners, suffer from sillacosis, tuberculosis, emphysema, and other diseases occurring in that industry. It is because members of the Liberal Party now want to promote nuclear technology and the sale of uranium that they say the coal mining industry is a cursed industry, but only a few years ago not one of them would admit that that was the case.

This change in emphasis has come about because of the mighty dollar; that is what is at stake here. When it was

financially beneficial for the Liberal Party and big business to make money out of the coal mining industry, it was said to be a good and clean industry, and workers ought to be proud to belong to it and should not ask for conditions of safety, early retirement, and so on. Now that there is a more financially beneficial product available in the way of uranium, the Liberals are willing to forget about its dangers. They compare it with what happened in the coal-mining industry over 100 years, and use that as a basis for supporting the new technology. I find that strange, and I would be interested to hear the Government explain to me why this conflict occurs in its attitudes to these problems over this length of time. It might not be a personal change, in the opinion of the member for Newland, but it is a significant change in the attitude of the Party he represents.

The Hon. H. Allison: That's not true. The same arguments were put forward last year, and the year before.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, in 1978 and in 1979, but I am talking about the whole period of coal mining, and the attitudes that have changed in the past 10 years when people of the opposite political persuasion want to make money out of uranium technology.

Prior to the September 1979 election, we were told by the then Opposition (the present Government) that South Australia was in desperate straits. To substantiate this allegation, the election campaign concentrated mainly on three areas: taxation, employment, and crime. We were told that South Australians were the most heavily taxed in Australia, and that something ought to be done about it. We were also told that only the election of a Liberal Government would provide jobs for all those people seeking work, and that it would not be safe for our citizens to walk the streets of South Australia if a Liberal Government was not elected. We were all assured that each of those evils would be corrected by a Tonkin victory in September 1979.

There was a victory for the Liberals at that election. The electors were sufficiently convinced by the arguments put forward by the Liberal Party to elect it to Government. So, I believe it appropriate to look at the first 12 months or so of this new Government to see whether its deeds measure up to the promises it made. In doing so, we must remember that the Liberal Party had spent 10 years in the political wilderness of the Opposition in South Australia. We were led to believe that, during that period, it was busy developing policies and programmes, and would be ready to implement them immediately it gained office where, incidentally, it believed it rightfully belonged. The Liberals believe that they have been born to rule, and so on.

We were led to believe that massive legislation change would be passed through the Parliament so that South Australia could be free from the evils of that 10 years a socialist Government had allegedly given the State. We all acknowledge that the 1979 Parliamentary programme was largely an extension of the programme being carried on by the previous Administration, as the Budget, by and large, was the Budget of the previous Administration.

Of course, there were some major differences. The present Government bent over backwards to hand out massive rewards such as taxation concessions to those people who were its supporters and friends. In this way, some of the few wealth taxes that we had were given away.

Dr. Billard interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Newland, by interjection, states that these taxation concessions benefit the majority of South Australians. I put to him that these concessions, in my district, benefit no more than 5 per cent

of the population, and I believe that my district is no different from the majority of other districts in South Australia. The Government gave handouts to a few South Australians by way of financial benefits at the expense of everyone else, because those taxes that it abolished must be recouped in other ways. However, I will come to that later. These funds will be returned to the Government coffers by way of increased charges on all taxpayers in South Australia, the majority of whom are working people, who are less able to pay taxes than the 5 per cent minority of friends and supporters of the Government who were promised handouts at election time.

One could not expect the Government in the short time available to implement the massive legislative changes that it suggested should occur. However, this year the Parliamentary programme is the Government's own work, and the Budget that will come up in about a month will also be the work of the Government; we will see then, as we see now, what the Government can do to correct the evils that it alleges occur in our society. Mr. Fraser, in Canberra, five years after the coup that took place in 1975, is still trying to blame the Whitlam Government for the inadequacies of the present Administration.

I hope that the Tonkin Government in South Australia will not bedevil the community with the same sort of rubbish. It is the Government's responsibility to administer. It has had 12 months during which to blame the previous Government; from now on, the Government should be strong enough to take the blame, or praise, whichever it may be, for the work it does.

We expected that the Governor's Speech would have concentrated largely on unemployment, taxation and crime, because those were the issues on which the present Government relied heavily at election time. I believe that electors should be able to expect that pre-election promises be honoured. The fact that Malcolm Fraser does not feel any obligation to honour his pre-election promises should not provide an excuse for the South Australian Government to do likewise. But that is exactly what is happening. I will cite two examples that show clearly that the attitude of this Government is different from its attitude when in Opposition. The member for Hartley, before the September election, was rather doubtful that the Liberals could deliver the goods; he considered that we could have another Malcolm Fraser on our hands. Prior to the election, at a workshop gate meeting on 3 September 1979, the previous Premier asked the question "Will deeds match words?" He commented further:

Malcolm Fraser offered Australians a programme of cutting taxes and reducing unemployment.

That was in 1975. He further stated:

Two years later, in December 1977, he again went to the polls promising to put tax money back into the pockets of Australians, bring down interest rates, stimulate economic growth and reduce the numbers in the dole queues. Yet, after four years in office, the Federal Liberal Government has given us higher taxes, higher interest rates, massive unemployment, and stagnating economic growth. Malcolm Fraser, the self-styled financial wizard of 1975, turned out to be a sorcerer's apprentice.

And now, in South Australia, our Liberal opponents promise another dose of Fraserism . . . When Dr. Tonkin promises to axe taxes and promote job creation, he is backing himself into a credibility crisis that he, like his friend in Canberra, cannot escape from . . . Let us look at what our State Liberal Opposition is promising. They've pledged to cut tax revenue by \$40 000 000. It sounds all very attractive. But what they are really promising is a major cutback in the community services South Australians expect and enjoy. That pledge will also mean that some 2 500 more South

Australians will be pushed into the dole queues. So much for his job creation scheme.

Quite obviously, those words were prophetic because that is exactly what has happened. There has been a reduction in the services provided by this Government to South Australia and there has been a massive increase in unemployment, just as the previous Premier warned the electors of South Australia in September last year. Unfortunately, South Australians did not heed the warning, and so we have the current Administration, which, thankfully, will not be with us after the next election.

The current Government's track record is not very good in regard to honouring promises. I stated earlier that I would refer to two particular instances. Prior to the State election, it was an article of faith with the Liberal Party that the classification of publications should be directly under Ministerial responsibility. Members of the Liberal Party waxed eloquent in this House about the benefits of such political censorship, but, in Government, they appear to have changed their mind; apparently, they have accepted the wisdom of the Labor Party's policy in this matter.

Some doubt must exist in everyone's mind about the statements made during 1978-79 by the Liberal Party, because the chief exponent of political censorship was the member for Coles, who is now the Minister of Health, the one whose bum is sometimes pinched. Any person who confuses the members' dining-room with the members' bar and a glass of water with a glass of beer cannot be expected to accurately represent her Party's policies, and that is exactly what she did in a well-reported article in a recent edition of the *Advertiser*. One wonders about the Freudian possibilities of such denial. Does she not want people to know that she was in the bar, possibly drinking beer?

Mr. Trainer: She might have been wearing a Freudian slip.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. It is interesting that the Minister should confuse what happened so dramatically as to mislead the reporter who gave her such a good run on that rather innocuous happening, which she seems to believe changed her attitude towards sexual exploitation.

Similarly, the pre-election determination of the Liberal Party that the public should be notified of all details about paroles granted appears to have dissipated the moment it arrived in the Treasury benches. Here again, the Government accepted that the previous Government's policies were wise and sound. I guess that I am digressing from the matters that I wish to debate—the present Government's legislative programme for 1980. We all recall vividly the pre-election advertising in regard to taxation, crime and employment; some of that disgraceful advertising will be etched on our memories for all time.

We can remember those slogans, "Let's open up the State for business", "Stop the job rot", "Get out of the way of business", and "Let us reduce taxation". Proposition 13 was also mentioned. We have not heard anything about proposition 13 in the past 12 months, because it has been totally discredited. The Premier was basing his whole financial programme on what he considered to be the success of proposition 13 in California. I would like the member who winked and clucked his tongue in agreement with the Premier, the member for Henley Beach, to have a look at what has happened in California to the Government services provided in that State before he so enthusiastically embraces proposition 13. It is typical of our Premier to just grasp for any straw on which he might be able to base a policy, and when that straw is broken, as it inevitably is, he does not want to know about it at all.

I was surprised to find no mention in the Governor's Speech of policies on which the Liberal Party won the election. It is an innocuous document which regurgitates some of the programmes which were in existence, such as the Crystal Brook to Adelaide railway line and the bit about Redcliff, of which we have heard before. We were also told that the Federal Government has not provided any money for the Stuart Highway. Despite all the press statements and the assurances given by the current Government in South Australia and by the member for Eyre, not one extra cent has been provided for South Australia.

The \$9 200 000 which will be spent on that national highway this year will be spent at the expense of other national highways and other roads in South Australia. Not one extra cent has been provided to South Australia for national highways by the Federal Government, although the Minister of Transport and his cronies would like us to believe that money had been provided. That is a fact of life. It is a national highway, and a national responsibility that the Federal Government accepted prior to the last election, and possibly somewhere in the middle of October, prior to the next election, it will accept it again, and then promptly forget about it and expect the South Australian taxpayer to pay for the sealing of that road. This current Government has badly let down the South Australian community on the whole issue of funding for the Stuart Highway.

Mr. Russack: You spent a lot on it.

Mr. KENEALLY: I see the member for Goyder is amused. If there is an 11 per cent increase in road funding for South Australia, which barely keeps up with the inflation rate, from where does the extra money come for sealing the Stuart Highway? This State is entitled to have the highway sealed because it is a national highway. Perhaps the member for Goyder can explain it to me. He was a shadow Minister, and he ought to know better.

Nowhere does the Governor's Speech give concrete examples of the massive legislative reform that our opponents alleged prior to the 1979 election that this State needed. All these past 12 months have shown is that the slogan "Let's open up the State for business" and "Get out of the way of business" are worthless mouthings of deceitful politicians. The only growth industry in South Australia in the last 12 months has been the growth in the crime industry. The following figures can be used to show that in the first six months of the Liberal Government rape in South Australia increased by 37.7 per cent; homicide by 69.2 per cent; serious assaults by 64.8 per cent; and robbery by 40.8 per cent. Figures can be used to substantiate that argument. I do not propose to say that that is exactly what the position is, but that was not the tactic of the Government when it was in Opposition. It used statistics such as this to accuse the previous Government of being almost directly responsible for the increase in crime in South Australia. I believe it is a societal problem, not so much the problem of Government.

Neither the previous Government, nor the present Government, can be blamed for the increase in crime. I ask members to look seriously at this increase in crime and then examine their consciences about the statements which were made prior to the last election, because not one statement has been made by Government members since September 1979 abhorring the increase in these violent crimes in this community. I recall the position of the member for Goyder before September 1979, as well as the crusades of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Transport. Not one word has been expressed by these people since 1979 showing any concern at all for people

who have been subjected to violent crime in South Australia. Apparently, the moment they reached the Treasury benches this problem was no longer of importance to them. There has been a dramatic increase in crime not only in South Australia but also in other States of Australia and in most of the Western capitalist world.

A strange thing has happened with regard to the collection of statistics in South Australia. I have been informed that they can be used in several ways. From January 1980 the police changed their method of collecting crime figures. Previously, they included in the quarterly totals all crimes processed by them during that quarter, and this figure usually contained a backlog of figures of crimes committed from previous quarters not yet processed. From 1 January the police include in their figures only crimes committed during the current quarter. The backlog has been removed, making all figures from January 1980 not comparable to previous figures. I have been informed that the change in method also accounts for the fact that the number of crimes seems to have dropped in the January-March 1980 quarter.

I wonder why this has happened. As I am a fairly cynical and suspicious type of person, I think the Government is trying to befuddle the people of South Australia and is trying to make us believe that crimes of violence in South Australia have been reduced because we have a new Government in power. In fact, the evidence will prove that that is not the case.

I point out to members opposite who were vitally concerned about this matter prior to 1979 that I can recall the political mileage that they were wont to make on the matter of violence and abhorrent crimes, particularly rape. I suggest that they look at some of the headlines that appeared in the papers of 1980. I have a shocking litany of violent crimes in the form of rape that have been perpetrated. I would have expected members opposite to be concerned about this and to express their concern to be consistent with their earlier views. The articles are headed: "Teenager raped in night of violence"; "Women afraid, says rape case judge"; "Fourth rape in 24 hours"; "Victim dragged from her home"; "Invalid, 57, raped in park"; "Gang rapes girl after car lift"; "Rape to soar 300 per cent in South Australia, says expert"; "Knife man rapes woman in flat"; and so we could go on and on. The only response from members opposite is the rather bizarre attempt by the member for Eyre, who suggested that the birch be reintroduced.

Mr. Gunn: What is your suggestion? What were you going to do?

Mr. KENEALLY: This is a very serious matter. It is quite evident that the procedures that have taken place over hundreds of years, including the sort of action that the member for Eyre wishes to take, have been totally unsuccessful. That sort of penalty only makes prisoners leave prison more bitter and anti-social persons than they were when they went in. That is hardly in accordance with my view of what needs to be done, but that is the subject of another debate. I think the member for Eyre and his Government ought to seek to bring that forward for debate in the House.

The stock phrases and the cheap and nasty political practices of the previous Party no longer seem to be relevant. As I said earlier, so much for making the streets safe again. I hope that in future, because of the experience the Liberal Party is now having in Government, that type of political point-scoring will not exist in future Parliaments. We should all be concerned about the incidence of violent crime in our society. We should all get together in a bipartisan way to develop the sort of policies that might help overcome this problem and help to

develop a society in which these criminal activities are less likely to occur. That is the responsibility of members of Parliament. We ought not to be point-scoring in the way we have done. I have merely spoken in this way to point out the hypocrisy of members of the Liberal Party.

There is not a word in the Governor's Speech about matters dealing with violent crime. However, all has not been lost, because we have been told we will instead be debating such important matters as the Trading Stamp Act and the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, so we will not be debating crime but will be debating those more important issues. Apparently Parliament has got its priorities right.

The slogan "Stop the job rot" has been revealed for the con trick that it is. We can all recall the man who led that programme, a Mr. John Rundle. At the time, we did not know (although our opponents did) that the job rot that concerned Mr. Rundle was that he was not able to get an employment plum with the Government. Mind you, he was totally opposed to public servants and the work that they did, but he was not opposed to accepting a plum of his own. That is one of the most blatant examples of jobs for the boys that this State has ever seen. It has been expressed to me that not only is this a pure political pay-off to Mr. Rundle but that he is not the sort of person who should have been given that job anyway. It would not be so bad if the man had the ability to fulfil the job as Agent-General in London. The man does not have the capacity, the capabilities, the temperament, or the personality to represent the needs of South Australians in London.

I refer back to the statement of the then Premier, Mr. Corcoran, made in a pre-election speech, when he pointed out that the Liberal Party's policies would increase unemployment in South Australia. Of course, the figures that the Leader of the Opposition gave to the House earlier this afternoon quite clearly point out that that is exactly what has happened. Stop the job rot indeed! We have a job rot right now. In three months in this year, 4 500 jobs were lost in South Australia, and we had the disgraceful performance last Thursday when the Premier tried to convince the community in South Australia by naming a few industries that were setting up in South Australia (and we are pleased we have them) as an indication that his policies are working and that employment is on the up and up in South Australia. Of course, the over-ruling majority of the industries that he mentioned are as a result of work done by the previous Administration. The most biased Government supporter would be able to add up the 2 400 jobs mentioned, because that includes jobs that previously existed and jobs that will exist in 18 months time.

Although those jobs are sorely needed, at the same time unemployment has increased in South Australia. We do not need any flippant expressions from the Premier: members on this side of the House can mention an industry that has been lost in this State for every industry that Government members can prove has been gained in this State since September 1979. We can match them one for one. In fact, more jobs have been lost. We have heard today what is likely to happen at Uniroyal. The Premier did not tell us that last Thursday; he did not intend to mention it unless it was drawn out of him by way of a question. This is a very serious thing indeed. I trust that the Government is able to retain jobs that are associated with Uniroyal in South Australia. I think it is very important; but it certainly casts some doubts on the pleasure he expressed about the extension to General Motors-Holden's plastics division and the likely consequences of that expansion.

The third critical election issue on which the Liberal

Party based its programme was that we ought to be reducing taxes in South Australia. So the Liberal Party did, and I have already mentioned this fact. It reduced taxation for those who can best afford to pay (its friends and supporters), but that money has to be collected from somewhere, and, if it is not collected from those best able to pay, it must be collected from those least able to pay. That is exactly what has happened in South Australia. We have seen a dramatic increase in the cost of services during the last few months in South Australia. During the last few months electricity tariffs have risen by 12½ per cent, and the Government takes 5 per cent of the total ETSA revenue. Bus and train fares jumped an average of 25 per cent, and the price of water has risen by 12½ per cent. This is reducing taxation, but the Government's understanding of reducing taxation is that it reduces the burden on its supporters and friends. The Government does not consider the burden that it is placing on the overwhelming majority of people in South Australia, who, I repeat, are working people who would not be required to pay such taxation under the provisions which the former Administration introduced and which it proposed at the last election would not be required to be paid, such as succession duties. Land rates are not of importance to the overwhelming majority of citizens of South Australia (certainly those I represent), and the reduction in pay-roll taxation is of absolutely no benefit to people in my electorate.

