LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 27, 1977

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL presented a petition signed by 11 600 persons alleging that the population growth rate in the city of Noarlunga was the highest in the State and that a public hospital was therefore urgently needed in the Christies Beach area, and praying that the South Australian Government would build a hospital in that area.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: SHEPHERD HILL RESERVE

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE presented a petition signed by 716 persons alleging that restrictions were being placed on the use of Shepherd Hill Reserve, hitherto relatively unspoilt, by equestrians, children on bicycles, and dogs, and praying that the necessary action be taken to keep the area in as nearly a natural state as possible, to prohibit the use of motor vehicles in the area, to ensure that the archery club already present can have unrestricted use of the area, and to ensure that it can continue to be used for recreational purposes.

Petition received and read.

QUESTION TIME

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on honourable members for questions, I think it is appropriate that I should refer honourable members to chapter 13 of the Standing Orders and make some comments about unsatisfactory developments during Question Time in this Chamber. I repeat what I have said on several occasions, that the principal purpose of Question Time is to allow honourable members to question Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs connected with their respective portfolios. Yesterday I ruled that questions, whether on notice or not, addressed to other private members must be on a matter connected with the business of the Council in which such member may be specially concerned and that in this context "specially concerned" means a matter of which the member is in charge, or for which he is responsible to the Council. That ruling stands unless the Standing Order is altered in the future.

The chapter in the Standing Orders to which I have referred says that, in putting any question, no argument, opinion, or hypothetical case shall be offered, nor inference or imputation made, nor shall any facts be stated or questions made, including quotations from *Hansard* of debates in the other House, except by leave of the Council and so far only as may be necessary to explain such question. It has been customary for a long time for members in this Council to seek leave of the Council to make a statement prior to asking a question, and such leave has always readily been given. I point out that this procedure is not very helpful either to the Minister to whom the question is going to be addressed or to the Chair, because it gives no indication whatsoever of the subject matter of the proposed question.

I therefore propose to ask members in future, when seeking leave to make a statement prior to asking a question, to indicate not only to whom the question will be addressed but also the subject matter of the question: for example a question directed to the Minister of Agriculture concerning fishing licences, or to the Chief Secretary concerning a complaint against the police. In this way the Chair will at least have some indication of what the preliminary statement is about. Long-winded and meandering statements which give opinions and comments and make inferences or imputations will be not allowed in future and I intend to enforce Standing Orders Nos. 109 and 110 rigorously. I will give two warnings to honourable members who offend in future and will then act. The same goes for unwarranted and irrelevant interjections during Question Time.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Are we allowed to get political?

The PRESIDENT: May I add some advice to the honourable Ministers in this Chamber arising out of my recent observations of how questions are handled in the House of Commons? As I said yesterday, when replying to questions Ministers are free to do so in their own way but they should strive to avoid introducing new subject matter. Normally, a short question calls for a short answer. If the questioner or any other member is dissatisfied with the answer given, he should ask a supplementary question or questions. I would greatly encourage this procedure and preferably before a new subject matter is introduced. Finally, Ministers should expect that some questions from Opposition members will have a political slant to them.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You are not going to allow that, surely!

The PRESIDENT: Such questions should be taken in their stride and not be treated as unfair or calling for a return serve on the Minister's part. Having said all this, I ask for the co-operation of all honourable members in the future.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I thank you, Sir, for the way in which you intend to conduct Question Time in the future. I assure you that, as far as possible, the Government will abide by your ruling, but I was a little perturbed about the implication you made about the Opposition introducing political matters.

The PRESIDENT: It is to be expected.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I appreciate that; I assure you that members on the Government side will co-operate but we cannot co-operate if reference to political matters can be made only by the Opposition. If you are giving the Opposition the right to introduce political matters, I think the Ministers should also be able to deal with political matters. That aside, that being the only weakness I see in your ruling this afternoon, I assure you of the utmost co-operation provided both sides are treated equally.

QUESTIONS

RURAL COSTS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding rural costs in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have heard advertisements emanating from the Committee for Good Government, and issued by a Mr. Leo Burnell, of 162—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question!

The PRESIDENT: Order! "Question" has been called.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As Mr. Burnell, on behalf of the Committee for Good Government, has issued advertisements, authorised by Mr. K. Neighbour, stating that South Australia has the lowest costs in Australia, will the Minister of Agriculture tell me whether he is aware that agricultural costs paid by farmers in this State are, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics quarterly index prices issued on March 29, 1977, the highest in Australia, and will he tell the Committee for Good Government that its statement that South Australia has the lowest costs in Australia is false in relation to rural costs?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I have not seen the Bureau of Agricultural Economics figures regarding rural costs in this State to which the honourable member has referred. However, judging by the way in which the Leader usually uses figures, I am sure that they would have been quoted out of context. Until I have seen the figures and studied the Bureau of Agricultural Economics report, I will not comment any further on the matter.

CHRISTIES BEACH HOSPITAL

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the continuing saga of the Christies Beach Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: In this morning's *Advertiser* there appears a brief letter to the Editor written by a Mr. W. B. Wreford, of Morphett Vale, which I will now read in order to clarify my question.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Question!

The PRESIDENT: Order! "Question" has been called.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Has the Minister seen the following letter from Mr. W. B. Wreford in this morning's *Advertiser*:

Sir, in the *Advertiser* (June 6, 1977) it was stated the proposed non-public 60-bed hospital for the Christies Beach area ". . . would be a community-type hospital, with a 24-hour casualty service." My latest inquiries from local doctors, and so on, indicate there will be no casualty facilities; the very thing people who contact me want most of all. Would the Dunstan Government please explain, and state which is correct?

Although I realise that he has answered this type of question umpteen times previously, I ask the Minister, as a member of the Dunstan Government, whether, for the benefit of this gentleman and of the people in the area, he will again explain the position regarding casualty facilities at the proposed Christies Beach Hospital.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: True, Mr. Wreford probably initiated this action because he wanted a place at which people could get attention if they had, say, cut their feet on a bottle at the beach, or were suffering from a bee sting or sunburn. We have gone further than that and made provision for emergency facilities at Christies Beach in the following way. Regarding emergency services, the first phase of hospital provision in the Noarlunga area will enable local doctors and those specialists called in consultation to give the forms of emergency service traditionally given in community-type hospitals such as Blackwood, Glenelg, Western, and LeFevre hospitals. This will relieve the casualty position considerably. The availability at the hospital of operating room and support facilities including anaesthetic equipment, suction and oxygen supplies will provide a useful supplement to the emergency services provided traditionally at community health centres and doctors' surgeries for illnesses and injuries such as infections, burns, lacerations, stings, and simple fractures. If those emergencies require complicated life support facilities such as continuous monitoring, repeated rapid laboratory investigations, or the assistance of highly specialised teams (for example, severe burns, or severe head injuries), they still will need to be directed to the large teaching hospitals. We bring people from Mount Gambier, Whyalla and Elizabeth to the large teaching hospitals, so the services available to the people of the Christies Beach area will be similar to the type available in other hospitals of similar type.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Hon. Mr. Blevins.

The PRESIDENT: What is the subject matter?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The subject matter is the Christies Beach Hospital and the statement by the Hon. Mr. Blevins a moment ago that this point had been made, to use his own words, "umpteen times". Can the honourable member tell me one occasion when there has been a Ministerial statement dealing with whether there was to be a casualty and accident section in the proposed hospital development at Christies Beach?

The PRESIDENT: I think that that question is out of order, on the basis of my ruling yesterday that such questions should not be directed to the honourable member, who is not an authority on this matter. As I see it, the Hon. Mr. Hill is really asking the Hon. Mr. Blevins to explain his question further. I think the question should be directed to the Minister.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I would have been willing to explain the matter but the Hon. Mr. DeGaris called "Question" on me and I could not continue.

The PRESIDENT: I rule the question out of order.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE ALTERATIONS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I direct a question to the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in this Council, and the subject matter of my question is the cost of renovations and alterations in Parliament House. I ask leave to further explain my question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I intend to ask the Minister what has been the cost to date of renovations and alterations at Parliament House.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You drew up the plan when you were in Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have noted from *Hansard* reports and replies given to date that in 1971-72 an amount of $41 438 was expended.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is that a fact?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: Is it a fact?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I also know that in 1972-73 an amount of $87 640 was spent and that in 1973-74 an amount of $1 015 919 was spent. In 1974-75 an amount of $2 036 735 was expended, and in 1975-76 an amount of $623 651 was spent. The last reply to a query of this kind, I find from my research, was given on August 17, 1976. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether he can tell me what has been the total amount spent here in Parliament House up to today, July 26.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain the information for the honourable member from my colleague in another place. I will get not only the amount spent but also the reasons why it was spent.

QUESTION TO MINISTER OF HEALTH

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My question is directed to the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: What is the subject matter?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It does not matter. I want the rules committee to look at that first. I will let the question go first. I think that is unnecessary.

The PRESIDENT: That is the honourable member's prerogative.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I was directing a question to the Minister of Health. If I was directing it to the Minister of Agriculture, I would have said so. If enough common sense prevailed in this place, you would have known what the question was about.

The PRESIDENT: I am sorry, I misunderstood the honourable member. Was he going to seek leave to make a statement?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: One does not have to be a mind reader to know—

The PRESIDENT: I asked the honourable member if he was going to seek leave to make a statement.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No. If I was going to do so I would have sought leave, and I did not. There was no necessity to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: If I may rise on a point of order when you have finished.

The PRESIDENT: I think you had better rise on the point of order now.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In future, will you, when giving rulings and making alterations, indicate such changes, as you did in this Chamber following prayers this afternoon, by putting such changes in writing and having notices left on members' desks, which is the way it should be done?

The PRESIDENT: That information will be available to the honourable member tomorrow morning. It will be in *Hansard*.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise again to ask whether you will consider my request and be fair and reasonable in carrying out your responsibility in the same way as such changes are carried out in other States of the Commonwealth where the Chair, on instituting some change, notifies members of that change by leaving a circular on members' desks?

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member requires it in writing he will get it.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You should do it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member for the first time.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to direct a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, regarding the security card entry system at Parliament House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague the cost of the entry card security system and its installation in Parliament House? I understand that the car-parking system to which we have access is an imported system but that the card system for ingress to Parliament House is locally designed. I seek clarification on that as well as information about what are the individual costs of each scheme, and what guarantee is given by the manufacturers to the Government as to the effectiveness of the system? For instance, if it were found that persons could use other than the prescribed card for ingress to this building, would the manufacturers or the Government have to replace the system?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain that information for the honourable member from my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

PINE TREES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture concerning the dying off of pine trees in Government forests in the Chain of Ponds area.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Mr. Hill asked a similar question in September last year about pine trees in the Williamstown and Chain of Ponds area. The Minister said it was probably the normal autumn die-off as the trees had not recovered from an extremely dry year. Of course, this is now the second successive dry year. However, just east of the township of Chain of Ponds and just north of the road is a large area of pine trees deteriorating to the extent that they appear to be dying and I understand that this condition is probably related to salt rising close to the surface as a result of this dry year. I have inquired whether there are any possible cures and have been told that there is probably only one, which is normally too expensive to be practical and which is irrigation. However, as that plantation is adjacent to the Mannum-Adelaide main—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster is speaking in too loud a tone, as I can hear him above the question.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: What can the Minister tell me about the situation generally? Will he investigate it further and see whether (and I do not know this, which is why I am asking the question), as the main is so close to this plantation, is it practicable to irrigate these trees?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: As the honourable member said, the problem is caused by a moisture deficit, and there is really no answer to it in practical economic terms. Of course, the trees need good, soaking rain. It is surprising the number of trees, apparently dead, which would recover if we had good rain in the next few weeks. Some good trees in the forests in the Williamstown area, which were badly affected last year, have, in fact, recovered. The simple answer is that it would not be economic to carry out irrigation: we must depend on natural rainfall.

CONTAMINATED FOOD

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek your guidance, Mr. President. When I rose to ask a question a few moments ago, I did not seek leave of the Council.

The PRESIDENT: I misunderstood you.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Thank you for the admission, Mr. President. You warned me about that.

The PRESIDENT: I did not warn you about that. Actually, I warned you about arguing.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Following certain questions in this place yesterday and the publication this morning of a report concerning contaminated baby food of several different brands, I point out that it appears that there is no guarantee that such food has been removed from retail outlets. Can the Minister of Health ascertain from his department how likely it is that contaminated food may still be in retail outlets?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said yesterday that the department was investigating the position, and it is continuing to do so. Up to the present, the department has found that stores are co-operating and, therefore, it does not have to use the processes of the law to act against any retail outlet. The department is inquiring of all outlets to ensure that the contaminated batch of baby food is removed from the shelves of shops. The department will continue these inquiries until it is satisfied that there is no danger.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, regarding the furniture in Parliament House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In this morning's *Advertiser* a report states that $150 000 is to be spent on furniture in Parliament House. Although I agree that some of the furniture in the corridors on this side of the building badly needs recovering, it could be said that the furniture in most, if not all, of members' offices on this side is adequate and in good condition. Indeed, the design of the new swivel chairs would appear to be inferior to that of the swivel chairs we now have. Will the Minister of Lands ask his colleague whether, in view of the tightness of the financial situation that we are all hearing about, he will reconsider what would seem to be the needless expense that this proposal envisages (with the exception of the most necessary recovering of the corridor seating)? Further, if the Government is determined to go ahead with this project, will the Minister ask his colleague to consider toning down the "shocking red"—and "shocking" is the only word for it—which is proposed for the furniture on this side of Parliament House?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will direct the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

NATIONAL WAR MEMORIAL

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The following announcement was made on January 17, 1927, by the Hon. W. J. Denny:

The National War Memorial to be erected by the State Government, representing the community generally, is to be for the purpose of perpetuating and commemorating the victory of the Great War, 1914-1918, the supreme and personal sacrifice of those who participated in that war, and the national effort involved in such activities.

The Second World War memorial was unveiled and dedicated on Remembrance Day, November 11, 1956, while the original war memorial was unveiled and dedicated on Anzac Day, April 25, 1931. I have been approached on several occasions by people interested in the war memorial asking whether there is any legislative protection on the use of the memorial and who can legitimately use it. Some people have been concerned that the site is being used for purposes other than those originally intended. Has the Government had any similar approaches from interested people or any approaches regarding the controlled use of the war memorial from local government or any other organisation? If the Government has had such approaches, does it intend to act to ensure that the memorial is used only for its intended purpose?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not aware of any approaches in this connection. Although the war memorial commemorates the sacrifices made during the First World War and the Second World War, since those wars other groups of people have wanted to pay homage to their departed ones, and they have been using the memorial for this purpose; I cannot see anything wrong with that. The war memorial is a national monument, and I know of no approaches of the kind referred to by the Leader, but I shall have inquiries made.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: A few moments ago, when the Hon. Mr. Foster was addressing a question to the Minister of Health, you, Mr. President, conceded that you misunderstood what he had said when he rose previously to address a question to the Minister. The result of the misunderstanding was that the honourable member was warned for arguing with you when, in fact, he was only putting his viewpoint vigorously. Since you later acknowledged that it was a misunderstanding between you and the honourable member, will you, Mr. President, withdraw the warning?

