

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 June 1982

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

PETITION: CASINO

Petitions signed by 219 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State were presented by Messrs Ashenden, Becker, Gunn, and Plunkett.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILD-PARENT CENTRES

A petition signed by 156 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide for child-parent centres to remain under the care and control of the Education Department, without funding cut-backs, was presented by Mr Langley.

Petition received.

PETITION: MURRAY RIVER PLANNING

A petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to repeal the Murray Mallee Planning Area Development Plan River Murray planning regulations and the Riverland Planning Area Development Plan River Murray Valley planning regulations was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CASINO

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I bring to the attention of the House certain public statements which have been made following the report given to the House yesterday by the Chairman of the Select Committee on the casino legislation. In that report, the House was informed that the Select Committee had adjourned its proceedings until allegations in relation to the casino matter were either substantiated in the House of Assembly or withdrawn without qualification. One of those allegations relates to statements made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

In the *News* on 23 April the Deputy Leader of the Opposition alleged that it was well known in political circles that a prospective casino developer was offering a sizable amount of money for a casino Bill to be introduced. He did not name the developer, but he did say the money had been offered to the Liberal Party.

On 20 May the Deputy Leader repeated these allegations and added to them. He alleged that the Government had been actively negotiating with an interstate hotel corporation about the establishment of a casino, he alleged that at least one Government Minister was involved, and he alleged that a monetary inducement of more than \$30 000 had been offered to have the Bill introduced.

In this House on Tuesday, the Deputy Leader alleged that Federal Hotels Limited had been involved in negotiations about the establishment of a casino in South Australia before and after the introduction of the casino legislation. He also stated:

The Leader of the Opposition and I have both been reliably informed that a monetary inducement was made to the Government to introduce a casino Bill.

While the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had promised in his statement on 20 May to raise new information when Parliament resumed, the only new material in his statements in the House on Tuesday was the naming of Federal Hotels.

On the *Nationwide* television programme last night, the Managing Director of that company, Mr John Haddad, specifically and categorically denied the Deputy Leader's allegations, and was reported as having described them as 'rubbish'. I therefore call on the Deputy Leader to withdraw immediately, completely and unequivocally, the accusation against Federal Hotels Limited.

The Leader of the Opposition made a number of public statements yesterday following the report to this House by the Chairman of the Select Committee. On the channel 10 news, he said in part:

Let's wait until there is a new Government elected so we can do this exercise properly and cleanly.

On A.B.C. television news, he said, in part:

The Government should table all the evidence that has been presented to the committee. I understand there may well be some interesting things in that, and indeed if the investigation of the select committee had continued we might have got to the bottom of some of the matters that have been raised in the House.

On *Nationwide* he said:

I think the important thing now is just to wind up this whole shabby operation, wait till a new Government is installed, and we will initiate a completely new and clean inquiry into casinos.

This morning's *Advertiser* quotes the Opposition Leader as saying he believed the Government decision to adjourn the casino inquiry had been made because the Government was concerned about evidence soon to be heard. Honourable members will gather from the Leader's statements that he believes that, in some way, the conduct of the select committee has been 'unclean' and a 'shabby operation', to use his words. He also continues to use innuendo by suggesting that the committee may have already heard some evidence to substantiate the Opposition's allegations, or that, if the committee does continue, this evidence could be forthcoming, all of this, some extension of the allegations made, he says, by some unnamed informant. Mr Speaker, in this the Leader of the Opposition is clearly at odds with the members of his own Party who have sat on the select committee. In this House on Tuesday, the member for Playford said:

I believe that the deliberations of our committee have been perfectly impartial. The inquiries have been very forceful and, in my view, very objective.

That was from the member for Playford. Both the member for Playford and the member for Gilles have supported a motion which states, in part, that the committee believes that it has at all times carried out its duties objectively, without fear or favour.

An honourable member: That has nothing to do with it.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: It has everything to do with the matter before the House.

Members interjecting:

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: All members of the select committee, including those from the Opposition, have called on the Leader and his Deputy to withdraw or substantiate their allegations so that the committee can carry on its work. What has been the Leader's response to this call, which has come, I repeat, from his own side of the House as well as from this side? On *Nationwide* last night

the Leader said, when challenged to substantiate his allegations and name his sources:

Well, just as a journalist is in an ethical position if his sources don't wish their names to be used, he can't, so I'm in the same position.

Mr Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is not a journalist. He is a member of Parliament who has raised certain serious allegations which have jeopardised the proper conduct of a Parliamentary committee. It is grossly irresponsible to attempt to evade his responsibilities in this shabby fashion.

Of course, this is not the first time the Opposition has behaved in this way. In March, for example, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition made unsubstantiated allegations against Mr William Sparr in relation to the Windy Point Restaurant. Yesterday, we had some information from the member for Gilles, in which there was no hesitation in naming a company in this House. When it suits the Opposition's purpose, it has not been reluctant to name people, organisations and sources under Parliamentary privilege, even when those people have had no chance to defend themselves.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted for a Ministerial statement. I would ask the Deputy Premier to continue with the prepared statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In relation to the casino matter, the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition have now heard the answer from Federal Hotels. They should now publicly apologise to the executives of Federal Hotels Limited. If the Opposition does not, what are the implications? It means that the Opposition is branding the Managing Director of Federal Hotels a liar, and that it will continue to prevent the select committee from fulfilling a task which this House has appointed it to undertake.

The Leader of the Opposition has suggested he must protect his sources. If he wishes to maintain that cowardly position, he should at least come forward with the name of the Minister alleged to have been involved in negotiations with an interstate company. That will not require him to name any sources, merely a member of Cabinet. Let him do that, with some evidence to substantiate the naming of the Minister and whom, if not Federal Hotels, so that this House can consider the matter further. If he refuses to take at least this action, it will be impossible to escape the conclusion that, for one reason or another, at least some members of the Opposition are determined to ensure that the casino question is not resolved by the normal Parliamentary processes now in train.

In saying that, I exempt the members for Gilles and Playford, because implicit in their support for the motion passed yesterday by the select committee is the desire for the committee to complete its work and report to the House. I put the Leader and his Deputy on notice that, if they do not take action to resolve this matter in the manner called for by the select committee, the Government will not let it rest where it is at present. The Government will not allow the workings of Parliament to be obstructed and jeopardised by the type of scurrilous muckraking to which the Leader and his Deputy have descended.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition asked a question regarding the Bolivar treatment works and the company G. H. Michell and Sons. In the absence of the Premier, I would like to give this report to

the House. The company has approached the Government concerning a proposed expansion of its operations in this State, although it is also looking at possible expansion interstate. In the course of these negotiations it was necessary to clarify the basis for the existing operation of the company in South Australia. In 1971, under a Labor Government headed by Mr Don Dunstan, it was agreed that the company could dispose of its trade wastewaters and in return pay the normal sewerage and waste disposal rates as levied on any company in the State.

All this Government has done in the current negotiations is to put a time limit of 20 years on the otherwise unlimited agreement made by the Dunstan Government. In return, the Government has assured the company that there will be no change of policy for a period of 20 years. The suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that a payment of \$15 000 000 will be made by the Government to the company is grossly incorrect; the Government is making no payment for the use of the Bolivar treatment works. The truth is just the reverse. The company will continue to pay the normal sewerage and waste disposal rates for the next 20 years based on the valuation of its property. The Leader of the Opposition's reference to this as a 'secret' deal—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is a pity that they do not listen to the facts.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: They stand in this House and make outrageous statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs has asked leave to make a Ministerial statement. I ask him to complete the prepared statement.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition's reference to this as a 'secret deal' (to use his words) is also wrong. In fact, the matter is about to be referred to the Industries Development Committee, as all requests for establishment payment scheme grants must be referred. That committee contains two members of the Labor Party, so in effect all such grants have to be approved by the Labor Party representatives. So much for the allegation of secrecy. This Government and previous Governments have consistently maintained a policy that charges to recover an appropriate cost contribution for the conveyance, treatment and disposal of domestic and industrial wastewaters should be levied by means of sewerage rates based on property values.

The nature and volume of Michell's trade wastes were assessed by the previous Government prior to the establishment of the Salisbury South plant and the proposals for their discharge into the sewerage system were deemed acceptable. After the establishment of the Salisbury South plant, the previous Government, again led by Mr Don Dunstan, continued to accept the trade wastewaters with no complaint. The current trade wastewater discharge from the Salisbury South plant into the sewerage system is substantially in line with the proposals accepted in 1971.

In seeking to win significant new development opportunities for South Australia, negotiations were entered into between the Government and Michells. It has been agreed that, for a period of 20 years commencing from 1 May 1982, provided Michells maintain a significant level of employment and operations in this State and proceed with a \$5 000 000 expansion programme, which is expected to create 60 new jobs, the Government will continue to:

- (1) accept the current nature and level of trade wastewater on the basis of normal sewerage charges;
- (2) use its best endeavours to provide the firm with adequate power supplies under the normal terms, conditions and rates; and,

- (3) have the right to install pre-treatment facilities on Michell's site to reduce or modify the effluent load on the Bolivar Works.

In the event that Michells wish to increase its effluent level, or substantially alter the nature of the effluent, this will be a separate matter and the subject of negotiation between the company and the Government of the day.

I am advised that the C.S.I.R.O. pre-treatment process, referred to yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition, is not yet fully proven nor widely supported by the wool industry. Furthermore, this Government and all previous Governments have maintained a sewerage rating policy that does not include an additional trade wastewater charge. Our dealings with Michells have been consistent with this policy. Perhaps the most serious aspect of the statement yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition is not only that it was inaccurate but also that he chose to use the protection of Parliament to attack and ridicule a major new industrial expansion in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That expansion, if successful, will result in 60 new jobs, but, even more importantly, it will help to secure 300 existing jobs. I ask the local members of Parliament out there to keep that in mind. If this expansion is not successful, there is a grave risk that a considerable number of existing jobs will be lost from this State. At this stage, the negotiations are almost complete. Should this new development not now go ahead because of the Leader of the Opposition's innuendos, the hundreds of jobs lost will be on the head of the Leader of the Opposition—a man who claims to be concerned about the number of people unemployed in South Australia.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I indicate that the Deputy Premier will take questions that would normally be taken by the Premier.

STATE CHARGES

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Deputy Premier say when the Government plans to withdraw from its policy, decided in January 1981, of deliberately increasing a wide range of charges for public services which are striking heavily at industry, commerce, civic organisation and individuals?

Members will recall that the memorandum issued by the Premier in January 1981 insisted that all departments review all State charges. This included licences, registration, permit fees, and the like. Departments were required to introduce what was termed 'appropriate increases' as soon as possible. The Government at that time was apparently puzzled by the way in which the previous Government had held back increases, even deliberately as a matter of public policy, as in the important area of public transport fees. So, the word went out—'Put up charges as soon as you can—'

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is fully conversant with the ruling that comment is out of order in an explanation.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, Sir. The latest information available to me from the *Government Gazette*, which must carry word of such increases, even if there has been no Government announcement, is that from early 1981 to the present day 95 fees of one sort or another have been increased. That is quite apart from such major imposts as water rates, motor vehicle registrations, bus fares, and electricity tariffs. Last week, without announcement, five separate

sets of licence fees increased, one set as much as 733 per cent, in one area of commerce. Today, it was the turn of the dealers in hides, skins and wool: their annual licence fee was doubled.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition never fails to lead with the chin. It has a policy, which is clearly available to members of the public, in relation to the way in which it will operate in coming to office. The Opposition states quite unequivocally that it will increase the services to the public and raise State Government charges and taxes to do so. The question that was asked at the start of the monologue (if I remember correctly) was whether the Government will revise its policy in regard to increasing charges. If the Deputy Leader believes that any Government can go ahead and frame and balance a Budget in a climate where wage pushes occur and salary increases are constantly being awarded and encouraged by the efforts of the Opposition, without increasing charges to the public, it is made up of bigger fools than I thought. In fact, this Government has been able to contain the size of those charges by the very reason of its policies. If the Labor Party policies were in full play in South Australia at present, I would put my last dollar on a bet that charges would be increasing at a significantly higher rate than they are under this Government.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: More than 733 per cent, do you think?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is quite easy for one to pluck out of the air an isolated charge for some item which has not been increased since 1976, such as a charge of \$1 that has been increased to \$7, and say, 'There has been an increase of 700 per cent.' That statistic is nonsensical. The plain facts are that this Government has been more successful in curbing public sector expenditure than has any other State Government in South Australia. Only yesterday I saw the figures in terms of growth in the public sector in other States, and the situation in South Australia and in the Commonwealth, and we have been more successful in containing expenditure within the public sector than has any other Government in Australia.

Mr Langley: What about Queensland?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, Queensland has experienced a significant growth in public sector spending. We have been able to achieve this without any diminution of the service that is delivered to the public. I have no hesitation in saying that we have the finest Public Service in this nation, and I pay a tribute—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition does not like what it is hearing. However, I pay a tribute to the co-operation that this Government has received from senior public servants and departments in their coming to terms with budgetary reality, something that members opposite are incapable of doing. We know from the stated policy of the Opposition and from its last so-called economic package that, if calamity befalls the public of South Australia and the Labor Government is elected, the public can look forward to charges that will escalate at a far greater rate than they have escalated under this Government.

CASINO

Mr GUNN: Will the Deputy Leader of the Opposition now withdraw the statement that he made in this House on Tuesday in view of the fact that the Managing Director of Federal Hotels Ltd has denied that his company has been involved in the negotiations with the Government in relation to a casino? On Tuesday, the Deputy Leader, when asking a question, said:

I have been reliably informed that the Government and Federal Hotels were involved in negotiations about the establishment of a casino in South Australia before and after the introduction of the casino legislation currently before this House. On *Nationwide* it was stated that the Managing Director of Federal Hotels, Mr John Haddad, had described the Deputy Leader's allegations as rubbish.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I advise the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he may or may not answer the question; it is his decision.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am delighted to answer the question. In fact, I almost expected it from the member for Eyre, so it has come as no real surprise that he is the culprit. I have no intention of withdrawing anything that I have had to say on this matter. I could give further consideration to my position at some future stage if the Government has the courage and the conviction to release the documents of the select committee and the evidence which was called for yesterday by the Leader of my Party, because we think that it is imperative that that evidence be made available so that we can all judge for ourselves. There has been no comment. I have been right through this statement made today by the Acting Premier, and nowhere in there does he give any indication about whether his Government has the courage to release that evidence. I call on the Government again to release the evidence given to that select committee and I will reconsider my position, but not before that time.