I do not know of very many jobs that have resulted in my electorate as a result of that reduction. Simply, what has taken place in South Australia is that the more wealthy and affluent section of the community is paying less and the poorer section is paying more. We ought not to be surprised that this has occurred. It has occurred federally since 1975 and is occurring in South Australia now. I find this absolutely abhorrent, and it is something totally opposed to every principle that I hold. I will fight it and expose it at every opportunity that I get. I represent working people, and it dismays me to see working people being required to pick up the tab for the whole community in South Australia. I think that tab should be fairly shared among those who are able to pay for it, and that has not happened. I think it is a disgrace that this Government has allowed that to be the case.

I shall now address myself to a theme on which I have spoken on a number of occasions in this House, namely, the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical plant, which is to be built in my electorate. I am firmly convinced that the decision to build the petro-chemical plant will be a favourable one, but I am concerned about the impact that that development will have on the city of Port Augusta.

There will be a marginal impact in Whyalla and in Port Pirie, but I think it will complement existing development there. The major social impact will be in Port Augusta, and it will be dramatic in the extreme. I think this Parliament should know, and certainly the Ministers responsible should be aware—and I hope they take the time to read what I am about to say—that there has been a dramatic change in the attitude of the people in Port Augusta towards this plant. As a Port Augusta citizen, I know, along with my fellow citizens, that what Port Augusta believes on this matter will not be the basis on which the final decision is made. That is well and truly out of our hands. But what we believe, as Port Augusta citizens, should have some effect on Government decisions affecting our area.

Early in the 1970s, when the plant was first mooted, there was an enthusiastic response to the development within the northern part of the State. Over the years many problems, both physical environmental and social

environmental, have been highlighted. Whilst I am confident and I remain confident that the answers to these problems have been and can be found, nevertheless publicity has not been given to those answers. Recently, we have had a film by Channel 7, *Shadows over the Gulf*, which raised many questions that both Government and industry should be required to answer. People have become very concerned as a result of that film and the other environmental doubts raised by environmental groups within South Australia. I do not criticise these groups. I think they render an important service to the community, highlighting problems that can and do exist. If these problems are there, Government and industry must be able to come up with the answers if they wish to proceed with the development.

There has been this change of attitude in Port Augusta. As we get closer to the time of the final decision, and because of the lack of information fed through to the people in the area, an attitude of unease and uncertainty has permeated the community. That is a bad thing, and it is not necessarily the responsibility of the present Government. The present Government happens to be there at the time the decision is to be made. I think the position probably would have been the same if the previous Administration had still been in office. I know that the Government is reluctant to make statements at what it considers a delicate time in the negotiation period with Dow.

I wrote to the Minister of Environment recently, because one of the most important matters to be clarified in the minds of the citizens of the North of this State is how the environmental impact statement and the indenture agreement are to be slotted into the programme once the decision is made. Many people believe that buildings will be on site by the time the environmental impact statement is finished and available for public comment and Government consideration, and that it will be a *fait accompli*, because the development will be in progress and it will be too late to stop it. People believe that the same problem exists with the indenture Act, and that, by the time the Parliament has processed it and it has been agreed to by both Houses and the company, the company will be on its way to constructing the plant and it, too, will be a *fait accompli*.

I have written to the Minister stating that it is my view that the company has agreed and that the Government has agreed that the environmental impact statement and the indenture agreement will both be completed, will be made available for public comment, and will be agreed upon by Government and the industry prior to building taking place on the site. I repeat that belief of mine, because it is absolutely vital. If that is so, and if the people in the northern part of the State and Spencer Gulf can be assured that that process will take place, many of their present fears will disappear.

I want to say something about the social impact, which I believe will be more dramatic than the physical environmental impact will be. I remain confident that the company and the Government, if for no reason other than their own selfish interest, will ensure that the plant is environmentally sound and will not in any way affect our environment. I want to concentrate on what is likely to take place in Port Augusta. I do not need to say what is likely to happen in a city the size of Port Augusta which suddenly has an influx of 4 000 or 5 000 single men, with a good deal of money in their pockets, nothing to do, inadequate facilities, and a limited number of the opposite sex in the town to interest them. We know what is likely to happen as a result of that scenario; it will be dramatic.

We in Port Augusta are concerned about this, and we

expect the Government and the industry to assist the city in gearing up to meet this problem. But that is not the only problem. The development at Redcliff will result in high living costs in Port Augusta. The high wages paid to the construction force will attract labour away from existing small industry within Port Augusta. Existing employers in the city will have to pay rates equivalent to those being paid on the site if they want to attract and keep employees. This will flow through the community in high living costs, and it will express itself, for instance, in the price of land, which will escalate. Although one cannot put a figure on it, it will be in hundreds of per cent. I ask the Government to use its powers to control the price of land at Port Augusta so that citizens already there will not be exploited because of the contractors who move in.

Although that matter worries us, even worse than the escalation in land prices will be the escalation in the cost of rental accommodation. People who come to Port Augusta will have their rent paid by the contractors, who will be paying from \$100 to \$150 a week. This situation already prevails in Gladstone, Queensland, which is a classic example of the problems Port Augusta will face. Young local people who wish to marry will have to compete on the market for rental accommodation. If they are unable to acquire a Housing Trust house or flat they will have to compete with an industry which is prepared to pay up to \$150 a week.

The ultimate result will be that young people will not get accommodation and they will be living in caravans in caravan parks if they are fortunate enough to be able to do that. There will be severe problems unless this Government is determined to grasp the nettle and to exercise rent control in Port Augusta. I understand that that is anathema to the political philosophy of members of the Government. Anathema or not, the Government owes it to the residents of Port Augusta to control both the price of land and rents. A failure to do that would deny the people of the city natural justice, denying the young people the possibility of getting accommodation, of being able to buy land and build, or get their own flat.

That will not exist for only a year or so, because we will be facing this problem for the next five or six years. People can imagine what is likely to happen in Port Augusta over that period. I ask this Government to ensure that adequate front-end finance is made available to the city of Port Augusta, to allow it to gear up so that it has the facilities available to accommodate the dramatic upsurge in demand, to accommodate the needs of a work force and the needs of the citizens who live there, and above all my great concern is for the citizens who already live there, whose way of life will be so drastically changed as a result of a decision over which they have no control.

We owe it to them as members of Parliament and I owe it to them as their member to inform Parliament and the Government and all those people who are in a position to have an effect on what happens in Port Augusta as to the needs of Port Augusta. One of the most important aspects of what this Government can do for the city of Port Augusta is to support it in obtaining from industry adequate rating. I am concerned at what took place here last year, because I made a speech couched in not dissimilar terms at that time. The member for Eyre, now the Deputy Speaker, previously a shadow Minister and now a senior member of the Government Party, said in response to my speech, "However, I think he should bear in mind that it (the Port Augusta City Council) should not get too greedy." He further stated:

If some concessions relating to rates and other taxes must be given to Dow Chemical so that it can obtain the Redcliff site, that should be done. This matter is far too important for

the welfare of the people of this State; it should not be hindered by the introduction of taxes advocated by the honourable member.

So, the honourable member for Eyre says, "Don't worry about the citizens of Port Augusta. They can be lambs to the sacrifice for big business." He is suggesting that the people of Port Augusta should subsidise a trans-national petro-chemical company, the annual turnover of which is probably greater than the g.n.p. of this country. He believes that the people of Port Augusta should be required to subsidise Dow Chemical and we should be prepared to make sacrifices, accept limited services, and accept the dramatic impact so that this Government will not be offside with Dow Chemical. Dow Chemical will come to South Australia if the economics of the project is satisfactory to them. That is what is important to Dow Chemical—whether it can make a quid at Redcliff. I think it can. I am not going to enter the debate about my attitude to multi-nationals, because it is irrelevant to this debate. The decision has been made; it is going to be Dow Chemical and Redcliff or, I believe, no-one.

I wrote to the Premier on 1 May 1980 expressing my concern that the member for Eyre should make such statements about rating for Port Augusta. The Premier was in the Chamber, and he gave every indication of supporting the honourable member's comments. My letter, in part, reads as follows:

During this debate the member for Eyre, Mr. G. Gunn, made statements which have caused considerable concern to authorities and individuals in Port Augusta. As you were in the House at that time, and as you appeared to be nodding in approval of Mr. Gunn's statements, I am concerned to know if they represent the Government's policy.

I then went on to say:

Mr. Gunn's thesis that a trans-national company with an annual budget greater than the South Australian Government should be subsidised at the expense of citizens of a relatively small rural city is totally unacceptable to my constituents.

The Premier answered my letter on 6 June, five weeks later. In fact, he did not answer me, as the letter is written by the Director-General of the Premier's Department and states:

The Premier has asked me to acknowledge your letter of 29 May 1980, and to apologise for the fact that, due to an oversight in his office, your earlier letter of 1 May concerning certain statements made by Mr. Graham Gunn, M.P., in the House of Assembly on 1 April 1980 was not previously acknowledged. Mr. Gunn's comments on his reported statements are expected to be with the Premier in the next few days, and he will then reply in full as soon as possible.

I still have not got a reply, which leads me to believe that the member for Eyre was the shock trooper for the Government. What he said at that time is the view of the Government, and Port Augusta will be sold down the drain by this Government. We cannot expect that the present Government in South Australia will be supporting the efforts of the citizens of Port Augusta to have adequate rating to allow us to provide the structures required to accommodate this development. What should Port Augusta expect to get? It should expect to get a lot more than the citizens of Whyalla get from B.H.P. I was shocked to hear Mayor Ekblom of Whyalla say on an A.B.C. programme that they are delighted with B.H.P. in Whyalla as it has been very helpful to the city. Only this year that company gave \$95 000 to the city to help in the community programme, it was stated.

The B.H.P., under any sensible rating system, would be paying to the Whyalla City Council not less than \$1 500 000 in rates per year. However, because of the

indenture struck by the Liberal Party when in Government many years ago, it does not have to pay a cent. The company does make some contribution, because its conscience pricks it. It ought to be paying rates in excess of \$1 000 000 a year, and the fact that it is not means a charge upon the citizens. The same applies in Port Pirie, where the B.H.A.S. pays no rates at all to speak of. ETSA for its power house in Port Augusta paid \$80 in rates to the Wilmington Council last year. I would hope that this Government, as was the intention of the previous Government, will require ETSA to pay rates that are equivalent to the capital investment and the impact it had upon Port Augusta. However, I do not believe that that impact is anywhere as near as dramatic as is going to happen in the next few years because of the new power house and petro-chemical plant.

What rates are paid by industry in Victoria, a State that was competing with South Australia for the petro-chemical plant? The petro-chemical plant at Altona has a current capital value of \$132 000 000, and the local rates for the year 1979-80 were \$1 187 000. In Corio, the Shell Oil Refinery has a current capital value of \$106 000 000 and paid local government rates in 1979-80 of \$740 000. In the Shire of Hastings, the Esso natural gas refinery has a current capital value of \$84 000 000 and paid \$418 500 in rates for 1979-80. That is the sort of criterion that we as citizens of Port Augusta and we on the Opposition benches in this House ask the Government to consider when negotiating the rate for Port Augusta. The original decision was that the Port Augusta City Council should negotiate rates directly with the company. If that is the case, that is the sort of rate that Port Augusta will be seeking. Unless the Government supports the Port Augusta City Council in its efforts, how can we expect that the company will provide these rates, as it is a commercial undertaking? It will pay as little as it can possibly get away with, and so we in Port Augusta depend upon this Government.

I ask the Government not to let the citizens of that city down, because an abdication from rates that will provide the facilities which we require as front-end financing and that which we will require in the long term is nothing short of denying justice to the citizens of this State who, over many years, have required very little from the Government indeed. I trust that, as I have made that plea, it will be taken up by members of the Government and that my electors will not be let down.

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In rising to take part in this debate, I congratulate the mover and seconder. They displayed an enlightened approach to the problems facing South Australia, unlike the approach that we have just heard from the honourable member for Stuart, whose thinking has been clouded.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. GUNN: Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was explaining to the House the more enlightened approach that my colleagues had taken in relation to this debate. However, I want to use the opportunity on this occasion to report to the House (in more detail than I did in my Address in Reply speech last year) on the findings of my Parliamentary trip overseas. An Address in Reply debate is appropriate during which to report to the House, as members' reports are no longer printed. I do not disagree with that concept because, obviously, unlike the case with a Parliamentary report, many more people will have an

opportunity to see what members are doing overseas and to read their reports in *Hansard*.

I had the pleasure of visiting South Africa, where I met with the management of the South African Coal, Oil and Gas Corporation Limited and inspected its extensive works. I visited Pretoria and Johannesburg and also had the pleasure of visiting a private game reserve, where much work is done on breeding and protecting endangered species.

While in the United Kingdom, I was lucky enough to be there during the election campaign, which resulted in the election of the Thatcher Government, and I found this very interesting. I also visited the fast breeder reactor in Dounreay, Scotland, the Hunterston Nuclear Power Establishment, which is run by the Scotland Electrical Undertaking Authority, and the Windscale and Calderhall works, and I also had the opportunity to visit Massey Ferguson, the manufacturers of farming machinery.

In France, I met with the management of the Marcoule installation and other nuclear officials. In Brussels, I met with officers of the Commission of the European Communities. They were all very helpful, and I gained a large amount of knowledge and a real insight into that establishment. While in Belgium, I had lengthy discussions with Euratom officers.

In Bonn, I met with officers of the Department of Energy. In the United States I was able to visit a wide selection of places and establishments, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington, the Minnesota Association of Wheatgrowers, the Washington Public Powers Supply System, the Exxon Nuclear Company, International Harvester, the U.S. Department of Energy, and also the United Nuclear Corporation, as well as being entertained by the South Dakota Department of Agriculture. I also had the opportunity to look around U.S. agricultural areas.

In Taiwan, where my visit was brief, I went to the nuclear-sparked power station. I also visited the China Shipbuilding Corporation and the steelworks. That country has great manufacturing industry potential and it certainly must raise fears in the minds of manufacturers in this country for them to see the competition they will be facing in the future.

Just summarizing on the agricultural scene overseas, I believe that, when we compare the agricultural equipment produced in this country with that produced overseas, our agricultural tillage machinery is equal to if not better than anything produced overseas. I hope Governments take appropriate action to ensure that the South Australian companies concerned can continue to operate and be protected from take-overs.

The reason I visited the countries I have mentioned was to look at the nuclear industry, as I was concerned to find out at first hand what was taking place in Europe, what were the latest developments and, in particular, what disposal methods had been devised. The following information I obtained from my inquiries and information I received overseas.

At the beginning of this century, coal supplied approximately 96 per cent of the world's energy needs. At the beginning of the Second World War, the contribution made by coal decreased to 70 per cent and that of oil increased to 18 per cent. At present, using 1977 figures, oil and natural gas provide, respectively, 52 per cent and 18 per cent of the free world's energy needs, and coal approximately 21 per cent.

The years 1985 to 1990 are already being seen by most oil experts as the watershed period, as far as the balance between supply and demand of crude oil is concerned. To avoid serious shortages of oil in the 1990's, it is important

that investigation be increased into finding other sources to meet our energy needs. This will necessitate the development of nuclear energy. Unfortunately there have been delays in the nuclear energy programme, caused by groups who are opposed to nuclear energy and who either are unaware of the critical energy situation or are deliberately wanting to prevent adequate supplies of energy to be available to the developed and the developing countries in the free world.

The total amount of coal in the world is very large, perhaps 10 times greater than the oil reserves. Unfortunately, much of the world's coal is in difficult areas such as Siberia, where it is difficult to mine. A great deal of it is located at great depths, or in small seams, making it expensive to get out. Over 50 per cent of this is in Russia, and other communist-controlled countries that obviously have their own problems, but are fortunate enough not to have an anti-nuclear lobby preventing the development of nuclear energy.

There is of course a great deal of coal in the United States, South Africa, Australia and Indonesia. It is my view that this coal will be required to replace oil. The work and the development of the coal to oil process in South Africa clearly indicates beyond doubt that in the short term this is a viable alternative to oil. I consider it essential that everything be done in this country to establish a coal-to-oil conversion plant in the near future. Investigations and inquiries should continue.

I agree with the following reference to comments of Senator Carrick, as reported in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 2 August, in an address to the Sydney Branch of the Australian Institute of International Affairs as follows:

... Australia's present 67 per cent self-sufficiency in oil would drop to 40 per cent in 1990 and to less than 20 per cent in 2000 unless substantial new discoveries were made. But while exploration could produce small but worthwhile additions to crude oil resources, discoveries of any magnitude were unlikely. Senator Carrick said the synthetic crude oil developments must be programmed to come on stream in the late 1980's or early 1990's at the latest if the sharp expected fall-off in Bass Strait production was to be offset. A rough rule of thumb is an outlay of \$4 000 m for a every 100 000 barrels a day of synthetic crude output.