The PRESIDENT: In those circumstances, I will cancel the warning.

VEGETATION CLEARANCE REPORT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister for the Environment, concerning the vegetation clearance report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The committee that prepared the vegetation clearance report continually stresses the need for further discussion and co-operation. However, when I tried to obtain further copies of the report, which was released last October, I found that all supplies had been exhausted and that there were no further copies available at present. The front page of the report states:

Written submissions dealing with the report and the matters raised by it are welcome, and should be addressed to the permanent head of the Department of the Environment.

I hope that many submissions are sent to the permanent head. Further, the report says that submissions should reach him not later than August 31, 1977. Since there are no further copies of the report that can be widely distributed, as they should be on such an important matter, will the Minister ask his colleague to extend the closing date for submissions to September 30, 1977?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works, regarding alterations to Parliament House, and seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I direct my question to the Minister of Lands as it would probably be out of order to direct it to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. A few minutes ago, he asked a question of the Minister about the alterations, making various suggestions and comments about what was taking place at this end of Parliament House. Could the Minister please ascertain whether the Hon. Mr. Dawkins replied to the circular sent to all members of Parliament asking for comments earlier this year? I am sure we shall be interested to know whether the Hon. Mr. Dawkins availed himself of the opportunity provided for making comments at that time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to get the information for the honourable member; I will refer the question to my colleague.

USED CAR BUYERS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Chief Secretary, the Leader of the Government in this Council, on used car buyers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Chief Secretary will know that a series of advertisements has appeared in the press referring to the protection of all used car buyers. The advertisement states, in part:

Many so-called "private sales" are actually made by backyard dealers. These are people who make their living by selling to the public from their homes. Some of these people are not licensed but surprisingly many are, irrespective of whether they have proper facilities or not.

Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to legislate to bring these people under the control of the used car legislation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague, the Attorney-General, and ask him to provide this information.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I address my question to the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Works; it deals with the provision of facilities for disabled people within Parliament House. Before asking my question I seek leave to make a short statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I draw members' attention to the publication I know they receive called *Rehabilitation in Australia*. It is the official publication of the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, which council has affiliated associations throughout the world. I am sure that those who have read it will have noted that this organisation and many similar ones advocate provision in buildings for the disabled and handicapped people of Australia. I point out that, in my belief, all handicapped people—one would think one would get a little decorum in this Chamber; if you want me to name the Hon. Mr. Foster, I will do that.

The PRESIDENT: There is too much audible conversation. The Hon. Mr. Geddes and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall will please moderate their conversations. The Hon. Mr. Whyte.

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order, because I never said anything. I don't care a damn who represents me in this place; I was not a member who held a conversation at all.

The PRESIDENT: You were talking to yourself.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: If I was, I was talking to a more intelligent person than others in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Because of the efforts of various organisations, buildings generally, transport and toilet facilities have been so designed that handicapped people can handle their own affairs as normally as possible and accept the challenge of coping with their disabilities. Despite the expensive and extensive renovations to this building, there seems little evidence that any such provision has been made. I raise the point because I find that to enter the back door of Parliament House is some sort of a challenge to me. Although I am able to hold the card in one hand and open the door with my foot, I fear that on some occasion someone may be leaving the building just as my foot is caught in the door handle, and there could be some sort of upset. I do not make the plea on my own behalf, because I hope I can adapt to such requirements, but I make the point to honourable members and to the Government, which is responsible for the renovations, that further thought should be given to this matter because I am not the only handicapped member of Parliament, and I hope sincerely I am not the last.

There should be facilities for people using wheelchairs who come into Parliament House. There is no reason why a person in a wheelchair should not be a member of Parliament, for that matter. I raise this matter not as a personal issue, although I point out that anyone entering through that door while I have my foot in it could either be knocked down or get kicked in the face. Further attention should be paid to the facilities being installed in so many buildings throughout Adelaide and the world, to cope with the requirements of incapacitated people.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I know that the Minister of Works is aware of the problems referred to by the honourable member. I do not think for one moment that the honourable member would kick anyone in the face. Nevertheless, I will refer his question to my colleague and see what he comes up with.

CHARITABLE ORGANISATIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Will the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer, have incorporated in *Hansard* a list of those charitable organisations that are accepted as being completely exempt from the payment of succession duties in South Australia?

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member can get that done only by having a reply brought down first.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek a reply and read it to the Council; in that way, that information can be incorporated in *Hansard*.

MANDRAX

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health regarding the drug scene in this State.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: In the *Sunday Mail* of July 17, at page 41, there was an article by Dennis Atkins headed, "Move sought on Mandrax". I will read the letter to refresh honourable members' memories regarding the matter. It is as follows:

The State Government will be asked to take firm action to halt the free availability of the hypnotic drug mandrax. It is understood Health Department officials are becoming increasingly concerned about doctors prescribing mandrax, mainly made available for insomniacs, too readily. Mandrax is freely available in all States except Queensland and New South Wales.

In Queensland it is listed as a narcotic, which is technically incorrect because it has no opiate properties, and in New South Wales it is a "special recordable" drug. This means that names, addresses and quantity of drug prescribed must be sent to the Health Department by doctors. Mandrax, or "mandies" as they are commonly called, are manufactured and marketed in Australia by Roussel Pharmaceuticals Proprietary Limited. During the past five years they have become increasingly popular among young people who take two or three or more mandrax and then consume alcohol. This produces a half-awake state during which the person fights off sleep.

The drug taker's speech is said to become slurred, erratic, and garbled. General loss of co-ordination also is experienced. Medical authorities are particularly concerned about people who mix mandrax and alcohol, then try to drive. It is not known if Health Department officials will suggest directly to the Government that some type of legislative amendment be introduced, or make a special submission to the Royal Commission on drugs.

That letter speaks for itself and, therefore, requires no further explanation. Has the Health Department approached the Government regarding the apparent free availability of mandrax, and what action does the Government intend to take to deal with this apparent problem?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: This preparation is included in schedule 4 of the poisons regulations, so that it is available on prescription only. Therefore, the statement made in the *Sunday Mail* that the drug is freely available is open to misinterpretation, because the drug can be obtained by prescription only. However, the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee will soon review the poisons schedule. Indeed, the matter is on its agenda, and the committee will make recommendations to me in due course.

MILK POWDER

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the unfortunate salmonella infections in babies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yesterday, I asked the Minister a question on this subject, my object being to ascertain whether the Minister had some warning regarding this matter before the actual date of the announcement, which was, I understand, July 18. My question was prompted by a report from Victoria about which I had been told. The Labor Party's shadow Minister of Health in that State had raised the matter there. In reply yesterday, the Minister said:

Action was taken as soon as it was known that the cause of the complaint had been isolated. I indicated to the Council in my statement that the cause of the outbreak had been discovered and isolated, and this was immediately conveyed to the Australian Minister for Health; and warnings came out immediately. I do not know about the Victorian position or whether people there had any information that we did not have.

The matter has again been raised in this morning's press, which carried a front-page story along the lines that some information regarding this matter was, in fact, available to the health authorities in Victoria several months ago. I have been contacted this morning by some people who are concerned about this matter. They claim that this information was available to the Minister in this State and that he should have warned the consumers and the general public in South Australia well before he did. I remind the Council that regular meetings of Health Ministers are held throughout Australia. There is close communication between the departmental heads of the various Health Departments throughout the country and, when any problems that might cause alarm are known in one State, it is generally expected that some information regarding such a possibility will permeate through all the departments. I therefore again ask the Minister of Health whether he can say with absolute certainty that he did not know about the Victorian situation prior to the announcement that he made regarding the withdrawal of the product.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I can truthfully answer that question. The fact remains that South Australia was the first State to isolate the problem. This was done at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, which traced the problem. We had no information until the weekend referred to. As I read it, this morning's press report was to the effect that the Nestle company was aware that something might have been wrong. As I understood it, the Health Department had not isolated the cause of the gastro-enteritis that had been discovered in various States. No-one has contradicted the fact that South Australia had isolated the cause. I reiterate that we had no prior knowledge of the matter. We knew that there were cases of gastro-enteritis, and we did everything in our power to ascertain the cause of it. Eventually, the cause was isolated in this product in South Australia, and a warning was issued as soon as it was realised what the problem was.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Health a question on this matter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am somewhat surprised that the honourable member who asked the previous question made no condemnation of the company concerned.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to give opinions or make innuendoes.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I never gave an opinion: I merely stated that he made no condemnation.

The PRESIDENT: It seems to be an indirect way of going about it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Mr. President, I take objection. It is an inference made against me.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No. I am merely saying that you neglected to make any condemnation.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I regard it not as an inference against the Hon. Mr. Hill, but as an attempt by the Hon. Mr. Foster to get in some sort of opinion or comment about a certain manufacturer, and I rule that course of action out of order.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You did not have to do so, because I did not persist with the matter. I do not know what everyone is going on about. In view of the statement published in this morning's leading South Australian newspaper, wherein the Nestle company was named, will the Minister tell the Council whether the State Government has at its disposal any means of taking action against a company that is guilty of the unscrupulous and irresponsible manufacture of a product—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is out of order in making those remarks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Even if I am out of order, my remarks are true.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: That is all right, but what I have said is true.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member can ask his question without including those remarks.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask whether the State Government can take any measure to prevent the circulation in this State of foodstuffs manufactured by the company known as Nestles, which, because of the statement in this morning's *Advertiser,* must be regarded as unscrupulous and absolutely irresponsible, because it knew almost 12 months ago that food contamination was taking place. That, according to the press, is a statement of fact.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Health Department can act to stop the distribution of contaminated food. In relation to the premises themselves, that is a matter for the Government of the State where the factory is situated.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Does that mean that the Commonwealth Constitution inhibits the State regarding the taking of action against such an unscrupulous food manufacturer?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am not aware of what the Constitution provides in this regard. All I am saying is that we have sufficient power to stop the distribution of any contaminated food once it is found that that food is being sold here.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 20. Page 45.)

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr. Burdett introduced a similar Bill to this last session.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He has not changed it.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: This Bill is identical to the one he introduced last session. I opposed that Bill then and I oppose this one now for the same reasons. Recently, the Premier, at a news conference, stated why the Government was opposed to this Bill. I will not repeat everything he said but, in summary, he said that the Hon. Mr. Burdett was merely playing porn politics and that existing legislation was adequate to cover this kind of offence.

I will leave the matter of the adequacy of present legislation to the Hon. Mr. Sumner to detail to the Council. I want to deal with how the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Liberal Party are trying to scare the South Australian people into believing that South Australia is some kind of Sodom and Gomorrah and that a vote for the Liberal Party will somehow save us all. That is the consistent theme running through all the rather crude propaganda being inflicted on the people of this State by the Liberal Party.

To me, that shows that the Opposition has no attractive policies to put to the people, so it must stoop to the lowest form of politicking, of which this pathetic Bill is one example. It was certain that this Bill would come before the Council again, when we look back on a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly (Mr. Tonkin) on April 10 this year. A report in the *Sunday Mail* of that date states:

Mr. Tonkin said that the Privy Council could give its finding at any time—

that, of course, related to the boundaries question—

and it was obvious Mr. Dunstan was keen to have an election. The evidence being given to the Royal Commission into juvenile offenders, the child pornography question, and that of late shopping hours had embarrassed the Government. The longer these things go on the better it is for the Opposition, he said.

Therefore, according to Mr. Tonkin, the longer he can keep the issue of child pornography going the better it is for the Liberal Party. I find it quite revolting that the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Liberal Party will use an issue such as the sexual exploitation of children, and keep the issue going in an attempt to make cheap political capital. Everyone on this side of the Council is completely opposed to this type of material being available, and the Government has done everything possible to see that it is not available in this State. The board that deals with the classification of publications has refused to classify this type of material, and rightly so. It is an offence to sell a publication that has not been classified and, if anyone has any evidence that it is available in this State, he should notify the police and let the law take its course. The surest way to stamp out this kind of material is to remove the profit motive that Opposition members constantly refer to: if there is no longer a way to make a dollar out of child pornography, it will not be produced, and the Government has taken action to remove the profit motive.

In his second reading explanation, the Hon. Mr. Burdett quoted from a public opinion poll conducted by Peter Gardner and Associates and published in the *Advertiser* of May 20, 1977. The Hon. Mr. Burdett said:

A recent poll shows that a majority of people want heavier penalties for child pornography offences. The poll, conducted by Peter Gardner and Associates, interviewed 787 people throughout the metropolitan area. They were asked: "A Bill was defeated in State Parliament in the middle of April which would have made it an offence to photograph a child under 14 years in pornographic circumstances and provide penalties of up to $2 000 and three years gaol. Do you believe laws on using children for this purpose are adequate, or do you think heavier penalties should apply than exist at the moment?"

If that is the way Peter Gardner and Associates frames its questions when conducting its polls, then I, for one will never again give any credence to any of its findings. As quoted by the Hon. Mr. Burdett, nowhere in the question posed was the detail given of what the present penalties are. How on earth could people give a considered answer to a question posed in that way? For almost anyone who was polled knew, the present penalties could include burning at the stake. Surely that information would be essential to enable anyone to give a considered and reasoned opinion. About the only other thing of substance in the Hon. Mr. Burdett's explanation was a quote from the *Advertiser* of April 19, 1977. According to the *Advertiser,* a judge said:

Oddly enough while the maximum sentence for a first offence of indecent assault is imprisonment with hard labour for five years, the maximum sentence for a first offence of procuring an act of gross indecency by a person under the age of 16 years even in front of a camera is imprisonment with hard labour for two years only. It is for Parliament and not for me to say whether that is enough.

I do not think there is anything terribly significant in that statement: it was one judge's comment. I am sure other judges would comment in an entirely different way if they wished. Everyone is entitled to his own opinion, and honourable members opposite have said in this Council that some judges' opinions, as evidenced by certain sentences, are completely wrong. What the honourable member seems to be doing is picking the judge's comments that suit him and attacking other comments when they do not suit his purposes. As it happens I agree entirely with the quoted remark of the judge in question when he said that it was for Parliament and not for him to say whether the present sentence for this type of offence is enough. I, as a member of Parliament, think it is enough, and I am sure the Parliament as a whole will agree with me that it is enough.