Members interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order! Before there is any other misunderstanding of the situation, I think all members of the House should appreciate that the evidence of the select committee is the property of the Parliament—not of the Government, the Opposition or any individual member.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You're a coward, Jack.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would ask that the Minister of Industrial Affairs withdraw his comment concerning the word 'coward' which I recall you, Sir, having said during last session is an unparliamentary remark.

THE SPEAKER: Order! To which remark is the member for Albert Park referring and to whom was the statement made?

Mr HAMILTON: I am referring to the interjection when my Deputy Leader was called a coward.

THE SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The member for Albert Park will appreciate the direction which has been given from the Chair, namely, that it is competent for a person who is aggrieved by a remark directed at him to seek a withdrawal, but not for another member to seek the withdrawal.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr Speaker, I put this to you. I did not hear the actual remark. Otherwise, I certainly would have countered it much much more strongly than that.

THE SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: But if—

THE SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Deputy Leader would fully appreciate that if, on perusal of the report, he finds that he has been aggrieved, he may rise in his place and seek to make a personal explanation.

SMALL BUSINESS INSURANCE

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Deputy Premier say whether it is policy for the State Government Insurance Commission to operate a quota system for insuring small businesses, and, in particular, can he say why and on what grounds the

S.G.I.C. refused to insure a small hairdressing business in Hindley Street?

Earlier this week I received a letter from Maudan Pty Limited, which trades as Daniels Hairdressers, at 109 Hindley Street, Adelaide. The letter states:

Dear Sir,

I am penning this letter to ask you if you could make inquiries why S.G.I.C. refused to insure a hairdressing business in Hindley Street, City. Last Thursday, 27/5/82, Mrs S. Copping Junior went into the above insurance company and asked an assistant about insurance for a hairdressing salon and was told to 'come this way' but as she gave the address she was told, 'We have our quota for that area,' and the assistant closed up the book, thus ending any further discussion. I thought the Government was interested in promoting small business or is this only paper talk, because if a Government insurance won't cover your business how can you expect others to, and I can assure you all our private insurance will be withdrawn from S.G.I.C.

Yours in haste.

I would like to know the Government's policy on this matter.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: When I was an Opposition member of the front bench, I made it my habit to go direct to the S.G.I.C. and get an answer without taking the circuitous route of raising the matter in the House. It is not clear from the question what type of insurance is involved, except that it is a hairdressing firm. I will be perfectly happy to take up the matter with the General Manager of the S.G.I.C. and see what policy its board adopts in this matter. If the honourable member will make clearer to me what type of insurance he is talking about and what is involved, I will take up the details of this particular case.

LABOR PARTY'S ECONOMIC PLAN

Mr SCHMIDT: Has the Deputy Premier examined the economic plan recently promoted by the Leader of the Opposition and what effects these proposals would have on the taxpayers of South Australia? The Labor Party's economic plan was reported in the media last week. Many proposals from the document were published but no indication was given where the money would be coming from to pay for the proposals. Members may recall that on the radio last week an economist at Flinders University—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will remain silent.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: As will the member for Glenelg.

Mr SCHMIDT: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Members may recall that on the radio last week an economist at Flinders University described the proposal as being very fuzzy, with no substance as to where the finance for the proposal will come from. The Deputy Premier may be in a position to report to the House his assessment of the effect on South Australian taxpayers of this so-called economic plan for our future.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have had a look at the economic plan, and I think a considerable number of members of the business community and others who are interested have also studied the so-called plan. The Leader stated:

The document represents the first stage of that policy formulation. It does not represent our final plan in detail.

I think that is fortuitous, because this plan tells us not much. The Leader continued:

Labor recognises that a State Government presiding over a small regional economy has limited economic powers.

Therefore, the Opposition's plan for the South Australian economy, by its own admission, does not present the answers. This is even more obvious when the 85-page document is

analysed. No definite proposals are put forward. Many of the broad suggestions have already been investigated by this Government and in some cases implemented when details have been worked out and found appropriate. There is no costing and there is no hint as to where the additional capital that would be required will come from or be taken from.

It is for these reasons that we cannot give much credence to the paper. I was surprised that the Leader challenged the Government to debate the so-called plan. I will take a moment or two to read the Premier's reply to the Leader of the Opposition as follows:

Thank you for your letter of 28 May together with the Labor Party's 'economic development strategy' for South Australia. I note, too, your suggestion that we should debate these matters on television. I can see no purpose in entering such a debate, given the lack of key information in your document and the contradictions and inaccuracies which are revealed. Specifically, there are no individual costings of the job creation schemes, the State enterprise fund, the home buyers assistance scheme and increased funding for capital works, and no overall costing of the proposals in the document.

Further, the document provides no clear indication of where the additional funds for these schemes would be obtained.

While it is appreciated that this document is an attempt to elucidate the A.L.P.'s economic strategy, the lack of such vital detail would make any worthwhile or meaningful debate quite impossible. Indeed, many of the proposals you put forward are those adopted unsuccessfully by the A.L.P. when formerly in Government. On the basis of the statements you have made in the economic document, and with past experience of previous A.L.P. Governments' job creation schemes, I am advised that your package of proposals would conservatively require an annual increase in State Government expenditure of \$200 000 000, at 1982 values.

It tends to reinforce the answer I gave to the Deputy Leader earlier in relation to increasing State charges. I continue with the Premier's reply:

This would be on top of the normal expenditure increases faced by the Government to cover wage and price increases. From a consideration of your economic document, the Labor Party's policy convention documents, your past statements on taxation and your Parliamentary speeches, I can only conclude that in Government you would implement significant increases in State taxes and charges. No other practical option is available to a State Government. An extra \$200 000 000 a year would require the imposition of additional taxation of \$154 a year for every man, woman and child in this State. For a family with two children this would mean, on average, an extra \$616 a year, or nearly \$12 a week. I do not believe that this is acceptable to the people of South Australia. Because the avenues available to State Governments for raising additional revenue are limited—

and that was acknowledged in the document I quoted earlier—

It is clear the only other option available to the Labor Party in Government is the introduction of a State income tax. There is no other possible alternative. An income tax surcharge is something my Government would not contemplate. I note that the Labor Party policy platform gives clear directions about increased taxation when it says Labor would:

where possible, regulate its financial position by raising tax rates rather than cutting public expenditure programmes.

I also note that in 1980, when my Government introduced legislation abolishing death duty, gift duties and land tax on the principal place of residence, you said, on death duties:

Unfortunately, this unpopular tax is one that has the potential to be extremely fair and just, and it is a pity that at one stroke it is to be abolished.

I can therefore only conclude that increased State taxation is a most significant, although silent, part of your plan to raise extra revenue to fund your economic package. There are also some major inconsistencies in the approach you have adopted. I refer particularly to the proposal to have an inquiry into taxation. You are advocating job creation schemes and other high-cost proposals on the one hand, while on the other hand you are pledging there would be no changes to State taxation for three years. This is a direct contradiction in terms and further confuses the so far unanswered question of where the money comes from to finance these proposals.

I cannot give any credibility to a so-called economic strategy which appears to contain numerous weaknesses and contradictions and which attempts to deceive the public by failing to acknowledge

the added financial burden on the taxpayers which would result. Some of the proposals in the document undoubtedly have merit.

For example, leverage leasing, pay-roll tax exemption levels to benefit small business, five-year capital works planning, and the mobilisation of additional funds for capital works are among initiatives already implemented by this Government. Moreover, because of our innovative approach to fund raising, 1981-1982 will prove to be a record year for housing funds. But give the inconsistencies, weaknesses and lack of responsible information on the cost to the taxpayers of your proposals, I can only conclude that your economic strategy document is a most unfortunate one. It is of little value except in exposing your Party's lack of understanding of economic matters and of management.

I think that the Premier's answer to the Leader of the Opposition more than adequately covers the extreme weakness and lack of detail in the so-called plan for South Australia's future. We have had experience in the past under Labor of their job creation schemes which cost in excess of \$50 000 000 and did not create one permanent job in South Australia, but led during a period of that expenditure to record levels of unemployment so that this State came to have the highest number of unemployed in the country. If members opposite think that by implementing these temporary schemes through raising taxes and charges they are going to solve our problems, they have not learned from past experience.

GOVERNMENT-ASSISTED STUDENT SCHEME

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In the light of the change in name of the free book scheme to the Government-assisted student scheme and the consequent implication that the students in need are not entitled to support as extensive as that previously applied, will the Minister of Education say what action the Government proposes to take on the recommendation of Touche Ross Report, entitled 'Study of options for the financing of schools'? That report states:

There are compelling grounds for legislation to be introduced allowing the Minister to require the payment of fees.

The Touche Ross Report was completed in January of this year, although it has not been widely available since then, and in part it makes these comments on school-derived funds:

There are compelling grounds for legislation to be introduced allowing the Minister to require payment of fees by parents up to a maximum prescribed by regulations or by proclamation . . . The notion of 'free education' has not been a reality for many years and the local community cost burden for schooling should be borne equitably by all parents, particularly if their direct responsibility for school costs will increase.

I was advised by the Minister in correspondence last April of the change in name from the free book scheme to the Government-assisted student scheme, and the statement was made it could not be taken that anyone approved for free books automatically would have all the book costs met. That was a change of emphasis in that scheme. In May this year, when I sought information from the Minister as to what happened to the review of parent funding that the Minister said was under way in 1981, the recommendations of which were supposed to be implemented in 1982, I was advised that that review was deferred pending consideration of the Keeves Report and the Touche Ross Report. As that statement by Touche Ross is therefore obviously still being considered, I believe that in fairness to the parents of this State the Minister should come clean regarding what parent funding is to be expected.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There are one or two implications inherent in that question which should certainly be answered first. One is the suggestion that the change of name from free scholar to Government-assisted scholar is some form of trick. That was simply an acknowledgement (I think it

would have to be an acknowledgement by the House) that free—

Mr Lynn Arnold: Read the comment from your office on that change of name.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, the press release was quite unequivocal on this issue. There has never been such a thing as a free scholar, and there has always been some onus on parents and schools to assist those students. The honourable member chose specifically to refer to the question of the provision of free books; in fact, I think it was more a recognition of the fact that school after school has pointed out to successive Governments that those Government-assisted scholars were entitled to a number of things like stationery and school books, but that also on the annual school syllabus was included a range of additional items such as, for example, as indeterminate number of school excursions.

What has happened in all of the years that I have been involved in education (and that would be since 1959 with the South Australian Education Department) is that if there were Government assisted scholars, or 'free scholars', as they were euphemistically called, if Government funding ran out there were two options: the student did not go on excursion in which case there might be peer group embarrassment or, alternatively, the school (that means the parents or other Government funding sources) were used to send those youngsters on those excursions. To change the name from 'free' scholars to 'Government assisted' is recognition of the fact that the name itself has been incorrect for many years.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Did you increase the allocation per capita?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Hang on a moment. The other question was to what extent should grants be increased to assist parents generally in putting their children through school. That, too, is a question that was addressed to the previous Government but received one of the most negative responses imaginable. What happened is that the former Minister commissioned an inquiry into 12 schools in South Australia to find out the increases in charges that parents had had to meet. I think that those increases ranged from a minimum of 16 per cent in one school to about 56 per cent in the highest. That would have taken place in 1979. What did the then Minister do? He cut the school grants by half. What sort of hypocrisy is that? Here we are now weeping crocodile tears when, in fact, this Government has had to pick up a 50 per cent cut that adversely affected all schools in South Australia. It is that sort of question which makes one wonder how far hypocrisy can really go. This Government, immediately on coming into office in 1979, reinstated to 100 per cent of the 1979 value that school grant. Since then we have increased a range of grants by a percentage which, in general terms, I think, one will find has more than met indexation.

Mr Lynn Arnold: You didn't last year.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There was a backlog to catch up which this Government was not able to catch up and which I suggest the honourable member's Government would not have been able to catch up, either, if it were of the same philosophical attitude as is the Victorian Government, with the strange promise that it has made to the Victorian Teachers Federation; they are in more trouble than the early settlers over there. What we are doing responsibly at Government level is to appraise the Touche Ross Report and the Keeves Report, and to consider the fact that parents have been asked to take over a considerably increased burden and that the previous Government lumped them with a far bigger burden than they deserved. I think the honourable member will find in the current Budget review, when the Budget is presented, that there will be some favourable

consideration given to these matters. I am not in a position at the moment to divulge the precise nature of any alterations, and I do not see why I should, but certainly I think many parents will be treated far more generously than ever they were under the previous Government, particularly in 1979.

MOONIES

Mr OSWALD: Is the Chief Secretary aware that the Moonies are considering laying charges against certain officers of the South Australian Police Force for withdrawing their hawkers licence to collect funds from members of the public in a northern regional city in South Australia and, if so, why did the police officers withdraw that hawkers licence? It has been reliably reported to me that followers of the self-styled Reverend Moon, in the United States, who reside here in South Australia have been conducting an appeal for funds in the metropolitan and country areas. When collectors approach members of the public they inform the potential donor that he is contributing to the work of the Unification Church in Australia. I am informed that the Unification Church has no traditional religious base and that, in fact, the leader (Reverend Moon) and his deputy have been sentenced to gaol in the United States on tax evasion charges.

I am also informed that the police withdrew the hawkers licence after they became acquainted with the fact that the Moonies and the Unification Church were one and the same organisation and it was not possible to determine to what use the money eventually would be put. I have been told that there could be a loophole by which the police could not legally withdraw the hawkers licence, and that, because the police, in fact, withdrew the licence, lawyers acting on behalf of the Moonies are now considering laying charges against certain police officers.