It is obvious that the Commonwealth Government's current world parity price will assist in that development. It is interesting to note that South Africa expects the Sasol's coal-to-oil plant to meet 65 per cent of that country's liquid fuel needs by 1985. During my visit to South Africa, I had the opportunity of visiting Sasol "1", and it was clear from the developments there and the other developments that were explained to me that there are great benefits flowing to that country from the development of that industry, in relation not only to liquid fuel but also to the resulting by-products. It is also interesting to note that South Africa already exports approximately 9 500 tonnes of uranium a year. It was clear from my discussions in Taiwan, not only that there is a uranium demand for that country to fuel its nuclear powerhouses, but also that they would be expanding that method of energy generation, and that there will be an expanding trade between South Africa and Taiwan. I had the pleasure of meeting the Deputy Foreign Minister, who, on the very day of my meeting with him, it was announced had been appointed Ambassador to South Africa.

During our discussions he made quite clear that that country needed raw materials from countries like Australia. It will be unfortunate if we allow a situation to be created that will prevent us from exporting our uranium to a stable, prosperous and developing country that has been a friend of this country for a long time. I would point

out that, from the limited knowledge that I gained when I was in South Africa, that country has very large deposits and is keen to export them, and therefore we will be in direct competition with South Africa.

In supporting the view that we should be looking at all alternative forms of energy production, I would like to briefly quote from a paper presented by Mr. J. A. Stegmann, the managing director of Sasol, at a seminar in Pretoria in March 1979, as follows:

There can be no difference of opinion on the necessity to continue with steps that would systematically reduce the country's dependence on . . . crude oil.

That obviously also applies to Australia. The paper continues:

In this regard, there are especially two aspects which require our continuous attention. The first is to find methods that would minimise the consumption of oil products and to determine those areas where alternative forms of energy which are not derived from crude oil could be introduced.

Secondly, there is the aim of increased production of liquid fuels from coal. In both these fields positive steps have been taken since the 1973 oil crisis to reduce the consumption of petroleum products and to increase the supply of liquid fuels from other sources by means of Sasol . . .

I do not have to remind the House that we should pay close attention to those recommendations by the Chairman of that large and successful organisation. It is clear that there is going to be a continued demand for nuclear power for a number of years. If the energy demands of the developed and the developing countries are to be met and if industry is to continue to develop and have reliable and efficient power at reasonable costs, it is clear to anyone with an open mind who has been overseas that Australia cannot live in isolation from the rest of the world. We are a very fortunate country, with large supplies of energy. Not only do we have a moral obligation but also it is in our own long-term interests to export not only our uranium, but our coal and our other minerals as well, which are in such demand. Failure to do so will affect our economy directly, as well as indirectly affecting those countries on which we rely so much to export our other commodities. These countries will find themselves in a position where they can no longer do so, and will be looking for other markets.

The nuclear industry has unfortunately failed to keep the general community properly informed of the benefits, the safeguards that have been developed, and the long-term programmes for nuclear storage which are currently being developed and which can effectively overcome the so-called hazards from nuclear generations.

I consider that Premier Dunstan did not accurately inform the House of the true picture on the nuclear industry in Europe and that the information he conveyed was incorrect. No reasonable person, in my view, could make a report of that nature after having been overseas and visited the installations and power houses in various countries, if he went with an open mind and was prepared to be objective in his considerations.

I want now to quote from a letter I received from the Director of Marcoule (Mr. J. Bellot), to whom I gave a copy of Premier Dunstan's speech to the House on his return, following his investigations of the nuclear industry in Europe. Mr. Bellot stated:

The statements which have been made in the South Australian Parliament have considerably surprised me and seem to call for at least two comments. The first concerns our idea of storing, in solid form, highly active waste products from fission. It is quite inaccurate to say that the French specialists are not interested in the problem of permanent storing of vitrified products. Indeed, although the period

necessary for the first cooling of the glass blocks is rather long (several years), the storing in which the cooling down takes place offers both sufficient capacity and a great safety of exploitation; this storing is only an intermediate step, as we always tell our visitors. Studies have been undertaken by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of Geological and Mineral Research, especially in liaison with the E.E.C., to lay down the specifications of the permanent storing places, whether it be a salt mine, a mass of granite or clay. The studies presently being undertaken in France are dealing with thermic gradients twisting and movement within the granite. They are undertaken very actively and reveal our determination to do something about permanent storage.

My second comment concerns the capacities of the enrichment factory of EURODIF. Although it deals with an activity which does not affect the establishment at Marcoule, I can however give you some of the following details:

Mr. Hemmings: Where did you get that from?

Mr. GUNN: From the Manager of the Marcoule installation in France, after I had given him a copy of Premier Dunstan's speech. The statement continues:

The EURODIF factory should attain its nominal production level in 1982, the greater part of which will be immediately used for the manufacture of combustibles for nuclear stations (light water reactors) which presently are functioning or are under construction and which will produce at least half of France's electricity production from 1985 onwards. The rest will allow our European partners to cover their own needs.

When one measures the size of the energy crisis within the world and its effects on nations which like France and its European partners have only their own territory's limited resources, one cannot but congratulate oneself on having a great enrichment capacity.

In fact, the question which presents itself at the moment is not that of an eventual over-production, but that of the greatness of the European demand for enriched uranium in 1985, a demand which I could liken to the construction of a second factory whose realisation here has been moreover predicted since 1976.

I thought it was appropriate that I should be in possession of the views of the people who are dealing on a daily basis with nuclear waste, in view of what had been said by the former Premier on his return. In my opinion, the recommendations and conclusions by Mr. Dickinson were accurate and were a very fair assessment of the nuclear industry in Europe. Based upon my own observations and discussions, I basically endorse them. I consider that the reports by Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Wilmshurst were accurate and gave a correct and balanced view of the nuclear industry in the countries that they visited. I make this statement, having visited a number of the facilities that Mr. Dunstan's party looked at, having had discussions with some of the people that Mr. Dunstan spoke to, having visited other installations and given the matter a great deal of consideration during my visit, and having made further inquiries on my return to South Australia.

I want to briefly quote from both reports, because I believe the comments are relevant to the general debate and give a true picture which can assist me in making my views clear to the House. I will now quote from page 23 of Mr. Wilmshurst's report, when he said:

Perhaps the most outstanding impression gained was that in the three areas visited—Sweden, Austria and California—in which major policy decisions had been made against nuclear power, these decisions appear to the author to have been taken on grounds unconnected with the technical facts.

I would agree with that statement entirely, and in California the issue appeared not to be nuclear power, as such, but the personal political aspirations of the people

involved. I believe we currently have a similar situation in South Australia. He then went on to say:

In relation to the scene in South Australia, it is concluded that:

- (a) there is a proven route available for treatment and disposal of high-level waste. Reprocessing of spent fuel is being practised, as is vitrification of high level wastes from reprocessing. Final disposal in granite formations has been demonstrated to be practicable. Not all of these stages are available in any single country at present, but other overall schemes as good as or better than the composite route will emerge in several countries within 10 years.

I entirely agree with that statement, having had the opportunity of visiting the Marcoule reprocessing plant in France. I understand that the present Premier also visited that establishment, and I believe he will agree with the comments that I have made. I believe that any member of the House who has the opportunity to travel overseas in the next few years should avail himself of the opportunity to visit Marcoule. After a considerable effort in devising means for long-term waste disposal that lasted for over 10 years, it was found by the people at Marcoule that the vitrification process was the most effective, that is, the casting in glass of the fission products. There are a number of advantages in this process: the liquids are made solid for disposal, the volume is reduced, and the 15 cubic metres of liquid waste, which is produced from a thousand megawatt reactor, becomes two cubic metres of glass. The glass is environmentally safe; it will not be leached out, and can be safely stored.

After the fission products have been vitrified and stored in a stainless steel container, either they will eventually be stored in granite formations in France, or, as the authorities in Germany were investigating, the possibility exists of storing vitrified products in the salt mines in the Asse area.

It was pointed out to me that the East German Government is already storing its nuclear waste material on its side of the border. It would appear from discussions I had with officers of the West German Energy Department that products will be stored in the salt mines in the Asse area in the near future. It was also interesting to note the attitude of the Federal German Government; it wanted to bury nuclear waste; the conservative Government of the State in which storage would take place was quite happy to effect the scheme; however, the Opposition in that State (the socialists, or the Opposition to the conservatives in Germany) were making a fuss. Therefore, the conservative Government told Chancellor Schmidt that he must bring his colleagues into line and, when they agreed, the Government would be happy to go ahead.

Mr. Hemmings: Did they tell you that?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. On the day that I was in Bonn, there was a fight between the two groups. Mr. Wilmshurst went on to say the following:

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

Personally, I believe that any reasonable person would agree with that assessment. He further stated:

If for any reason uranium mining in South Australia is not to be permitted, a full and detailed statement should be published giving the reasons for the ban and the conditions under which it will be removed.

The Opposition has a clear obligation to lay the cards clearly on the table and tell the people of this State where it stands. I believe that there is no reason to continue the ban on mining and exporting of uranium in South Australia. The motion passed by the House of Assembly

during the period of the Dunstan Government should be repealed, as it is no longer appropriate and it could hold back considerable investment and development in this State. I now briefly quote Mr. Dickinson's conclusions in sub-headings of his report; the first was as follows:

1. OECD countries dependent on nuclear power.

I endorse that. Anyone who has had a look at those countries would be aware of that situation. His second conclusion was as follows:

2. Expanding world trade in nuclear plants and materials.

Mr. Hemmings: What about the health risks?

Mr. GUNN: I will come to that later. His further conclusions were as follows:

3. Operational risks can be regulated.

5. Disposal of high level waste no longer a critical issue.

6. Uranium enrichment—A national investment project.

I entirely agree with those sentiments, and I support the statements made by the Premier that it is feasible. I believe that we should do everything possible to establish a uranium enrichment plant in the iron triangle area of South Australia.

One of the most topical subjects in connection with the nuclear industry at the time when I was having a look at the problems overseas was the discussion associated with the Three Mile Island nuclear power generation reactor. It was clear that a great deal of concern has been generated in the minds of many people throughout the world. It was also clear that it was one of the major issues which has been seized upon by sections of the press and anti-nuclear groups in this country and overseas. This particular incident has not, in my view, been reported in a practical or logical fashion, but it has been used to create an issue which certain sections of the media could highlight. It certainly raised the fears of a number of people who are not well versed in the industry.

Unfortunately, there has been a deliberate campaign to confuse and to over-emphasise the problems that have been associated with this particular installation at Pennsylvania. It has been a newsworthy subject, and the media have been able to attract tremendous attention by making statements which, in many cases, had no relationship to the facts. During my visit overseas, the controversy on the Three Mile Island was at its height and I was fortunate enough to have discussions in Brussels with members of the European Economic Community, who are responsible for the nuclear industry. On the very day I had these discussions, a report on the accident at Pennsylvania was made available. This was a report which was handed to the Ministers and on page 16 of that report, under the heading "Radiological consequences of the accident", it was stated:

According to the survey results, doses received by members of the public as a consequence of the accident are low compared with the dose limits.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: I thank the honourable member for his bringing people into the House. Members opposite are so interested in this debate that the member for Napier is the only Opposition member in the Chamber. The report continued:

The environmental contamination has also been minimal. Occupational exposure up to 4 April was still within the annual limits. Therefore, from a health point of view, the consequences of the accident can be considered as not significant.

I would be happy to make available a copy of that report to any of the anti-uranium members opposite. I now refer

to a responsible editorial headed "The Power View" which appeared in a newspaper, the *Grand Forks Herald*, on Wednesday 13 June 1979 and which stated:

Another view of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident is presented in the current issue of the *Minnkota Messenger*, by Frank Rose, power supply manager of Minnkota Power Cooperative.

I believe that the following comments should be considered by all members:

Rose claims the news media built the accident into a panic situation "when nothing of the sort was warranted". He charges, "The credibility of the press must be questioned when they can make a nuclear accident, in which no-one was injured, into the disaster of the century." Rose further claims that scientific facts developed since the accident are being given "short shift" by news media.

"Government scientists have gone over the Three Mile Island area with a fine-tooth comb and have concluded that radiation released at the nuclear site represents an insignificant addition to what would normally be received from living on earth," Rose says. "The average radiation dose received was very small." A standard X-ray exposes a person to between 20-30 millirems, Rose adds.

Rose continues, "Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb, reports that the maximum dose for any worker at the plant is 3 roentgens (rems) over a 90-day period. One of the plant workers received 3.4 rems and another received 3.1. No-one else in the plant received as much as 3 rems of radiation, while an astronaut is allowed to receive 35 rems. Airline hostesses insisted a few years ago that they have the right to stay in service whether or not they are pregnant. Yet they receive 50 millirems of radiation for every 50 hours aloft in a jet plane," Rose says. He adds it is doubtful that anyone living near the Three Mile Island plant site received as much as 50 millirems. Rose says each of us receives each year 44 millirems from the sky, 40 from the earth, 5 from watching television, 60 from our homes due to building materials, plus additional amounts if we receive X-rays or go on airplane flights. He doubts there is any good in radiation but "we live with radiation exposure every day just by living on the earth". Rose points out that one nuclear reactor replaces 40 000 barrels of oil per day. The 72 reactors in the U.S. can replace 3 000 000 barrels of oil per day, and we are importing 9 000 000 barrels per day.

As my colleague pointed out, the press took photos of the Three Mile Island site with infra-ray cameras to make the situation look worse than it was.

I believe that those comments are worthy of consideration because they come from a person who has had a long and varied experience in the industry. The particular report which I recently quoted on the accident and this editorial clearly indicate what I said earlier about the press highlighting the issue beyond the limits of responsible journalism, purely for emotionalism. Unfortunately, there has been an attempt to create fear in the minds of the public that nuclear power houses cause large amounts of radiation to be discharged through the atmosphere with dire consequences. Secondly, that nuclear power houses are liable to go off like an atomic bomb or, even worse, terrorists could obtain suitable material for the production of nuclear devices. This, of course, is not correct, but unfortunately it is still peddled by people around the country.

Many people fail to understand that we are constantly being bombarded by radiation in our daily activities. Naturally, the level of radiation is not the same everywhere, as it is dependent upon the nature of the rocks and the amount of radioactive materials which they contain. In the United Kingdom, granite rocks in the north

and west contain significantly more uranium than the younger rocks in the south. For example, a person living in London will receive 67 millirems of radiation per annum; however, someone in Aberdeen would receive 106 millirems of radiation per annum. In a brick house in London, the level of terrestrial radiation can be as low as 30 millirems per annum, while in Aberdeen a house built from granite can be as high as 105 millirems per annum. Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a statistical chart giving the "Per Caput Radiation" that was measured in the United Kingdom in 1978.

The SPEAKER: Do I have the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

Per Caput Radiation: U.K. 1978		
Source	mrem	%
Natural Background	96	74
Medical Irradiation	~30*	23
Fallout	2	1.5
Nuclear Wastes	0.2	0.2
Occupational	0.7	0.5
Luminous Watches	0.2	0.2
Air Travel	0.6	0.5
*UKAEA estimate		

Mr. GUNN: I believe that the following information, which I am about to quote from the *New Scientist* of 12 May 1977, is important to the argument, because it gives a clear indication of the situation. The article is headed "Can we measure safety?" and, in part, states:

During the past decade a number of attempts have been made to derive a scale for measuring risk, comparing different occupations or activities on this scale and selecting those where elimination of hazard should have the highest priority.

I believe we are talking about an examination of the risk involved. The article continues:

One such scale is a fatal accident frequency rate (FAFR), the number of fatal accidents in a group of 1 000 men in a working lifetime (100 million hours).

The British chemical industry's FAFR is about four, excluding Flixborough, or about five if Flixborough is averaged over a 10-year period. Within the chemical industry, if we can identify an activity which contributes more than 0.4 to the FAFR, we should try to remove it as a matter of priority.

In a few moments I will seek leave to insert in *Hansard* another chart that supports the chart that I previously tabled.

The following information was provided by the Secretary of State for Energy in the United Kingdom in 1977, showing the fatal accident rate per 1 000 employees in each of the fuel industries, averaged over the years 1971 to 1976:

Deep-mined coal	0.23	} fatalities per 1 000 employees
Gas	0.10	
Electricity (including nuclear)	0.10	
Off-shore oil and gas	1.6	
Oil refining	0.09	
Nuclear (UNKAEA and BNFL)	0.014	

None of the accidents in the U.K. was caused by nuclear power houses.

I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a further statistical chart dealing with fatal accident frequency rates.

The SPEAKER: Once again, is it purely statistical?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Leave granted.

 Fatal accident frequency rates (FAFR)

British industry	4
Clothing and footwear	0.15
Vehicles	1.3
Timber, furniture, and so on	3
Metal manufacture, shipbuilding	8
Agriculture	10
Coal mining	12
Railway shunters	45
Construction erectors	67
Staying at home (men 16-65)	1
Travelling by train	5
Travelling by car	57

Mr. GUNN: The annual radiation exposure of the U.K. population resulting from all the activities of the nuclear industry (of which waste disposal is the most significant) amounts to less than one-half of one per cent of their total annual radiation dose from all natural and man-made sources. To an individual it is less than the radiation received from one diagnostic X-ray a year, and far less than the increase in natural background radiation exposure that he or she would incur by moving house from, for instance, London to a granite area like Aberdeen. It should be understood that in the U.K. each operator has to be covered by insurance of up to £5 000 000 per accident. Therefore, it is fairly obvious that, if the plants were not safe, efficient and well run, they would not receive cover from anyone.