In summary, I am opposed to this Bill for the same reason as I was when it was previously before the Council, I consider it to be a cheap political stunt, an attempt to exploit the abuse of children in a political way by the Liberal Party, and to me that puts that Party on about the same level as the porn merchants, and members opposite ought to be thoroughly ashamed of themselves. I am sure that there are some people in the Liberal Party—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You're certainly logical in your arguments!

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Thank you. I am sure that there are some people in the Liberal Party who find it uncomfortable, to say the least, to be associated with this type of electioneering. Indeed, you, Mr. President, expressed some doubts yourself about this Bill on the last occasion it was before the Council, and I am sure other Liberal Party members also have reservations. I hope that those decent members of the Liberal Party will follow their consciences and dissociate themselves from the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and those of his ilk, and assist members on this side in defeating this Bill. The sooner the Liberal Party gets away from certain members' obsessions and personal hang-ups about matters of this nature, and concentrates on real alternative policies the better off that Party and South Australia will be. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 26. Page 108.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This is the second Supply Bill for this financial year. The procedure that has been followed over several years is that the first Supply Bill is passed to take the Government through until the end of August, and the second Bill usually comes before Parliament in the middle of August to take the Government through to the end of October, by which time the Budget will have been passed by both Houses. This Bill appears earlier than the usual Supply Bill.

As I said, it was introduced in another place almost one month ahead of its scheduled time. The first Bill granted the Government Supply of $190 000 000 and it supposedly takes the Government through until the end of August. This Bill is for a similar amount which should take the Government through to the end of October. I make this comment because the Bill has been introduced ahead of time. I do not see any reason why the Bill should be opposed on that ground or why we should ask for it to be deferred, because Supply is necessary. Whether the Government is running short of money at this stage, I do not know. Perhaps the Minister can reply to that question. I merely comment that it is noted that the Bill is some weeks ahead of its normal time. Apart from that, I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): In reply to the Leader, I indicate that the Government is always running short of funds, but not to carry out its normal procedures. This Bill will take us through to October, and the reason for its early introduction was indicated in the second reading explanation (and I believe this was done last year). We are now, generally, sitting for three weeks and having one week off, whereas usually in the past Parliament has continued through the session without a break. In order to meet the wishes of members, we have now adopted this new system, and largely for that reason we have introduced the Bill a little earlier. I thank the Leader for his consideration of the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 26. Page 116.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I join with other honourable members in conveying to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor our expressions of loyalty to the Crown and our appreciation of his service to the State of South Australia as Her Majesty's representative. Also, I support the sentiments expressed in the draft Address in Reply regarding the previous Governor, Sir Douglas Nicholls, who, because of ill health, was unable to continue as Governor of this State. I, along with other members, express the wish that in retirement Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls continue to enjoy the fruits of their labours.

Reference was made in the Lieutenant-Governor's Opening Speech to four members of Parliament who died during the past 12 months. Along with the sentiments expressed by the Lieutenant-Governor, I am sure that all other honourable members join in recognising the service of those members and expressing sympathy to their families. Three of those former members had long and distinguished careers in politics in South Australia, and two of them, in particular, gave service through a long period of Parliamentary history, commencing before the Second World War and retiring from Parliament only in the past few years. Reference has been made to Sir Glen Pearson, a former Minister of the Crown and a gentleman with whom I had the pleasure of working as a Cabinet Minister.

I was pleased to hear the Hon. Mr. Sumner yesterday deal with the question of human rights in relation to declarations of the United Nations. I was interested to

hear what the honourable member had to say about the rights of people in relation to those declarations. Indeed, I should like to direct the attention of this Council to a similar matter in this country where rights, powers, and privileges were held by people and were removed by Act of Parliament whilst now, when there is some hope that those rights, powers and privileges may be returned to those people or given back to them, there is much opposition to their return. Considerable publicity has recently been given to the question of the announced plan of the Federal Government to grant Statehood to the Northern Territory. This announcement, coming 67 years after the rights, powers and privileges were removed, has caused a flurry of opposition from some Australian political leaders. In an article in the *Advertiser* of July 19, Mr. Hawke, the President of the Australian Labor Party, strongly attacked the proposals for self-government in the Northern Territory. The article states:

The Federal Government's proposal of Statehood for the Northern Territory was a "recipe for disaster", the president of the A.L.P. (Mr. Hawke) said here yesterday. Mr. Hawke was speaking at an open-air rally to mark the opening of the A.L.P. campaign for the N.T. Legislative Assembly elections, on August 13.

In an article in the *News* of July 19, the Premier attacked the idea of granting these people the rights, powers and privileges to which they are entitled. The article states:

The people of the Northern Territory needed their heads read if they accepted the Commonwealth Government's offer of Statehood, the Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said today. The terms under which the Commonwealth would allow Statehood for the Northern Territory would bitterly disadvantage the local people. "What the Commonwealth is doing is to propose that the Northern Territory be funded on the same basis as the States," Mr. Dunstan said. "The Territory is under a massive disability and it will be obliged then to run State taxes, even given disability grants from the Grants Commission, at an enormously high rate."

One can only say that it is paradoxical that the people who are now so strongly opposing the legitimate demands of more than 100 000 people in the Northern Territory, with a gross national product of $250 000 000 annually and with a tremendous potential for increasing that gross national product, to achieve self-government within Australia's federal structure are the same people who have been extremely vocal in demanding the ending of colonial rule in countries outside Australia's borders. I applaud the Federal Government's initiative in making this announcement, and I strongly oppose the paternalistic attitude adopted by those people who wish to tie permanently the destiny of the Northern Territory to Canberra's apron strings.

A strong case can be made for the view that the Northern Territory still is, constitutionally, a part of the State of South Australia. Because the ramifications of that case should be detailed in *Hansard*, I shall deal with it at length. The first section in the Federal Constitution that one should consider is covering clause 6, which defines the States as meaning *inter alia* "South Australia, including the Northern Territory of South Australia". The next section to consider is section 111 of the Federal Constitution, which provides:

The Parliament of a State may surrender any part of the State to the Commonwealth, and upon such surrender, and acceptance thereof by the Commonwealth, such part of the State shall become subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Commonwealth.

This was the section used for the transfer of the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth, because the alternative method under section 123 required a referendum, and all Parties realised that the South Australian electors would never approve the transfer of the Northern Territory to Commonwealth control. Indeed, in 1910 a Bill was introduced to repeal the 1907 Act, but the Commonwealth beat the State to the punch by racing through an acceptance Act before the repeal Bill could be passed at the State level. Section 111, when read with section 122, raises its own particular difficulties. Is a "part of a State", when surrendered, a colony or a territory as referred to in covering clause 6, or only a "territory" as referred to in section 122? One would have thought that the disjunction of a huge area like the Northern Territory, covering 1 295 000 square kilometres, created a separate colony, and that "territory" in the Commonwealth Constitution more properly referred to places like Jervois Bay. This use of "territory" is supported by section 125, but not by section 124.

Section 121 starts off with the words "The Parliament may admit", and the question is whether the use of "may" is permissive or mandatory. Some say that it is mandatory, as it is a power granted to the Parliament for the benefit of an identified group of people. However, other constitutional opinion, including that of Lunn, is that "may" is permissive. If "may" is mandatory, it adds to my case. Section 122 does not matter for this purpose. Assuming that the Northern Territory is a territory, not a colony, that section applies only while it is a territory. I wish to refer to *Hansard*, page 281, of October 19, 1910, where there is a report of a speech of the Hon. T. Bruce, on the following motion of the Hon. E. Lucas:

That the Council do now resolve itself into a Committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the question—that it is desirable to bring in a Bill to repeal the Northern Territory Surrender Act, 1907.

In his speech, the Hon. T. Bruce quoted a statement by Mr. E. F. Mitchell, K.C., of the Melbourne bar, who was a highly respected constitutional lawyer and who had appeared in many High Court actions on constitutional matters. The Hon. T. Bruce said:

For some time the people of this State had been perturbed about the position with regard to the Northern Territory and the thanks of the Legislative Council and the country generally were due to Mr. Lucas for having brought up the matter. Mr. Lucas had shown clearly the necessity for speaking with no uncertain voice, but it seemed as if they were in a similar position to the man who locked the stable door after the horse had been stolen. The transfer Bill was before the Federal Parliament, and had been passed by the Senate, but hung up in the House of Representatives, and they were at a loss now to know what action to take in the matter.

The position had been somewhat altered even in the last 24 hours by the statement of Mr. E. F. Mitchell, K.C., of Melbourne, that before South Australia could legally part with the Northern Territory a referendum of the whole of the people in the State would have to be taken. That opinion was of such vital importance, and so necessary for the well-being of the people of the State, that he would read it. Mr. Mitchell, who was one of the leading legal lights of Australia, had said, according to the *Advertiser* of that day:—"The point now submitted raises difficult questions as to the proper construction of the Constitution Act.

I have been myself surprised to find how serious these difficulties are. Take section 6 of the Constitution Act first of all. That section specifically declares that "the States" shall mean "such of the colonies of New South Wales . . . and South Australia, including the Northern Territory of South Australia as for the time being are parts of the Commonwealth." . . . Now, no-one can successfully contend that the effect of the present Federal Bill, if passed, would be to prevent the Northern Territory being part of the Commonwealth, so that, according to the plain language of section 6, South Australia, including the Northern Territory of South Australia, would still be

"a State" although it is also clear that for all practical purposes the effect of the Federal Bill when enacted as an Act will be to make it cease to be part of the State of South Australia. That is to say, to give full effect to the ordinary natural meaning of the language of section 6, would make it impossible for South Australia to surrender to the Commonwealth the whole of the Northern Territory (probably, without a further Imperial Act) as I doubt whether the power of to alter the Constitution given by section 128 would apply to the covering clauses of the Constitution of which section 6 is one.

This view goes further than the point submitted for my consideration as, if it were sound, it is plain that even the approval of the majority of the electors under section 123 would not enable South Australia to surrender to the Commonwealth the whole of the Northern Territory. I feel great difficulty in advising with any confidence upon this point, but I think that the members of the High Court would feel that the strict literal meaning of the section which I suggest was not what was intended by the framers of the Constitution, and would therefore make the literal meaning give way to the intention to be gathered from the other provisions of the Constitution. Apart from this difficulty which I have pointed out, I do not think section 6 throws much light upon the actual point submitted to me, which is whether the effect of section 123 does not render the approval of the majority of the electors of South Australia a condition precedent to a valid surrender of the Northern Territory to the Commonwealth. The point is: is the effect of section 123 to put a limitation upon the powers of surrender conferred upon the Parliament of a State by section 111, where such surrender involves an increase, diminishing, or alteration of the limits of such State by making the consent of the majority of the electors of the State voting also necessary?

It seems clear that there may be a surrender under section 111, which would not involve any alteration in the limits of a State and, therefore, this difficulty would not arise. The difficulty that arises here is, to my mind, almost the converse of what I dealt with under section 6 for, upon the ordinary construction of section 123 and the different relevant provisions of the Constitution Act, it would certainly look as if section 123 was intended to confer an additional substantial power and was not intended as a limitation of powers elsewhere conferred. But, when we come to look at the reason of the thing and to consider the history of how the words "and the approval of the majority of the electors of the State voting upon the question" came to be inserted (see for an account of this, Quick and Garran at page 974), it does seem an extraordinary thing that the States should have stipulated, when they made their bargain with each other as to federation, that the consent of the electors of a State should be necessary before that State's limits should be increased, diminished, or otherwise altered, and yet have omitted that safeguard altogether in the case of an alteration of such limits by the surrender of possibly a great part of its territory to the Commonwealth. No-one can contend that by the surrender of the Northern Territory the limits of the State of South Australia, as described and recognised in section 6, are not seriously altered and diminished. The point has not been definitely settled, but I think the opinion of the majority of the High Court is that for the purpose of interpreting the Constitution the court is entitled to look at the draft Constitution as submitted to the State Parliaments and I should think, therefore, also at resolutions passed by such Parliaments if afterwards given effect to in the Constitution.

If that history was looked at, it would support the view which I have formed independently of it, that the proper interpretation of section 123 is that the limits of a State were not to be altered by surrender or otherwise without the consent of a majority of the electors. The point is a difficult one, on which I think different legal minds will be found to differ, but my own opinion is that South Australia cannot surrender the Northern Territory without the consent of a majority of the electors voting upon the question.

It appears on the evidence so far that a referendum of the people of South Australia (including the Northern Territory of South Australia) should have been held before the limits of the State were altered.

The second point is this: Even if approval had been given by the people at a referendum to alter the limits of the State, did the power exist for South Australia to surrender to the Commonwealth the whole of the northern part of the State as it then existed? Another point that must be considered apart from those points covered in the opinion of Mr. E. F. Mitchell, K.C., is that the original grant to South Australia in 1863 of the present Northern Territory, provided that South Australia was to hold it, and "until We shall think fit to make other provisions therefor". It was assumed at the time of the surrender that the reservation of the South Australian Act of 1907 for Royal Assent covered the point.

There are many opinions that it did not, that it would have required an Imperial Order-in-Council, similar to those which vested the mandates in the Commonwealth in 1920. As a member of Standing Committee "B" of the Constitutional Convention, I say that one of the areas given to the committee to examine was the constitutional provisions relating to new States and Territories; the question of the severance of the Northern Territory from South Australia in 1907 and 1910 was examined. The arguments I have put so far, although brief, were canvassed in that committee. With the exception of one member, the committee generally held the view that the Northern Territory should not further be retarded politically and the political rights enjoyed by its citizens prior to 1910 should be returned to them.

One of the members of that committee was R. C. Ward, who in September, 1963, contributed an article to *The Australian Quarterly,* parts of which I would like to quote to the Council. They are as follows:

FEDERALISM AND THE NORTHERN TERRITORY

It is a curious anomaly that Australia's Northern Territory, comprising more than one-sixth of the continent in area, should be, and show signs of continuing to be, one of the world's most politically retarded territories.

The explanation most readily given by those constitutionalists whose democratic goal has already been attained (and they are many and powerful) is the Territory's lack of economic and industrial potential and the continuing need for the rest of Australia to finance its continued existence and future development. This explanation becomes converted into justification of the same constitutionalists (and this is not a Party matter but is generally true of the two major Parties) in their showing, with little or no exception, an unwillingness to make any changes or concessions resulting in advancement along the road to representative and responsible government, except where pressure has been applied by people in the Territory itself.