Finally, I am also reliably informed that there have been several well-attended meetings, which were open to the public, of concerned parents in this regional city who feared the activities of the Moonies in this country and who fully support the action of police officers in withdrawing the hawkers licence, believing that those officers acted in the best interests of the total community.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: I have been acquainted only in general terms with the fact that a group of people from Victoria visited the Port Pirie region to collect funds for the Unification Church. I have called for details of the situation from the Police Department, but I have not yet received those details in writing. However, I have received verbal advice, which indicates that the police, acting in accordance with the Act to which the honourable member referred, took possession of the property after complaints had been lodged by people in the region. As a result of the confiscation of goods and money collected in that region, a complaint has been laid against police officers by those people and by the Unification Church. The police acted in good faith on complaints that were lodged by the public which alleged, I am advised, that the church was collecting donations under what could be construed as false pretences; that is, that, using the title 'Unification Church', there was a misunderstanding that that church was an extension of the Uniting Church, which, obviously, it was not. The honourable member has referred to the Reverend Moon and his colourful history overseas. In addition, I understand that the badge used by members of the Unification Church (or the Moonies, as they are commonly described) was very similar to a badge used by a major and reputable South Australian charity organisation.

When people are approached in public places to donate funds to an organisation, it should be quite clear to whom those funds are being donated. In this instance, it appears

that the organisation to which the funds would go was not clearly identified. It is true that a technicality in relation to the law has meant that the charges have not been proceeded with. I cannot say whether there will be further legal charges in regard to police action, because the detailed report is not yet to hand, but when I receive that report, I will make it available to the honourable member.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Government or the Highways Department has any plans or intentions to upgrade the Birkenhead bridge, to replace that structure at its present site, or to build a new bridge across the Port River at any other site? As mentioned in a question yesterday—

An honourable member: It was answered—

Mr PETERSON: The question was not answered yesterday. As mentioned in a question yesterday, a lot of concern is felt by residents and the Port Adelaide council about allegations that this bridge is unsafe. It has been claimed that a new structure is required. As many of the residents of my district must cross this bridge daily, and because heavy transport uses it continually, will the Minister say what are the plans for the future for bridges over the Port River?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I mentioned in answer to the member for Price yesterday that I had received similar requests from the member for Semaphore and, indeed, from the Port Adelaide council and certain others. I gave an undertaking that I would look at the engineering report when it came and give a decision as to whether I would make that report public. I can assure the member for Semaphore that there is no danger whatever with the bridge; it is perfectly safe. I will make a Ministerial statement in the House next week that will give more information. However, the member for Semaphore has asked whether there are plans for a new bridge, and the answer is that there are not. The present bridge is quite safe; there will have to be some upgrading of the surface, and I shall give the honourable member details of that next week. However, there are no plans for a new bridge.

BLUE LIGHT DISCOS

Mr RANDALL: Will the Chief Secretary say what action has been taken or is planned in relation to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 12 April this year entitled 'Green light likely for blue light'? The *Advertiser* article on 12 April reported comments attributed to the Victorian Chief Commissioner of Police (Mr Miller), stating in part:

'I would commend the concept of Blue Light discos to any police organisation which has an interest in youth and establishing a rapport with young people in the community,' he said. Young people had a chance to see police in a role different from the artificial television image of police and detectives.

That is one basis of my question; another is that the Woodville council, in conjunction with the member for Albert Park and me, has consistently been looking at the problems of young people in the western districts.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: Following representations from the member for Henley Beach, I have taken this matter up with officers of the Police Department. The Police Department is currently looking at the operation of blue light discos in Victoria and how they can best be applied to South Australia. Those discos, which are supervised by police officers, have provided a very valuable community service to young people, ensuring that the discos are unli-

censed and strictly supervised and do not have some of the undesirable factors which on occasion are associated with discos. From the operation of these discos a large amount of money is raised for charitable purposes.

The honourable member's claim that the council within his area is anxious to see such a disco established in that region is recognised and I have requested the Police Department to consider establishing a blue light disco in the region on a pilot basis. I understand that the department is keen to see the scheme floated and the honourable member may be assured that the Government will give every encouragement to the force to establish such discos in South Australia.

BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Water Resources say what advice he has received from the Engineering and Water Supply Department concerning the impact on the Bolivar treatment works of the proposed expansion of the G. H. Michell factory at Salisbury South in so far as disposal of trade waste is concerned, and also what precedent would have been established by the arrangement entered into by the Government? I understand it is likely that the expansion of this factory, important though it is to this State, will place a substantial load on the Bolivar treatment works. In fact, I have been informed that the increased loads on the treatment plant could exceed capacity, requiring further works at considerable cost to the taxpayer. Because of the waiving of any waste treatment levy for 20 years and because the cost of the future treatment works has not been costed, the Minister should provide to the House information as to the real subsidy to the company.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The advice to me from the Director-General and Engineer-in-Chief of the E. & W.S. Department is that the Bolivar treatment works has the capacity to cope with the foreseeable additional load from Michell's operation.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONFERENCE

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I would like to start off by thanking all members of the House for the courtesy they have shown me and the advice that they have offered me, which I will certainly need in the future. I direct my first question to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General. Will the Minister ask the Attorney-General what action is proposed to be taken by the Government to pursue the issues raised at the Constitutional Conference in November 1981, and when will those actions take place? The last time that I spoke in this Chamber was at the Constitutional Conference in November last year, and I commented then that the success of the conference would be judged on the actions that followed. Since then, the Attorney-General, in a letter dated 22 December 1981 which accompanied the *Hansard* copy of the conference, said that early in the new year he would be giving consideration to the best means of pursuing the issues raised at the conference.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I shall be pleased to bring down for the member for Mitcham a considered reply from the Attorney-General.

CHALLENGE TO AUSTRALIA

Mr RUSSACK: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy seen a copy of the booklet entitled *Challenge to Australia*, which has been widely circulated? If so, has the Minister observed the positive statement made by Sir Mark Oliphant,

a past Governor of South Australia and an eminent physicist of world renown, and that by Sir Barton Pope, a distinguished industrialist of this State, concerning nuclear power? It is my understanding that this publication has come from a creditable source, and I would like to read the letter that accompanied the booklet that I received. The letter from the Challenge to Australia Committee reads:

The enclosed booklet is forwarded with the compliments of the Challenge to Australia Committee. It has been written by Sir Mark Oliphant, Sir Macfarlane Burnet and Sir Barton Pope to warn and challenge Australians to meet the problems of the century ahead which they claim will be the most difficult in the history of mankind.

The Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowen, has written a foreword, and Mr Justice Michael Kirby a summary and critique. It will be very widely publicised in all media and with national T.V. programmes, and is already assured of widespread commendation and support. It will be managed throughout Australia by the Jaycee organisation, with public launching in every State and the Northern Territory.

I would like honourable members to take note of the final paragraph, which reads:

It is non-Party political, does not represent vested interests and is written with the hope that the public at large can be better informed and therefore their judgment more sound when facing the future of this country with its impact on the destiny of tomorrow's youth.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have a copy of *Challenge to Australia*, which I understand was published a month or so ago by three world recognised Australians, Sir Macfarlane Burnet, Sir Mark Oliphant and Sir Barton Pope. I commend the publication to all members of the House. Probably the best way to answer the question is to quote briefly a couple of extracts, first, from Sir Mark Oliphant who, as members are well aware, was appointed Governor of this State by the Labor Party some years ago, and a very popular Governor he turned out to be. Sir Mark is well known for his hatred of warfare and the proliferation of weapons. As recently as a month or so ago, in relation to energy, Sir Mark Oliphant said:

As one who has been involved all my life in nuclear physics and nuclear energy, who has participated in many international discussions with Soviet and other workers in these fields, and in scientific and technical aid to developing nations, who is committed to the search for peace, I am convinced that Australia would be foolish not to mine, use, and sell uranium. Nuclear power stations are now far less polluting, and are safer, than coal-burning equivalents.

Pending the general acceptability of vitrification, or the Ringwood method of storage of radioactive residues, there is no need, while uranium is plentiful, to separate the dangerous radioactive 'ashes' of the nuclear burning, so that spent nuclear fuel can be stored unprocessed. There is continued development in all aspects of waste handling.

While nuclear power stations cannot be justified in Australia at present, because of the high capital investment required, the cost of coal-burning stations and the cost of coal itself are escalating so rapidly that nuclear power may soon be cheaper. Australia should maintain its nuclear expertise at a level consistent with the rapid utilisation of nuclear energy from uranium for the generation of electric power, and/or the desalination of seawater.

In this excellent booklet, Sir Barton Pope said:

The world in the next century will become acutely aware of the great debt to nuclear science and will pay tribute to its creators. It is possibly the only certain major source of energy from which the world can survive, pending a major breakthrough to fusion and the efficient, large-scale harnessing of solar energy. If nuclear energy helps to preserve the lives of but one quarter of the expected population growth of the next 50 years, the lives of 1 000 million people will be spared. A Nobel Prize would be totally inadequate recognition for the scientist and those millions so spared would owe a great debt of gratitude to the opponents of nuclear for civilian use who, when better informed, had the courage to reverse their expressed opposition and emotionalism of today.

SOUTH-EAST WATER SUPPLY

Mr RODDA: My question to the Minister of Water Resources relates to underground water supplies in the South-East, particularly in the Penola and Coonawarra areas. At a recent meeting of the United Farmers and Stockowners at Penola it was stated by an officer of the Department of Mines and Energy that the levels of nitrate in some of the underground water and readings from certain bores in the Coonawarra area had moved from a reading in March 1981 of 152 points per million to 172 points per million in December of that year.

It is well known that high levels of nitrate can be detrimental to young children and pregnant women, and there is some concern about this, although most of the domestic water supplies in the area involve rainwater. I also understand that landowners have been asked by the authorities to take all steps to prevent pollution and entry to underground water by bores—

Mr Keneally: We're looking at one now.

Mr RODDA: I could say something, but I will not. This is being done to enable the underground aquifers to be maintained with an optimum balance of nitrate levels. Is the Minister in a position to tell the House what is being done? I understand that his department is looking into this matter, although the matter touches upon the departments overseen by the Minister of Health and the Minister of Water Resources. I would be grateful if the Minister could say what steps are being taken to ensure the maintenance of the pure water supply in that area.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The levels of nitrates in the water supply throughout South Australia is of very real concern to the Government. It is being closely monitored. I do not have to hand the detailed information that the member for Victoria seeks, but I will certainly bring down a considered reply, giving the statistical information, so that the honourable member can bring it to the attention of his constituents.

MITCHAM BY-ELECTION

Mr CRAFTER: I ask the Deputy Premier whether the Government will release the report by members of the Premier's staff entitled 'Mitcham: the Millhouse Factor,' which details the political and electoral implications for the Liberal Party upon the appointment of the now Mr Justice Millhouse, then Member for Mitcham, to the Supreme Court bench. I have asked for the release of this report because I understand that it documents the Government's contempt for the judicial process. I believe that the report was prepared last year as a sequel to a similar report done by Mr Graham Loughlin, then a senior adviser to the Premier. I am informed that the appointment of Mr Millhouse was first considered shortly after the last election. It was then felt that, if Mr Millhouse was appointed, it should be done quickly so that the cynicism of the move would be forgotten by the electorate at the time of the next State election.

I am informed that the Attorney-General fought such a move in Cabinet because he believed that it would not only be politically damaging for the Government but it would also be an unpopular move with the legal profession. However, I am told that after the report on the electoral implications was received by the Premier he raised it informally in Cabinet late last year at a time when the Attorney-General was absent. I understand that the move to appoint Mr Millhouse to the Supreme Court bench was supported by all but two Cabinet members. I am sure that members opposite would be as keen to see the report as the rest of us.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to explain. He is now entering into comment.

Mr CRAFTER: If the report that I am seeking to be made public shows that the appointment was politically inspired and not made primarily on judicial grounds, then the Attorney-General should tender his resignation in accordance with convention.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That question sounds about as credible as the spurious rumour-mongering in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the Opposition have been indulging in relation to the casino question.

An honourable member: You're in trouble now.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am in no trouble whatsoever, because obviously the Labor Party sits down, dreams up some story, and says, 'This is some nonsense that we will trundle out during Question Time to try to give it some sort of credibility.' I am not aware of any such sort of working party. I do not know what bits of paper Opposition members scribble on. At no meeting of Cabinet, informal or otherwise, was the matter ever discussed in the terms described by the honourable member.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

Mr LEWIS: I ask the Minister of Agriculture a question about the Middle East live sheep export controversy. Does the Minister know which, if any, of the recommendations made by the touring party comprising members of the industry that went to the Middle East have been accepted by the Federal Government? If so, will he reveal that information to the House? I am aware that the sheep meat industry, the Government and union delegates have not long ago returned from their tour of the Middle East market for our live sheep and sheep meats, and that they have made some 18 recommendations to the Government. I am concerned, though, that a number of my constituents who are involved in this trade, as well as a large number of South Australian primary producers who supply not only sheep but also food pellets and other necessary services, do not know what their future is and what the value is.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is true that a number of recommendations were made to the Government following the delegates' return from the Middle East tour. All but one of those has been accepted. The exception involves a proposal to tax the industry on live sheep exports. As today's Question Time has expired, I will need to provide the detail associated with that very delicate recommendation to the honourable member during Question Time on Tuesday next. I appreciate his raising this matter, and I will bring back a report, even, if necessary, in the form of a Ministerial statement next Tuesday.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER: During the course of Question Time, the member for Albert Park correctly raised a point of order, which was denied, having regard to other matters that were active at that time. The honourable member was correct in seeking, on his own behalf, to have the word 'coward', if it had been expressed by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, withdrawn, because on 21 October 1981, at page 1460 of *Hansard*, it has been explicitly designated as an unparliamentary term. Did the Minister of Industrial Affairs use that term?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I now call upon the Minister of Industrial Affairs to withdraw the term without reservation.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I withdraw it.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: CASINO BILL SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PETERSON: As a member of the select committee investigating casinos, I feel that my personal integrity and honesty have been put at question by comments attributed to the Leader of the Opposition in the *Advertiser* this morning, as follows:

The new Labor Government will introduce a proper inquiry into casinos.