It should be clearly understood that radiation has always been a part of daily living and that the effects are well known. I believe that the effects of radioactive materials, in the various ways in which they are used, greatly outweigh any of the problems that they may cause, because we have devised methods to safely handle them. An article headed "After Three Mile Island—Nuclear Power Bogey" by Robert Moss, which appeared in a number of newspapers in the U.K., is very relevant to the matters which I have been discussing and to the current situation in this State. In part the article states:

Britain may imagine that, with its coal reserves and its windfall of North Sea oil, it enjoys a privileged position and can afford to backpedal on the further development of nuclear power.

This would be a foolish and dangerous illusion—and not only because the availability of coal is vulnerable to the whims of left-wing demagogues like Arthur Scargill, who now figures, significantly, as the leader of an anti-nuclear lobby called Energy 2000.

In the long run, we will have to depend either on nuclear energy, or switch off the lights and shiver through the winter.

That particular point was made clear to me during my visit to the Hunterston commercial power generating plant, which is situated in southern Scotland—a most efficient, engineered and operated plant, where all safety factors are given high priority. It was interesting to note that there were cattle grazing along the boundary fence and there were no problems with the local community, and everyone seemed to be quite happy, particularly those people who had a job in the plant. And, from the discussions I had with them, they did not appear to have any concern for their health and own safety, and the same applied to the management.

I was informed by the management of the plant at Hunterston that, if they were ordered to turn off their generating power nuclear plant, many people in Scotland stood the chance of freezing to death in the following winter, because they would not be able to supply

electricity for people to heat their homes. The article by Mr. Moss states:

In fact, as a cynical American safety expert observed to me, "Fewer people have died as a result of nuclear accidents in the United States than as a result of a single road accident in one celebrated Senator's car."

Under the heading "Health Hazards" he further stated:

A leaked report from America's National Academy of Sciences suggests that the price of going ahead with nuclear power could be 2 000 deaths from cancer by the end of the century.

The figure is suspect, but even if taken at face value, it is not alarming when compared with the greater health hazards of developing other forms of energy.

Coal provides the most notorious example. A hushed-up report by the United States Energy Research and Development Administration in 1977 suggested that coal-burning power plants east of the Mississippi were responsible for 13 000 premature deaths from lung diseases and cancer every year.

Professor Cohen says that, according to official American estimates, the health hazards of developing power from coal are one thousand times greater than from using nuclear energy.

Dr. Beckmann goes further: "Each year we delay in building a nuclear plant to replace 1 000 megawatts of coal-fired power. We condemn between 20 to 100 Americans to death."

The most complete statement of Dr. Beckmann's view can be found in his book *The Health Hazards of NOT Going Nuclear*, available from the Alternative Bookshop in Covent Garden.

When members opposite go to London I hope they will take the time to buy, read and attempt to understand that book.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: From the information I gained overseas, I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that, when he avails himself of the trip overseas available to him, he take the time to look closely at the nuclear industry in the United States or Europe, or anywhere else, so he can better educate himself, and I hope he will then be in a position to make constructive comments, and will not persist with the line he expressed in the House on Wednesday 11 June 1980, when he said that he was opposed to the development of Roxby Downs, that he was in total opposition with the views of the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie.

Mr. Hemmings: He didn't say that. Graham, you've been stupid so far; don't be more stupid.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: For the benefit of the member for Napier I shall quote what he said on that occasion. The *Hansard* report is as follows:

Mr. GUNN: And you do not support the mining and export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

Mr. Bannon: No.

Mr. GUNN: As Premier, you would stop that project?

Mr. Bannon: I am opposed to it.

Mr. Hemmings: Come one, that's not what he meant, and you know that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier is interjecting too often, and I ask him not to persist.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is fortunate that you have protected the member for Napier from continuing to make a fool of himself. Nuclear power is not very expensive. People claim that it is no cheaper, the facts

that I was able to glean are as follows; these figures are some 12 months out of date now, but they serve a useful purpose.

Every tonne of uranium burnt in a power station produces as much heat as about 20 000 tonnes of coal. Taken over the lifetimes of the stations, the very low fuel cost of the nuclear power stations more than outweighs the high cost of building them. The latest comparative costs of electricity available, commissioned in a 12-year period up to 1975-76, are as follows:

Nuclear—0.69 pence per kilowatt hour

Coal—1.07 pence per kilowatt hour

Oil—1.27 pence per kilowatt hour.

The updated figures I have received recently for 1978-79 are as follows:

Nuclear—1.02 pence per kilowatt hour

Coal—1.29 pence per kilowatt hour

Oil—1.31 pence per kilowatt hour.

By using nuclear generation in place of coal or oil, the Central Electricity Generating Board of the United Kingdom saved £120 000 000 in 1975-76. This represents, according to the information I was given, \$10 for each family in the U.K. If we were successful in preventing not only our own uranium from being exported, which is of course impossible to do, but also prevented other countries from exporting their uranium, the situation would be that we would see an acceleration of the development of fast breeder reactors. France will accelerate its production of electricity from fast breeder reactors. Britain has been experimenting for a number of years. I had the opportunity to visit Dounreay, and saw the latest plant constructed there which is in the forefront of the fast breeder technology. It was very interesting when one considers the potential for this type of generation.

I point out to members opposite that the dome of the first fast breeder reactor built at Dounreay has now been turned into a museum. When the member for Napier visits his homeland, he will be able to see the museum at Dounreay, and the exhibits from that operation. It is most interesting. When I left Australia I had read articles by the opponents of nuclear power that said that nuclear plant could never be removed, yet in Dounreay the dome was being used as a museum.

At Dounreay I was supplied with the following information:

Fast reactors can burn plutonium well, and at the same time they can convert rejected or depleted uranium into more plutonium. Using a system that includes both fast and thermal reactors, and repeatedly recycling the fuel, nearly all the uranium fed to the system can be burnt to produce useful power, without building up stocks of plutonium and depleted uranium.

I believe that the system will soon be so developed in the United Kingdom that there will be little or no residue. The information I obtained continues:

In practical terms this means that with fast reactors every ton of uranium mined can be made to produce 50 to 60 times as much useful power as at present. Britain has a stockpile of about 20 000 tons of depleted uranium; fast breeder reactors can make this equal in energy output to 40 000 000 000 tonnes of coal—which is comparable with our total known coal reserves.

Mr. Hemmings: What is the percentage of the dependency on nuclear power in the United Kingdom?

Mr. GUNN: I think it is about 14 per cent.

Mr. Hemmings: It is more than that; it is 20 per cent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre has the call.

Mr. GUNN: It is my understanding that those people

who have reservations about nuclear energy are even more concerned about fast breeder reactors, so those figures that I have quoted clearly indicate that, if they want to delay or prevent fast breeder reactors coming into operation until suitable alternative energy can be produced, they should support the export of our uranium yellowcake, for the use in the nuclear powerhouses similar to those in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: If the member for Napier went back to his home country and his will prevailed he would freeze and starve to death in the dark.

Mr. GUNN: True. In the United States I had the opportunity of visiting the open-cut uranium mining which is operated by Exxon Minerals, and also saw their yellowcake production, just out of Casper in Wyoming. This was a very large open-cut operation. It appeared to me that it was no different from any other open-cut mining operation I saw. It was more than 500 feet deep. When I discussed with people who had worked there for a number of years and people who had been in the industry for a life time, whether they were concerned about their safety, they looked at me in amazement, as they considered that they were not running any greater risk than would be the case in any other normal open-cut mining operation. That particular operation was of great interest, as I believe it would be on a smaller scale than what will take place at Roxby Downs in the next few years.

It has been claimed, that there has been a down-turn in the building and development of nuclear reactors for electricity generating. I visited the State of Washington, and was very kindly looked after by the Washington Public Power Supply Company, which is a government organisation, which has the responsibility of providing electricity to a large area in the United States. It had under construction three nuclear power stations, on the one site. It was a huge engineering project which was costing hundreds of millions of dollars, but would guarantee the long-term energy requirements of that State. I also had the opportunity there of visiting a number of nuclear installations, which clearly demonstrated to me that a country, even with the energy resources of the United States, must have nuclear generation to continue.

It has been stated on a number of occasions that there will not be a demand for our uranium. That is contrary to the information that I was given. I indicated clearly that it was my view that Taiwan was interested in buying our uranium. The Premier has indicated that other countries such as South Korea, will require our uranium. It was made very clear to me from officers of the Energy Department in the U.K. (including the same person who spoke to Mr. Dunstan) that they believed Australia had an obligation to supply Britain and those other industrial countries with uranium. As Australia was a stable political country, with a high standard of living, they were looking to us for their long-term needs. They believed that they had the expertise, and it was clear to anyone who looked at their installations that they safely used uranium for the production of electricity.

I believe that it can be demonstrated clearly that Britain and other countries in that region need our uranium. In an article that appeared in the *Press and Journal* on 27 April 1979 under the heading "Britain's future lies in nuclear power", the following statement is made:

Nuclear power is still the salvation of Britain's prosperous industrial society, despite recent criticisms, Sir John Hill, Chairman of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, said yesterday. He said there were "far too many ostriches in our society"—

somewhat like the member for Salisbury and the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia—

who believed Britain can continue living on "a buried treasure of fossil fuels, forever". We can and must have huge central power stations pumping electricity and power into our industrial society. Sir John told the British Nuclear Energy Society and the Institution of Nuclear Engineers that countries with the highest standards of living protested about nuclear power most. There was not protest from the developing countries, which saw nuclear power as the way to achieve high standards of living. He said the nuclear industry, by seeking perfection in the disposal of nuclear waste, had led the public to believe the problem was worse than it really was.

I agree entirely. It is interesting to note that in the United Kingdom there is basically a bipartisan view on nuclear energy. To reinforce that statement I quote from the United Kingdom *Atomic Energy Authority Bulletin* of July 1979. Mr. J. Milne, General Secretary of the Scottish Trades Union Congress, stated:

I cannot for the life of me see how any active committed trade unionist can find himself in the anti-nuclear camp. Why? Because to sustain the rate of economic growth necessary to start making serious inroads into unemployment, we need nuclear power. It was completely inconsistent for trades unionists to argue on the one hand for the so-called alternative economic strategy and on the other hand for abandoning or curtailing the nuclear programme and reliance on so-called alternative energy sources. No possible error on the part of the department's statisticians, and no amount of windmills and nodding ducks, could possibly bridge that energy gap. If, of course, you want to argue for continuing mass unemployment and depressed living standards, it is certainly consistent to argue for an abandonment of the nuclear programme. So we are not pro-nuclear—

he was referring to unionists—

or anti-anything else. If there are those who say that we are in the position of wanting to have our cake and eat it I could not agree with them. It is true that resources are finite. But those who argue that we can have either nuclear programmes or an energy strategy based on other resources are living in a world which has a prospect of little or no economic growth into the future. We have, in this country, the resources, human and material, to sustain a diverse and balanced energy strategy including a substantial nuclear component. If we are to retain the sort of economic objectives which I have mentioned, we are going to need all the energy we can get now and for the future.

We depend on growth to maintain our standard of living in this country and, if we want to create more jobs and a better standard of living, we need that growth. One of the areas of growth in this State will be the continuing development of a nuclear industry and the mining and further development of Roxby Downs. Many people believe that fuel from nuclear powerhouses could be turned into atomic bombs by terrorists. I said earlier that this was not possible. Unfortunately, there has been a great deal of incorrect information given to the public. It is unfortunate that the media has not been more responsible, because it has raised fears in the minds of many people.

One of the things that soon became very evident was that the opponents of nuclear energy, wherever they may be, are all following a co-ordinated line. It would appear that they are being organised on an international basis, since they are mouthing basically the same line. Their leaders are basically of the left wing of the political spectrum, and some of them extreme left wing. I say to my colleagues opposite that it appears that they were happy to reap the benefits of the uranium industry when they were in power, both federally and in this State. I believe that the basis of a great deal of the Opposition's stand is to make life as difficult as they possibly can for the current Federal

Government and this State Government.

However, referring to the opponents of nuclear energy, I am prepared to concede that there are some well-meaning concerned citizens, who do not fit the label of extreme left wingers, but who have become caught up in this exercise. Many of them are the same people who marched and protested during the anti-Vietnam campaign. We are aware of the success of that campaign, which has caused disaster to that region. Thousands of people have had to flee for their lives, and economic chaos has been brought to Cambodia and Vietnam, not to mention the enlarged Russian influence throughout the world.

If the opponents of nuclear energy are successful, it is clear (and I must emphasise that it is clear) that the Western democracies will have their economies destroyed. They will be shattered, and the economic chaos that will result could only benefit one group—those people who are attempting by all means either to destroy or render ineffective society as we know it today. They want to make life impossible in the free world.

When one says to people marching in London and various other parts of the United Kingdom protesting about the plant at Torness, I wonder what their reaction would be if suddenly there was a power blackout because of industrial action or lack of coal. Had the authorities responsible for the supply of electricity accepted the views of the demonstrators, I believe the same demonstrators would have been the first to criticise those authorities when the lights went out. And that could happen in this country or anywhere else.

It is very easy for people to protest when they are not charged with the responsibility of providing long-term energy or public services. One can be critical when one does not have that responsibility. A good example of such responsibility was when I was in the United Kingdom and I was informed by those responsible for the supply of electricity in Scotland that, if they were ordered to close down their nuclear power generating capacity, a third of the population in Scotland would most likely freeze to death in the next winter, because they would be unable to meet the electricity demand. The position was the same in places such as Chicago. I can say clearly that my impression from discussions that I was able to have is that there is a need for the continuation of the nuclear industry. I believe that we must develop Roxby Downs.

In conclusion, I want to say that I appreciated the opportunity given to me to go overseas. I consider it to have been of benefit, and I hope that all members of Parliament can receive this benefit if they stay in this place for a reasonable time. I consider that such travel makes us better members of Parliament, by giving us a broader outlook. Many of the things one looks at and the discussions that one is involved in clearly assist in helping one to represent one's district.

Regarding the subject on which I have tried to give the House some detail tonight, many of the problems associated with it stem from the fact that it is a new process and people fail completely to understand the effects that the new technology will have on them. While I was in Washington I had the pleasure of going through not only the Lincoln Memorial but also the Jefferson Memorial, and I would like to round off my speech by referring to a statement made by the third President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson. I am sure that this statement will make all members think. Thomas Jefferson stated:

I am not an advocate for frequent changes in laws and constitutions, but laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths discovered and manners and opinions change,

with the change of circumstances, institutions must advance also to keep pace with the times. We might as well require a man to wear still the coat which fitted him when a boy as civilised society to remain ever under the regimen of their barbarous ancestors.

I support the motion.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I support the motion, and I trust that this will be a productive session of Parliament. Certainly, I hope it will be a better session than the last session, which lasted for 35 days and in which we saw very little of a productive nature. First, I wish to discuss some of the procedures of this Parliament and this provides an appropriate occasion. Members will recall that for various reasons this is the third Address in Reply debate in about 12 months. However, in the normal course of events we would still have an Address in Reply debate annually in which every member receives one hour's speaking time.

Looking back in *Hansard* for the past few years, it will be seen that every private member has used the opportunity to the fullest and that on some occasions as many as three Cabinet Ministers have also spoken. One asks whether this is proper allocation of Parliamentary time, particularly when it is recalled that in most cases members use the opportunity to make a lengthy statement of philosophy or, alternatively, to comment in detail on the policy of the Government in office.

I personally think that our procedure is archaic in many respects, and this is one example. Certainly, I think that, at the beginning of the first session of each Parliament, the existing opportunity should be granted to all members. That would provide an opportunity for new members to make their maiden speeches in the traditional manner and a sufficient period of time would have passed to allow some useful general analysis by other members. However, the matter does not end there. The Address in Reply debate is simply an example of what I believe is, in substance, an entirely unproductive approach to the Parliamentary role, which is basically that of scrutiny of specific Government action, whether that action is by legislation, sub-legislation, or by any other executive or administrative form.

In the first place, we sit at silly times. Why should not we meet at, say, 11.30 on each morning of the session? We could commence the sitting in the normal manner, so that by 12.45 or 1 o'clock at the latest we would have completed the laying on of papers, Ministerial statements, and Question Time. Might I, at this stage, say that Ministerial statements should be totally excluded from Question Time. I think that one hour is quite sufficient for Question Time, provided that that is done, and provided also that Ministerial answers of a prolix kind are prevented. I have noted with some disapproval that in this Parliament recently we have had increasingly, from both political Parties, the not very edifying sight of Ministers deliberately extending their answers, so that they become in fact speeches, so as to cut into the Opposition's time.

Mr. Gunn: You should speak to Hugh Hudson about that.

Mr. McRAE: He was an offender, indeed. There have been many offenders on both sides, and I am discussing the principle of the matter. This suggestion as to starting times has been made previously. If anyone should say that departmental and other duties make this suggestion difficult to accomplish, then it would be quite simple to provide some roster of Ministers to receive questions on a basic agreed formula.