Deficiencies in economic potential and the need for money from outside if existence is to be maintained and development continued are one thing, but these factors certainly do not provide the whole explanation, which is to be found at least as much in historical considerations and more particularly in the effect of Federal attitudes on the Territory's demands for democratic advancement. Indeed, the result of such a study is that, without the development of federalism and its peculiar impact on the Territory, Territorians today would find themselves with all the rights, powers and obligations of representative and responsible government.

Although European settlement of the Territory commenced in 1824, the Territory's constitutional history and the first effect of Australian influence on it should be dated from 1863, when South Australia secured annexation of the area by Letters Patent.

As for Parliamentary representation between the time of the Territory's annexation to South Australia and its surrender to and acceptance by the Commonwealth in 1910, the people of the area enjoyed a luxury denied them since and for the restoration of which they have had to fight every inch of the way. The Territory became part of the electoral district of Flinders, one of 18 electoral districts each returning two members to the House of Assembly and, as part of an electoral division, including several other districts, also assisted to elect members to the South

Australian Legislative Council, subject to property and other qualifications. In 1872, the electorate of Flinders contributed three members to the House of Assembly. This was reduced to two in 1882 by an amendment of the South Australian Constitution Act which also excluded from the Territory's franchise persons brought into the Territory under the "Northern Territory Indian Immigration Act, 1882", and provided that no person residing in the Territory was qualified to vote "unless he be a natural born subject of Her Majesty, or a naturalised subject of Her Majesty of European Nationality, or a citizen of the United States of America naturalised as a subject of Her Majesty".

By the Northern Territory Representation Act, 1888, the South Australian Parliament constituted the Northern Territory a separate electorate sending two members in its own right to the House of Assembly, and the Territory also became an electoral division for the election of members to the Legislative Council. In due course, one of the Territory's members, Mr. H. V. Solomon, even achieved the distinction of being Premier of South Australia, if only for a few days. The high water mark of constitutional development, however, was reached with Federation. Representation of the Territory in both Houses of the South Australian Parliament continued and, in addition, there was representation as part of South Australia in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

At the same time, the very act of Federation was the Territory's constitutional undoing. For years prior to Federation the Territory had become an increasing burden to South Australia. Remoteness made administration expensive: agriculture and other industries were difficult to establish; and the importation of Chinese, Indian and Cingalese labour seemed to provide the only hope of development within economic limits. How could South Australia manage in the face of general restrictive legislation on aliens agreed to at an All-Australian Conference in 1888? Indeed, from then on, hand in hand with negotiations already proceeding between the States for the establishment of a Commonwealth, South Australia exerted pressure to relieve itself of responsibility for the Territory.

In any event, by a South Australian Act of 1907 and a Commonwealth Act of 1910 ratifying an agreement already made subject to Parliamentary approval, the State surrendered and the Commonwealth accepted the Northern Territory, its past and its future. The propounders of the agreement were meticulous in their concern for the reimbursement of State expenditure and interest on loans in respect of the Territory, the acquisition and further construction of railways, and the continuance of existing freight and passenger rates (apparently for time immemorial) on the Port Augusta railway; but apparently there was no regard for the existing political rights and possible future political disabilities of the people who were part and parcel of the land being surrendered on the one part and accepted on the other. Nor did the Surrender and Acceptance Acts themselves have anything to say on political rights and disabilities, notwithstanding that in ratifying the agreement both Parliaments, in extension of the agreement, legislated to ensure the continuance of the rights of South Australians in land held by them in the Territory at the time of the surrender and acceptance.

It is a strange comment on the effect of the passage of time on human beings and governments that, on the realisation in 1919 that railway freight and passenger charges could not be fixed for time immemorial, rectification was made by mutual amendment of the agreement between State and Commonwealth and the ratification of the amendment by both Parliaments, but that when, following the discovery of uranium, seemingly it was necessary to make further amendments to the Northern Territory Acceptance Act in 1952 to take away mineral rights from lands held in the Northern Territory by South Australians (and others) at the time of surrender and acceptance, this was done without any amendment of the relevant agreement and only by the unilateral Act of the Commonwealth, with no ratifying legislation in South Australia.

Although R. C. Ward, in his article, does not touch upon the question of the constitutionality of the original Acts of South Australia and the Commonwealth, he does clearly underline some of the things to which I have already referred. The people of the Northern Territory enjoyed representation in the South Australian Parliament, first, in the electorate of Flinders (which, by the way, ran from Darwin to the Great Australian Bight), and later in a district covering only the Northern Territory of South Australia. Further, a Territorian was for a period the Premier of South Australia. Had it not been for the development of federalism, the people of the Northern Territory would still posses all the rights, powers and obligations of representative and responsible government, either as part of South Australia or as a separate entity.

That is why I said I was pleased that the Hon. Mr. Sumner raised this question regarding human rights and United Nations declarations. Here, we have the case where people enjoyed the rights for many years and where, by Acts of Parliament (of this State and of the Commonwealth), those existing rights were removed. We still have opposition at present to the return of those rights to those people. To me, as a layman, it seems to be a peculiar twist to the whole federalism issue.

Up to the transfer agreement, there had been considerable argument as to South Australian "title" to the Territory. On March 2, 1907, the *Observer* doubted whether the State Parliament had any mandate to deal with the Northern Territory in this way and advised the holding of a referendum. Sir Josiah Symon addressed the Great Central State League on March 5 and, in opposing the transfer, pointed out that, under its terms, South Australia would not be reimbursed adequately for its investment in the north. What effect did the Federal Constitution have on South Australia's powers to deal with the Northern Territory as it did? Was South Australia only the "manager" of the Northern Territory as claimed by the Hon. Thomas Price at the Premiers' Conference in 1907? If it was, what rights did South Australia have? The *Australian Encyclopedia,* page 274, contains the following information:

"South Australia. On August 15, 1834, an Act was passed, creating South Australia a province, and towards the end of the year 1836 settlement took place. The first Governor, Captain Hindmarsh, R.N., arrived at Holdfast Bay on December 28, 1836, and on the same day the colony was officially proclaimed. It embraced 309 850 square miles of territory lying south of the 26th parallel of south latitude and between the 141st and 132nd meridians of east longitude. On December 10, 1861, by the authority of the Imperial Act 24, the western boundary of South Australia was extended to coincide with the eastern boundary of Western Australia; that is, the 129th meridian. The area of the extension was approximately 80 220 square miles. Nearly two years later—on July 6, 1863,—the Northern Territory, comprising 523 620 square miles, was by letters patent brought under the jurisdiction of South Australia, which therefore controlled an area of 903 690 square miles. The Territory was transferred to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Government in 1911, leaving South Australia with an area of 380 070 square miles.

The original boundaries of South Australia were extended westward on December 10, 1861, from the 132nd meridian to the 129th. By letters patent July 6, 1863, Northern Territory was brought under the jurisdiction of South Australia. Covering clause 6 of the Federal Constitution refers to South Australia (including the Northern Territory of South Australia). The point that arises now is: would it be competent for that part of South Australia between the 129th and 132nd meridians to be transferred by Act of Parliament to a Territory of the Commonwealth without any reference to the people of South Australia or an amendment of the Imperial Act?

If the procedure adopted between 1907 and 1910 is constitutionally valid, it follows that surrender of the

western part of South Australia that I have just mentioned, by the same means, would also be legitimate, but, if it is thought that citizens should not today be disfranchised without at least their consent in a referendum it follows that they should not have been disfranchised in 1907 and 1910. This takes the question further. If an Act of this Parliament—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Why not? What about the uranium? He does not trust Fraser.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. C. W. Creedon): The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has refused to give way.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If it is constitutionally correct that the rights, powers, privileges and obligations of the people of a large part of a State, like the Northern Territory, could be removed by an Act of Parliament and if that could be accepted by the Commonwealth Government, and if the same sort of Bill came through now transferring the whole of South Australia as a Territory of the Commonwealth, not allowing any rights or privileges, would that move be constitutionally valid? That is the question. Is section 123 an additional substantive power that should not be read into other sections that empower the creation of Federal Territories?

I come back to the point I made earlier, namely, that any honourable member would agree that it would not be competent for the rights, powers and privileges enjoyed by citizens living in the area between the 129th and 132nd meridians to lose those rights, powers and privileges by being transferred by Act of Parliament under section 111 to a territory of the Commonwealth, at least without a referendum as required under section 123.

Therefore, there must be constitutional doubts on the original transfer of the Northern Territory of South Australia to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth, with the consequent loss of rights to the people living in that area. Having pursued the point about four years ago, the matter was raised again by Mr. Peter Paterson of the Law School, University of Western Australia. Mr. Peter Paterson had obtained a copy of material I had provided to the Parliamentary Library, in which I expressed the opinion that 65 years after the event, the point was only of academic interest.

The transfer of the Northern Territory of South Australia was made under section 111 of the Federal Constitution, which provides that a State Parliament may surrender any part of a State to the Commonwealth, and that, on acceptance of the surrendered part by the Commonwealth, it becomes subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. Under section 111, only two limitations are imposed. They are approval by State Government and acceptance by Commonwealth. The provisions of section 111 were fulfilled in the transfer. Under section 122, Commonwealth Parliament may make laws for the Government of any Territory so surrendered. Section 123 provides that the Commonwealth Parliament may alter the limits of any State, with the consent of the Parliament of the State and a majority of the electors of the State voting in favour of the change. The question is: if a State surrenders part of its territory to the Commonwealth under section 111, does this alter the State limits under section 123? In a letter written to me by Mr. Paterson, he said:

With respect, I would question your observation that the matter is "of academic interest 65 years after the event". Surely South Australia has a proper claim to its 1901 boundaries and area, unless the section 123 guarantee of territorial integrity of the States is to be read out of the Constitution as inconvenient on the historical facts, and Mr. Dunstan's Government should assert that claim. In deference to the aspirations of the people of the areas, the views of South Australians in both areas might be sought at referendums.

Following Mr. Paterson's correspondence with me, he wrote to the Attorney-General (Hon. Peter Duncan) stating:

I enclose a draft statement of claim by which a colleague and I wish to rectify certain matters under the Australian Constitution if our views be sound. The defendants in the action would be the Commonwealth and the Federal Executive Council. Would you be willing to give your fiat to such an action either to us or to a South Australian elector?

The Attorney-General replied:

I refer to your letter of the 15th April, 1977, concerning an action that you propose bringing against the Commonwealth in the High Court. I have given consideration to your request, but do not intend granting my fiat in this matter because I do not think it is in the public interest to do so.

The interesting point in the Attorney-General's letter is that he refused his fiat in the matter because he did not think it is in the public interest to do so: the more likely reason is that the granting of Statehood to the Northern Territory, no matter how it is to be achieved, is obviously against Australian Labor Party policy! The Attorney-General seems to be convinced that Australian Labor Party policy and the public interest are synonymous.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Why don't you define "the public interest"?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: They are not my words. They are the words of the Attorney-General, so the honourable member better ask him. There is still a further point to be considered, which is raised by Mr. Paterson in a letter to the Chief Australian Electoral Officer. That question concerns the electoral distributions. If the Northern Territory is still constitutionally part of South Australia, and the Australian Capital Territory is still constitutionally part of New South Wales, then the proposed divisions in several States could be challenged. This would mean that the elections for the House of Representatives would have to be conducted in most States on an at-large basis.

The position I have placed before the House is clearly arguable. However, the point that concerns me most is the fact that the people of the Northern Territory are entitled to the rights, powers, obligations and privileges they enjoyed prior to 1910. I do not think anyone can deny that any more than the part of the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights read by the Hon. Mr. Sumner yesterday can be denied. Here, people have those rights and they were removed, I believe, unconstitutionally. We still have total opposition from some to the regaining by those people of rights that they had in 1910.

The reasons for the refusal to grant Statehood include the claim that there are not enough electors in the Northern Territory and, secondly, that the Northern Territory could not pay its way. There are more electors in the Northern Territory now than there were when South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania, and Queensland were granted their rights. I have pointed out, regarding the statement that the Northern Territory could not pay its way, that the gross national product of the Northern Territory already is $250 000 000 annually.

There is no case for denying those people the rights that they enjoyed before 1910 any more than there is a case for denying anyone in any other country rights they are entitled to regarding representation and their own form of Government. The statement that appears to have angered Mr. Dunstan and Mr. Hawke is as follows:

The Government has approved a programme under which the Northern Territory will be granted responsible self-government by July 1, 1979. This was announced by the Hon. Evan Adermann, M.P., Minister for the Northern Territory, in a statement released today. Mr. Adermann said that the Government had made a firm commitment to bring the Northern Territory to responsible self-government and eventual Statehood. An initial transfer of administrative responsibility to executive members of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly and an associated expansion of the Northern Territory Public Service had taken effect from January 1, 1977. He said that the measures now approved by the Government represent the most significant step to date in the constitutional advancement of the Territory.

I reiterate that this Parliament should give absolute support to the claims of the Northern Territorians and give absolute support to the policies being followed by the Federal Government to ensure that these people have returned to them the powers and privileges that they held before 1910.

The second matter on which I want to speak (and I will do that as briefly as I can) concerns the announcement of a hospital to be built in the Christies Beach area. That project has created much controversy in this Chamber since it was first announced. First, I am delighted that a scheme has been approved for the erection of a hospital to service the growing needs of the Christies Beach, Morphett Vale and Noarlunga areas.

The announcement opens a new approach for this Government in providing community hospital facilities in South Australia. When the Minister was replying to a question asked by, I think, the Hon. Mr. Cornwall, he said that negotiations had been under way for six or eight months. At that stage I interjected, suggesting that they had been in progress for about two years. However, on reflection, I believe it is probably about four years or more since the matter was first raised with the Government. Since about 1970 there has been a need and a growing community pressure in the southern area for the establishment of community hospital facilities.

All honourable members in this Council realise the type of pressures that have been exerted. I refer to problems in relation to Government finance, especially with the commitment to Flinders Medical Centre being such that the establishment of such a hospital did not seem possible. I accept that situation from the statements made to me by the Minister of Health on various occasions when I have approached him on this matter. In considering this question I concluded that some other source of finance had to be found if such a facility were to be provided.

It is fair to say that the Government did not wish to build a community hospital in that area. In other words, it believed that the policies being followed in regard to community hospitals were not applicable to that area. However, during my inquiries I was contacted by a private hospital developer from interstate seeking my views about the establishment of a private hospital in the Christies Beach area. My advice to the group concerned was to approach the Minister with a proposition, because I considered that there was no way that a community hospital would be built in that area or that the Government could build a Government hospital there.