I believe that he also said in an interview that the committee was a farce. These statements imply that I, as a member of that committee, have not acted in a proper manner. I refute this absolutely and request clarification of the meaning of these comments.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

REGISTRATION OF DEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill amends the principal Act, the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1980, in order to enable the fees under the Act to be fixed by regulation. The fees are presently set out in a schedule to the Act and have been fixed at their present levels since 1935. The amendments proposed will enable a new scale of fees to be fixed that is appropriate in terms of the present value of money and enable the scale of fees to be varied from time to time thereafter without the need to amend the Act.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 21 by removing the present provision for payment of a fee of twenty-five cents for the signing of a memorial of a judgment. Clause 4 amends section 31 by removing references to the payment of fees prescribed by the eighth schedule. Clause 5 amends section 40 which provides for the making of regulations. The clause amends the section so that provision is made for the making of regulations as to the fees to be paid for acts or things authorised or required to be done for the purposes of the Act. Clause 6 repeals section 42 which provides for the payment of fees set out in the eighth schedule. Clause 7 repeals the eighth schedule.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

**ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION)
BILL**

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the report of the Select Committee be noted.

(Continued from 2 June. Page 4268).

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Yesterday should have been a great day for South Australia, a day of excitement for the State, because the Government tabled the indenture to ratify the Roxby Downs project. Instead, we have a situation in this State where there is a feeling of gloom because of certain members of the Australian Labor Party who have put Party politics above this State's interests. For 10 years under the Labor Administration, the State waited with bated breath for former Premier Dunstan to bring to fruition just one major project which he had promised and which would have created jobs and put money in the pockets of the workers of this State. Instead, we had 10 years of promises and continued promises without any results. I find it terribly hard to cast my mind back during the Dunstan era and see one major project which was put forward and on which Opposition members could hang their hats, look up to, and say, 'We, through our policies, brought that project to South Australia. We, through our policies, have created jobs for those workers whom we aspire to represent.'

Of course, they cannot answer that charge, because their policies did not bring prosperity to the State and did not establish an industry anywhere along the line of what we are looking at today. I would like members opposite, if they do not believe me, to name one major resource development that they can hang their hats on—just one that matches anything remotely like Roxby Downs. Of course they cannot, hence the deafening silence opposite.

Yesterday was a significant day, when Parliament was presented with concrete proposals for a project of world proportions which will put South Australia on the world map in the eyes of the industrialised nations. This is not a Dunstan election gimmick, as was the Redcliff proposal, which he trotted out with regular monotony. This is a concrete proposal on which vast sums—amounting to some \$50 000 000—have already been spent. This indenture would have to be the greatest proposal for the development of South Australia that has come before this Parliament in the past century. It is going to set this State on a course of industrial development for the next century. There is no doubt in my mind that the majority of South Australians are behind the venture, yet the Labor Party and the Democrats say 'No'.

Surely, they are not all blind to the benefits that the State will reap from this project. It is well known that there are deep divisions in the Labor Party on whether members opposite should or should not support this indenture. Unfortunately for this State, this is a minority, albeit a powerful, group within the Labor ranks which has a vested interest in preventing the economic recovery of this State. One might ask why, and the answer is extremely simple and evident to those who care to study politics. There is a group of people in the A.L.P. Parliamentary wing who, for ideological reasons, are saying 'No', and they have the power over the moderates to enforce this. It has nothing at all to do with uranium as such or their alleged concern about its safety.

Certainly, with lengthy speeches on the subject of safety, they have geared up several of their moderates to support them. What we are talking about here is an ideological split within the Labor Party, a certain group putting forward reasons why this project cannot proceed. Again, it has nothing to do with uranium, radiation and any fears about safety.

We only have to look to Russia and the Eastern European bloc nations, those socialist countries that already have committed themselves to nuclear power, to see that they have no ideological hang-up about uranium, the use of uranium oxide to generate power and its use for peaceful purposes.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: Suddenly the communists are good guys!

Mr OSWALD: I will respond to that. It is the communists, through Russia and through the scientific journals of that country, who are saying to the free world, 'Please release your uranium oxide, because it will save those countries that do not have ready access to reprocessing their waste plutonium.' We are being asked by the communist countries to produce uranium oxide so that this process will not be necessary. Their ideological hang-up in South Australia is simply that Olympic Dam will bring prosperity and jobs to South Australia in large numbers and will put dollars in the pay packets of people, including workmen, here in Adelaide, not at Roxby Downs, not people going into the town to be built there, up in the scrub. It is here in Adelaide that people, including working men and women and families, will see the tangible benefits of this mine. Members opposite do not like the idea of that happening because they know that if Roxby Downs goes ahead they will then be set back dramatically in their programme to spread socialism throughout South Australian communities.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: They are laughing. I hoped they would laugh—members opposite only laugh when you strike a nerve. I have struck a nerve here, because the radicals know that creating within the community an economic situation in which people are starved of funds and are in hard financial times, is the type of atmosphere you must create in order to establish a base for spreading the socialist doctrine. If we create a prosperous State, they will be set back for years in their programme of implementing their socialist philosophy, and the best thing that could happen for half a dozen or so members who form a hard core within the Labor Party is for us not to proceed with this project.

I believe that members of the public do not agree with those members, and I believe that perhaps more than half their fellow members (their comrades, as they call each other) do not agree with them, either. I hope that common sense will prevail for the benefit of the State and that we will see the Labor Party do an about-face and acknowledge that the future of this State rests in their hands, as well as, with respect to the new member for Mitcham, in the hands of the Australian Democrats. The Australian Labor Party and the Democrats must think again on their attitude to blocking this development. We are not just talking about uranium: we are talking about one of the largest copper, gold, uranium and rare earth mines in the world, yet a handful of people in this place intend to block South Australia's access to it.

This indenture must pass, or the Labor Party and the Democrats will be responsible for South Australia becoming the poor relation in Australia. I for one do not want to see that happen, and in that view I am joined by my colleagues on this side of the House. If this Bill fails, it will be because of the bloody-minded ideologies of members of the left-wing fringe who have won the day over their moderate colleagues—won the day pursuing a policy resolution and a policy change which the left wing forced through back in about 1977 when it had a national conference, I believe in Perth.

Let us look at the priorities of the State when it comes to assessing our total resources. Over the last 2½ years, I believe that there has been an increase in the inflow of capital investment dollars of over 1 000 per cent (I believe

it is in the area of 1 160 per cent) in the manufacturing and mining sectors, and those figures specifically exclude the \$50 000 000 already invested in Roxby Downs. I think that we can thank the South Australian Liberal Government for this about-turn and the flow back into South Australia of these investment dollars. But in the past, and certainly for the immediate future, we are a primary-producing State, and we are heavily dependent on the fortunes of this industry and its seasonal markets, both here and overseas. Over recent years small coal and iron ore deposits, and more recently the Cooper Basin project, have lifted us closer to the big league as far as secondary industry is concerned. We still have a strong industrial base, and during the good times it is indeed very handy to have, and we can benefit by it.

However, it is a base which is still dangerously vulnerable if some external force swings across the nation and there is a nationwide down-turn. If we can develop our resources as we are moving at the moment to the extent that we have a thousand-plus percentage increase in investment dollars in mining and manufacturing, and if we can top that off with the Roxby Downs project, South Australia will be set on a course which will be the envy of our compatriots interstate.

Over recent years South Australia has seen resource booms all round. We witnessed the resource boom several years ago in Western Australia and have seen Queensland and the Northern Territory take off. Whether we like it or not, this State has lagged badly behind. Certainly, that has been contributed to, to a great degree, by the anti-development policies of the former Government, but we now have an opportunity to reverse this process and to set the State on a course of prosperity. There is no doubt that Roxby Downs will produce jobs in South Australia and put dollars into people's pockets. All the evidence given to the select committee, excluding that from the Friends of the Earth, does indicate that South Australia will benefit. It has been interesting that, so far, no-one from the Opposition side has really disputed that.

I say, with due respect to the Leader's speech last night, that it was a short one on the subject; he spent 10 minutes winding up to get into it and then cut the speech short. However, I am still at a loss to know what he had to say about this development, as he was beating around the bush. At no stage, though, did he dispute the report, and at no stage did he say anything, other than that he does not want Roxby Downs to proceed. The Leader is not prepared to come out and say why, because he knows that if he does he will lose his position as Leader of the Opposition and will be either relegated to the back bench or out of the Parliament altogether, because of that core of ideological heavies who have control of the card-carrying votes at the union level and who will move immediately on any member opposite who chooses not to toe the Party line and dogma. That is why many members opposite are locked into a particular course of action, and I think that it is a sad day for South Australia that those members opposite who want to vote for the Bill cannot do so because their positions representing the people in South Australia would be in jeopardy—people, the polls tell us, who are overwhelmingly in favour of Roxby Downs proceeding.

I will refer briefly to statements made by industrialists about this project, men close to it who have far more knowledge of the potential of the project than anyone in this House. I will start with a statement, made by Mr Hugh Morgan, Executive Director of Western Mining Corporation, which was reported in the *Sunday Mail*, referring to the development, as follows:

Development of the \$1 000 000 000 Roxby Downs copper-uranium prospect would see well in excess of 60 per cent of the

funds spent in South Australia and more than 80 per cent outlaid in Australia.

It mentions 60 per cent of the funds to be spent here in South Australia, yet members opposite want to deny that to this State. Mr Morgan is also President of the Australian Mining Industry Council, so I imagine that he can speak with a fair degree of authority. The article continues:

'That's potentially a lot of money and I would hesitate to put numbers on it,' he said. 'The size of the project has not yet been determined. That's the task we are presently engaged on. But if it were of a size that resulted in about 100 000 tonnes of contained copper being produced each year, and the products that would come with that production level, there would probably be in the order of 2 000 to 3 000 permanent jobs and about 4 000 to 5 000 jobs during the construction period.'

With a multiplication factor of four, which is recognised throughout the industry, this could easily lead to a township of 12 000 to 15 000 people. The benefits in royalties, to which other members will allude later, are untold. I refer now to a statement by Mr Keith Parry, Director of Mining Operations for Western Mining Corporation, who was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

He said Olympic Dam at Roxby Downs would be one of the biggest copper-uranium ore bodies in the world. South Australia had a tremendous area in which major ore bodies would be found. The firm employed 250 people at the Olympic Dam site and another 50 involved in development work in Adelaide. 'Their one motivation is to turn this particular ore body into a successful mining, smelting and refining operation and build a town which at some stage in the future will rival a Broken Hill, Mount Isa or Kalgoorlie.'

I am reliably informed that that is the view, to a man, of all unionists working on the site—they are united in the belief that the company is doing the right thing by them, and they can see this project's enormous benefit to the State. Goodness knows why they cannot get that through to their membership down here. It gets back to this fact that there are members opposite who are ideologically blinded and who have no interest in the economic recovery of this State, for the reasons I have expounded. I turn now to the transcript of a *Nationwide* interview with Sir Arvi Parbo, as follows:

In the first instance we would be thinking of a township of perhaps ten to fifteen thousand people, but ultimately, it's anyone's guess just how big it would be. Today's market really has no relevance to these long term projects.

Question—Do we need an indenture Bill?

Sir Arvi—Yes, very much so.

Question—In other words, if you don't get it, that's the end of the project?

Sir Arvi—It will have to be put on ice; yes.

Question—Do you think that this project is worth all the fuss that's going on at the moment?

Sir Arvi—Well, if South Australia wishes to have a substantial new industry then it certainly is worth it, because it really is the only project that there is at the moment that you can imagine would bring about this sort of economic development.

Question—But you would definitely deny that Roxby Downs is a mirage in the desert and not likely to be of any great benefit or of significant benefit to the State?

Sir Arvi—Very much so, very much so.

Nowhere else in the world would a group of politicians on the Opposition benches turn a blind eye to a project of this kind and want to pull the plug on it just to suit their ideological beliefs. The interview continued:

You either decide that it is good for South Australia and ought to go ahead or you don't. Once it's put on a standby basis there is no telling when it might be revived. It's necessary to continue doing the work so that when conditions are favourable you can take advantage of them as the market picks up. If you haven't done the work you are three or four years behind. It's not just a matter of turning it on when you want to.

The Labor Party heavies to whom I have referred are those who have the power over other members in the way of card-carrying votes and support of their large left-wing unions which have stood over their members and tied them down on Party dogma. If people do not believe me, we should

briefly look at the history of change in attitude of members of the Labor Party over the years, because there was a time when Labor was happy to go ahead with uranium development in Australia.

In 1969, the A.L.P. (according to the Federal policy of the Labor Party) stated that a Labor Government would immediately ratify the nuclear non-proliferation treaty to ensure that any Australian uranium was used for peaceful purposes only. I assume that we are all in accordance with that view. In 1971, the A.L.P. stated that a Labor Government would take action to stimulate the growth of nuclear technology and to establish enrichment plants and nuclear power stations in Australia. The Party was happy then. In 1975, the Federal conference confirmed Labor's commitment to the uranium industry. The commitment to construct enrichment facilities in Australia was also confirmed.

In Perth in 1977, at the conference that put the death knell on uranium development as far as the South Australian Government of the day was concerned, the A.L.P. imposed an indefinite ban on uranium mining and processing in Australia. The South Australian branch of the Labor Party, in March 1977, through a Parliamentary motion, imposed a ban on uranium development in South Australia, and, by so doing, the Dunstan Government became the first Government in Australia to take such action and the only Government able to effectively implement such a ban at that time, because of the known existence of significant uranium reserves in South Australia. The Parliamentary motion was introduced without reference to the State conference or the executive of the Party, indicating that Dunstan wanted to avoid any opportunity for a public debate that would expose the divisions within the Party. What is the current policy of the A.L.P.? It is to declare the whole of South Australia a nuclear-free zone, which is one blanket way of saying, 'Let us pull the plug on it and stop development occurring in South Australia.'

The anti-State development minority of members opposite is using four areas of objection to Roxby Downs to beat the moderates into submission and to force them to vote against the Bill. I refer briefly to these four areas that are used to spread fear and apprehension throughout the community, quite without foundation. Any responsible person who reads the evidence before the select committee will be able to verify that. The four areas of opposition are: first, the potential for weapons proliferation; secondly, it is believed that technology for the disposal of radioactive waste is not yet safe; thirdly, it is believed that radiation hazards exist; and, finally, it is believed that hazards exist in relation to reactors. I am sure that other speakers will develop those four subjects, but I briefly refer to the potential for weapons proliferation.