From the Opposition point of view, unless the Government were to risk the political damage of extreme obstruction, matters of extreme urgency calling for

motions of no confidence or motions of that type are still available. The opportunity would, therefore, be present to permit constructive debate to begin at 2 or 2.15 that afternoon. If that were the case, then in normal circumstances there should be sufficient time available to permit 50 minutes in grievance time at the conclusion of the days session, instead of the existing 30 minutes.

So, in the first place, I am calling for reforms of a procedural kind, which include new sitting times as I have outlined, and the elimination or substantial reduction in time of the Address in Reply debate, except on the occasion of the opening of a new session of Parliament. The extension to that time which I propose would then permit a much greater opportunity to private members to deal with matters of specific current interest.

I should also add that the 11.30 starting time should still permit the existing committee meetings on sitting days, and thus not interfere with the duties of country members in their often distant electorates, on non-sitting days. There is no reason why Executive Council should not sit a little earlier on Thursday morning if that is required. I am not proposing any changes to the existing Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday sitting days, so that Cabinet could still meet on Mondays.

All these proposed changes are an attempt to make the session more effective and more productive. But really, little will be done to attack the real problem unless we have a different approach to the examination of legislation in the first instance, and unless we also have standing committees in various legislative areas in which members are regularly involved.

In this respect, I am very pleased in some senses that the Government is proceeding with its proposed changes to the method of considering the Budget. The Opposition most certainly supports the notion of four or so committees which, hopefully, would comprise the whole of the number of private members meeting to consider the Budget lines in their appropriate area in some detail. These committees most certainly should have the opportunity to formally question civil servants in the appropriate areas, not in relation to Government policy but in relation to their expenditure proposals, including the background to those proposals and the current state of the various departments. In such a way there can still be an effective second reading debate which deals with Government policy in a much more informed manner, and there can be a marked improvement of informed debate on these specific lines. The Standing Orders Committee currently is awaiting specific proposals, and until I have seen those proposals one can only congratulate the Government in principle.

However, in addition to those sessional committees on the Budget, there should also be standing committees in the various areas of legislation. There is no reason whatsoever, except in the case of extreme urgency, why legislation, as soon as it is introduced and the second reading speech given by the Minister, should not be referred to the appropriate committee for detailed consideration, including questioning of the appropriate civil servants, of the Parliamentary Counsel, and of others where knowledge may be useful.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. McRAE: In that way, when the Bill was before the House again there would be a much more informed approach. In no way does that take the sting out of the attacks on Government policy, but it can, in addition to providing a more informed debate, provide a more productive one. Under the current procedure I have seen

far too many instances of important matters simply being overlooked in the second reading debate because it is not until the Committee stage of the whole House that an issue is noticed or a problem uncovered.

In support of these propositions I should like to cite Mr. Graham White, the Assistant Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, Canada, who, in the January 1980 edition of *The Parliamentarian*, published an interesting article on committees in the Ontario Legislature. He said at page 18:

Committees are not only better suited to the tedious slogging of clause-by-clause study of major Bills than is the House, but they also permit public participation. In the most recent session public hearings were held on 11 Bills (six of these, which dealt with children's services, were grouped as a package). For such significant and detailed Bills as those on occupational health and safety and on residential tenancies, dozens of witnesses were heard and hundreds of submissions received. Although the strains on a member's schedules and patience may be formidable, these exercises in public access to lawmaking are of great importance, not only in making for better, more responsive legislation, but also for bolstering public familiarity with and confidence in the Parliamentary process.

I certainly agree, as does Mr. White, that there will be difficulties accompanying the establishment of such committees, but I believe the rewards will far outweigh the difficulties. The sad fact is that not only now, but throughout its history, the South Australian Parliament has been dominated by the Executive, whether that Executive was comprised by Conservative or Labor Parties. It is now time to change the system.

All honourable members (and I include private members opposite) should realise that unless they support such a programme they are in grave danger of becoming simply irrelevant in the sense that they cannot maintain any authority over the Government. Of course, it follows that the whole Parliamentary system is in danger if that occurs. I, therefore, call upon this Government to very seriously consider all the proposals that I have made and at least do me the courtesy of publicly replying to these proposals. I must say that I was alarmed today to read the guidelines for public servants appearing before Parliamentary committees which were tabled, I think by the Premier, in the House yesterday afternoon.

I think every honourable member should read these guidelines with great care. As far as I am aware, it is the first time in the history of the South Australian Parliamentary system that we will have muzzled public servants appearing before committees of the House. I am alarmed to read through these guidelines. In the first place, there must be, so we are told, an adviser arranged through the Public Service Board accompanying an official appearing before a Parliamentary committee. What nonsense and arrogance that is. Does that mean to say that a Parliamentary committee cannot have before it a public servant who wants to give evidence as an expert witness or as a citizen without that person having an adviser from the Public Service Board sit there and menace him, as indeed he would be menaced by the Public Service Board? I know the Public Service Board and its procedures; I have dealt with unions that have had dealings with it, and I know what its attitude would be. It would be a menacing attitude.

These guidelines are a disgrace, and I hope that back-bench members of the Government will be expressing concern in their Party caucus as soon as possible. I now refer to guideline 5. This is an example of 1984 double-talk and double-think. If it does not come from the Public Service Board or the Crown Law Office, I will eat my hat.

It states, "In either situation"—and it refers to whether a public servant is there as an expert or a departmental official—"public servants are not expected to", and then various things are set out. That means that public servants are expected "not to", but by the delicate change of the words, by the semantic exercise in dialogue at which the Crown Law Office and the Public Service Board are so expert, they have managed to take the sting out of it. Every public servant in this State has been muzzled as a private citizen the moment these guidelines were introduced. I congratulate the Leader of this Government on putting forward a number of the proposals that I have supported tonight. I congratulated him before publicly, and I do so again. However, he does his cause no justice at all by having these guidelines, because he is defeating the whole purpose of the exercise.

Every public servant can expect, the moment he wishes to give evidence as an ordinary citizen or as an expert as distinct from a public servant, that he will be menaced by the board just as he would be by a K.G.B. official or a Fascist official or some other arrogant official. I want these guidelines removed, and I hope that every Public Service union will be with me in demanding that they be removed. Not only is that so, but when we come to the content of guideline 5, it is appalling to read. These officials who for the last 100 years have been coming before our committees, whether under a Liberal, Labor, or Conservative Government, who have never caused any problems and have never been criticised as far as I am aware, and have always expected to be witnesses of truth and fact and give honest opinions, are suddenly told that they are not to express personal opinions on Government policy. Government policies cover everything from private education, church schools, and a wide ramification of issues.

Public servants are expected not to express personal opinions on Government policies. Even worse, they are also expected not to express personal opinions on policy options. That means that if there was a witness before the committee into the mining of uranium, for example, and that witness agreed with the member for Newland, he should not say so. That is one option open to the Government. If, on the other hand, he agreed with the honourable member for Napier, he should not say that either. If he does, there is a K.G.B. man sitting alongside him to make sure that that information is carried back to the Minister, and the threat hangs over that public servant that he will be dealt with because of that. I suggest that the honourable member for Newland, who has many Public Service people in his electorate, should be reading these guidelines with some trepidation.

Dr. Billard: I was one myself.

Mr. McRAE: Then the honourable member will understand the very difficult situation in which this will put public servants. The next thing that they are expected not to do is provide information of a controversial kind. That is unbelievable. If they were to say, "In my own expert opinion, if we did go ahead with such and such a project, 50 people could be killed," that is controversial, and he must not express it because it is controversial and might be used against the Government.

The next guideline is really worthy of Moscow or Berlin at their height. A witness is expected not to provide information of a politically-sensitive nature. That could refer to the man called from the V.D. clinic or the abortion clinic at the Q.E.H. They are sensitive political matters in the minds of many people. They are two examples and I can think of others, such as the pornography board and matters related to the Minister of Health, which are also politically sensitive. How this

public servant is going to work his way through this maze of guidelines, I do not know, except by referring to the secret agent alongside him. That agent has no duty to the public servant. The Public Service Board is responsible only to the Government of the day, not to the public servant. Honourable members know what is going to happen. If the Public Service unions have got any sense at all, they will demand legal representation so that we will then have the public servant, the representative of the Public Service Board, and a lawyer representing the Public Service union. What a nonsensical farrago. None of that is needed, but it is an attempt to cover up by a Government that has suddenly got frightened at the potentiality of these committees and what they might disclose.

There is more to come, and anyone who reads this incredible document can only be amazed. I urge all honourable members on both sides to read guideline No. 8. That is a classic that could only have been jointly prepared by the Public Service Board and the Crown Solicitor's Office. It states:

When an officer being questioned or the adviser—that beats Berlin and Moscow—

considers it inappropriate to provide the information or opinion requested, or considers that the committee's questioning goes beyond these guidelines, a postponement should be requested pending consultation with the Minister.

That is unbelievable. That means that the public servant, having been muzzled with all these guidelines, even if he is convinced that he wants to give evidence of a purely factual nature that is not politically sensitive or controversial and does not do anything, suddenly gets a tap on the shoulder from the K.G.B. agent, who says, "That is enough." That is muzzling in the face of court. It is a disgraceful document, and I give it the treatment that it deserves.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. McRAE: I did not wish to burden any of the officers of the House with picking up the discarded junk; I will do that myself. However, I do not withdraw a word of what I have just said, and I hope that every Liberal Party backbencher will study it overnight and give it the same treatment, because it is the most disgraceful document that I have ever read and the most undemocratic document I have ever seen produced in the House.

I turn now to other matters of importance. Since the last Address in Reply debate there have been important and overwhelming developments in the international, national and State scenes. Certainly, it is clear to any observer that, in the past 15 years, technology has moved at such a lightning rate, company structures have changed so fast, the method of corporate transaction has developed so quickly and, in short, almost all of our institutions have suffered such tremendous pressures that it has been impossible for academics to provide any suitable basis for political Parties on which to work. And nowhere is this more evident than in the field of economics.

However, before dealing with those matters, I point again to one major international menace, and that is communist imperialism as demonstrated never more clearly than in the invasion of Afghanistan. That great Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, in February of this year, set forward in clear terms the way in which the West has continued to miscalculate and misunderstand communism. He refers to the prevailing—

total incomprehension of the malevolent and unyielding nature of communism which is equally dangerous to every country.

He says:

Communism is something new, unprecedented in world history; it is fruitless to seek analogies. All warnings to the West about the pitiless and insatiable nature of communist regimes have proved to be in vain because the acceptance of such a view would be too terrifying. (Did not the Afghan tragedy take place two years ago? But the West shut its eyes and postponed recognising the problem—all for the sake of an illusory detente.) For decades it has been standard practice to deny reality by citing "peaceful co-existence", "detente", "the Kremlin leadership's pursuit of peace". Meanwhile communism envelopes country after country and achieves new missile capabilities. Most amazing is that the communists themselves have for decades loudly proclaimed their goal of destroying the bourgeois world (they have become more circumspect lately), while the West merely smiled at what seemed to be an extravagant joke. Yet destroying a class is a process that has already been demonstrated in the U.S.S.R. So has the method of exiling an entire people into the wilderness in the space of 24 hours.

Unless the West squarely faces this problem and stops its continuing retreat, it is bringing about its own destruction at an ever-increasing rate. In the process, it is also abandoning to their fate tens of millions of people for whom freedom and justice is still an ideal and who certainly have ample evidence to know that they do not find it in communism. I can only point to the disgraceful attitude of the West towards Afghanistan. We well know that millions of people in Afghanistan do not for a moment want the U.S.S.R. annexation of their country, yet the West has stood by and done nothing whatsoever. It is because of my strong views on totalitarian regimes, both communist and capitalist, that I was at some pains to stress my attitude to those guidelines tonight. If any backbencher thinks that some of the things I have to say are extreme, let him remember that both totalitarian communism and the totalitarian Governments in the West, to which I am coming now, have started the chipping-away process by just such guidelines.

Meanwhile, in the West itself, great evils continue to exist in many countries, as I have continually pointed out. My opposition to communism is founded on my positive assertion that freedom and social justice are not just privileges but are the rights of all men everywhere. Therefore, I am just as critical of South American countries in their denial of freedom and justice to their own people as I am to the communists.

This is why I was delighted to find Pope John Paul II, after a series of international forays on other matters, visiting 12 Latin American countries and demanding rapid, significant reform. In 13 different cities, he warned the authorities that, unless basic rights were given to their people, violence would inevitably occur. Never in the history of Christianity has a world leader of a church been so clear or so blunt. In Brazil, he told President Figueiredo that among those rights were:

life, security, work, a home, health, education, religious expression—private and public—participation.

In several cities, before massive audiences, he demanded sweeping reforms to guarantee human dignity and the basic necessities of life to the continent's massive population living in misery and poverty. He bluntly summed up the political leaders of Latin America:

reform or violence; the choice is yours.

As a person whose personal philosophy is based on the ideals of personal freedom, I could not be more delighted to have those principles so clearly and bluntly enunciated. However, the reality remains that even in those parts of the West where substantial liberty exists (and I refer to North America, Japan, Australasia, Western Europe and Britain), we are facing an enormous social and economic

revolution. The reality is that the historical era of the sovereign national State has gone. The West is now in reality one federation, or alternatively a series of federations. Whatever unease or trouble plagues one part inevitably plagues the rest. But putting aside the problems caused by communist imperialism and the Arab monopoly and the manipulation of oil prices, it is clear that the biggest problems we face are to find ways of curbing the corporate revolution without destroying freedom, and ensuring genuine freedom of the press within democratic guidelines.

The dreadful situation in Australia is that the national press, for all practical purposes, is now controlled by Messrs. Murdoch and Fairfax. Again, Government members, particularly back-benchers, might pause to consider that dreadful combination. The much vaunted free enterprise ideal along with the principle of competition on the open market have gone. What is more, both of these gentlemen have a track record of satisfying their egos by making and breaking Governments.

It is in fact, I know, a reflection of what has occurred in the West generally. It must be said, however, that the general standard of factual information provided by the two groups in Australia is deplorably low. It is a disgrace to think that Australia, with its highly educated and talented population, has to suffer the inane policies of these papers. What a disgrace, when as Australians we have to turn to British, American or European papers to get any clear and reliable picture of the facts in any complex situation.

I realise, of course, that it is not only the Liberal Party which has collaborated with each of them (referring to Murdoch and Fairfax). Certainly, the Labor Party did so federally in 1961 and again in 1972. Neville Wran did so in 1979, in New South Wales. But the disgraceful situation is that it now appears that, without such collaboration, there is a very strong case to suggest that no political Party can gain office.

So, we have the grave danger of a monopoly situation, and who can deny the possibility that any semblance of competition will go if one group suddenly toppled the other? This year and last year we have seen the corporate bodies in violent upheaval, one with the other, and take-overs at an ever-increasing pace.

In combination with this evil we have a very low standard of journalism. I hasten to add that this is not because of mediocre journalists, because we have very talented men and women in this field as well as all others. It is simply that their corporate bosses take the line of the lowest possible standard (most honourable members would agree with that). In addition, they are hampered by the collusive deals between the newspaper and the political Parties (both major political Parties have been equally guilty), the newspaper and other large corporate groups in which those papers have an interest (only today we heard from the member for Stuart, or possibly from my Leader, the interest that the Murdoch group apparently now has in the gas supply of our State), and, finally, deals between the advertisers and the newspaper. And, added to all this, is the clear enjoyment that newspaper bosses take in wielding this colossal power.

I am not, of course, saying that a newspaper in a democracy should not be able to say what it likes but, when there are fundamentally only two newspapers and they each say the same thing, freedom itself is at risk. Everyone knows of the hatred that Mr. Murdoch has for Mr. Hayden. In fact, everyone knows of the hatred that Mr. Murdoch has for anyone who dares to defy Mr. Murdoch. Many people in this city knew Mr. Murdoch well in his youth and young middle age and many people

overseas have found that their evaluation of Mr. Murdoch and his egomaniac character is quite correct.

Mr. Hayden had the courage to point to the evils that exist. For that he has suffered. It is well known that Mr. Murdoch supports Bob Hawke and will do everything in his power to disrupt Hayden's run for the Prime Ministership of this country. This is quite open knowledge. I am not giving anything new to members on either side.

A very good argument can be mounted, and is mounted, by prominent academics that the situation (that is, the fight between Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Hayden) can frustrate the A.L.P.'s electoral hopes. To add to all this, the same newspaper groups have established a stranglehold on television, and no-one can rest assured that they will not deal with their remaining competitors in that area of the media in the same way as they have acted elsewhere.

It is also obvious that, in Malcolm Fraser's term of office, every attempt has been made to stifle and restrict the A.B.C. That, too, frightens me, when I think that we have only two major newspaper groups and now Mr. Fraser is muzzling the A.B.C. It is all very well for the Deputy Premier to laugh. I take it that he was a co-author of this disgraceful document on the guidelines. I am not surprised that he would be very pleased. We have a grave danger of a monopoly situation, and it does not matter whether the monopolies are working for the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, or any other Party. If one is a democrat, one should oppose it on those grounds alone. There needs to be a solution found as between the different Parties.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: I hope that the Deputy Premier will allow me to continue.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will ensure that the member for Playford will be able to continue his remarks, and he must not invite interjections.