To his credit, when I approached the Minister about four years ago, he agreed to meet with Mr. Gilligan from Melbourne to hear his suggestion. I believe that the original approach on this matter was made over four years ago when I introduced to the Minister the deputation from Melbourne. Further, I informed the Minister that I was available to assist in any way I could to achieve a community hospital in that area. Therefore, I am pleased that hospital facilities will be provided there, and it is even more pleasing that the hospital will be built by the private sector, without which this development could not have been considered at this time. Although the major part of the financing will be undertaken by private enterprise, I wonder what will happen to the 3 per cent levy that is forced upon local government areas. The funds collected must amount to a considerable sum. From the figures I have taken out, I assess that in the next 10 years with the levy at 3 per cent about $1 000 000 will be taken from ratepayers of that area for hospital purposes.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You were the Chief Secretary once and you neglected the people of this State in that regard. What are you rattling on about?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That may be the honourable member's opinion, but I do not have a high regard for his opinion. As I said, the 3 per cent levy being forced upon Christies Beach, Noarlunga and Morphett Vale ratepayers will in the next decade total $1 000 000. That would be sufficient to fund a community hospital dealing with not only maternity but also casualty and other facilities. This is another angle, which I do not wish to pursue, but it is nevertheless an interesting point. I reiterate my pleasure that the development will be proceeding, and I am also pleased that the Government has had to turn to the private sector to play such an important role in the development of the hospital in this area. I should now like to deal with the uranium question.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He must have shares—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As the Hon. Mr. Foster seems concerned about that aspect, I should like to put the record straight and say that neither I nor my family have any shares in any mining company in Australia or anywhere in the world.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You're not the most truthful person in the world. You do not expect me to accept that, do you?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, I do not. The honourable member can see only one honest person, and that is each morning when he looks in the mirror to shave. I should like to look at the history of the development of the uranium industry in South Australia. First, I refer to a report in the *News* (May 13, 1974) under the big heading "$2 000 000 000 uranium project", as follows:

The State and Federal Governments are to make a feasibility study into the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia. The Federal Minerals and Energy Minister, Mr. Connor, made the announcement at the press conference in Adelaide today.

He would not put a cost on the giant project, but it is believed it could be as high as $2 000 000 000. Mr. Connor did not state possible sites, but Port Pirie is understood to be highly favoured. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, later confirmed the study, and said several sites were already under consideration. The project could mean work for 600 people, he said. Mr. Connor, at his crowded press conference, said: "As I see it, the Spencer Gulf region would be the most ideal site in Australia." He said South Australia had vast supplies of intermediate quality brown coal at Lake Phillipson, north of Port Augusta, which would be necessary for power generation at the plant.

The next press cutting in the uranium story is an *Advertiser* report (June 20, 1974), stating:

South Australia will join the industrial nuclear club if it becomes the centre of uranium processing methods on lines being researched by the Australian Mineral Development

Laboratories at Glenside, Adelaide. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) wants the Port Pirie area to become the focal point of such development.

The report then goes on with the statement of the Federal Minister. Next, I refer to a *News* report (September 27, 1974), stating:

URANIUM PLANT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA STILL: DUNSTAN

The Premier Mr. Dunstan, said today he did not think the Federal Government's decision to establish a uranium milling plant in the Northern Territory would rule out the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being built in South Australia. The Federal Government is at present carrying out a study into the possible establishment of a $2 000 000 000 uranium enrichment plant near Port Pirie.

Another *News* report (November 4, 1974) under the heading "$2 000 000 000 bid for uranium plant in South Australia", states:

Talks between the Prime Minister, Mr. Whitlam, and the Japanese Prime Minister, Mr. Tanaka, are believed to have enhanced the State's chances of getting the project. State Mines Minister, Mr. Hopgood said today he was more confident than ever South Australia would get the massive plant. A three-year Federal-State inquiry is under way into the feasibility of building the plant in South Australia. Mr. Hopgood said: "The Federal Government has already nominated South Australia as a likely spot for the plant." Mr. Hopgood said his talks with the Federal Government were centred on two major points:

Was South Australia the likely site for the plant if it went ahead?

What environmental dangers would be involved in the establishment of an enrichment plant?

The first stage of uranium development in South Australia would probably be a $25 000 000 uranium hexafluoride plant. Uranium hexafluoride is the intermediate stage between uranium oxide—known as yellow cake—and enriched uranium destined for nuclear power plants.

An article in the *Advertiser* of November 5, 1974, states:

The Minister of Development and Mines (Mr. Hopgood) said yesterday he was extremely confident South Australia would be chosen as the site for a Japanese-Australian uranium enrichment plant. A weekend announcement by the Federal Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) that contracts had been signed with the Japanese for the sale of uranium would accelerate plans for a plant in the Spencer Gulf region. Mr. Connor said the Japanese were keen to build an enrichment plant in Australia and there would be a detailed investigation of proposals. On the eve of the May election he said the Federal Government would study the potential of the Port Pirie area for a uranium processing centre.

Mr. Hopgood said yesterday he expected talks to be held between Federal and State officers of his department and the Atomic Energy Commission before Christmas. "We already have a substantial file of information which will be of benefit to the proposed joint feasibility study by the Australian and Japanese Governments", he said. Mr. Hopgood said he had not spoken to Mr. Connor about the uranium scheme since May.

An article, headed "No decision on site for N-plant", in the *News* of February 26, 1975, states:

A uranium enrichment plant at remote Lake Phillipson, 480 km (300 miles) north-west of Adelaide is not likely. But South Australia is still considered in the running for the massive project.

An article in the *News* of June 14, 1975, states:

A uranium enrichment plant will almost certainly be established at remote Lake Phillipson, 480 km north-west of Adelaide. He said Australia would closely control the overseas sale of uranium through the International Energy Agency. "Countries who buy Australian uranium will have to account for every ounce they purchase", he said.

An article in the *News* of May 14, 1976, states:

Renewed moves to build a $2 000 000 000 uranium enrichment plant in South Australia have been launched by the State Government. Federal talks are to be held soon with a powerful British, German and Dutch consortium.

By this time the Minister of Mines and Energy was the Hon. Mr. Hudson. The article also states:

In Adelaide it was recalled that the State Mines and Energy Minister, Mr. Hudson, has held a series of private discussions with Federal authorities in a bid to have any enrichment plant based in South Australia. The Mines and Energy Minister in the Whitlam Government, Mr. Connor, said in June that a site at Lake Phillipson, 480 km north of Adelaide, was an ideal site.

An article in the *News* of June 30, 1976, headed "Redcliff best site for $1 400 000 000 uranium complex", states:

A State Government report says Redcliff, south of Port Augusta, is the best site in Australia for a $1 400 000 000 uranium processing and enrichment complex. If the project went ahead it would be Australia's largest single industrial complex. It would be bigger than B.H.P.'s steel plants or any car factory or oil refinery in Australia. The report says the plant would generate an income of $426 500 000 a year when fully operational and employ up to 800 workers during the eight years it would take to build. It would also provide direct factory employment for 1 550 people, support a $60 000 000 a year centrifuge manufacturing industry in Adelaide and support a town with a population of 4 650.

The report has been distributed by the Government to executives of private industries, embassies and Government departments. The Mines Minister, Mr. Hudson, has taken copies abroad. He will show it to major industrial concerns in Europe.

Now we come to the crucial point. An article in the *Advertiser* of July 1, 1976, headed "Dunstan issues report after 'leak' to magazine", states:

A South Australian Government report has recommended the development of a $1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment plant on the Redcliff site at the head of Spencer Gulf. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) issued copies of the report yesterday after it had been leaked to a national magazine which went on sale in Adelaide yesterday.

Mr. Dunstan said the magazine article had been designed to "stir and get headlines" and the copy of the report it used had been stolen. The report, produced by the trade and development division of the Premier's Department, is dated February, 1976, and marked confidential. It is a glossy publication.

The article then goes on to give details of the project. It claims that environmental matters are covered and that everything will be all right. An article, headed "Globetrot Hudson seeks cash for uranium", in the *News* of July 1, 1976, states:

Minister of State for Monarto and Redcliff, Mr. Hudson, will be looking for financial backing overseas for the development of the uranium enrichment plant. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, said this today. The uranium enrichment plant is estimated to cost $1 400 000 000. Mr. Dunstan could not say who Mr. Hudson was seeing overseas but said he was certainly discussing uranium enrichment on his trip. "The centrifuge system of uranium enrichment is of great interest to us and Mr. Hudson is closely studying the development of this system, particularly in Europe. In other countries they are an integral part of a car manufacturing plant. If the uranium enrichment plant goes ahead at Redcliff, several hundred jobs will be created at either General Motors-Holden's or Chrysler plants in South Australia."

State secretary of the Australian Railways Union, Mr. W. W. Marshall, said today his union was firm in its opposition to uranium enrichment and would not handle materials for any plant in South Australia.

That is the first fly in the ointment.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Leader give way?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The give-way rule does not apply unless it is adopted as a sessional rule, and it does not apply so far this session.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: An editorial in the *Advertiser,* headed "An enriching prospect", of July 1, 1976, states:

Australia has the largest and richest reserves of uranium in the southern hemisphere. Uranium has the potential to emerge as the major new growth sector of the Australian mining industry during the next few years. This single resource could be the economic bell-wether to lead the country out of its worst recession in 40 years, slashing unemployment in the process and restoring general prosperity and living standards. Such glowing prospects are shadowed at present by serious trade union opposition to exploiting uranium, opposition based on the genuine fear by some environmentalists of possible harmful consequences for mankind, and on a desire not to allow mining on land sacred to Aboriginals. But yesterday's release of a Government report on proposals for a $1 400 000 000 uranium processing and enrichment complex south of Port Augusta will give heart to those who believe all dangers can eventually be overcome. The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) naturally presents the new project as dependent on the results of Mr. Justice Fox's Ranger inquiry, and to A.L.P. policy. But if the preliminary Ranger report due in August gives conditional approval to development of uranium resources subject to a series of safeguards, it must be hoped that the A.L.P. and the trade unions would not seek still to block development for other reasons. It must be hoped Mr. Dunstan and his colleagues will be able to attract the necessary capital to bring their bold plans to fruition.

An article in the *Australian* of July 2, 1976, headed "$1 200 000 000 dream doesn't daunt Dunstan", states:

South Australian Premier, Don Dunstan, carefully weighed his plans to build Australia's first uranium enrichment plant against Japan's future energy needs and decided: "To the Japanese, $1 400 000 000 is a mere bagatelle! It is certainly not beyond their capacity or even daunting to them." And, obviously, neither are the gigantic hurdles of launching Australia's biggest single industrial development daunting to Mr. Dunstan, even though he is the first to admit that the final cost will be "markedly in excess" of the $1 400 000 000 his planners estimated on 1975 values. Mr. Dunstan caught other Premiers hopelessly napping on Wednesday when he released a two-year feasibility study for an enormous uranium enrichment complex at Redcliff, near Port Augusta, which would double the value of Australia's uranium exports from $500 000 000 to $1 000 000 000 a year on present prices. He does not intend to lose the advantage. Copies of the report were delivered yesterday to the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser, and the Minister for National Resources, Mr. Anthony. And today, Mr. Dunstan will make his first approaches to winning vital Federal approval and assistance when he meets the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator Cotton, in Sydney.

A.L.P. Policy

Although the Federal Government is hamstrung in formulating a long-term uranium policy until it gets the first report of the Ranger inquiry into uranium development next August, Mr. Dunstan is anxious to begin talks as soon as possible. "I don't think that opening talks have to wait until the report is presented," he says, pointing out that it is the policy of both the Government and the Labor Party that uranium mining and enrichment are both desirable and necessary for Australia unless the Ranger inquiry presents a verdict that the dangers outweigh the benefits. In fact, Mr. Dunstan is hoping that the Federal Government will take up where the former Labor Minister for National Resources, Mr. Rex Connor, left off. Mr. Dunstan said in Sydney yesterday he had discussed the plans in detail with Mr. Connor, who canvassed Japanese opinion, and found it favourable. Mr. Connor's plans were for the countries which buy Australian uranium—mainly Japan—to lend the necessary funds to the Australian Industries Assistance Commission, which would develop the enrichment project. This would ensure that the project was Australian-owned. The investing countries would be repaid in capital and in long-term supplies of enriched U235 at guaranteed and favourable prices.

Same League

"I would still prefer that all the money came through the AIDC," Mr. Dunstan said. "However, we would be ready to go along with any plan that ensured Australia had a majority and controlling interest." Mr. Dunstan is not concerned that the enrichment plant would come under Commonwealth control. His prime aim is to get Australia's first—and for a long time, only—uranium enrichment plant built in South Australia, a dream which would put his State in the same league as the mineral-rich Western Australia. At the moment, South Australia's Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr. Hugh Hudson, is on a seven-nation oversea business trip. The nuclear enrichment plant is high on his agenda.

Mr. Dunstan said he believed it would take at least four years to start work in the plant. The plans, prepared by his trade and development staff, call for an eight-year programme which, when finished, would generate income of $426 500 000 a year, employ 1 550 people and support a new township of 5 000 people—

and so it goes on, to July 2, 1976, when we see in the *News*:

It would indeed be a coup. What a tremendously exciting prospect for South Australia—a possible massive uranium enrichment plant—

and it finishes up with:

There are such enormous benefits in prospect for South Australia that Mr. Dunstan deserves all the backing he can get to attract the project here.

Let us go further:

Opposition support for uranium plant.

The *Australian* states, "Dunstan trying to enrich his State", and it concludes:

Western Australia and Queensland are the other two States in the running for an enrichment plant, and Mr. Dunstan is well aware of this. So his move in going out and trying to get oversea finance for a South Australian plant has put his State ahead of its rivals in the race. Full marks to Mr. Dunstan.

Gradually, we come to some sort of changes that took place and on July 28, 1976, we read:

It would be at least two years before any decision could be made on building a uranium enrichment plant in South Australia, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) told the Assembly yesterday.

Again, on July 28, we read:

Financing a $1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff would not be a problem if the Federal Government gave the "all clear", Mr. Hudson said yesterday.

So the Minister of Mines and Energy was still a little bit on-side. Then on October 2, 1976, Peter Ward writes:

A dilemma for Dunstan. Whenever it comes out, the Ranger uranium report is going to cause the Dunstan Government, the South Australian A.L.P., and Don Dunstan himself considerable trouble. The Dunstan Government is locked into a policy that requires major industrial development in the Mid-North of the State adjacent to what is known as the "iron triangle", that is, the three industrial cities of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie. The prime industrial site is at Redcliff, between Port Pirie and Port Augusta, on the Spencer Gulf, and for its general area there are three possibilities, a new $100 000 000 power station, a petro-chemical works and a uranium enrichment plant.