I remind the House of a statement that I made earlier that the Russians, through their scientific journals, are pleading with the West to release more uranium so that user countries will not have to resort to converting waste to plutonium to recycle it, because the world recognises that there are difficulties involved. It was also stated that there is a potential for weapons proliferation. Goodness knows, any ailing country in the world, if it wants to get hold of uranium oxide or by-products to turn them into nuclear weaponry, can have ready access to them. Those countries do not have to buy through Australia: they can get the products anywhere they like, because they are readily available throughout the world for that purpose.

Regarding the claim that technology for the disposal of wastes is not safe, I point out that there are methods which are now scientifically safe for the disposal of waste. The French use vitrification in glass, and the Swedes put the waste into natural copper cylinders that are bedded into bentonite, and stored. By that process, the waste goes well

into the earth. I do not have time to develop that argument, but technology is available that world experts claim is safe.

In the debate on the medical uses of radiation, I believe it was well established that dosages can be measured and, if one can measure dosage of radiation, one can control the exposure to it of workers and the public to the extent that, if a dangerous level is known, people are not exposed beyond that level. No-one says that radiation is not dangerous. I certainly do not say that radiation as such is not dangerous, but, by the same token, so are the by-products in the atmosphere from the burning of coal and the burning of oil. Of course radiation is dangerous, but it is all around us.

It is dangerous to go before an X-ray plant in a hospital, but the radiation is controlled. Members of the public are very happy to have an X-ray taken in a hospital if they believe that some good may come from it. They are not frightened to front up before an X-ray if they have a broken limb. Yet the danger from radiation from that source is considered by scientists to be something about which one must be very careful. However, we know how to control it, and so we take precautions. Radiation can be measured and controlled, and safety precautions can be taken to protect the workers and the public.

For the Labor Party to jeopardise the Olympic Dam project because of the fears associated with uranium mining, when these fears have no scientific base, is pigheadedness taken to the extreme. The reality is that we live in a nuclear age. When I was in London on one occasion, I saw a play called *Stop the World, I Want to Get Off*, which could easily have been written for the members of the South Australian branch of the A.L.P. The world will go on, and Australia will prosper. If South Australia does not proceed with the Roxby Downs project, the Labor Party and the Australian Democrats will have been responsible for another major industry not coming to South Australia, and that will add more weight to the already wellknown argument that the Labor Party in this State is anti-State development.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): Before I start on the text of my speech, I would hope to have your concurrence, Mr Speaker, to raise another point of considerable sadness to me. I raise this matter because I know that the person concerned was well known to many members in this place for many years. My personal assistant, Mr Fred Hansford, died suddenly last night of a heart attack, and his funeral will be held on Monday. He was known to many members in this Parliament and to many people in the community at large, in both his former capacity as a staff member of the Premier's Department, charged with the responsibility of handling individual constituency problems, and latterly as my personal assistant at the Salisbury electorate office. He will be very sadly missed by members in this place and by thousands (and I do not exaggerate) of people in the community. I am sure that I express the feelings of many people in offering my condolences to all members of his family. I offer our prayers that they will get through this period of great trial. May God speed him on his continuing journey through life eternal, and may we say 'Thank you' for the contribution that Fred Hansford made when he was alive.

Leaving that very sad note, I refer now to the Bill. I stand by all of the comments I made earlier, and for those who wish to know a fuller viewpoint and understanding of my views, I refer them to that as continuing evidence, even in the light of the report of the Select Committee. Indeed, I was pleased to note that, in the appendix attached to the report by the two members of the Opposition, they have drawn on this statistical data relating to the market projections of estimated demand for uranium in the years ahead

and the very serious problems that exist for any producer of that ore.

I still maintain that far too easily have those doubts been swept aside, far too glibly have they been swept aside. They are very real doubts that affect the economic viability of that proposal, and by consequence, must affect investment patterns in this State at large. No responsible member of Parliament on either side, or of any political persuasion, would want to buy into a project unless he could be certain that he was to benefit from it. While nothing in life is absolutely certain, it is foolhardy to fly in the face of the sort of market doubts that have been raised concerning the uranium market.

I shall repeat some of the points that were made in the appendix and in my speech on another occasion about the market supply situation. It was indicated that the demand throughout the 1980s, though it will grow, will not be sufficient to use up all the supply that will be available, and by the end of the 1980s we will therefore have a supply in excess of demand situation, coupled with very large stock piles of uranium ore. Of course, stock piles are not just there to sit there glowing prettily in the dark—they are there to be sold, and they will have a very important price impact. The statement quoted both in my speech and in appendix C was this:

There is little likelihood of a price recovery in the near term or for that matter prior to the mid or late 1980s.

Indeed, I remind the House yet again that in compiling statistics concerning uranium supply that would take place Roxby Downs was not included in the calculation, so, one has to believe that, if the Roxby Downs project proceeds, the supply situation will be even higher than taken into account in the paper. The article concluded with the words:

This is not a picture to warm the hearts of existing and would-be uranium producers.

I believe the propositions put forward by the two Opposition members on that select committee are very sound and very reasonable and I hope that in the furtherance of this debate they will be answered fully by members of the Government. At this point I do not believe that the Deputy Premier has given them the serious consideration they deserve. They deserve that consideration because they are the genuine deliberations of two members who do not lightly jump to conclusions, who do not lightly jump on the band wagon; in fact, they are men who are concerned and who have always been concerned that this State should develop and provide proper resources and wealth to all its citizens.

I shall deal with each of the points in this appendix made by the two members of the Opposition, but I want to make the point that the Opposition's attitude could be summed up to be that we firmly support development, we firmly support the provision of jobs, we firmly support the progress of this State, and indeed we have always done so. However, we do so with the requirement that such development be proper, safe and sound; in other words, development with safety. What we believe the Government might be tempted to do, if it rejects the amendments to be moved by the Opposition, is to say that it will have development at any price. There are too many circumstances in history where development at any price has been gravely disadvantageous to various communities.

One can raise the proposition concerning the time in the 1940s when the cadmium processing plant at Minimata, in Japan, was being considered as a major development, as a major job creator, and it was found of course that it was development without safety, at tremendous cost. That example is probably very well known to all members, and I will not relate all the details here. There are other similar instances; there are examples of gross over-industrialisation in certain spots where environmental hazards literally have

taken their toll on life in those communities. Indeed, I have to accept the proposition made by Government members that, for example, coal mining, the production of coal, has proven it to be a very hazardous material. The mining of coal has been very hazardous and the extensive reliance upon it with regard to industrialisation has also caused serious hazards. I am not overlooking that fact; I think that serves to reinforce the point.

By proposing the seven conditions in appendix C, the Opposition really is saying that it will support development, subject to its being safe, subject to the provision of pre-conditions of safety; we want development with safety, not development at any cost. The burden of proof then falls on the Government, and it is for the Government to explain why, should it not see reason enough to do so, it rejects those conditions. That challenge has not been answered.

If this Bill is passed with the amendments that we propose, the indenture stands as a legal document. There is, therefore, that condition upon which the indenture could get through, namely, that the conditions for safety be listened to by this Government. Of course, there has been a lot of debate about whether or not an indenture is even necessary, and I suppose that in a sense that is not entirely so relevant at this moment since we are debating this Bill, and if the Government can still accept our conditions then that matter is not part of the debate.

I suppose in many ways the proposition of whether or not we should accept such an indenture on this agreement can be summed up by an example of family life. We have been told by the previous speaker that Sir Arvi Parbo says, of course, that the company needs an indenture, that it would not proceed without one. I suppose what could be being proposed by those who do not want an indenture is a kind of common law marriage rather than a marriage of binding contract: one can still survive, and we are trying to provide opportunities whereby that kind of common law marriage could well survive without the need for an indenture. As my colleague says, it has certainly survived this far.

I refer to each of the points made by the Opposition in the appendix. First, regarding that decision for production to be deferred, the Deputy Premier indicated yesterday that that gave no guarantee at all to the company and effectively killed any chances that it ever had. I think that it would behove the Deputy Premier to look at paragraphs (2) and (3) of the conditions nominated by the two members of the Opposition because those two conditions guarantee protective aspects to the company as well as to the Government. Their interests would certainly be protected under that provision, because under (2) the company would be granted a 50-year lease on the tenements in that area. That is a major alteration of the present situation where they presently operate under a two-year lease. There would be no purpose granting a 50-year lease and then being simply bloody-minded about it: rather there would be the obligation on both the Government and the companies to fully examine all the implications of any proposal to mine uranium. So, the debate at that level would move out of the hysteria of the full-page advertisements that we are seeing from the Chamber of Commerce and instead start focusing on some important questions that have not yet been answered.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Mr Schrape said he has not even been to the mine site.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Has he not? I would have thought that such a gentleman, who speaks so much and so often and seems to know so much about it, might at least have visited the mine. The 50-year lease suggestion allows for that coolheaded debate to take place on the whole proposition. Condition (3) provides:

that the lease be subject to periodic assessment by the Government and the companies to show why commercial mining should or should not proceed and on what basis.

That is a protection to the company, because it lays the onus on two parties, not just one. It lays the onus upon the Government that it should explain why it may not be permitting the commercial production to proceed, and again the debate would be on cold, hard, rational facts about the safety or otherwise of mining the product.

In considering this matter I gave some study to a book called *The Mining Industry in the Developing Countries*, published in 1977, and the chapter headed 'Modern mining code' draws heavily on the UN proceedings of the Seminar on Mining Legislation and Administration, and it talks about the various aspects that are important in entertaining mining development. It is true that it makes the statement that the holder of a prospecting licence must be guaranteed automatic mining rights with the discovery of an economic ore deposit but note that it refers to the discovery of an economic ore deposit. In other words, it would subsequent to the discovery of an economic ore deposit, not dependent upon the possibility that it might be there, not dependent upon some future event, but subsequent to such an event and that naturally would be a legal right that no-one on this side would dispute.

However, the further point is made that the mining companies would be assured of full possession of granted rights (and we are proposing that under the 50-year lease situation and under the provisions of condition (3) it would require the Government as well as the company to give evidence periodically as to why or why not mining is being permitted). Furthermore, it indicates in that report that the Government has the right to re-evaluate the licensee. The actual exhibition of that right, the enjoyment of that right by the Government, and as a consequence the people of this State, only becomes a full reality if the full commission has not taken place until the economic ore body has been determined, and that is not now. No-one in this Chamber has definitively said that that body is an economic ore body at this time. It is a significant deposit but no-one has said that it is an economic ore body that will proceed to be mined. In fact, the very purpose of the further \$50 000 000 in the feasibility study is to determine the answer to that question.

Another point that can be made in relation to condition (2) is that that in itself becomes a security against the investment. It is true that a business would not willingly invest \$50 000 000 if it did not have some guarantee of security. The 50-year lease is a pretty profound guarantee of security. It is certainly a guarantee of freedom from expropriation. I would suggest it would be worth as much as the right of guaranteed production. I would suggest that a company such as B.P., which is involved in mineral exploration in many parts of the world, where the fear of expropriation is a real fear, would confirm that the proposition for a 50-year lease is indeed a valuable one. Of course, the provision of condition (3) that the lease be subject to periodic assessment I believe is eminently obvious. Surely that right should exist. Likewise, the company is under the onus to prove why it should not go ahead. If it is deciding not to go ahead once the Government of the day has decided that mining should proceed, the company should be obliged to answer periodically in the same way as the Government should be obliged. If it is holding up that development of course such a process would be the subject of public scrutiny and the electorate of the day could make its determinations on that matter.

Condition (4) relates to the radiological safeguards, saying that it should be amended to allow for properly endorsed requirements for radiation protection to be imposed by the Minister without the statutory limits contained within the

Bill. I strongly urge the Minister to accept that because my reading of 8 (2) in the Bill and in the indenture provides no possibility for daughter bodies in the event of present-day bodies controlling safeguards going out of existence. We are dealing with a proposal and a project that will last for a long time. We are not dealing with an indenture that will last from now until the election, or from now until 1990. We have been told that if this ore body is exploited it will last for decades. Indentures already in existence in this State have lasted for decades; therefore, surely there must have been entertained or should have been entertained in the Bill the proposition that future bodies may exist that presently do not exist and present bodies that exist may cease to exist. My reading of 8 (2) and my reading of the indenture Bill entertains that possibility not at all.

The remote chance would therefore happen that in the disappearance of some of these international regulatory bodies between now and some future time there would be no safeguard controls at all in the Bill. Is it too much to ask the Government to introduce that extra possibility? May I suggest one easy way it could do that: It could accept the Opposition's proposition relating to condition (4). Proposition (5) in the appendix states:

that special workers compensation provision similar to that enacted in the United Kingdom, covering short and long-term exposure to radiation of workers be prepared urgently and passed and a State register of all persons involved in the mining, milling, processing and transport of uranium and uranium products be drawn up and maintained.

This matter was not addressed in the report of the Select Committee as a whole; it was touched upon only in the appendix by the two members of the Opposition. May I say that indeed that must be considered by all to be important. That must, in fairness to the employees who will work if Roxby Downs proceeds now and in the future and who must be given that right of protection.

In its Legislature the United Kingdom obviously thought the same, recognising that in dealing with nuclear materials, the mining, processing and transport of such materials, different categories or workers compensation ailments and diseases come into play but that they take a lot longer than the six months to show themselves, and a lot longer than the six years allowed by common law to show themselves; and that unless we bring those into our Act we will be saying to a large number of workers involved (and we are told it will be a large number of workers involved according to the number of jobs it is said will be created) that they will have no protection against the main threat posed in their employment by such employment. We know, sadly, from examples in this State in the 1950s that indeed real problems are posed in the handling of nuclear materials. I do not want to be closed minded on this. I indicated in my previous speech that there are a significant number of stages in the processing of uranium that now can be considered safe if certain measures are adopted and if proper regulation applies.

I reiterate that other parts of the protest are not satisfactorily concluded to be safe at this stage. But, even with those that are concluded to be safe at this stage, we need to have the protective aspect of workers compensation regulations. The United Kingdom Nuclear Installations Act, 1955, provides for an expiration of 30 years from the relevant date, that is to say, the date of occurrence that gave rise to the claim. That is a significantly greater time than applies under any legislation that we have in this State at the moment. Again, I put to the House that that is an eminently reasonable proposition.