Mr. McRAE: In the circumstances I have mentioned, it is absolutely essential that Australians try to find a solution, within democratic principles, to the newspaper monopoly, and most assuredly should strive to prevent any further erosion of competition still existing on television and radio. It is amazing that such a proposal should be greeted with alarm, because it has often occurred to me in the past that there are a number of issues on which the two major political Parties in Australia could readily find common ground and eradicate these evils, to their joint advantage in the long term. For instance, Steele Hall proved in this State that it was possible for the Liberal Party to gain office in a democratically organised franchise. He was attacked in this House when he introduced the reforms in the 1968 Parliament.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You just said Murdoch won the election.

Mr. McRAE: I am referring, first, to Steele Hall, who as Premier in the 1968 Parliament proposed that there could be a democratic franchise and that within that democratic franchise the Liberal Party could win.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You're talking about—

Mr. McRAE: The Minister is mumbling. I cannot hear what he is saying.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to ignore all interjections.

Mr. McRAE: I will try to do that, Sir. The Liberal Party did not win in 1970 but, within the same guidelines and somewhat further extended by the Dunstan Government on the strictly one vote one value principle, the Liberal Party did win in 1979. The fact is that the very proposals that were used to make Steele Hall a whipping boy have given the Liberal Party office. To me, it is a disgrace that the political Parties in Australia cannot find agreement on

such a basic principle as one vote one value. The situation in Western Australia is a nationally-known evil. You will know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because of your noted admiration for what occurs in Western Australia, that it is an evil that they have, and whatever—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not reflecting on the Chair.

Mr. McRAE: Certainly not. I am saying that, no matter what is the strength of your argument here and arguments in other areas, it is a nationally-known evil that the system in Western Australia is such that the Labor Party cannot win office in the Upper House, because the boundaries are rigged. I agree that in Queensland for 40 years the Labor Party did what Joh Bjelke-Petersen has now done, but that is not the point. If one is a democrat—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You didn't complain then.

Mr. McRAE: I do not think I was alive when the Queensland gerrymander was first enunciated and put into force. Whether it is the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the National Party, the Country Party, or whatever other Party, it is a disgrace. Surely all Parties ought to be able to agree on one simple principle of one vote one value. It is an insult to our highly talented population that the political Parties cannot agree, and surely all Australians ought to be able to agree on the sort of boundary structure we now have in South Australia and New South Wales. Similarly, all Australian political Parties ought to be considering the newspaper monopoly to which I have been referring.

When we combine all that with the success of Governments throughout Australia (and again I draw no line between the Labor Party, the Liberal Party, and the National Party) in suppressing information, the whole picture is quite alarming. Freedom of information in this country is a joke when it affects Governments or their instrumentalities, and it always has been. In the same way as when 100 years ago the Executive ruled this State and Parliament was a rubber stamp, that is the case today. In the same way as when 100 years ago there was no freedom of information to Government departments or instrumentalities, nor is there today.

The United States had to endure the Nixon disaster before ensuring freedom of information, but to its credit it has done that. No American political leader at any level could conceivably get away with what occurs in Australia. And most American citizens are guaranteed access to documents and records which might harm or damage them, except in the case of real demonstration of security risks.

Australians deserve at least that much, and so I call on both the Federal Government and this Government to introduce legislation on the U.S. Federal model, with a view to public hearings being conducted before a Select Committee of the House of Assembly.

Furthermore, I again demand that this Government introduce an obligation on all M.P.'s, judges and senior public servants to disclose their financial interests along the model of the Bill introduced by my Party.

In addition to these threats to our nation's freedom, we are also faced with the alarming activities of the large corporate bodies. Let me set forth what I think is the reality and then ask whether anyone would or could deny it.

First, is it not true that Australia has every conceivable resource, natural and human, that any nation on earth could want? Is it not true that we have a very small population? Is it not true that until recent years our citizens had the highest standard of living on earth, matched only by the North American democracies and the Scandinavians? Is it not now true that our standard of

living has dropped so badly that, once having been in second or third position, we are fortunate to be in the 25th position? Is it not true that unemployment is at a disastrously high level and that wages in real terms have decreased quite dramatically in the past five years? At the same time is it not true that the large corporate bodies in almost every field from mining to car manufacture, the retail industry, banking and commercial enterprises, have consistently secured record profits? Specifically, is it not true that in the past five years average corporate profits and dividends have increased from a healthy 9.5 per cent to a bloated 14.5 per cent?

I doubt that anybody could answer these questions negatively. And all of this has happened in the context of the most curious method of handling our so-called mineral boom. Australian Governments of all persuasions claim that there are enormous profits and opportunities available to corporate bodies in mining ventures, and this is true beyond any doubt. Yet the taxpayer pays hundreds of millions of dollars (and that figure is probably conservative) for all the industrial infrastructure. True, there are royalties, but it is very hard for me to believe that in the long term the return on the royalties will do much better than equal the servicing of the infrastructure debt.

Meanwhile, with all these advantages granted to them, it is not surprising that the mining companies can control enormous profits which, in many cases, depart the country. Would anybody deny my assertion that about 50 per cent of all Australian industry is now in foreign hands? The supposed return for all this is employment and, if that was the case, while not being very happy, I would go along with the mining companies, but all Australians should now know that, apart from the initial employment in supplying the infrastructure, the final employment figures are very low. In other words, the taxpayer is financing huge corporate bodies and, in the case of the wage and salary earner, is not unlikely to gain employment for himself or his children as a result.

I realise that not all industry provides as glaring an example as do the mining companies. But, even in the case of car manufacturers, huge contributions have been made by the taxpayer and yet employment opportunities are falling, not increasing. I also appreciate that these same corporate bodies are expert blackmailers and have threatened, and no doubt will continue to threaten, the transfer of their activities to the Philippines, Indonesia, Taiwan or South Africa to gain the benefit of the dollar-a-day worker.

Mr. Keneally: Or even one State against another.

Mr. McRAE: That is another possibility. Some would argue that this whole situation is utterly without solution within the democratic framework. Indeed, they would say, for instance, that the only way for Mr. Hayden to gain office, or for my Leader in this State to gain office, is to have Murdoch and Fairfax on side and to bend every policy to suit the corporations. I am not prepared, without an enormous effort being made, to say that anything is incapable of solution inside the democratic framework, but I do say that this whole situation is wrong and that in itself is a threat to democracy. Unless in some way the corporations of this country are required to act in a manner conducive to social justice, the erosion of all our standards will continue unabated.

The fact is that corporations, like individuals, should never be exempt from proper standards of conduct. It is interesting to note that the corporations have profited very much from technology, and it is even more interesting to note that, in the context of the following observation by Albert Einstein:

I believe that the horrifying deterioration in the ethical

standard of people today stems primarily from the mechanisation and dehumanisation of our lives—a disastrous by-product of the development of the scientific and technical mentality.

I now refer to the State scene. In doing so, I wish to speak constructively. Nearly one year has passed since government changed hands in this State. It was a change of government that has been discussed at length by academics and also in this House. In particular, the members for Todd and Newland, for instance, have made an excellent analysis of many of the factors that were involved.

Several of my colleagues and I gave our own views. I, at the time, pointed out that there were two particular falsities continually thrust upon the electors, and in particular in the outer suburban areas, to which I objected. I stringently maintained then, and I still do now, that it was a dreadful injustice to the unemployed of Florey, Playford, Salisbury, Todd and Newland to suggest that the incoming Liberal Government would be in a position, granted all its other ideological commitments, to provide employment for all, or the majority of those in difficulty.

Indeed, I put on public record again and again that, while there were many factors about the election that were highly unsatisfactory, I was quite prepared as a politician to expect and accept tough treatment. But, most assuredly, I drew the line at the large advertisements in the newspapers, on the T.V. and the large signs near the polling booths in my own district, which clearly asserted that a vote for Labor was to continue unemployment and a vote for the Liberals was to solve it. This was an assertion that very clearly had a marked impact on the result.

The member for Newland, Dr. Billard, said so in his Address in Reply speech, his maiden speech in Parliament (*Hansard* page 749, 6 November 1979). Likewise, the member for Todd, Mr. Ashenden, indicated in his Address in Reply speech, also his maiden speech, that unemployment was an issue he spoke on frequently in the lead-up to the election (*Hansard* page 832, 7 November 1979). That honourable member continued to say that people in his district had felt the effects of unemployment very much.

Indeed, that is quite right, and all of these districts in the outer metropolitan area are in the same category. I well recall that, in my own district, the polling booths were, in many cases, manned for the Liberal Party by young unemployed people, and I am sure that they honestly believed what was being put. I said so at the time, and accordingly, predicted that they were being misled. I do not blame them; I blame the power brokers behind the Liberal Party campaign for the fraud that was perpetrated on those young people. The members for Newland and for Todd were quite right when they said that the north-east suburbs were badly affected by unemployment.

I agree that miracles cannot be performed overnight but, in the light of those promises and those clear assertions and expectations built up in the minds of those young people, unemployment should have decreased to at least some extent in the intervening 10 months. The sad fact is that it has not; it has increased and will go on increasing unless the Government can produce some programme that it has not mentioned before.

If I was one of those young people, I would feel very bitter; I would feel cheated and disillusioned. I would, of course, know that somebody like Mr. John Rundle had a very good job on election day and wanted for nothing in material terms. The committee which he led suddenly scattered the moment the election was decided. The

traders he had represented got what they wanted and they will continue to get it, I have no doubt. Employment is no better for the youth of Playford, Todd or Newland, but Mr. Rundle's employment prospects were excitingly improved.

I have no intention of reflecting on Mr. Rundle's character from a position of privilege. He is entitled to his good name and I say nothing about him personally; but I can certainly say there are many, many businessmen who could represent this State just as well as, or better than, Mr. Rundle could. I know from my dealings with the industrial and business communities that there is a large split in the Liberal ranks on that issue alone and that there are many people in the manufacturing industry and in commerce generally in the Liberal Party who, just on the grounds of competence, have been upset by Mr. Rundle's appointment. However, that is for the Government to decide. I do not reflect on Mr. Rundle's good name but, regarding his competence, I believe that there are many other people who could represent this State at least as well as Mr. Rundle could represent this State.

However, I do say that on election day Mr. Rundle had a good business—he may very well have earned it (I have no doubt that he did). I believe that he inherited a good part of it, but I do not reflect on him for that: no doubt he has built up the business as well. I assume he still has that good business or, if he does not, he will gain the benefit of a capital sale. But he now has a very highly paid five-year employment in one of the world's most interesting cities. His wife, I am sure, and his family, will be delighted. I am sorry I cannot congratulate him or feel happy for his wife or his family, but I am afraid that when I read of his appointment, and, in the *Advertiser* social notes, read of his wife's preparations for her shift to the house in London—Wimbledon, no less—which we the taxpayers will pay for, I could not help but reflect on how much better he had done than any of the unemployed.

I could not do anything else but draw the conclusion that this was his reward for a job well done. The sorrow of it is that the job was so dirty, rotten, ill conceived, and, at worse, maliciously conceived. I would hope that the members for Todd and for Newland will be raising this matter in their Party room because, clearly, in their speeches to their electors, they helped raise these expectations. Regrettably, they are either innocent, incompetent, or guilty of collusion with the unsavoury collection of miners and traders that Mr. Rundle led, or perhaps I should say, acted as bag-man for. I hope that each of them will be able to explain why unemployment has not decreased by 17 000 jobs, because that promise was printed on the placards in the north-east suburbs. That was the promise; it was not 7 000 jobs or 10 000 jobs, but 17 000 jobs.

The other issue at which I drew the line was the clear assertion in the course of what was termed "the law and order campaign" by the then Liberal Opposition, that the Labor Party was in some way responsible for some of the dreadful crimes committed over the years of its office. In fact, the member for Todd in his Address in Reply speech (*Hansard*, page 831, November 1979) stated:

First, in my campaigning, there is no doubt that the electorate saw the control of crime as one of the key issues of the election. I assure all South Australians, particularly in the seat of Todd, that I regard with the greatest importance the support the Government can offer the police and the courts. I also believe that it is time that we had a Government that considered the victim of the crime as well as the criminal. I do not for a moment suggest that we ignore helping the person who perpetrates the crime, but at the same time, surely we must take a much greater interest in the innocent victim of

crime, and ensure that South Australians can move freely about our cities and towns.

I quite agree with him. There were, however, two basic things wrong with the way in which the Liberal Party approached this matter. First, it implied that the Labor Party was allied with crime figures. Who will forget that disgusting advertisement of the hooded hoodlum, authorised by Mr. Buick and paid for under cover of darkness by Adrien Brien Ford?

As in the case of unemployment, it was a case of saying anything, no matter how scandalous or wrong, to denigrate the Government. As in the case of unemployment, it was a case of promising solutions without having any solution to offer. That is the plain fact of the matter. The Liberal Party had no solution to offer in relation to the unemployment question or the law and order issue. In fact, it is remarkable that, on such a key issue to any political Party now assuming office, there have been no changes whatever. Just contrast what the Labor Party did on its first election in 1970, after having waited for a similar period of time as the Liberal Party did. It raised issues such as workmen's compensation and consumer protection, and legislation was introduced in the first six months in many cases. Obviously, changes could be introduced because solutions to problems had been thought through. Again, in a fraud on the electorate, the Liberal Party offered something it did not have. In the case of criminals we call that false pretences: why not be blunt and use that language for politicians?

The member for Todd referred to support for the police and support for victims of crime, yet, when I put forward a specific series of proposals, the Government in no way offered any constructive debate on the issue, let alone any action. Indeed, it deliberately refused to let the motion be put to a vote. The truth was that neither the Chief Secretary nor the Government were capable of discussing the issue. I attempted to discuss the issue with the Chief Secretary, but he was able to tell me only that he was going to get some instructions from Cabinet. The motion I put on record at that time was very rational and reasonable. It stated:

That in the opinion of the House victims of crime suffering personal injuries should be compensated by a publicly funded insurance scheme similar to the Workers Compensation Act and should otherwise be assisted and rehabilitated if necessary on the basis that public moneys expended be recovered where possible from those at fault, and further that a Select Committee be appointed to report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on the most efficient manner of achieving that result and also to examine and report on property loss suffered by victims of crime.

I would have thought that this was a proper issue for a Parliamentary Select Committee, but no, it was blocked. Some weeks later not the Chief Secretary but the Attorney-General made the following statement in the *Sunday Mail*:

I ordered the inquiry because the Government believes more can be done to help people who are victims of crime in our community. Among the areas which will be investigated are the services now available for victims, the needs of private community based service programmes and whether the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act is the best way to help victims.

That clearly implies that neither the Chief Secretary, the Attorney-General or anyone else in the Liberal Party had any answers to that question. The Government had to appoint a committee to inform it of the answers, and then, in the light of that report, produce some answers for the community. Obviously, the Government did not have

those answers on 19 September last year. The article continues:

Membership of the committee will be—Inspector J. Murray of the South Australian Police; Ms. J. Barbour, of the Adelaide Children's Hospital Non-Accidental Injuries Unit; Mr. C. Harris, Assistant Deputy Director-General of the Community Welfare Department; Mr. R. Whitrod, of the Victims of Crime Services community organisation; Ms. Rosemary Wighton, Women's Adviser to the Premier; Dr. Aileen Connon, health services co-ordinator of the South Australian Health Commission; and Mr. B. R. Martin, Principal Assistant Crown Prosecutor of the Crown Law Office.

I am not criticising the membership of the committee, which is in fact very good. What I am criticising is that it has been taken out of the hands of Parliament for political capital only. Just like the famous guidelines I was pleased to tear up tonight, it is designed to muzzle the Opposition and to prevent people from having recourse to the elected representative. So much for the great promises of free and open Select Committees of Parliament.

If one thing is clear in the past 10 months it is this: anyone can forget those basic promises made by this Government on which it was elected, except those secret promises made to those who paid for or helped in the election of September 1979. We still have unemployment, we have worse unemployment, and we still have crime and we still have victims of crime. The Government does not have answers to any of those questions, or even tentative solutions to any of those problems. We still have transport problems, and we still have enormous problems for small business people, but it is interesting to note that Mr. Rundle, the miners and the retail traders have all done very well. I shall be interested to find out Mr. Buick's price, and perhaps Adrian Brien's as well.

It should be noted that in winning this election the Liberal Party had the support of the press and also of the corporations. In discussing the national scene, I had posed the question whether without such help it was any longer possible to gain Government. Perhaps on the smaller State scene the problem is not so acute, but at the least it can be said that such support is a very great assistance towards gaining power. The Liberal campaign was stage-managed by the Murdoch Press in an absolutely blatant way. It was so blatant that many of its employees who had no particular love for the Labor Party, but who were supporters of democracy, were amazed.

The corporations, and in particular the miners and the retail traders, supplied a very substantial majority of the money needed for the campaigning. Never since then have these groups raised the question of unemployment. That is true because under our system as it exists the corporations are concerned only with profit, not with employment.