The power station is an essential development if projected electricity consumption in the 1980's is to be met, while both the uranium enrichment plant and the petro-chemical works are regarded as "goers" by the State's industrial development authorities given the right conditions. One of the right conditions for a petro-chemical works at Redcliff occurred yesterday when it was announced that significant additional natural gas reserves had been found in the State's Far North and that the Redcliff petro-chemical project was being re-examined in the light of the improved economics of the project. But it is the $1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment deal that Dunstan would now most like to see established in the area to strengthen the State's economy overall.

The problem is that both projects have been opposed within the State A.L.P. on environmental grounds, and in respect of uranium enrichment, the issue is regarded by senior Party members as "tense, sensitive and potentially explosive". At the moment, Premier Dunstan says that the State's policy will be determined by the Ranger inquiry report. He is bound by a resolution passed at the last State A.L.P. convention in which "all levels of the A.L.P." oppose the "mining, treatment and export of uranium and its by-products" until an independent public inquiry

can show that waste disposal and transport of material can be "clearly established and guaranteed" to be safe. In this, the Ranger report may give him the out.

He is on record as saying that environmentally a uranium enrichment plant would cause South Australia less trouble than a small Adelaide chemical works run by I.C.I. and tends to regard hard-line environmentalists as irrational "doom watchers". But senior members of his Party do not, and so the Ranger inquiry report when it does arrive can be expected to blow quite a number of industrial whistles in South Australia's Mid-North.

The final statement is on October 29:

Cabinet split over findings. The Ranger inquiry findings will create a deep division in the South Australian Cabinet—

and most assuredly it did. We go to a Labor banning of uranium mining, and the *News* carries an editorial "Short-sighted decision". It states:

The State Government's sudden about face on uranium mining and treatment—and there can be no doubt it is a complete policy switch—could have serious repercussions. . . . Mr. Dunstan himself obviously played the major role in getting the new policy adopted. He has shifted his ground and persuaded most of his colleagues to do likewise.

Then we see:

Dunstan's dilemma—or the bonanza that didn't begin.

There is another heading:

Labor says "No" to uranium mining.

That was at the Perth A.L.P. convention. Out of this press record, which is a condensed but accurate account of the obvious victory for the Left influence in the A.L.P., several important points emerge. The expenditure on the feasibility studies and the cost of oversea trips, must rank close to the loss of $20 000 000 spent on the dream of Monarto. The loss of face of Mr. Hudson with his contacts overseas, must also be personally embarrassing to him. Up to July, 1976, no criticism can be levelled at the way the Government handled this question. Following through the press story, in July, 1976, suddenly all was lost. What can an intelligent, political pragmatist like Hugh Hudson be thinking? Or does he still cherish the hope that after the next election policies will change again? What can the enthusiastic former Minister of Mines, Don Hopgood, be thinking? Perhaps he, too, shares the same hopes as the Hon. Hugh Hudson, or do they know that on this issue the A.L.P. faces the ultimate issue that could split the A.L.P. down the middle?

Let me for a moment put aside the sad record that I have detailed so far. Let me forget the views of Connor a couple of years ago; let me forget the views of Hudson; let me forget the views of Hopgood; let me forget the views of the Premier, because he is no longer in control of his own destiny on this question. Let us look at the facts. Australia has been selling uranium to oversea clients for many years. These sales have been approved by Governments of both political colours in Canberra.

The Atomic Energy Commission, Lucas Heights, has a stockpile of uranium oxide for its own purposes. Mary Kathleen has been unable to maintain the contracts for oversea sales, the shortfall being made up by drawing on the Lucas Heights stockpile. By 1979, that stockpile will be exhausted. To maintain our existing contracts and to maintain a reasonable stockpile at Lucas Heights, there is a need to develop, as soon as possible, a new uranium source in Australia. The second fact is that to supply the world's growing demands for power, to maintain the existing standards of living, and to ensure a rising standing in the emerging countries, the world must look to new sources of energy. The only economic source for the supply of that energy is nuclear power. Nothing we do in Australia will alter that fact. Whether we mine uranium or not has no bearing on the certainty of what I have said. Already, reactors are operating in many countries. I will not refer to them all but there is a great list.

Indeed, at the end of 1976, 168 reactors were operating in the world, generating 73 000 000 000 kilowatts. At present, in planning, 345 reactors will be operating by 1980, generating 220 000 000 000 kilowatts of energy. Compare that with a total generator capacity of South Australia of 1 500 000 000 kilowatts; 200 times the total generating power of South Australia will be generated in the world by nuclear reactors by 1980. This State is in the box seat. We can mine uranium with a technique that is the most acceptable means to environmentalists and conservationists around the world. The spin-off from the mining and enrichment to South Australian industry is quite phenomenal. An expert to whom I spoke recently told me that, when a uranium enrichment plan was established in South Australia, it would create 15 000 jobs in South Australia. That was the opinion of someone who knows about what he is speaking.

The return to the State Treasury in mineral royalties would multiply our present royalties by at least five times. If this State adopts a "leave it in the ground policy", South Australia will continue its industrial decline, whereas the Northern Territory may well be a viable State and South Australia steadily declines to Territory status. About half the Labor Party knows that what I am saying is factual and accurate. The other half continue to bury their heads in the ground and refuse to face reality. Further, if South Australia is the first cab off the rank in the mining and enrichment of uranium, all the work that has been done in establishing the Amdel Mineral Foundation will grow and develop. Let us be extremely proud of the work that has been done over the years in this State by Amdel. We are indeed fortunate to have that organisation in South Australia. If we do not take our opportunities, we will be losing not only an industry that will eventually be the largest industry in Australia but also the lead we have in mineral research through Amdel. That organisation will not stay in this State if we do not gain this industry.

The stakes are high, and this State must be ready to compete and win. We can win. We were in front in 1976. At present, however, we have no hope with the attitude of the Government. If we, on receiving the Fox report when His Honour Mr. Justice Fox returns from overseas, adopt a policy with all the safeguards required by the Australian Labor Party when Mr. Connor was Minister, and the uranium industry in this State proceeds, we will have absolutely no hope here of being able to achieve anything in the industry. This State has nothing to do with the determination of foreign policies. Criticisms are often made regarding Mr. Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland, it being said that he interferes in international affairs. That is exactly what we are doing here.

I am not advocating our moving ahead without the necessary safeguards being provided. However, those safeguards will be achieved, because, whether or not honourable members in this Council want it, the world is going to move into the nuclear generation age. If the Commonwealth Government, after a full inquiry, seeks the development of uranium, under safeguards which have been established and which may be identical to those suggested by Mr. Connor, what hope will this State with its present policy have of achieving any development? The answer is simple: none!

How long will it be before the realists in the Australian Labor Party bear the stupidities of the policies that they are being forced to follow in order to retain their seat in Parliament or their executive roles? The Government demands that a certain sum of money be spent each year on the search for uranium; otherwise, the licences will be withdrawn. The people concerned are, at the Government's direction, spending much money searching for uranium. However, when they find uranium, they are told that they must leave it in the ground. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I, too, support the motion. I take this opportunity of reaffirming my allegiance to Her Majesty the Queen. I thank His Excellency for his Speech and, as did the Hon. Mr. DeGaris and the Hon. Mr. Foster, I join with His Excellency in expressing regret that Sir Douglas Nicholls' time among us was foreshortened. I also join in expressing hope that Sir Douglas and Lady Nicholls will have a long and happy retirement. I join with other honourable members in expressing sympathy to the families of the former members of Parliament who died during the last session, namely, Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Tom Stott, Mr. Clarke, and Mr. Shannon.

I wish to address a few remarks to the Council about metropolitan transport. An efficient, well-planned metropolitan transport service is obviously necessary in any major city, particularly a city like Adelaide, which is not only the political capital but also the commercial and industrial capital, and very much the largest city in the State, housing as it does 75 per cent of the State's population. An effective transport system is obviously necessary just for sheer convenience and the need to move around. Such a system is essential to enable employees and others in the work force to get to their place of work, to transport goods, and to allow access to retail outlets. These things are obvious, although it is sometimes overlooked that a public transport system is just as essential to allow access to education, health and welfare services, whether supplied by the public or private sectors. These facilities are necessary and properly decentralised, although it is obviously not possible to provide such services within the easy walking distance of everyone. Also, we are told that an effective public transport system is necessary in order to preserve the supplies of fossil fuel and to avoid excessive air pollution.

Let us examine the policies and performance, or lack of it, of this Government in the field of public transport. I was recently at a meeting where the provision of child minding services, and in particular access to them, was being discussed. I said that an adequate transport service would largely solve the problem, in reply to which there was a loud interjection from the back of the hall. Although this was a meeting of ladies, the loudness of the interjection would have put the efforts of some honourable members in this place to shame. The interjection was, "What public transport system?"

One important aspect of any metropolitan transport plan is obviously the final access to the centre of the city without causing congestion. In 1969-70, a Liberal Government first put forward as a definite proposal an underground railway link. This was taken up by the Labor Government on July 24, 1973. The Director-General of Transport said he hoped that work on an underground railway line could start in about three years. On October 4, 1973, it was stated that tunnel work on the underground railway link beneath Adelaide was expected to start in 1976. This was part of a five-year plan to improve the transport system. Another part of the plan was the electrification of the suburban rail system. On June 26, 1975, Mr. Virgo announced that the Government had let a contract for geological and groundwater studies associated with the railway link. The link was part of the Scrafton report, which Mr. Virgo said on October 4, 1975, he would follow slavishly, subject to the availability of funds. It is no good Mr. Virgo repeating the parrot cry, as he did last Friday, that the whole problem is that the "dreadful Fraser Government" will not give his Government any funds.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. Foster, will you please moderate your voice a little? I can hear you above the voice of the honourable member who is speaking.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: During a considerable part of the period to which I have referred a Labor Government was in office in the Commonwealth Parliament. In this matter of the underground rail link, the Government has sounded off. It has made promises and has received the plaudits of the press and the public, but it has done absolutely nothing definite and constructive.

I will deal now with another aspect of city transport. The 1975 policy speech of the Government promised an east-west Bee-line service in the city, yet two years later, on April 12, 1977, Mr. Virgo stated in Parliament, as reported in *Hansard* at page 3301, that the Bee-line bus service could not be extended from the railway station to the Royal Adelaide Hospital without adverse effect on the present standard of service. Well, what will happen to this promise? I suppose it will just go into the next election policy speech and still not be carried out if the present Government wins the election.

I need only refer in passing to the monumental debacle of dial-a-bus. We are all only too familiar with the details of that. In order to make a public transport system serve the public, the fare system must, of course, be reasonable and sensible. On March 5, 1973, Mr. Virgo, following the success of bus-tram transfer tickets, stated:

> The next step will be to extend the transfer ticket scheme to the South Australian Railways so that passengers can transfer back and forward between the South Australian Railways and Municipal Tramways Trust services.

This has not been done. On May 4, 1973, and on October 22, 1973, Mr. Virgo said that the old concept of fare charges was out of date and should be abolished, and he stated that he would like to see one fare for the whole metropolitan area. I certainly agree with what he said four years ago, namely, that the old concept of fare charges was out of date and should be restructured, but when will he do it? Perhaps he will do it after the next election, if his Government wins office. In the 1973 policy speech of the Government, this was stated:

> We will undertake the introduction of express routes using reserved bus lanes to suburbs such as Ingle Farm, Grange and West Lakes.

It is now 1977, and the only signs of reserved express bus lanes are those on a short section of Botanic Road. On August 29, 1974, we were told that a 12-mile route was planned for a new bus service circling Adelaide that would begin operating by October next year. On May 19, 1976, Mr. Virgo repeated that statement, but still nothing has been done. This process of making repeated promises and doing nothing about them demonstrates insincerity and, to use a word commonly uttered in this Council, it is appalling.

On July 27, 1973, Mr. Virgo said that double decker electric trains could be operating on the Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by July, 1975. They would

be introduced in a $22 700 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway service. This has not been done, and we must remember that a Labor Government was in office in Canberra at that time. On July 2, 1975, the Premier said that it was hoped to have the first electric train running in 1977. Well, there is not much of 1977 left.

Mr. Virgo's hover train, predicted on May 27, 1971, seems a long way off. An even more patent flight of fancy on the part of the Minister was his prediction on September 19, 1975, of "Project Peregrine" an improved railway line to Murray Bridge. This was to allow speeds of 160 km/h, the speed at which a peregrine falcon can attain during diving. I think citizens of South Australia would be much more satisfied if Mr. Virgo would do something practical about satisfactory transport in the north-eastern suburbs, and if he would do it now.

This is an appalling record of promising everything and giving nothing. The worst aspect of it is that the people who suffer most are the aged, the sick, the handicapped, and the economically disadvantaged. I have concentrated on metropolitan transport, but country transport is, of course, equally important and it is equally neglected by the Government. I hope that other speakers in this debate may deal with the Government's record in the field of country public transport.

The road tax is most inequitable, particularly because many people evade it and impose a burden in added cost on people in country areas. The Government ought to face up to its responsibilities in the field of country bus passenger services. This applies particularly in towns not served by rail. The obvious answer is an adequate scheme of subsidising bus operators. Once again, it is the aged, the sick, the disabled, and the economically disadvantaged who suffer most from the Government's lack of concern.

It is a short step from the transport problem to the question of compulsory acquisition. I say this as an example, because after years of neglect, the only solutions to the transport problems in, say, the north-eastern suburbs will involve extensive compulsory acquisition of land. Whether the solution ultimately adopted involves express bus routes, an additional highway, light rail, or one of Mr. Virgo's fancy gadgets, extensive compulsory acquisition will be necessary. I have spoken several times before about this Government's administration of compulsory acquisition procedures but I make no apology for doing so again, because the Government has done absolutely nothing in the meantime to change its tactics. The first thing the Government must remember is that in most such cases the owner has not asked to have his assets acquired and has not wanted to have them acquired. He would have much preferred to say as he was. Somewhere in the system of assessing the compensation to be paid to him, this must be considered.

It must be acknowledged that compensation is not only the value of the thing acquired, but compensation because it is taken away. All political Parties, as far as I am aware, including the Communist Party, acknowledge the right of private property. All political Parties, including the extreme exponents of the doctrine of *laissez faire,* acknowledge that it is sometimes necessary, in the public interest, compulsorily to acquire land. I think that this Government is far too quick in acquiring land compulsorily, and I consider that the power of compulsory acquisition ought to be restricted in general to the acquisition of land for public utilities.

Further, it ought to be made a requirement that the Government, within a reasonable time, use the land for the purposes for which it was acquired. There will be more cases where it is necessary to acquire land compulsorily for other purposes, but in such cases much restraint should be shown. This Government has used its powers of compulsory acquisition oppressively and without any consideration for the persons whose land has been acquired. The Flinders Medical Centre acquisition was a prize example. A letter was sent by the Government to the people whose land was to be acquired, telling them of this fact, but the letter did not constitute a notice of intention under the Act.