On the matter of tailings, I have quoted on a number of occasions the INFCE summary volume, because I found it very worth while. It has played a very important part in

my thinking on the uranium issue. I have already indicated to this House that I have had my views modified in a number of areas because of closely studying all the information contained in that. But, of course, it is not the sort of book, by virtue of its close study, that provides easy answers for anyone on any side. It also provides cautionary notes to those who would have us go down the nuclear path without any bridles. On the matter of tailings, it said this:

... attention is drawn to the need for accepted international standards aimed at providing guidance for all aspects of waste management and disposal.

It further says:

Some further development of—

and it is talking here about conventions for third party liability—

is necessary to accommodate the long-term nature of radioactive waste disposal activities.

To my mind, the thinking inherent there is entirely consistent with the proposition being made in condition No. 6 by Opposition members, namely, that adequate arrangements be made for the storage and disposal of tailings for the drawing up, for the approval of the Minister of Health, of an appropriate plan. That acknowledges the need for some more development at this stage, inasmuch as the INFCE summary volume also acknowledges the need for more study on that matter.

Likewise, when I was reading the management, stabilisation and environmental impact of uranium mill tailings, produced by the Nuclear Energy Agency of the O.E.C.D., after going through all the conference proceedings, the delegates to that conference themselves acknowledged in the chapter on policies and regulatory aspects that there is still work to be done to improve the impact of those policies and regulatory aspects. We have not found the total wisdom at this stage on that matter. Accepting condition No. 6 of the Opposition would recognise that state of affairs.

The final condition seemed to me to be the one that the Deputy Premier accepted yesterday, namely, that the project be subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth environmental impact statement legislation requiring that there be a public inquiry into all aspects of the project. The Deputy Premier says that it is. If it is covered already, I am reassured, and I am sure that the Opposition members who were on that committee are likewise reassured.

I do not on this occasion have much time left to me, but one area that I would have thought it would be useful for the Select Committee to examine is the examination of what one might call the Stavanger syndrome. Members will not have heard of that before, because I made it up about 10 seconds ago. I refer to the impact of the economy of a local part of a country by research and resource development investment nearby. The community of Stavanger in Norway is very close to the North Sea oil deposit, and is their landing point. It is held by the Government of Norway. There has been a significant economic impact on the life style of that community, which is the third largest city in Norway. The economic wellbeing of the locals in some senses has improved dramatically, but in other senses it has not: it has gone down. So, we do need to look at the economic impact of procedures such as this.

Last evening, the member for Hanson talked about the need to have financial impact statements. May I also suggest that there is some merit in considering economic impact statements on proposals as large as this. The Deputy Premier, in response partly to my speech on a previous occasion, indicated that it was not foreseen that there would be an impact on the capacity of the nation to generate investment capital by the huge investment demand created by the Roxby Downs development. I accept that. It has obviously been stated. International capital flow and possibilities have been

looked at. In as much as that aspect has been considered, I ask the Deputy Premier to consider this further aspect. I may be surprised to find that it already has been, and the Deputy Premier will give those answers. If it has not, I ask that attention be given to that aspect by the appropriate authorities, perhaps by the I.D.C.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Are you still talking about where the capital is coming from?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: No, I am talking about the impact of the investment on the local State community, and its effect on prices, house prices, commodity prices, and the like.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: At the time of greatest activity.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, at the time of greatest activity. We are talking here about the end of the decade. But, I close once again on the point that I made before: we are not a Party that would seek to take South Australia back into the middle ages or the dark ages. We are not a Party that is so unalterably opposed to any form of job development or creation that we would say 'No' just for the sake of being bloody minded. We are a Party that firmly believes in development, but we have our sites well and truly set on this State's future. We have our sites well and truly set on the true wellbeing, in every sense, of the citizens present and to be. Thus, we want development with safety. We call on the Government to accept that and accept the propositions made in the appendix put forward by the two Opposition members to the Select Committee.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I quite cynically could start my speech this afternoon to the tune of 'where have all the flowers gone' and replacing 'flowers' with 'unions'. When I was asked to have a look at this report and present some comment to Parliament (I believe that we as members have an obligation to make statements to this House), I thought that I would arrange for a copy of the report, which I now have. I then perused appendices A and B to see who had presented to this August Select Committee sitting on behalf of this House to look at this indenture Bill. I could see there the companies and groups of people who made commitments and comments to the committee.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr RANDALL: I respect Select Committees and believe that they have a role to play in this House. Having served as a member of a Select Committee, I know that they can fulfil a good, positive role if they work correctly and provide information to members. In this case one assumes that members opposite had to go elsewhere to get their information to put in their minority report. I do not believe that enough information has been given to that Select Committee to help in formulating a minority report. The difficulty one has, if one wants to be fair and take the challenge offered to all members this week in the *News* that we should not get emotional but should base our comments on facts, is to get the other side of the story. What story has the union movement put to this committee? It has put no story, comments or facts to this Select Committee. Perhaps the Minister would like to tell us why. Perhaps he knows. I am sure that the Minister, in summing up this debate, can tell us why he believes that the union movement did not approach the committee. I say to the people of South Australia that the workers of this State have been let down by their union movement representatives who I believe have a role to play in the political sphere in which we live.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr RANDALL: I leave that to the honourable member. He can ask his members who were on the Select Committee.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: At the request of one of the Labor members, we arranged a special meeting to hear

them, but they sent a telephone message to say they would not be coming.

Mr RANDALL: I will not pursue that point any further. I believe that workers of this State have been let down by their representatives in the union movement. The union movement does not hesitate at other times to make its voice heard through local members in this House. I would listen with very clear interest to those members of this House who have ties with the union movement to see what they are saying on behalf of their former unions or the unions which they now represent. I believe that the union movement has comments to make and should make those comments to the House. So, the challenge is that, if those members have those links back to the union movement, let us hear from them. I do not mind whether they are for or against this, but the union movement has the right to be heard in this House. I do not intend to stand up here this afternoon and speak on behalf of the union movement. I believe that the challenge is there to come forward and make their views known.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Well, have a look at the previous—

Mr RANDALL: If I look at the indenture Bill select committee evidence, I can find no views from any union. I will not ask why.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Nor the Conservation Council.

Mr RANDALL: Nor the Conservation Council. One could look at the select committee in the Upper House and wade through the reams of evidence before that committee. One could spend days doing that. One can grant that the union movement did put evidence before that select committee. That evidence is there for members to peruse.

Mr Hamilton: You may be answering your own question now.

Mr RANDALL: No, I am not answering my own question. I believe that the committee was set up by this House to investigate the indenture Bill. This Bill has, or has not, depending on one's viewpoint, ramifications for the workers of this State in the future. Therefore, on that basis the union movement should have been represented at the select committee and should have been putting a viewpoint.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The A.W.U. want it and some others don't. That's the problem.

Mr RANDALL: I guess one will find out in weeks to come which unions do support the resolutions of this select committee. The thing that concerns me most is that we have here a prospect for the future of families, and young people in this State who are now trying to find work. These are guys who have the ability to do some hard yakka, to do some laborious-type work with their hands. Although they have little job opportunities in this city, these men are prepared to uproot their families in the hope of getting a job in the middle of the country of this State; they are prepared to live in a mining town with all the benefits that go with that. They are prepared to work hard to get finance for their families and get a good start in the community in which they are prepared to live. We should not deny them that opportunity. The opportunity is there for young people who want to do some work to get out and do that. Let us provide them with the jobs.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr RANDALL: I am sure that the workers will let their unions know where they want to go, and that the members of this House who belong to those unions will get the message. I want to move now into the area of radiation protection. I want to insert into *Hansard* a brief message. I do not want to take up my full speech time, as I believe that other members want to make their contribution too.

Let me refer to radiation protection. In establishing radiation protection standards, the cautious assumption is made

that any exposure to radiation, no matter how small, carries with it some risk of injury (i.e. there is no threshold dose). To give some numerical estimate of risk as a function of dose, it is further assumed that the risk is linearly proportional to dose down to the lowest levels of exposure.

The maximum permitted individual exposure for workers in the nuclear industry is 5 000 millirems per year and to members of the public is 500 millirems per year (these standards exclude medical exposure). The I.C.R.P. recommends that all exposures shall be kept as low as is reasonably achievable, economic and social factors being taken into account.

Quite rightly, the workers and members of the community are concerned about radiation. Indeed, I believe that all members of this House are concerned about radiation. Unfortunately, when one talks about radiation one has to contend with the fact that some people do not fully understand the implications, and radiation tends to become an emotive word because it has dramatised and overplayed itself. The news media has tended sometimes to paint a not too pretty picture in relation to it and quite rightly in past cases, where one can look back and see where over exposure to radiation has caused some deleterious effects. Let us look at the sources of radiation in our community. Potentially harmful ionising radiation emanates from many natural sources e.g. the sun and outer space (i.e. cosmic radiation) rocks, soil, food, water, and our bodies. It also comes from man-made sources such as X-ray machines, cancer therapy equipment, T.V. sets, luminous watch dials, radioisotopes used in industry and medicine, and from the coal and nuclear fuel cycle. I am well aware of the concern regarding radiation in our community because from time to time I see major stories erupting concerning the potential hazards of radiation from T.V. sets. Because it is a scientific problem and some people do not fully understand how their television sets work, or about electrons and the atoms associated with electronics, they get a bit afraid when they hear that their T.V. set can become a major source of X-ray radiation. It is true that there is an X-ray radiation source in a T.V. set, but what is not told is that, for one to suffer from X-ray radiation and the consequences of it, there is a factor called distance, a factor of intensity, and other factors to be considered when one is exposed to radiation.

As a technician working on television sets, I was only too well aware that there is an area of exposure in a T.V. set where, if one places one's hand too close, radiation exposure can be suffered, but to a minor level. It is the level about which we must be concerned. The biggest exposure for the average person comes from rocks, soil, building material, and medical X-rays. The average Australian (excluding workers in the nuclear industry) receives about 150 millirem of exposure per year from all these sources. Jet aircraft travel enhances the exposure to cosmic radiation. Air hostesses in Australia receive up to an estimated 670 millirems per year from their hours in the air. Pilots average about 450 millirem per year because they have fewer working hours. As a group, these people receive more occupational exposure than any other group in Australia, including the workers on the nuclear reactors at Lucas Heights (south of Sydney) who average 200 millirem per year.

So, when one considers the exposure that we are suffering in radiation from various sources, one begins to pose the question: do we travel on aircraft if we are going to be exposed to X-ray radiation, if we are so concerned? Do we live in our homes? Do we watch television? There are all sorts of sources if we are concerned about this unknown quantity of radiation.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: You get a lot in here, because this building is granite.

Mr RANDALL: I was going to come to that at a later stage. The Minister is quite correct. If we look at the radiation exposure, we see what happens around us. We find that the potentially harmful ionising radiation emanates from many natural sources, for example, the sun and outer space. It also comes from man-made sources, as I have stated. If one follows this through, one begins to ask questions of where they actually are.

Let us have a look at the natural background radiation. The earth has always been naturally radioactive, and plants, animals and man have always been exposed to this radiation. It involves the entire living populations of the world and has been present at a relatively constant rate. However, from place to place there can be substantial variations in exposure rate, and even locally, for example, within one building. Natural radiation is the largest contributor to the collective radiation dose of the world population.

We are exposed to natural radiation and radioactivity of external sources such as cosmic radiation, the ground, the buildings we live in, and internal sources such as the air we breathe and the food and water we consume. The radiation dose varies, whether we are considering the lung, bone, gonads, etc., because of the way different radiosotopes are absorbed or taken into the body, the sensitivity of the different organs to radiation and the difference in the damage that can be caused by the different types of radiation. For simplicity, the radiation dose of the whole body is what generally needs to be considered. We talked earlier about cosmic radiation, and I believe that, generally speaking, exposure to cosmic radiation increases by two to three millirem per year for every 100 metre increase in altitude.

Jet air travel exposes plane crews to higher levels of cosmic radiation, especially as most flights seek to fly at an altitude over 10 000 metres. For subsonic jets the mean radiation dose is about .7 millirems per hour. Air hostesses in Australia receive an estimated 670 millirems a year from their hours in the air. I believe one must keep an eye on that area.

Let us look at the ground and buildings. The biggest doses and biggest variations in natural background radiation come from external terrestrial radiation, that is, from rocks, soil and the buildings where we live. These radiation effects can be demonstrated by the fact that here, at Parliament House, some of the bases of its walls, the ballustrades and front steps are made of granite, which gives off about 2½ times the radioactivity of the general background. So, where do the protesters, the people who are most concerned about this radiation, stand? They stand in the most vulnerable place in this building, under the ballustrade on the steps. Records in this House indicate clearly that that is potentially the most dangerous place for them to stand in this House, if they are worried about radiation, because the radiation potential for those standing under the ballustrading on the steps is 2½ times the potential for those of us in here. They are standing in the most dangerous place in this House to protest.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: On the steps.

Mr RANDALL: Yes, under the ballustrade, with the granite surrounding them, and with the radiation emanating from it naturally. I do not deny the right of protesters to express an opinion, but let us get it into balance and perspective. Let them understand what we are talking about. Obviously, one must look at radiation in the community in which we live, because it does exist. Indeed, it exists in the very place in which these people stand and protest.

I turn now to my final point, which relates to lung cancer. The annual incidence of lung cancer among non-smokers in the general United States population is about 130 per million persons, about 65 of which may be primary lung cancers originating in the bronchi. Natural radon background

could account for some 20 cases of lung cancer per million people per year in the United States. I emphasise the words 'natural radon background'. But, we need to look at Australia. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a statistical chart referring to the number of lung cancer deaths in this country.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the House that the document is purely of a statistical nature?

Mr RANDALL: Yes, I can.

Leave granted.

TABLE 11.3 LUNG CANCER DEATH STATISTICS FOR ALL AGES

Reference	Percent of Total Deaths			Death Rate/Million Population		
	1976	1977	1978	1976	1977	1978
(1) Australia						
Male	3.1	3.2	3.4	508	501	513
Female	0.6	0.7	0.8	97	113	117
(2) South Australia						
Male	—	3.1	3.5	—	475	528
Female	—	0.7	0.5	—	101	81
(3) U.S.A.						
Male	—	3.6	—	—	—	—
Female	—	1.2	—	—	—	—

References:

- (1) Australian Bureau of Statistics, Canberra, 1980. Deaths Australia 1978: Table 10.
- (2) Calculated from Table 3, pages 44 and 45 of Cancer in South Australia. Incidence and Mortality 1977 and 1978 by The South Australian Central Cancer Registry, South Australian Health Commission. The figures for total South Australian deaths in 1977 (9 787) and 1978 (9 763) which were used in the calculations were obtained by personal communication with the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, 59 King William Street, Adelaide on 14 November 1980.
- (3) Calculated from pages 24 and 25 in Silverberg, E.; 1980.