The unemployed have learned the hard way in relation to the offers made to them, and small business people, too, have learned the hard way. They thought they would be on the receiving end of a bonanza; instead, of course, they were led like lambs to the slaughter. They are gradually coming to realise that the support of the large corporations was gained to the detriment of the small business man, who I understand is the traditional backbone of the Liberal Party in Australia. It is quite clear that, in relation to all kinds of corporate and trading practices, this Government is committed to give big business what it wants. The glaring recent example of that was the Government's incredible decision on bread discounting. Of all the parties involved, including manufacturers, small business men, the consumer and large corporate retail traders, only the corporate retail

traders were the winners. No other person was heard to support the decision. The manufacturer, small business men and the unions all spoke together in condemning it. The consumers had nothing to say because they already well know the unsavoury results of discount practices. Just as Mr. Rundle led the business men at the election, the retail traders were among the biggest contributors to the funds. Mr. Rundle has received his benefit, and the retailers have received their's over and again.

About one year ago today it was a rather shell-shocked Opposition which entered this place. In that one year we have become a united and capable team and have reorganised our Party at all levels. We are an alternative Government and seek to win on constructive policies. I have pointed out negative aspects because that must be done. In the course of the session, however, I look forward to each Government measure that is deserving of support, receiving it, but equally, each Government measure deserving opposition and condemnation being opposed or condemned. But, most important of all in that latter circumstance, I look forward to this alternative Government not just opposing and condemning but proposing its solution to be used when it regains office two years or so from now. The public in two most important aspects were conned one year ago, but we have a population that is far too talented to be conned again. What they want, and demand, is an alternative Government which has a freshness and the vigour of excellent Labor Governments of the past, and that they shall have and endorse.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): As the member for Albert Park, since taking office I have deliberately set out to justify the support of my constituents, which I gratefully acknowledge by seeking out issues and problems that affect my electorate and, more importantly, my constituents. These needs are diverse because of the many ethnic groups, diverse activities and various aspirations of the respective suburbs and families in the eight suburbs that make up my electorate. However, before commenting on the needs and aspirations of my constituents, I believe it is worth while reflecting on some of the history of the District of Albert Park. This electorate has seen many changes since its inception in 1970, particularly the development of the area of West Lakes (and I shall refer to that area shortly) and the influx of the many thousands of new residents who currently reside there.

The development and expansion of the Royal Park industrial areas has created jobs for many but, conversely, one has seen the virtual closing down of Philips factory at Hendon. This complex at Hendon houses six firms occupying approximately 350 000 square feet and has 290 000 square feet of unused covered area which is suitable for light to medium industry and which is open for leasing. The industrial development of the Hendon complex would compliment the industrial and service industries in the Royal Park area and, together with the current and future development of West Lakes, would assist in overcoming many of the unemployment problems in the area.

West Lakes has seen some of the most dramatic changes of any electorate in this State. This area, which had originally bordered the estuarine swamps of the Port River, was transformed with the development of West Lakes, which is certainly Adelaide's and probably Australia's foremost urban development project involving co-operation between Government and private enterprise. This has resulted in the electorate becoming a unique blend of old and new, and has involved the upgrading of a region which was once considered to be the back of

beyond to what is now one of Adelaide's most visited locations.

The West Lakes indenture involved negotiations with private enterprise by successive Governments. However, all the major progress at West Lakes in the 1970's was made under a Labor Government, and West Lakes Ltd., underlining the fact that a Labor Government has the expertise and ability (contrary to what our political opponents state) to co-operate with private enterprise for the benefit of this State. There are many significant factors about this development, as it has produced a unique blending of types of accommodation incorporating some 600 rental apartments in the area, extensive areas of housing for older families, and single houses for young families, as well as expensive lake-front homes.

West Lakes is a good example of how communities should be developed. To date, approximately 3 000 dwellings, housing 11 000 people have been built in this area, and the eventual population of West Lakes alone will be approximately 20 000. Thus it forms a significant portion of the electorate. West Lakes Mall is the major shopping centre in the electorate and provides one-stop shopping for approximately 60 000 to 100 000 customers a week, and it is within this mall that I have endeavoured to relocate my electorate office so that I may have greater contact with my constituents. Hopefully, the Government will agree to such relocation when the further extensions to the mall are completed within, I understand, 18 months.

There are plans for further development around this centre, which include a hotel convention and leisure complex. Because of its exceptional location on the lake front, this development has tremendous tourist potential and should therefore receive every support from the Government. This area boasts some of Adelaide's most beautiful beaches and has Adelaide's biggest recreational lake. The 260-acre lake is an asset used not only by residents of West Lakes but also by the general public of South Australia. The international standard of rowing is the best in Australia, and the lake has the potential as a major venue for major aquatic events.

Housed in this area between Frederick Road and the coast are two golf courses including the Grange golf course which has in recent years been the venue for many major golfing classics. This area of West Lakes is the centre of Australian Rules football in this State, having Football Park and, once the question of lighting this stadium has been resolved, I believe that, coupled with the aforementioned development and the erection of more seating accommodation at the S.A.N.F.L.'s headquarters, this area of the Albert Park electorate is capable of attracting and providing a national and international venue for many sporting and other events.

This is an area which the Government should, in co-operation with the sporting bodies of South Australia and the Tourist Bureau, exploit to its full potential. This locality has the potential to create urgently needed job opportunities for the unemployed in the north-western suburbs.

I would now like to return to the needs of my electorate. The Albert Park electorate, in terms of public transport, is one of the most under-privileged in metropolitan Adelaide and, as the Minister of Transport is aware, this is highlighted by the number of complaints I have forwarded to him on behalf of my constituents. The worst served areas are Royal Park, Semaphore Park and West Lakes.

The Adelaide-Grange line runs through the middle of the electorate, but the majority of the aforementioned suburbs are serviced by spasmodic bus services. In fact, those suburbs of Royal Park, Semaphore Park, and West

Lakes have virtually no public transport before 8 a.m. and after 6 p.m. on weekdays and no transport at weekends after 1 p.m. on Saturday, with the exception of those services provided for patrons attending fixtures at Football Park.

The upgrading of public transport will intensify rapidly and will be required to provide services for, first, the increase in customers at West Lakes Mall and to cater for the needs of the public once the extensions to that complex are completed within 18 months; secondly, the expected increased utilisation and attendance at the sporting facilities adjacent to and at Football Park; thirdly, the increase in tourists and local residents at the hotel, convention and leisure complex to be built on the lake foreshore; fourthly, for the occupants of the three blocks of multi-storey flats envisaged opposite Football Park; fifthly, the projected increase of 9 000 additional residents in the West Lakes area within six to nine years, coupled with the present population, will mean that public transport will have to serve a compact population of about 20 000 residents; sixthly, because of the increasing percentage of the retired and elderly citizens in the electorate, more and more demands will be made on public transport; and seventhly, the need to provide a better bus service for students attending Seaton and West Lakes High School, in particular the latter which has not received a reply from the Minister of Transport, by 31 July 1980 as promised, with respect to the provision of a bus service along Frederick Road for students attending that school. The West Lakes High School is anxious to hear from the Minister on this matter, as promised.

As detailed in the fifth requirement listed above, one can anticipate an escalation of many psychological and social problems for many of the elderly, disadvantaged and ethnic groups in the electorate owing to the inadequacies of public transport and the need to communicate with their respective friends and relatives. As an adjunct to the upgrading of the S.T.A. services, the need for a community bus service is justified and such a service could be run in a way similar to that which currently exists in the Tea Tree Gully area. I refer here to the initiative taken by the Woodville Council in this respect.

Moreover, the extension of the Circle Line bus routes should be investigated and, together with the suggestions above, many of the transport problems in the areas previously designated could be overcome. In addition, the Government, because of the continual escalation in the cost of fuel prices, increases in motor registration and comprehensive and third party insurance rates and the costs of accidents, particularly in relation to hospital costs, should investigate the relative costs and community attitudes towards the extension of the Hendon rail line into the West Lakes area, as originally planned. This investigation should include a study into the feasibility of a bus-rail interchange at West Lakes Mall which could not only serve the western sea board from Henley Beach to Semaphore Park but could also cater for patrons attending the sporting fixtures at the localities I have previously mentioned in the Football Park and lake area.

One can envisage national, international and other fixtures in that vicinity attracting crowds of 150 000 to 200 000 over a long holiday weekend, and more so if the football stadium becomes the sporting mecca of South Australia. However, such studies must be carried out in conjunction with all major commercial, residential, social and community groups in the electorate. Plans to link West Lakes Boulevard between Tapleys Hill Road and Clark Terrace have been delayed because of the strong community reaction and insistence by Government

departments on achieving a particular standard of roadway.

Some groups in the electorate feel that "the time has arrived when this road junction needs to be made but in such a manner so as to reduce to an absolute minimum the amount of interference with residents in that area". However, I would stress the need for community meetings and consultations to occur, as I am cognizant of the strong reaction that a similar proposal engendered in 1973-74.

As in so many other areas, projections of likely school population made in the early 1970's have now been revised dramatically, and the major West Lakes High School, which was proposed for West Lakes Shore, has been shelved, despite the fact that residents were promised this facility.

The Royal Park High School has now become the West Lakes High School. This school, whilst achieving excellent academic results over recent years through the assistance of very dedicated staff, is lacking in the standard and type of facilities which were promised for the West Lakes High School.

Whilst I am talking about the school, it is important, too, to mention the sewage treatment works which is located in Frederick Road, immediately opposite the school. Work was commenced some four years ago on eliminating odours by removing sludge lagoons and upgrading the treatment process by covering tanks, etc. This programme, however, seems to be falling well behind schedule.

Again it is essential if we are to fulfil the promises made to Royal Park and West Lakes residents and also to upgrade the image of the West Lakes High School that this work proceed as a matter of urgency.

The requirements for Seaton North High School include the provision of additional and more flexible buildings to replace temporary buildings, improvements to book storage, administration office and technical study areas and the need for more new art and craft facilities.

Moreover, changes in use of school facilities over the years has led to some incongruous situations. In relation to the bookroom floor, the upper storey of the main building was not designed to take the weight to which it is currently subjected. Some offices have a urinal along the wall. Because of its age the school is out of date, severely restricting the curriculum options and organisation structures within the school.

Many young families live in the West Lakes and surrounding areas and therefore will require secondary education. The comparison between Seaton High School and West Lakes High School shows that facilities are nowhere near equal. Indeed, neither school favourably compares with the more recently constructed high schools. Because of the removal of school zoning, parents and students have the opportunity to select between schools, and unless Seaton High School can provide opportunities and facilities, etc., equal to those at the West Lakes High School I can envisage many problems for both high schools before long.

The requirements for Woodville Primary School include the need to enlarge the clerical assistant's office, floor coverings in all classrooms, more adult toilet facilities, improved lighting, and the upgrading of the expressive arts centre. Other matters of concern include the loss of the clerical assistant and 30 hours of ancillary staff time, the poor condition of the school yard, classroom units built without essential facilities, and the lack of a public address system or intercom which is essential as the school grounds and buildings cover a large area. In all, this school and the Hendon Park Primary School need to be upgraded to at

least a level of facilities similar to those at Semaphore Park and West Lakes Shore Primary Schools.

Whilst speaking of the latter schools, I should say that the Semaphore Park child-parent centre has recently been advised that a new building is to be erected adjacent to the current building to overcome the gross overcrowding and unsatisfactory conditions under which children and teachers had to function. Vandalism is of concern to most primary school principals in the electorate, in particular at Woodville and Hendon Primary Schools. I refer to the following report that appeared recently in the Messenger Press under the heading "School action plan for vandals":

Hendon Primary School Council wants urgent positive action from the Education Department to curb incessant vandalism and stealing at the school. Principal Rosemary Gracanin said upgrading of security lighting was needed immediately. The school council wrote to the department last week. Area director Reuben Goldsworthy said he and his staff would investigate the problems.

Recently the school had a large spate of thefts which included audio visual equipment, a tape recorder, sporting gear and televisions and cassettes. The school and canteen have been broken into frequently and members of the public also use the school grounds as a thoroughfare to get from Cedar Avenue to North Parade.

"We have stopped that problem by ensuring that one of the gates is always locked as soon as school is out," Mrs. Gracanin said. In a letter to Albert Park M.P. Kevin Hamilton, school council secretary Roger Halliday said councils had tried for some time to combat the stealing and vandalism with their limited resources.

"In the past we have obtained quotes from security patrol firms and when the problem was at its height council members patrolled the school grounds themselves," Mr. Halliday said. "However this system was not practical over a long term as members are neither trained for the work, nor do they have the time as they have to go to work. Now is the time for decisive action with no more security surveys and funds availability nonsense from the Education Department."

Mr. Halliday said funding for a security system was of prime importance. The school recently held a meeting attended by parents, staff, council and a local police representative. Inspector Peter Mildren from Port Adelaide Police said the school had a lot of louver windows and faulty locks on doors which could be improved for security. He said police believed a group of children living near the school were responsible for most of the thefts and vandalism.

Mr. Hamilton said the problem was of grave concern and the Education Department should do something quickly in reply to the letter sent to the department from the school last week. "I have seen the broken windows and jemmied doors at the school," he said. "The department has an obligation to provide satisfactory security."

Seaton North Primary and West Lakes High schools which are in the near vicinity both have Metropolitan Security Service systems.

Another matter that concerns me is the incidence of accidents in my electorate over the past three years. Again, I refer to the following report in the Messenger press of 21 May 1980 under the heading "Corner could kill—M.P., school says: 45 accidents in three years":

The Frederick Road/Trimmer Parade intersection on the outskirts of West Lakes looks nice enough with its wide, smooth roads and neat medians. But don't be fooled—it is a potential killer, according to Albert Park M.P. Kevin Hamilton.

When school is out and workers leave their offices and factories, the harmless Dr. Jekyll intersection turns into a bituminous Mr. Hyde. In three years it has seen 45 smashes.

Motorists must creep out from the "give way" signs on Trimmer Parade and wait for a break in the busy Frederick Road traffic before crossing.

Traffic signals have been promised but Mr. Hamilton, local residents and Seaton High's school council won't be satisfied the intersection is safe until lights are in and working. The Highways Department told Mr. Hamilton that: "Traffic signals are justified . . . and as soon as sources permit they will be installed."

But he just wonders whether the Minister is going to wait until there is a serious accident in which a school child or motorist is killed. "It is essential lights are installed quickly".

Seaton High School Council Chairman Carl Bulau said the crossing was dangerous for schoolchildren to cross on foot or by bicycle. He said traffic lights would help solve some of the problems caused by Frederick Road.

"But we were uptight with a letter we received which said there had been no fatalities at the corner so the situation wasn't serious."

He said the number of school children using the intersection was likely to increase as the school expanded.

According to Mr. Hamilton, the intersection was also a problem on Saturdays when the football was on at Football Park and other ovals in the district. He said requests had also been made for a bike track along Frederick Road which would particularly cater for bike-riding schoolchildren. Similarly, in the *Messenger* of 9 July 1980, in an article headed "Red tape costs motorists", by Mark Voisey, the following report appears:

"Subject to finance"—that bureaucratic cliché which protects the Government's coffers—is costing Port district motorists plenty. It is branded on plans for lights at the dangerous Old Port Road/Frederick Road/Webb Street intersection. But while the Highways Department keeps a tight hold on the \$20 000 needed to put up the lights, accidents in the past 18 months have cost drivers more than \$71 000. Since January last year there have been 41 accidents there. Twenty-one people were injured and one died.

Mr. Slater: You need a traffic policeman.

Mr. HAMILTON: You are not wrong. The report continues:

A few kilometres away, the Tapleys Hill Road/Trimmer Parade crossing has seen 44 accidents in the same time. Damage has been estimated at more than \$49 000 and seven people were injured. Yet the Highways Department said it wasn't likely to modify the intersection for at least another two years because of work planned for the rail line which runs along Trimmer Parade. Nearby, 14 motorists driving onto West Lakes Boulevard from Brebner Drive slammed into cars in front of them. Another \$6 000 damage. Then add up \$23 000 from the 20 accidents at the Clarke Terrace/Morley Road rail crossing in which four people were injured. The total of these trouble spots over 18 months—119 accidents, 32 casualties, one death, \$149 509 damage. And there's others such as the hazardous Frederick Road/Trimmer Parade crossing.

Albert Park M.P. Kevin Hamilton has a file of letters from residents complaining about the danger at these intersections. But he too is having trouble getting around the "subject to finance" clause. His priorities include lights for the Old Port Road trouble spot and turn right indicators for the Tapleys Hill Road/Trimmer Parade crossing. Motorists are burdened enough without the cost of Government red tape.

One would hope from comments made by the Government today that it would eliminate that red tape and put its money where its mouth is.

Another matter which concerns me relates to road widening programmes which the Government mentioned at the commencement of this session. Only a few months

ago I put a Question on Notice to the Minister of Transport. I asked:

Is it intended to purchase properties or portions of properties in the following streets as part of a road-widening programme?

That referred to roads within my district, and related to statements made to me that Trimmer Parade, between Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton, and Findon Road was to be widened. I asked several questions in relation to this, and then concluded my question as follows:

And if so, how many properties will be involved, what is the number of properties to be purchased in each street, when does the Government intend purchasing these properties and what is the width of the road widening which the programme entails?

In part, the Hon. Michael Wilson replied:

Regarding Trimmer Parade, Seaton—

and I ask members opposite to listen to this, because I still cannot work out what he is talking about—

the metropolitan Adelaide road widening plan indicates that Trimmer Parade may be widened in the future. However, the Highways Department has no present proposal to widen Trimmer Parade, nor does it intend to do so in the foreseeable future.