One person whose land was acquired had, in the meantime in the course of his occupation, to move to Melbourne. He tried to sell his house but was told by agents that it was virtually unsaleable because of the letter. On the other hand, there was no procedure that he could put in train to obtain compensation. In my opinion, where owners receive such a letter or where an announcement has been made by the Government of a scheme that will necessarily involve compulsory acquisition, this letter or announcement ought to be deemed to be a notice of intention and persons in that position should be able to insist that the Government forthwith acquire the property at a proper compensation.

When there is a compulsory acquisition the Government is always in a position of strength, and the owner of property is usually in a position of weakness. This Government mercilessly exploits that situation. It seems that the officers who conduct the negotiations on the part of the Government are instructed to acquire the land at the cheapest possible prices. I have spoken to many people involved in the Monarto and Flinders Medical Centre acquisitions, and they complained about the rudeness on the part of the officers conducting the Government's negotiations.

These people were told that they had better accept the amounts offered. They were told that, if they went to court, they would have to pay costs and would not get as much as they had been offered, anyway. The Government must stop this situation from continuing by administrative action. Public servants negotiating compensation figures should be instructed to deal courteously and sympathetically with people who did not want their land or other assets to be acquired.

I believe the Government should go further than that and establish an administrative body to act as negotiator between the Government and the citizen in cases involving compulsory acquisition. This procedure should not deprive the person involved of his or her right to have his compensation assessed by the court if that is sought. The Land Acquisition Act requires compensation to take into account the value of the assets to be acquired, the disturbance, the severance and the injurious effect. However, disturbance has been narrowly interpreted by the Government and is usually confined to removal costs and stamp duty to purchase a property of similar value.

I know of cases where, in respect of the property acquired, the owner has borrowed funds to purchase the land in the first place on favourable terms. However, on acquisition it is impossible to borrow money on such favourable terms again in regard to interest and repayment. The Government's negotiators have, in fact, refused to take this into account in assessing disturbance or any other form of compensation. I believe the Act should be amended to spell out loudly and clearly that all genuine financial loss occasioned by the acquisition should be made good to the owner.

It is strongly arguable that this is so under the existing Act under the heading of "disturbance" but, in view of the present position to which I have referred, namely, that most owners do not want to go to court and are bludgeoned into accepting whatever they are offered, it is necessary to spell these matters out clearly in the Act. Also, it should be made clear that the cost of re-establishment in a site of similar utility ought to be taken into account.

Finally, I wish to say something about law and order. I believe the reports in the press indicate a real breakdown in law and order in our society. The Library Research Service has given me figures on violent crime in the various categories from 1971-72 to 1975-76.

These figures were supplied by the Attorney-General's Department, I understand with the Attorney's approval. I am indebted to the Attorney for those figures. I did specifically ask for more recent figures, but was told that such figures were not available. I understand that the Government also stated recently in another place that these figures were unavailable. That is a pity, and I hope that the Government does not in the next few weeks magically produce the current figures and claim that they support the existence of a lower crime rate.

The figures from 1971-72 to 1975-76 inclusive indicate a general total increase in the occurrence of violent crime. Apart from the crime of rape, the percentage of reported offences does not vary markedly either way from the South Australian mean population as a percentage of the Australian mean population. I do not think that that makes the position any better. We would expect that vice and violence which owe a good deal to oversea influence would increase in the eastern States before they would increase here. The reported offences of rape have increased dramatically during the period mentioned and, with the exception of one year, the cases of reported rape have exceeded substantially the South Australian mean population as a percentage of the Australian mean population. It has been stated by the Attorney-General, and it has been stated in this Council, that one reason for the increase in reported rape has been the changed attitude of society, and the fact that procedures have been made for reasonable and humane treatment for rape victims.

I am sure that this is part of the reason for the dramatic increase in the reported number of crimes of rape. However, whether this is the whole explanation, no-one can say, because there can be no way of producing satisfactory statistics. However, unlike the Attorney, I am satisfied that there has been a substantial increase in the crime of rape in South Australia as well as in reports of rape in this State.

The Hon. Anne Levy: How can you say that when you have just said that no-one can say that?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have said that statistically no-one can know what the position is, but the Attorney has said that he believed there was not an increase in crimes of rape, and I believe the honourable member said something similar, and I am merely expressing my view on this matter.

The Hon. Anne Levy: With no proof.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the absence of statistics and in view of the fact that there has been a dramatic increase in reported rape, I believe there has been an increase in the crime of rape and its incidence in South Australia. I have said that I am sure that explanations given by the Hon. Anne Levy and by the Attorney are part of the general explanation, but I do not believe they give the whole explanation. The higher percentage of rape in South Australia compared with the whole of Australia may also be partly due to more humane treatment of rape victims, and a more enlightened approach, but I do not believe that that has applied for the whole of the period. I doubt whether the statistics tell the whole story.

I believe that press reports show accurately that there has been an increase in grossly violent crime. The statistics lump violent and other crimes together. If the press has given an accurate picture, and I think it has, then there has been a substantial increase in really violent and vicious crime. In this area I do not believe the press has had any motive to paint a picture which is not accurate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If there was an increase in violent crime, an increase in rape would fit in as part of that.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: True. Million dollar arsons and bombings of massive proportion are matters which have generally been foreign to us in South Australia, as have been bashings of old men to rob them of a few cents. Indeed, I am sure it is much less safe to walk through the streets at night now than it used to be.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is rubbish, bloody rubbish.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member can say that it is rubbish, but I doubt that many people in Adelaide will agree with him. I have been told often by many people that they are afraid to walk through streets in the late periods of the evening. If the honourable member honestly believes what he said, and I doubt that he does, then I do not know what is his source of information. I believe that there are many people in the community who disagree with the honourable member if he believes it is now safer to walk through the streets in the early morning hours than it was five, 10, 15 or 20 years ago.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I walk in streets now that I would not have walked in 20 years ago.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member must be an exception, although I suppose it depends on the streets.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the honourable member give way?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will not do that as you, Mr. President, pointed out that the rule does not apply in this instance. The Leader of the Opposition in another place rightly drew attention in the media to the issue of law and order in our society.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: More people are murdered in the country per head of population than in the cities. Do your own work on that. There were 11 killed in Kangarilla in 1972 in one hit.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Attorney-General and the Premier said that sentences were matters for the courts, that the Government should make no statement in this connection, and that the maximum penalties were adequate. Indeed, with some exceptions, that is true. I strongly believe in the separation of the three functions of Government, but I suppose the most fundamental task of the Executive Government is to preserve law and order, without which society could not function. On April 12, 1977, the member for Hanson in the House of Assembly asked a question on notice about the removal of police files by the Attorney-General's Department. The Minister of Community Welfare replied (*Hansard*, page 3294):

The Attorney-General and the Legal Services Department consider many police files, reports and dockets every week. The Attorney-General, as senior law officer of the Government, has general responsibility for all Government and Crown litigation, and with respect to criminal proceedings it is he who is responsible for the enforcement of the criminal law in the courts.

It is the function of the Executive Government, the Attorney-General, and the Premier to ensure that law and order is preserved in the community. Where there is a breakdown of law and order, the Premier, the Attorney-General and the Government should express their concern and acknowledge their responsibility. I support the motion.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am pleased to take this opportunity to applaud the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech. I have no doubt that the State Labor Government, under the leadership of Australia's most intelligent and outstanding politician, Don Dunstan, will continue to be as vital and progressive as it has been in the past seven years. At the same time, it will exhibit the common sense and flexibility that it always has in managing the affairs of this State.

This is the last session of the present Parliament before a State election, and it is an ideal time to present a balance sheet. I make no apology if my contribution is regarded as a political performance. As a practising politician, I believe that this is an entirely reasonable and legitimate exercise. I submit that, given South Australia's lack of natural resources and the vulnerability of our manufacturing industries, a vulnerability built in by the myopia and lack of planning in the 1950's and early 1960's, we are surviving the severe economic recession very well indeed in this State. To date, the Dunstan Government has been able to insulate South Australia to a significant extent from the effects of the economic madness of the Fraser Government. Naturally, this is a time when people are looking for stability and realism in South Australian politics. Regrettably, it has become a time when the Opposition, in its desperation, has embarked on an unprecedented campaign of knocking its own State. Where are the positive policies of the Opposition, the people supposed to be the alternative Government of this State? If they have any, they apparently lie buried under a pile of misrepresentations, distortion and untruths designed to denigrate the Dunstan Government at all times and at any cost. The morbid oratory of the Liberal Party and its supporters is designed to discredit South Australia and South Australians, regardless of the consequences.

Politics are not for the naive or the thin-skinned. But there are ethical limits beyond which no decent politician can go without deserving the contempt of the electorate. I submit that some members of the Opposition have gone well beyond those limits. Their frantic efforts to grab for office have completely destroyed their credibility. Their antics are becoming more and more like a children's pantomime. It is interesting to examine how this pantomime operates. The director is the Liberal Party's chief executive officer in South Australia, a man know without affection among local journalists as "Squizzie" Taylor. The producer is the Hon. Martin Cameron. "Martin the Maverick" has come in from the cold to play a latterday Machiavelli. The choreographer is the Hon. Murray Hill, who in his policy pronouncements seems uncertain where the music or the money is coming from.

Between them, these honourable members have produced "the supergoose show", starring Mr. Tonkin. The supporting cast includes the member for Davenport and the member for Fisher, playing "Dirty Dean" and "Slippery Stan" respectively. They keep up a continuous flow of funny business, more in the tradition of W. C. Fields and Charlie Chaplin than Norman Gunston. This is even more tragic coming at a time when the electorate, especially the under 20's, desperately needs to regain its self-esteem and confidence.

The figures for youth unemployment in Australia are devastating. The latest available Australian Bureau of Statistics quarterly population survey shows that in May, 1977, 15·5 per cent of the labour force aged 15 to 19 years was unemployed compared with 12·1 per cent a year earlier. The number of unemployed persons aged 15 to 17 years still looking for their first job totalled 36 000 in May, 1977—51·2 per cent above the overall level a year earlier. A total of 36 000 young people in Australia in 1977 have never had any work experience since leaving school. What a shamefully demoralising and debilitating effect this must have on the youth of this nation. It would be unbearable, even if there was conclusive evidence that inflation was being dramatically controlled. With clear evidence that it is not, the policies are abominable.

And what is the response of the Federal Government to these sorts of figures? Senator Guilfoyle in the Adelaide *News* of July 6, under the headline "Three out of four on the dole are single", said ". . . The survey proved that it was not families that were being hard hit by unemployment." Where does Senator Guilfoyle think the unemployed youth of this country come from? Does she think they just appeared from under cabbages? Of course, she does not. She knows as well as the rest of us that their plight is causing untold suffering and distress not only to themselves but also to their parents, parents who have educated their children for 10, 12 or even 15 years to see them go directly on to social security payments. What do her Liberal colleagues in the State Parliament think of the Federal Government's approach? Their attitude is clear. It has been recorded publicly time after time in the past 18 months. It has been recorded time after time in this Council. They have consistently applauded the economic policies of the Federal Government. Even when it is clear that these policies will hurt South Australia and South Australians very badly, they continue to clap and cheer. Among members of the Liberal Party, it has become an infectious disease.

The truth is, of course, that the South Australian Opposition has become a professional Opposition. Until it can enlist more men and women of imagination and ability into its Parliamentary ranks, it will stay on the Opposition benches. The Opposition lost its two most talented members during the great split, and it lost them at a time when the South Australian Parliamentary Labor Party was continuing to attract people of a very high calibre. Let us examine some aspects of Government in South Australia between 1970 and 1977. The quality of life for all citizens, whether they live in the city or the country towns, has been greatly enriched. Regrettably, standards of living for several sectors of rural industry have continued to fall. But let us make no mistake about where the blame for this lies.

Only the Federal Government can take the initiatives so necessary for the survival of the farm sector. In the 20 months that it has been in office, the Fraser-Anthony Government has shown scant concern for the average primary producer. The restored superphosphate bounty was, in fact, an act of positive discrimination in favour of the large producer and against the small. They are trying to play a whole new ball game in the farming community with yesterday's rules. The Country Party is so blinded by the alleged El Dorado of minerals and mining that it has forgotten its traditional supporters.

Yet every expansion in the mining field strengthens the dollar through minerals export and places the farming community at a further disadvantage.

To the extent that it is able to do so the State Government has attempted to help both the farm and non-farm sections of our rural community. The Department of Agriculture, under an excellent Minister, has continued to move its emphasis to marketing. In areas of direct responsibility, especially co-operative systems, it has given help both in cash and in kind. Regionalisation of most State Government departments has given people all over the State ready access to Government services. The Festival Centre is acclaimed throughout the world. Regional cultural and arts centres have recently been announced for Whyalla, the Riverland and Mount Gambier. The trustees are already nominated and the funds are available.

Why do we enjoy this most favoured status? The answer to this is that the members of the State Cabinet are competent administrators as well as excellent innovators. I have stated time and time again in this place that good administration is the key to good State government. This Government is seen by the electorate to be competent. I do not intend to go on at great length about all the areas of competence but let me examine some of the more outstanding examples. First, there is the Trade and Development Division of the Premier's Department, which incorporates the South Australian Industries Development Corporation. The Parliamentary "watchdog" for the corporation is the Industries Development Committee. I have had the good fortune to be a member of this committee for the past two years. I am therefore in a position to know the sort of assistance that has been given over this period. Quite clearly, it would be out of order for me to give any details of our decisions. However, in general terms much of the work, surprisingly, has continued to be of an expansionary nature. Some of it, understandably in the present economic climate, has involved restructuring capital arrangements. A great deal of this work has subsequently been made public by the Premier and the Government. It has done an enormous amount of good work in obtaining and preserving industry in this State.

Some of this work, where what might be called rescue operations were involved, was quite rightly and necessarily confidential. Nothing can destroy a company with some liquidity problems more rapidly than for these problems to become a matter of public controversy. Yet on several occasions the member for Davenport (who, I am pleased to say, is not a member of the committee) has publicly, completely unethically and for cynical political purposes, criticised the work of the corporation and the committee on the basis of confidential information to which he had no legitimate right. Dirty Dean at work again! On the matter of State taxes we have had public debate in this Chamber and elsewhere for the last two years. One of the lies propagated by the Liberal machine is that we have the highest State taxes in Australia. Many different sets of statistics have been bandied about to try and give some verification of this. The final upshot has been a recent admission on *This Day Tonight* by Mr. Tonkin that our taxes are certainly lower than those in Victoria and New South Wales. Supergoose in full flight!