Mr RANDALL: I refer honourable members to the evidence given before the Legislative Council select committee, to which this table was presented. On looking at the table, one finds that the Australian figures are taken from the Australian Bureau of Statistics in Canberra in 1980 and 'Deaths Australia 1978: Table 10'. If we look at the South Australian figures in this table, we see that they are calculated from table 3, pages 44 and 45 of *Cancer in South Australia, Incidents and Mortality 1977 and 1978* by the South Australian Central Cancer Registry, South Australian Health Commission. The figures for total South Australian deaths in 1977-1978 and 1978-1979, which were used in the calculations, were obtained by personal communication within the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages, 59 King William Street, Adelaide on 14 November 1980. Table 3 from the United States was gained by looking at pages 24 and 25 in 'Silverburg, E; 1980'. That table clearly sets out the population death rate from sources of lung cancer. What concerns me most are the figures and concerns that have been expressed publicly.

Lung cancer in men was a comparatively rare disease in the 1930s, but a 15-fold increase has occurred, and the upward trend is continuing, although at a reduced rate. Lung cancer among women increased only gradually until the 1950s but has been increasing more rapidly in recent years. Stomach cancer and cancer of the uterus have decreased dramatically. The death rates from other cancers have either remained about the same or are increasing slightly. The overall increase in the death rate from cancer is attributable to the explosive increase in lung cancer, which is due mainly to the practice of cigarette smoking. Those statistics are from Eisenbud, 1978, page 7. Members well know my stand about smoking that I have taken in this House, having

expressed from time to time my concern about the increasing number of lung cancers in this State and the close relationship between lung cancer and cigarette smoking. However, one still sees persons on the front steps of this House protesting about exposure to radiation and expressing their concern about nuclear activity in this State, whilst puffing away on their cigarettes.

Statistics show quite clearly that they are the ones who will suffer in about 10 years time and in years to come. Their life span is going to be shortened by 10 years at least. Let us see if they have the courage of their convictions now and can give up the danger of this health hazard which is clearly documented in the statistics we are gathering. If they are concerned about radiation, why not give up cigarette smoking, because that will quite clearly demonstrate to us that there is a problem because as a nation we suffer health-wise from cigarette smoking? If members opposite who are going to get up here and demand that nuclear standards be put into this indenture Bill give up their smoking as an indication that they are concerned about health, I will listen to them.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: I have, and you'd better listen.

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): How timely that I am able to enter the debate at this stage. I anticipate that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat will sit quietly for the next half hour and listen carefully to what I have to say, because I am a reformed smoker of many years ago.

Mr Becker: No wonder you're grumpy.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is another story. I am grumpy, if I am that, because of the rather depressed view I have of the future of the world and mankind as a result of the sorts of actions that this Government is asking us as members of Parliament to take in its desire that we should vote for and pass this Bill, and thereby approve this indenture. I have, over many many years (and this is known to every member of this House), been opposed to the development of Australia's uranium resources. I have been opposed to the commission of those resources to the nuclear fuel cycle and I have particularly taken whatever steps have been available to me to protest at every available moment against the so-called nuclear fuel cycle and the rush towards the nuclear armament of the world's powers, and lesser powers, for that matter.

This indenture Bill has been dealt with at considerable length by previous speakers, and I do not believe that it would be particularly valuable for me to go into the finer points of that indenture. Particularly, I do not believe that it would be of much value for me to canvass the issues that have already been raised by other speakers on this side in relation to that. Suffice it for me to say that I am not particularly happy about the fact that we are here debating an indenture as such because, inevitably, that has had the effect or impact of channeling the debate on this whole question of the nuclear fuel cycle and the commission of Australia's uranium to it into a technical debate about whether we are getting enough money for the sale of the resource, whether the State is having to pay too much for the infra-structure, and whether or not we are getting into an economically efficient project.

I do not particularly want to have to debate that sort of issue, because I do not see it as the fundamental and important issue in this question. The real issue at stake, the fundamental question for the 1980s, is the relationship between nuclear energy and nuclear power generally, on the one hand, and nuclear weapons on the other hand. That is the issue to which each and every member of this House and this Parliament and, for that matter, every citizen of

this nation should be turning their attention, because there is no doubt in my mind that the world is heading almost irreversibly towards a holocaust.

There is no doubt that members opposite will say, 'Well, if that's the case, we may as well get in for a slice of the economic action in the meantime, and good luck if someone at the top of the tree happens to be able to stop that. If someone cannot stop it, like the card players on the deck of the *Titanic*, we might as well have a nice time in the meantime by selling as much of the stuff as possible, making as much money as possible and enjoying ourselves in the next 20 years or so until the holocaust comes.' I believe that that is a totally immoral and irresponsible attitude, particularly for members of Parliament. We have responsibilities over and above those of ordinary citizens. In saying that, I do not for a moment suggest that ordinary citizens should not be involved in this debate to the full: they have every right to be, and in my opinion they have an obligation to be. We, as members of Parliament, having taken it upon ourselves to stand for Parliament and to allegedly represent the people, have taken on even greater responsibilities than have ordinary citizens. We should inevitably involve ourselves in this debate to a much greater extent.

I believe that time is running out: there is very little time left, and it is not true that the only way to avoid the holocaust is to start praying that the 20 per cent or so of the American people who actually elect their President might just have a change of heart at some stage and elect someone who is committed to at least some limited future for the human race, unlike Reagan who, of all American Presidents in my time, seems more committed to the holocaust than any other. That is not the way we should go about things.

I am one of those people who are prepared to stand up and say that the buck stops here. We should start taking whatever action we can individually and collectively within our community to try to ensure that we set some sort of example for the rest of Australia and the world in relation to this question. If we did that, we would be regarded by many, many millions of people in the rest of the world as having set a very great example and, on their behalf, having struck a great blow for peace, because that is really what we have an opportunity to do in this debate. If we, as concerned citizens and concerned members of Parliament, defeat this Bill, the impact inevitably will be that the local press will scream and squawk about the lost economic opportunities, and so on, but concerned and thinking people in this country and throughout the world will say that we have struck a blow against the nuclear holocaust and that we have shown the way forward. There is a way for ordinary people in smaller countries and in Parliaments of less consequence, such as this Parliament, to take such action to show the way forward.

Some people will say (and members opposite, no doubt, will say) that there is very little relationship between the nuclear fuel cycle (so-called) and nuclear power. Nothing could be further from the truth. I believe that the nuclear fuel system is a total system, and participation in any part of it is to participate in every part of it. If this truism needs any documentation, the calm analysis of the Fox Report supplies it. I recommend to members the introduction of Mr Justice Fox's report. More recently, the authors Pringle and Spigelman stated (and I commend this quotation to the Parliament):

Nations without nuclear weapons will always want them if others have them, and the easiest way to acquire them will be through nuclear power programmes. Thus the core of the proliferation problem is the expansion of nuclear-generated electricity: more nuclear power plants mean more fissile material available for diversion into bomb projects. There is no way of preventing this at present: the nuclear materials market is far too large and too diverse to be controlled through export sanctions, and the

current early warning system of a diversion of nuclear material, known as safeguards, is inherently defective.

That sums up the situation very well indeed. There is no such thing as an effective nuclear safeguard which ensures that the material that comes out of mines such as Roxby Downs will not be diverted into a nuclear weapons programme. There is no such thing as a certain safeguard.

Mr Becker: It would be the same for iron ore, wouldn't it?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Of course it is the same for iron ore, and I am glad the honourable member mentioned that, because he and his Party are in a situation similar to that experienced by 'pig-iron Bob' before the Second World War. One thing that very much concerns me is that people such as the honourable member opposite and his ilk never live to see the destruction and the effect of their unthinking short-term attitudes in questions such as this. I wish that Chamberlain had lived longer so that he could have seen the results of appeasement; I wish Hitler could have lived long enough to be put on trial and to see the results of his—I will not say 'bastardry', because I know that you, Mr Speaker, will not allow that word to go into *Hansard*, although I might try—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member correctly interpreted my thinking.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Perhaps I can call on other members to help me think of another word. There must be a word similar to 'bastardry'.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What about 'villainry'?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: My friend from Mitchell has suggested the word 'villainry', but I am reluctant to use that word, because it is far too mild to describe the activities of Mr Hitler and his ilk. It is a sad fact that people generally do not live long enough to see the error of their ways and the damage that they cause by their decisions. I believe that the policy of the Labor Party in this matter, strangely enough, is the conservative approach to the whole question, because we say, 'For God's sake, let us not make any mistakes. Let us not make the wrong decision. Let us be cautious about this. Let us not take action to mine uranium and to allow Roxby Downs (in this case) to go ahead until we can be finally assured that it is safe to do so.' I am one of those people who believe that it will probably never be safe to do so. The world is heading irreversibly towards a nuclear holocaust.

I think the reason for that is that too many people in powerful positions are prepared to make decisions purely on an economic consideration without regard to moral questions, without regard for the future of the human race, and particularly without regard to the long-term effects of what they are doing.

Mr Lewis: What about the hot-house effects of using the alternative?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I do not particularly want to get into a debate about issues such as alternatives to nuclear energy. I accept what the member says; there are problems with the hot-house effects. I am not one of those people rabidly anti-nuclear to the exclusion of proper debate of the other problems. I agree with the honourable member that there are serious problems in relation to the hot-house effects.

Mr Lewis: Your argument could be a bit like a Ptolemaic view of the world!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I am not saying the world needs to go in for a much greater programme of coal-fired stations at all. That is what the honourable member wants me to say. I believe that, with proper conservation measures and a much greater effort to develop proper alternative technologies, the world's energy needs could be properly and effectively met without getting into the problems

of the hot-house syndrome, as the honourable member described it. However, I want to get back to the issue at hand; I want to deal with the question of nuclear war for a couple of moments more. There is, of course, no such thing as a limited nuclear war, nor could such a war be won by any of the combatants. This should not even need saying, but in the present political climate, particularly in view of that which unfortunately prevails in Washington, it does. There is in this place and elsewhere a dreadful deficiency in intelligent thinking in high places, and I think—

Mr Becker: Well, it's obvious from your point.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Well, my friend says that it is obvious, and I am glad that he agrees with me; it is certainly deficient in this particular Government. But I do not want to enter into personalities—I want to deal with this matter on the proper level on which it should be dealt with. In relation to the question of the economics of Roxby Downs (and as I said I do not want to spend too much time on this question), I want to deal with two matters. First, the situation is quite obvious when one looks at the reports that are coming in from around the world. I would like to quote from no less a journal than *Australian Business*, which I read very astutely at the time—I find it very interesting. In the 10 June issue, the most recent edition, on page 26, it states:

Uranium cuts feared—Protectionist rumblings in the United States are threatening Australian uranium exporters' markets: The Reagan Administration's struggle to maintain a United States free-trade image is being challenged by a Republican-backed move in Congress to restrict uranium imports into the United States. Under a recently passed Senate amendment to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Authorisation Bill, United States utilities, which consume 30 per cent of world uranium production, could import no more than 20 per cent of their nuclear-fuel needs.

I do not want to quote all that article, but it is another example of the gathering storm clouds over the uranium market. No doubt members opposite will say, 'Well, it is of no concern to this Parliament whether the project is economically viable or not; if the company wants to take the chance and risk capital, it can put its money in and we as a State will benefit from that.' I think that is an irresponsible attitude, given the sorts of level of funding that the State Government will be required to make under this indenture. Because of that funding commitment, the economic question is a quite legitimate matter for this Parliament to concern itself with.

This project will probably at some stage in the future be put into mothballs long before it goes into production. I am pleased to have had the opportunity of putting that into *Hansard*, because I will be taking the opportunity in the future to say 'I told you so.' I do not believe that this project is economically feasible. The companies, of course, if they do put it into mothballs, will no doubt have all sorts of excuses at the time and will say that they are only temporarily putting it into mothballs, but I think the promise of the Olympic Dam prospect is much greater than the reality will be. I think that members need to consider that very carefully. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTORY AUTHORITIES REVIEW BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS: (Fisher): The opportunity to grieve on successive days is one that I do not very often enjoy, but I take the opportunity of doing so now. Last evening during the grievance debate I referred to people's attitudes to saving and their working to pay interest rates and maintain money-lenders. This evening I would like to continue in that area and refer to our attitude towards saving to acquire our own homes, our own allotments and our own shelters. It is true to say that the dream for most people in Australia has always been to own their own shelter. In days gone by the attitude has been that the shelter was usually for the conventional family, a husband and wife and children; marriages lasted a lot longer, and very seldom was it that people (whether they be teenagers or people in their early twenties) flating on their own, continued living in that way for a long period. The number of people in that category was very small. With the reduction in the age of majority from 21 to 18, because we were told that people were more mature than they had been in the past, that they had had a better education and were better able to manage their affairs, we found more people living in flats or in groups occupying larger homes.

In that situation, one would have thought that there would be a greater acceptance of responsibility to save for the future, but that has not been the case. The result has been that many young people leave home because they have argued with their parents for some reason or other. Perhaps they have objected to the discipline of one or other of the parents have interfered with the children. That is an area which is difficult to prove unless there are witnesses or direct evidence of it, but I will not go into that matter at this stage.

In many cases young people leave home to join peers who have been able to afford to leave home because they have had jobs with reasonable incomes and can afford to pay rent. If they want to keep up with their peers it is not just a matter of paying off a motor car: it is also necessary to rent some kind of accommodation away from Mum and Dad. They also need a stereo and all the other equipment necessary for such a way of life. There is therefore the situation of a family of maybe five, with Mum and Dad (hopefully still together) who have almost finished paying for their home or are in rented accommodation, and the rest of the family may be renting accommodation, paying—nowadays, if they are sharing—about \$30 a week or between \$80 or \$100 a week if they are living on their own. Of course those not wishing to mix with their peers may ask some Government or church agency to provide accommodation for them for almost nothing.