Get this:

Should it be necessary to proceed with road widening, 132 properties would be involved. The department is not seeking to acquire any properties, but, if a landowner requests that his property be acquired and provides evidence that he would suffer hardship if acquisition does not take place, the Highways Department will negotiate for its purchase.

To me, that seems quite ambiguous, and certainly it does not clarify the matter. Is the Highways Department to widen the road, or not? If so, why does not the Minister say so? Why purchase properties that the Highways Department does not need? I am at a loss to understand what the Minister is talking about. I have written to him recently asking for clarification, and I have received an acknowledgement saying that he would have the matter investigated. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): In this adjournment debate, I shall bring to the attention of the House a subject on which I have spoken on two occasions previously, prior to the Olympic Games. I refer to the participation of Australian athletes at the 1980 Olympic Games.

Now that the event is over and the Australian team, despite all the controversy, pressures, threats and intimidations, performed very creditably, I believe we ought to examine the matter a little more closely. I am sure the member for Hanson will agree with those remarks. Subsequent events have now proved that the proposed boycott by the Prime Minister was a complete failure and the decision by the Australian Olympic Federation was the correct one. Public interest and support for the games, despite all the polls, surveys and opinions for and against the boycott which were not a true indication of public opinion, was indicated by the outstanding success of the television coverage. I quote from a press report which is headed "Seven on Winner with Olympics", as follows:

Ten times the usual number of Saturday-night viewers watched the Moscow Olympic Games opening ceremony,

according to Channel 7's general manager, Mr. John Doherty.

I emphasise that it says 10 times the number of normal viewers watched the Olympics. The article further states:

It was obvious there had been "tremendous interest" although official McNair-Anderson ratings figures for South Australia were not available beyond the opening telecast live on Saturday, July 19.

The volume of letters and telephone calls from viewers on the exclusive Games coverage had been unprecedented in Mr. Doherty's 4½ years at the helm.

But official survey results from Sydney and Melbourne proved the thrice-daily telecasts from the Soviet Union were a resounding success with viewers.

Mr. Doherty said Channel 7 had almost completely dominated T.V. sets in use in South Australia on the first night.

The live coverage had drawn figures at midnight that hitherto had been attainable only by popular prime-time programmes.

There had been fears that audiences might have been curtailed by the boycott controversy surrounding the Games and that the network would fail to get a full return on its multi-million dollar investment.

But, Mr. Doherty said all indications were that this would not be the case.

There is no doubt that a section of the media read the public more correctly than did the Prime Minister, and the real loser in the games controversy has no doubt been the Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser. The whole sorry episode of the boycott controversy need not have happened, and the threats and intimidations by the Federal Government and by sections of the press gives the Australian people a real insight into the lengths the Government will go to impose its will on a section of the community believing that it has no political clout. It has misread the situation and, to compound one failure after another, the Prime Minister initially refused to send a congratulatory telegram to the winners of the first Australian gold medals—the swimmers in the 100-metres medley relay team.

Fraser proved himself a really good sport! He was described by one commentator as the winner of the gold medal in the petulance pentathlon. His initial petulance and pigheadedness were finally overcome, no doubt following some advice, because, 24 hours later, he relented and reluctantly sent a congratulatory telegram. No doubt he did this with tongue in cheek, and only because his political advisers informed him that it would be politically disastrous not to do so in an election year. Prior to the games, and during the height of the controversy, our Premier and the Minister of Recreation and Sport demonstrated their faith in the Australian sportsmen and sportswomen by resigning from the South Australian Olympic Council, and a number of sponsors, under pressure, withdrew their support from the team. Undoubtedly, most of them were influenced by Fraser and his Federal colleagues.

Subsequent events have shown that resigning from the South Australian Olympic Council and all of the controversy regarding the boycott have proved both stupid and unnecessary. Our athletes, despite the pressures placed on them, have performed exceptionally well. There may be some sour grapes, and some would no doubt say that, because certain nations were not competing (I understand that 81 nations accepted the invitation and competed, whereas 20 did not), the Australian performers could not be rated very highly. I believe that it is creditable to finish in the first 10 in world competition.

Mr. O'Neill: Look at the records that were set.

Mr. SLATER: A number of world and Olympic records

were broken during the games. It is a creditable performance to finish in the first 10, and this contention is defended by the Manager of the Olympic swimming squad (Mr. Peter Bowen-Pain), who said:

The absence of the Americans from the Olympic Games did not detract from the Australian medal tally.

I believe that that is the case. Our athletes performed creditably and, although certain other nations (particularly the Americans) were not competing, it took nothing from the Australian performance. The Australians proved themselves to be great ambassadors for our country.

Despite the fact that the Premier and the Minister of Sport and Recreation resigned from the South Australian Olympic Council, the Premier, as the head of Government, should now recognise the efforts of our representatives from South Australia by honouring them with a civic reception because of their efforts at the games. I have not yet heard of any move in that direction, but I believe that it would be worthy of him to provide such an honour on behalf of the people of South Australia. This important tradition has been observed on other occasions when teams have competed overseas, whereby they have been honoured either by the Premier, on behalf of the citizens of South Australia, or by the Lord Mayor, on behalf of the citizens of Adelaide.

Mr. O'Neill: He's still wiping the egg off his face.

Mr. SLATER: That is true, but, at the same time, as head of the Government, he ought to accept now that the courage and fortitude of the athletes, and their coaches and managers, should be recognised by the South Australian people.

The athletes can rest assured that, if my suggestion is not taken up, the overwhelming majority of Australians, including South Australians, salute and congratulate them on their efforts at the games and congratulate them for their fortitude and courage in the face of adversity, despite all the pressures, intimidation and threats made to them before the games. As I have said, the athletes behaved in the best interests of their country. They performed creditably and are a credit to the country, and they ought to be suitably recognised by a civic reception.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): I rise to bring to the attention of the House a regrettable situation that has arisen as a consequence of the determination of those people who oppose me politically to mislead the people I represent and of those who, in other districts, have that same view to do likewise there also.

Mr. Hamilton: Do you mean the Country Party, or the Liberal Party, or both?

Mr. LEWIS: I appreciate that someone else has been listening to what I have said, and the penny has dropped.

It is incredible. There are more Opposition members present now than there were very much earlier, even when their own colleagues were speaking, and perhaps it is of interest to people who may read the record to know that for a considerable time only one Opposition member sat in the Chamber, even when Opposition members were making their Address in Reply speeches.

A report in the *Advertiser* on Saturday 2 August 1980 states:

Country South Australia is being given second place by our new Government. This is because the Government Party room is dominated by metropolitan members. The refusal by the Government to commit itself to doing anything within State jurisdiction about petrol franchising during the last session is a case in point.

Not only is that statement misleading as a sample of the kind of things that have been said, but also the same people, led by the man who said that, have been saying

that the Liberal Party in South Australia and in Australia as a whole, and no other Party, is responsible for the policy of world parity pricing. Those people mistakenly, foolishly, and shortsightedly argue that that is an inadequate, inappropriate and unwise policy. They say further that the money that has been collected (and I do not know what money they are referring to in that instance) in the course of using that policy, as a contribution to Federal revenue, should be spent on the building and development of country roads.

Mr. Hamilton: What about railways?

Mr. LEWIS: No, on roads. One can deduce from the remarks that have been made that what they are anti and what they are for is another question. I guess that the Opposition might well look at its own record on that score. It seemed to be anti-railway, as I recall, in 1975.

Mr. Hamilton: What about in 1968?

Mr. LEWIS: There was a one-way ticket to Canberra for more than the South Australian Railways, and that is what Mr. Burdon, I believe, was doing in 1975. Consider his future now!

I should like to point out that the method by which the Country Party, no less, is seeking to obtain membership and credence is deceitful, because it is not consistent with the policy that has been stated by its members of the Federal coalition. They happen to be Federal Ministers, and I will quote them. On 19 June 1980, the Deputy Prime Minister, no less, said:

The Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Anthony yesterday confirmed the price of petrol would rise by about 3c a litre next month.

He told the National Press Club the Government had every intention of raising oil prices to the Saudi Arabian level each July and January.

The unpopular world price parity policy on petrol was in the national interest and the key to energy security for Australia, he said.

I agree with him. Quite clearly, if this policy of national pricing is not pursued—that is, to adopt well head prices of light Arabian crude in the Arabian Gulf as the basis on which we determine the price of crude sold to Australian refineries—we will certainly run out of liquid fuels in this country before the turn of the century. Mr. Anthony further stated:

The Government was not prepared to give temporary appeasement to a few farmers and fisherman with cheap petrol.

World petrol prices ensured that exploration was maximised and that people conserved scarce liquid fuels, he said.

How wise, how true, how accurate. It is a pity that Mr. Anthony's Party's confreres in this State cannot front up and be honest and acknowledge that that is the honourable view of their national Leader. Furthermore, another member of the Federal Parliament, in fact a Federal Minister and a member of the National Country Party, stated:

... another area of Australian Government policy that I want to spend some time on is our import parity pricing for oil. I realise that this policy has its opponents, and that farmers, in particular, have voiced some very strong opposition to it. But I am convinced that it is the only responsible policy for Australia to adopt, and it is essential that other countries take similar action. The need for greater world wide conservation of oil was recognised by the recent Venice Summit of major Western nations. World dependence on unstable oil supplies from the Middle East is too great. There is a need for greater exploration, conservation and use of alternative fuel. Our policy is promoting all of these for Australia. We have realistically faced up to the

world energy situation, and have recognised that oil is a precious and finite resource.

That the policy is succeeding can be seen in several different ways. Private exploration expenditure has increased to record levels, we are reducing the rate of growth in consumption, and new developments are getting under way. Also, while it has not been without pain, history will prove that it has been much better for Australian industries, and primary industry, to adjust gradually to changing fuel prices.

If parity pricing had been introduced later, then industries and the economy as a whole, instead of adjusting gradually over a period of years, as has been the case, would have had to face somehow and suddenly absorbing a price hike from around \$6 a barrel to \$30 or more a barrel, in one hit.

It is my judgment that it would not merely be \$30, but about \$60 a barrel. He continued:

I don't think any energy consuming industry, or the economy, could have withstood a rise of that nature. In the second place, delaying the parity pricing policy would have allowed continued wasteful and extravagant use of our indigenous oil supplies.

I could go on, but I have said what needs to be said in relation to the dishonesty of the local Country Party. These statements I cited were made by Peter Nixon. The same things have been said by the Prime Minister and by every responsible Australian; but not by any of the parrots opposite.

It is despicable that that sort of deceit be practised in the way it has been practised by the Country Party in recent weeks in this State with a view to misleading the people and with a view to clouding the people's understanding of the critical nature of the situation. In doing so, the Country Party allowed the people to believe that they can have their cake and eat it, too, which is not true. Nor is it ever true to say that this Government does not represent the people in South Australia's country areas.

After all, more than half of the membership of the Liberal Party comes from rural areas. What is more, the family farm will stay together now that, for instance, this Government has abolished succession duties. That was one of the first policy promises the Government implemented when it came to office.

It was my concern for the country that caused me, for instance, to look into the restoration of sidings, essential on A.N.R. lines in the Mallee.

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

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to an article that appeared in the *News* on 10 July 1980 written by the member for Rocky River. At first glance the member for Rocky River's hymn of praise for Utah Development in that article must have come as a surprise to regular readers of that newspaper. Just digressing for a moment, I was rather interested in the way in which the Deputy Premier took the bait the other day when I mentioned one particular word. Obviously, he is out to protect his big money supporters.

Why would a member of the South Australian State Parliament, with all the serious problems facing our State to choose from, want to devote valuable column inches to an article full of sycophantic praise to a company which does not even operate in South Australia? The answer to that question is this: because Utah will almost certainly be developing its coal leases at Lake Phillipson, south of Cooper Pedy in the near future.

Mr. Olsen's article should be regarded as the start of an intensive effort by Utah to build a favourable public image in South Australia. This is a wise precaution when one realises that this company, with good reason, is strongly

disliked in Queensland, where it has operated for many years. Unfortunately for the citizens of that State, they allowed themselves to be taken in by the sort of arguments that Mr. Olsen puts forward. By the time they realised what was really happening, it was too late. South Australians should be warned against making similar mistakes.

Utah's initial investment in Australia was only about \$25 000 000—approximately one-fifth of the amount it repatriates to its U.S. shareholders each year. It has been making profits since its first year of operation in this country, and over the past four or five years its profits have been averaging about \$160 000 000 per year. Put another way, Utah makes about \$50 000 each year for each person employed, making it one of the biggest exploiters of labour in the industrial world.

About 70 per cent of these profits are distributed each year to its shareholders, nearly all of them based in the U.S.A. Much of the finance needed for expansion is provided by the Australian taxpayer through Government subsidies and deferred taxation.

The taxpayer also provides all the infrastructure necessary for Utah's operations. The railway line from its Goonyella mine to its Hay Point export outlet was built by the Queensland Government for Utah's exclusive use. It is also maintained and operated by that Government. In return, Utah pays about \$1 000 000 per tonne in freight rates. Yet, some people wonder why our railways run at a loss! In the same way, the Queensland Government provides roads, schools, health facilities, power and water supplies to Utah's mining towns, again for Utah's exclusive use. Once the mines cease producing, all these towns, railways, etc., will be discarded, there being no further use for them.

Unfortunately, we have no way of checking information about Utah in Australia, as only Utah Mining Australia, owning about 11 per cent of shares issued by Utah International (the U.S. parent), is required to publish such information. Utah Development is not required to publish information at all, as it is legally only a branch of a foreign based company. All the information already mentioned in this article comes from America. Until Australia tightens its laws regarding corporate disclosure of information, we can only estimate what companies like Utah pay in taxes and royalties.

However, we can say that Utah's figures, as faithfully quoted by Mr. Olsen, are suspect to say that least. According to these, Utah either pays 60 per cent or 67 per cent of its income in taxes, and this seems rather strange when one considers that company taxes in Australia are about 46 per cent. Utah did not bother to tell the Australian Government that it had merged with General Electric, a major manufacturer of nuclear power equipment. Utah is heavily involved in uranium mining in the U.S.A. Its concern for the employment prospects of ordinary Australians is revealed by its refusal to employ Australian seamen, preferring to employ foreign sailors at wages far below internationally agreed rates.

We are not Utah's only victims. The *National Times* has revealed that Utah is paying the Navaho Indians 15 cents per tonne for coal mined from their Arizona reservation and selling it for as much as 100 times that amount. Jobs, foreign exchange, and capital expenditure come from the act of mining and selling coal, not from Utah's presence. These benefits would exist no matter who is doing the mining. The objection to Utah is that it is raking off massive profits from Australia's resources, while Australians meet much of the costs, receiving very few benefits. If the mines presently operated by Utah were owned by the Australian people, those hundreds of millions of

dollars worth of profits would not only remain in Australia but could be used to provide much needed services and to create much needed jobs.

Queensland's experience with Utah shows clearly what Governments such as those of Tonkin, Bjelke-Petersen and Fraser mean by encouraging free enterprise. In return for massive financial support at election time from Utah and companies like it, these Governments agree to hand over our national resources at a fraction of their true value. Thousands of millions of dollars are spent on providing the infrastructure needed by these corporations, while the rest of the population pays increasing prices for deteriorating public services. South Australians should not complain that their bus fares and electricity charges are increasing. The extra revenue gained will provide further record profits for companies such as Utah.

The Australian Labor Party does not oppose mining. What it does oppose is the virtual giving away of our prospects for future prosperity for the short-term electoral benefit of the Liberal Party. If Utah comes to South Australia we must ensure that ordinary South Australians receive their full share of the benefits from mining. If Utah does not like our terms, so what? The world does not lack customers for our energy resources.

Because of lack of time I will quote only part of an article in the *National Times* for the week ending 21 October 1978, headed "Utah—the blackest name in coal". It states:

It reports Australia's largest profits and sends the largest part of them back to its parent company in the United States. Utah Development Company has a big, bad image. A lot has been written and said about the size of its profits and the size of its dividend payments to the United States. It has been accused of taking the best coal from its areas and in the

process alienating the rest, making it impossible or too expensive to exploit in the future.

The article further states:

It has been attacked as the classic multinational, with policy decisions coming from San Francisco and all the profits flowing back to head office. Other Australian coalminers have been undercut by the marketing decisions made in the United States, the accusations go, making the Australian coal export industry fragmented, especially against the solid front of Japan's steel industry.

And Utah has been accused of making scant inputs to the Australian economy, of paying low royalties to a Queensland Government uninterested in getting the maximum return from the exploitation of its resources.

Utah denies it all, but it is obviously worried. And in the manner of big business, it is fighting back. The classic methods of image building are advertising, public relations exercises and influencing the media and Government.

Utah is doing the lot and putting a great deal of money and effort into it. The bulk of the money so far has gone into advertising. The Rod Taylor campaign with the slogan, "We're backing Australia," was valued at \$1 000 000. It went down badly and has been withdrawn. For the time being the emphasis has shifted to public relations.

Utah set up its own public relations section six years ago but has run across continuing problems. It is just not a PR-oriented operation, or has not been in the past.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 7 August at 2 p.m.