South Australia currently enjoys the most liberal and humane workmen's compensation in Australia, but consistently the Opposition continues to knock it. The conditions of compensation have allegedly pushed workmen's compensation premiums so high that no employer would consider setting up in South Australia—the great knockers putting down their own State and their fellow South Australians once again. But even a cursory examination of the latest figures available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Bulletin 5.16, released on June 6, 1977, shows that again the Opposition is wrong. These statistics are the latest reliable figures for workers' compensation comparisons State by State. The figures given for South Australia include the small Northern Territory sector. A summary of the figures is as follows:

1. The total value of workmen's compensation claims increased in South Australia/Northern Territory by 60·3 per cent between 1973-74 and 1975-76. This was the third lowest increase of all the States (after Tasmania and Queensland) and below the average Australian increase.

2. The total value of workmen's compensation premiums increased by 111·2 per cent in South Australia/Northern Territory for the two-year period 1973-74 to 1975-76. This again was the third lowest of all the States (after Tasmania and Queensland) and well below the average Australian increase.

3. While claims increased by 60·3 per cent to $45 600 000 in South Australia/Northern Territory premiums rose by 111·2 per cent to $72 300 000. Similarly for Australia claims rose by 63·3 per cent but premiums by 150·1 per cent and premiums exceeded claims by nearly $373 000 000. Perhaps the Opposition should examine these figures with their friends in the private insurance companies.

4. On a value of claims per worker basis South Australia/Northern Territory was third lowest of all the States and 22 per cent below the Australian average. So where are the gross abuses that the Opposition claims continuously occur? It is another one of the distortions of our opponents, a distortion deliberately propagated against working class people in their own State, a deliberate misrepresentation of the position for the same cynical political purposes. Mr. Dean Brown stands completely discredited by these figures, but loss of credibility is a prerequisite for the cast of the "Supergoose show".

5. Finally, on a premium/worker basis South Australia/Northern Territory was third lowest of all the States and 25 per cent below the Australian average.

I seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* the detailed statistics in support of these figures without my reading them.

The PRESIDENT: Are they statistics to support what you have been saying?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which figures are they?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You're too late. Leave has been granted.

The PRESIDENT: Leave has been granted.

WORKER'S COMPENSATION STATISTICS, 1975-76

Released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics on June 6, 1977

CLAIMS ($'000)

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	127 333	184 894	251 925
Victoria	103 308	147 312	180 044
Queensland	71 034	67 635	48 335
South Australia and Northern Territory	28 488	49 272	45 658
Western Australia	17 770	37 197	45 517
Tasmania	5 905	7 833	6 278
Australia	353 838	494 143	577 752

N.B.—excludes workers' compensation insurance in coal industry.

The percentage increases in value of claims from 1973-74 to 1975-76 were (in order):

	Per cent Declined
1. Queensland	+ 6·3
2. Tasmania	+ 60·3
3. South Australia and Northern Territory	+ 74·3
4. Victoria	+ 97·8
5. New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	+156·1
6. Western Australia	

N.B.—Victoria and New South Wales/Australian Capital Territory main competitors for South Australian manufacturing firms.

The Australian increase was 63·3 per cent, that is South Australia was third best and better than the Australian average.

PREMIUMS ($'000)

	1973-74	1974-75	1975-76
New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	145 446	204 705	357 981
Victoria	122 339	192 567	366 243
Queensland	48 489	79 448	97 835
South Australia and Northern Territory	34 246	63 125	72 347
Western Australia	20 883	31 512	45 627
Tasmania	8 799	9 308	10 708
Australia	380 201	580 666	950 740

N.B.—excludes workers' compensation insurance in coal industry.

The percentage increases in value of premiums from 1973-74 to 1975-76 were (in order):

	Per cent
1. Tasmania	+ 21·7
2. Queensland	+101·8
3. South Australia and Northern Territory	+111·2
4. Western Australia	+118·5
5. New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	+146·1
6. Victoria	+199·4

The Australian increase was 150·1 per cent, that is, South Australia was third best and well below the Australian average.

CLAIMS AND PREMIUMS PER WORKER

I have attempted to calculate a per worker figure since the statistics do not record how many are covered nor do they allow comparisons of rates in each State by occupation. Because of the uncertainty of who is insured, I calculated the numbers in each State in May, 1976, who were: (*a*) in the labour force, (*b*) civilian employee, and removed from these the number employed in coal mining.

CLAIMS/WORKER, 1975-76

	Labour Force $	Civilian Employee $
New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	117·6	142·7
Victoria	113·2	137·0
Queensland	60·6	77·9
South Australia and Northern Territory	77·1	95·1
Western Australia	90·5	117·9
Tasmania	38·0	46·5
Australia	99·8	122·3

In both cases, South Australia was third lowest and 22 per cent below the Australian average.

PREMIUMS/WORKER, 1975-76

	Labour Force $	Civilian Employee $
New South Wales and Australian Capital Territory	167·2	202·8
Victoria	203·2	278·7
Queensland	122·6	157·8
South Australia and Northern Territory	122·2	150·7
Western Australia	90·7	115·2
Tasmania	64·9	79·3
Australia	164·2	201·3

In both cases again, South Australia was third lowest and 25 per cent below the Australian average.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Let me turn to the State unemployment relief scheme. Partly because of this scheme and partly because of the good management to which I have previously referred, South Australia has the lowest unemployment rate in Australia. It is still far too high, but that is because of the fiscal and monetary policies of the Federal Government. The State Government remains firmly committed to a policy of full employment. But what is the attitude of our political opponents to the unemployment relief scheme? Have they supported the State Government in its pleas to their Federal colleagues for some funds for unemployment relief? Have they acknowledged that the funds are being used by local government for very useful purposes? Of course they have not. The super knockers would make the unemployment relief scheme one of the first priorities for the axe in what the Hon. Mr. Hill euphemistically calls a reallocation of priorities. Mr. Tonkin, on ABC radio on June 10, described the latest announcement of a further $13 500 000 for unemployment relief as useless. Again, the supergoose show! The Land Commission, unique to this State, has kept the price of building blocks the lowest in Australia. However, it is written off by the Opposition as some sort of socialist plot. Ocker the knocker is still alive and well in the Liberal Party—

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Who wrote this rubbish?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: —and it sounds as though he is interjecting now. Their extravagant claims that domestic building costs are the highest in Australia simply cannot be substantiated by any valid statistics, and they do not deserve discussion. Let me now turn to law and order. The recent Royal Commission into the juvenile court system in South Australia, while making many useful suggestions regarding ways in which the system could be improved, substantially vindicated the policies that have been followed in recent years. It is interesting to note that the rate of recidivism under the juvenile aid panels is a low 12 per cent. Yet, given this sort of evidence, the Opposition is still trying to paint a picture of hordes of young hoodlums roaming the streets in ever increasing numbers robbing, raping and pillaging.

A recent book *Delinquency in Australia, a Critical Appraisal*, edited by wellknown sociologist and criminologist Paul Wilson of the Queensland University and published by the University of Queensland Press, should be required reading for our conservative friends opposite. In the final chapter, the author summarises the current thinking of realistic and humane workers in this field, as follows:

Clearly, delinquency means different things to different individuals, and it means different things to different groups. This book has attempted to bring together a critical analysis of both research and practice in the delinquency field. Despite the clear exposition of the many erroneous assumptions surrounding delinquency in Australia that most of the authors make, it is possible that both policymakers

and academics will continue to perpetuate these assumptions. To begin with, there is no reliable evidence to indicate that the rate of delinquency is increasing. As Martin Wolfgang has admirably put it, "The public image of a vicious, violent juvenile population producing a seemingly steady increase in violent crime is not substantiated by the evidence available . . . It is only the incautious observer who is willing to assert that youth crime is worse today than a generation or even a decade ago." Yet, given this evidence, politicians still assert that delinquency is increasing at a staggering rate.

I turn now to the transcript of the *This Day Tonight* programme that dealt with crime. Mr. Clive Hale said:

So, has the Opposition Leader found an election issue in law and order? Is Adelaide slowly sinking into a morass of sordid criminality while the rest of Australia holds its nose? Well let's look at the facts with David Ransom.

In reply, David Ransom said:

Well, whatever you may believe, South Australia is not in the midst of an unprecedented crime wave. According to the most recent figures available today from the police, there are five areas of violent crime which actually show a decrease. They are assault and robbery, down from 63 to 50; larceny from a person, not much change, but well down from 1975-76; murder and attempted murder, a slight decrease; indecent assault on a female, substantially down from 151 to 148; and indecent interference with a female, a marked drop from 106 to 83. Although the figures are to June 30 last year, criminologists today said that preliminary information suggested no significant increase.

I am always wary of politicians who try to mount campaigns based on law and order, because I am reminded of Richard Nixon in 1968.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: And Spiro Agnew.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, his running mate.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What about Adolf Hitler? He was another.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Yes, as was Benito Mussolini. In education, this Government has promised and achieved more in seven years than conservative governments achieved in 37 years. There is better student resource use than in any State in Australia. What do the knockers have to say about this? Without producing any better evidence than Max Harris's job interviews with school leavers, they are able to assert that literacy and numeracy have decreased in some alarming fashion. South Australia, they claim, has a new breed of illiterates!

Quite apart from the fact that horizons have been immeasurably broadened by the new educators, there is no evidence to support the alleged loss of literacy and numeracy. The only definitive work undertaken in this country has been done by A.C.E.R. They have not been able to measure any difference in literacy and numeracy standards between this generation and the last. So, what is the other trump card of the shadow spokesman on education? He will stop building flexible units and revert to the old eggcrate system. Anyone who has seen these flexible units knows that he is simply trying to work on a few old-fashioned prejudices.

South Australia's so-called open-space units are not the open-space barns of oversea experimentation. They are flexible units found in our new schools which not only reduce building costs but also immeasurably increase the uses that can be made of a given floor area. They incorporate secluded areas and, in many cases, movable or sliding partitions.

I will not take up further time to detail the machinations and obfuscations of the Federal Minister for Education (Senator Carrick). His misdeeds have been clearly detailed by responsible newspapers and journals throughout the country. My colleagues will no doubt have more to say about them. It is not an exaggeration to suggest, as an American journalist recently did, that South Australia is one of the last well-governed, moderately contented places in the world. Although it is true that much remains to be done, it is equally true that an enormous amount has been achieved in the relatively few years of the Dunstan era. It is a good Government in the best sense of the term. It is inconceivable that the people of South Australia, who are well known for their common sense and political perspicacity, would consider the Opposition as a viable alternative. I look forward to the next State election with great expectations.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I support the motion. I compliment His Excellency, the Lieutenant-Governor, on his method of opening the Parliament. I also compliment the Government on presenting to the Parliament and the people its programme for this the last session of the Parliament. In common with other members, I pay my respects to the families of those members who have died during the last year. I refer to Sir Glen Pearson, Mr. Tom Stott, Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, and Mr. Huntley Shannon. I note that those members gave this Parliament a total service of 104 years, which is indeed significant. I was interested in the comment that the Hon. Dr. Cornwall made that South Australia had made dramatic achievements during the Dunstan era. On the other hand, it would not hurt to pay a compliment to those men who were this State's leaders before Mr. Dunstan and who contributed much during their term of office and within the dictates of their respective economic abilities. We cannot write up this State as being a fine one because of the progress made in the past nine years. The State's progress is a continuing thing, and it is to the credit of other Premiers, Leaders, Governments and Ministries that they have contributed to the best of their ability to the welfare of our citizens. This is a poor State geographically from a rainfall and agricultural point of view. Only 10 per cent of the land mass is available for intensive agriculture. Regarding minerals, compared to Western Australia, Queensland, or New South Wales, South Australia suffers many disabilities.

These remarks have been only the preface to what I wish to say. My considered opinion is that, by 1985, there will be a need for the Electricity Trust of South Australia to consider constructing a nuclear reactor to generate power to meet the advance in the electricity needs of the citizens of this State. Part of the trust's report for the year ended June 30, 1976, states:

The new Port Augusta power station, with existing power stations, will provide a high level of basic power output until the end of the century, but for increases in power requirements beyond 1985 a new source of energy will be required.

Electricity generation is like a status symbol of economic growth of the State. As the demand for domestic energy-consuming products increases (more washing machines, clothes driers, deep freeze units, refrigerators, and air-conditioners), so the energy demands of industry increase. More power is required and more automation is introduced to produce better goods more quickly. Last year, the trust increased its sales of energy from 4 400 000 kilowatt hours in 1975 to 4 700 000 kilowatt hours in 1976, an increase of 6·2 per cent.

Successive State Governments have aimed at increasing the industrial base of the economy by encouraging the establishment of new industries. Worthy and correct as this policy has been (and it must be so in the future), to my knowledge there has never been an assessment of the electrical energy wasted by industry, although it is pleasing to note that the South Australian Gas Company has recently

appointed officers to advise those industrial concerns that use gas on how to make the most use of the energy from natural gas supplied, with a minimum of waste and without the wastage that is so common in many other forms of industry.

Therefore, as I have said, by 1985 the Electricity Trust must start its forward planning to find out what type of energy will be available to drive the generators. Will it be gas, oil, coal, or nuclear power? It takes about 15 years to plan and build a power station, so by the turn of the century, it is safe to assume, the supply of brown coal and Cooper Basin natural gas will be available. The trust will not be looking to the use of brown coal from Leigh Creek or of other brown coal deposits in the State. We know that the opportunity to use natural gas from the Cooper Basin by 1985 and after that will be out of the question.

This leaves planners with two alternatives, namely, black coal from New South Wales or Queensland, or nuclear energy. If it was planned to use New South Wales or Queensland black coal, high handling charges from the pithead to the selected form of transport, whether by sea or by rail, would be involved for South Australia. In addition, coal-fired stations are notorious for causing pollution. The amount of CO_2 that would be released into the atmosphere is already concerning scientists. Recently, I read a report in a United States publication *Nature* that in the past 15 years the amount of CO_2 rising from the earth has increased by 3·2 per cent. This was attributed to the normal pollution problem from gas-fired or coal-fired stations and also to the fact that many trees that otherwise would have controlled some of the CO_2 had been removed.

It is difficult to give an accurate critical limit for CO_2 in the atmosphere, but the report stated that if the amount in the atmosphere increased to 10 per cent (7 per cent higher than it is now), there could be a marked melting of the ice fields at the north and south poles, a marked change in the water pattern of the world, and a marked increase in the level of seas on our shores, causing problems for cities such as Adelaide and Sydney and other coastal cities. There is concern about what is going on in the atmosphere in relation to President Carter's policy of using more coal to fire power stations in the United States. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.49 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 28, at 2.15 p.m.