Therefore, from a family of five persons, two may still be living in the family home, the other three living separately and spending, between them, up to \$200 a week on rent and also paying off motor cars and probably furniture at high interest rates, and the individual then becomes nothing more than a working agent for the money-lender and the slave of high interest rates. When such a person decides to settle down with a partner (it may not be in a married state) who has also probably been living in a flat away from home and wants permanent shelter (I do not put into this category those who may have been studying for several years and have been in the family home) he expects the Government to help him. He has been spending \$40, \$50 or \$60 trying to live a life of independence because the Government has said that he is mature and able to accept responsibility and that 18 is the right age to start accepting responsibility. He then expects the Government, the taxpayers, to subsidise his purchase of a permanent shelter. Of course, at the same time he wants to keep the motor car he has bought, possibly also a boat, and he does not want to accept that it was mainly his own actions that may have got him into his

present situation. When these people say that they want the Government to subsidise their house purchase, their living unit, they are saying that those taxpayers who have accepted the responsibility of saving for their shelter, who may have paid a substantial deposit on their home and who may be still driving around in a motor car that has not been paid for or is an early model involving a higher repair bill, should subsidise them.

The people concerned are saying that they expect those who have accepted the challenge and the responsibility to pay higher taxes to subsidise their home purchases, because they did not accept responsibility earlier to look to their future. The media blows up the situation and says that the Government should subsidise these people, even though they have got themselves into their present situation.

I cannot blame the groups who have got themselves into that situation. I am blaming the lack of action by Governments to be prepared to start advertising to try to stop it from occurring instead of afterwards saying that they cannot afford to help those who are in that category because taxes are too high. I have enough faith in our young people for me to say that, if the Government started an advertising campaign to suggest that if young people save for the future, their years from 30 onwards would be a lot happier, intimating that, if they take the other path and spend their money, it will be difficult for them when they decide to settle down. I am sure more of our young people would accept the challenge and there would be not such a need to subsidise those who are unable to meet high interest rates. I know the situation is bad but Australia cannot divorce itself from the world scene. If we take that path, I believe that this country would be much better off.

I believe parents are a lot to blame because in the past they tried to save for a block of land for their sons and daughters to give them a start in life. These days parents are inclined to say that they have given their children a good education and that now it is up to them to battle it out on their own and that they (the parents) are going around the world on a trip, buying a holiday shack or having all the luxuries they think they deserve. The old-time parents did not do that, particularly the newcomers to this land. They set out to ensure that their family was stable, even after their children were married and settling down. I hope Governments take notice of what I have just said.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I welcome this opportunity to be able to raise a matter that concerns many of my constituents. I refer to an announcement made by the Minister of Transport on 25 February 1982 about the north-west transport corridor. As constituents of the district of Peake are affected by that announcement, I wrote a letter about it to the Minister of Transport. Some constituents in the district of Adelaide are also affected by the announcement. My constituents are concerned about the side of South Road on which land would be acquired and also about the siting of over-passes. Adam Street and South Road from Port Road to Henley Beach Road are affected by the announcement. Many of my constituents who had intended to make alterations to their houses are anxious to know exactly what land will be acquired by the Highways Department. In my letter to the Minister on 28 February I asked eight questions. The Minister's reply will show why I am still concerned. My letter, in part, reads:

1. What effects will the widening of South Road have on my electorate between Port Road and Henley Beach Road?

2. How many houses, and therefore people in my electorate, will be affected by this plan?

3. Your statement contains the vague comment, '... including the construction of overpasses where necessary.' Exactly what are the proposed locations of these overpasses?

Those three points affect my part of the electorate. The other points affect that of my colleague, the Deputy Leader. I waited a long time for an answer, but in the meantime I letterboxed a section of my electorate along South Road and Adams Road with a copy of my letter to the Minister. I informed them that I would letterbox the Minister's reply. That was on 25 February. I did not receive a reply to my letter until 3 May, and I quote a portion of the Minister's reply, as follows:

I refer to your letter dated 25 February 1982 concerning the recent decisions taken by the Government in relation to the North-South Transportation Corridor and in particular seeking detailed information on that part which passes through your electorate.

The following information is provided in respect of the specific questions raised by you:

1. To date, detailed investigation of the requirements for South Road has been undertaken only on the section between Anzac Highway and Daws Road. The next sections to be investigated will be those between Anzac Highway and the River Torrens and between Port Road and Torrens Road.
2. The effect any widening will have on property between the Anzac Highway and the River Torrens; and between Port Road and Torrens Road is not known at this stage.

I letterboxed that reply to the same people, but I am afraid that the Minister does not answer any of my eight points. My great concern is that, on speaking to some people who recently moved into my district, I find that they acquired land on South Road in the section about which I made inquiries of the Minister. I told them that there had been no decision as to which side of South Road would be affected, and that they could lose part of their land. They said, 'That is all right. We have made inquiries of the Highways Department, which told us that a certain amount of land will be needed, that negotiations have already taken place for it to be acquired.' That was six weeks ago, yet my letter from the Minister in May informed me, as local member, that he was not aware which side of South Road would be affected. Does he not know what his own department is doing? Is his department not telling him which side of South Road will be affected or what land it will require? Or is it that the Minister is purposely refusing to inform the local member of Parliament, giving him information that he can pass on to constituents so that they can stop worrying about losing land? What is the situation? I would like the Minister to tell me. He should think carefully about what I have said.

That brings me to the question I asked yesterday concerning Lonsdale Road, via Christies Beach, and MacMahon Construction, the successful tenderer for a \$4 500 000 contract with the Highways Department. Because that contractor did not have the expertise to construct a crib wall on the Field River bridge, the contractor then required the Highways Department to build that wall. Prior to the Liberal Government's taking office, the Highways Department had its own construction gangs which specialised in roadworks and crib walls, and were probably the only people in the State who could build crib walls to departmental specification. The Minister said that in his answer.

However, construction gangs, in some cases, are not being used now to their full capacity. Contracts are being let. Taxpayers pay more money under this private enterprise and private contractor system than the Liberal Government has, because construction gangs which have the expertise are not being used. Without unduly criticising private contractors, I say that they have not the facilities to do the contract as well as the highways gangs. I have continually criticised the Liberal Government attitude towards private contractors, and I will continue to do so at every opportunity, because I see a blatant waste of taxpayers' money, where

the Liberal Government had a payback arrangement for assistance from private enterprise in winning office in 1979.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I should like to make a few remarks about a word that is taboo in this House at the moment: Mitcham, a subject upon which the Government understandably would have very little to say. But, before making one or two disparaging comments, I would like to take the unusual step of complimenting the Government on one step that it did take in relation to the Mitcham by-election, and that was the series of advertisements placed in the press by the Electoral Department. It is something that we on the Opposition can welcome, because those advertisements set out to encourage people to participate in the electoral process, although it is true that the Government would have been far from pleased at the result of the electoral process on this occasion. One advertisement was entitled 'Stand and be counted', pointing out that on 8 May voting was compulsory. Another is headed 'Situation Vacant', accompanied by a photograph of the seat of the then member for Mitcham, also pointing out that there was a by-election on 8 May and that voting was compulsory. Sometimes, we find at by-elections that non-attendance at the poll is slightly higher than on other occasions, but I understand that about 88 per cent of people turned out in Mitcham, which was quite reasonable. Another advertisement from the Electoral Department was entitled 'Six O'clock Closing', pointing out to those people taking part in the Mitcham by-election that the polls would close at 6 p.m. instead of 8 p.m., the normal closing time in the past.

Having been complimentary about the Government, I now want to draw attention to what a disaster the Mitcham by-election was for the Government. If ever a Premier, to use words that he has used previously, was left with egg on his face, he was on this occasion. The Liberals' master plan came unstuck. The people of South Australia, or certainly at least those who reside in the Mitcham electorate, rejected the cynical ploy that the Government used on this occasion.

A subsequent opinion poll published in the *News* on 10 May pointed out that two-thirds of the population did not approve of the way the Government handled the appointment, which is code for saying that most people were far from pleased with what had taken place.

It may well be that a recent addition to the Cabinet has a lot to answer for on this occasion. It seems to me that the Attorney-General for quite some time rather properly held out against the appointment taking place, but that some of the bright whiz kids (the small 'l' Liberals of the Party opposite) are getting the Government into a lot of hot water. It may be that the same small 'l' Liberal whiz kids have got it into a lot of hot water over the Casino Bill as well. The Government really thought it would come home in Mitcham, but that it had to be done at a by-election. The Hon. Martin Cameron was quoted on 12 May, as follows:

It would have been impossible for the Liberal Party to have won the seat of Mitcham at a general election if Mr Millhouse had remained the member—but the Party expected to win it at a by-election.

The Party expected it all right, but this expectation did not eventuate—not the way it wanted, anyway. Every article written right up to the very eve of that election portrayed the Government as a certain winner. The journalists were not whipping these phrases up themselves; they were phrases quoted to them by the Liberals within the precincts of this House and elsewhere. On 8 April, Tony Baker, for example, gave the Government 'an almost certain extra Assembly seat'. On 24 April, Greg Kelton said, 'The result is a foregone conclusion.' He said:

Unless the Tonkin Government self destructs with the force of a nuclear bomb, the Liberal candidate for the seat, Mr Robert

Worth, will win handsomely. There are those who say that even if the Tonkin Government made the most outlandish mistakes and decisions in the weeks leading up to the election, the seat is such a solid non-Labor seat that Mr Worth would still win.

There are a few other phrases from the press that I would like to get on the *Hansard* record. In an article in the *News* on 3 May we were told that the Liberals 'confidently expect victory'. That article was entitled, 'Who can stop Liberal poll win?' It said:

The Liberals... expect Mr Worth to poll about 55 per cent, making the preference issue redundant.

On 4 May, Greg Kelton again said, 'The result of the by-election is a foregone conclusion.' On the morning of the election, in the *Australian*, on 8 May, we see the comment that there will be 'a certain victory for the Liberal Government'. Peter Blunden said this:

The Liberals expect their man, Mr Robert Worth, a lawyer who is standing for Mitcham for the third time, to poll 55 per cent and win without the need of preferences.

Earlier in the piece, shortly after the appointment, an editorial in the *News* on 28 April said:

Upsets can and do happen in politics, but it would take an upset registering 10 on the Richter electoral scale if Mr Justice Millhouse's long-time personal fiefdom did not revert to the Liberals.

It certainly must have registered 10 on the electoral scale. There was one commentator who, right on the eve of the election, tended to ease back a little bit on the confidence predicted in the Liberal camp. Although he pointed out that there were confident predictions that Mr Worth would get about 55 per cent of the vote, a comment by Frank Jackson, one of the more astute political commentators in the community, said:

But now more Liberals are talking about the potential for the election to go to preferences based on a vote for Mr Worth somewhere in the upper forties.

That was not very far from the final result. However, because of the complexity of our system of preferences, in particular with postal votes, the result was not crystal clear on Saturday night. As late as Tuesday night we still saw headlines such as, 'Close Liberal victory likely', and 'Worth set to win Mitcham by a handful of votes'. That was written early on 11 May. But it turned out that the pharmacist candidate for the Australian Democrats gave the Liberals a bitter pill to swallow.

I think that, in view of the criticism that came from some quarters about the Leader of the Opposition being quite realistic about the opportunities of the Labor Party's winning the Mitcham by-election, an article by Frank Jackson sums it up well. I quote him again, because he is an astute commentator. He wrote a report in the *News City-State* edition on 13 May headed, 'Bannon has last laugh,' and I think that headline summarises it rather well. In fact, for reasons other than the horror which we normally associate with such an event, the attempt on the life of the Pope that day was also unfortunate, as it meant that the item appeared only in the early edition of the *News*, being displaced by the news of that other event from overseas. However, but I think that sums it up well: 'Bannon has last laugh.'

Then the post-mortems followed; there were plenty of those. The *Advertiser*, on 11 May, said that it was 'anything but the triumph the Government would have liked'. The editorial stated even before the final upset:

It is a reverse, and a damaging one in view of the importance placed on the result by the Premier as a test of his Government's standing in the community, in that the Liberal and National Country Parties together failed to muster half the votes in a seat in which Labor had conceded it had no chance.

We saw the nonsense that came out, trying to blame the Country Party for the results. I think Tony Baker (who writes most of the editorials on such topics in the *News*) tried to sum it up well on 12 May, when he used words such as 'drivel', 'popycock', 'ridiculous to blame the intervention of the National Country Party', and 'arrogant.' I think that last word summarises best of all the attitude of the Government. It was arrogant in its whole attitude. Now after the event, it is seeking scapegoats. As Tony Baker said, 'The Premier stoutly insists that he never assumed it would be a walkover'. That is what the Premier said in public afterwards, but as Tony Baker pointed out. If there was so much doubt why provoke a by-election in this electorate? The election was called at the choice of the Government and no-one else.

Greg Kelton made the point, on 10 May, that the 'Liberal ploy backfired'. That was the heading of his article. They were looking for scapegoats in all directions. They were blaming the media. As Greg Kelton pointed out, the media should not be blamed. The Liberals had confidently predicted a big win and were casting about for a scapegoat. Greg Kelton said:

There were a few who wanted to push the blame on to Mr Worth, saying he was a disappointing candidate. They were the same Liberals who, a few days ago, were praising the hard work he had put into the campaign, and saying that he was the best candidate because of his 'high recognition factor' following two previous Mitcham campaigns.

He said also (and I would love to know what was going on in the Caucus meetings on the other side of the House):

Those Liberals who had opposed Mr Millhouse's elevation to the bench would now be asking a few pertinent questions in the Party room about the Liberals' poor showing.

They have come a cropper. They tried to blame it on the media, the Country Party and the candidate. In the context of trying to blame it on the candidate, perhaps it is a lesson for those members opposite who have the big signs on their cars pointing out that they are the member for a certain district. They should be careful how they drive because post mortems in the press quoted one lady in Mitcham who decided not to vote for Mr Worth because he had cut her off with his car. So, I would suggest to members opposite that they be very careful with their driving habits because if they make themselves so readily identifiable it may count against them.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 June at 2 p.m.