

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 18 October 1979

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

Mr. ROBERT WORTH

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about a job for a failed Liberal candidate.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Minister is on the ball, as it looks as though he has a prepared reply. I have always been of the view, and it was the former Government's view, that personal staff were important to enable a Minister to carry out his duties. However, members opposite from time to time vigorously criticised the previous Government's policy of having personal staff to assist Ministers, and also forcefully criticised any suggestion that there should be jobs for the boys, as they and their Federal counterparts in Canberra termed it. Honourable members well recall the promise made about this by Mr. Fraser during the 1975 election campaign. First, has the Minister, in this Council or outside it, ever criticised or commented upon the appointment of personal staff for Ministers, or criticised Governments for providing jobs for the boys? Secondly, how does the Minister justify providing on his personal staff a job for a Mr. Worth, a twice-failed Liberal candidate in Mitcham? Thirdly, has Mr. Worth any special expertise in the areas of community welfare or consumer affairs? Fourthly, will Mr. Worth be engaged in any political activity during the term of his appointment?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I consider that the term "jobs for the boys" has been roundly abused. The term is properly used when applied to persons who have no proper—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Like Dr. Forbes?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is replying.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I was not asked about either Dr. Forbes or Mr. Story. I consider that the term "jobs for the boys" which, as I have said, is grossly abused, is properly used only when it is applied to persons who have retired from a political job or have no other useful or well remunerated job in the community. In this case it seems quite ludicrous, as the honourable member who asked the question well knows, to regard the appointment of Mr. Robert Worth as a job for the boys. His salary will be \$19 900 plus a 10 per cent loading for overtime, if it is approved. His salary will not be \$25 000 as was suggested in the press; where it got that figure from I do not know.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It is \$22 000.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is \$19 900 plus 10 per cent.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: That is about \$22 000.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is nearly \$22 000, and not \$25 000 as has been suggested.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: What about expenses?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The expenses are very limited and include such things as telephone rental and telephone calls directly made in the course of business.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: And the odd lunch!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It will involve a sum for specific occasions, as applies to all Ministerial officers, and as applied in the previous Government. To suggest that \$19 900 plus 10 per cent, which amounts to about \$22 000, as a salary for a practising solicitor of medium seniority is—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I demand that when a Minister is replying to questions he be heard.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is straying a bit, though, Mr. President.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not straying at all. I am saying that it is stupid to consider that this appointment was a job for the boys. The person appointed, Mr. Robert Worth, was a practising solicitor who is well able to command a remuneration much greater than that which he is receiving now, so there is no question of jobs for the boys.

The Hon. J. E. Dunford: Why is he doing it, then?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Because he likes the job, and he likes the idea of working in the political field.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is he engaged in political activity?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am coming to that. The second question was, "How do I justify his appointment?"

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You haven't answered the first question, which was, "Have you ever made any statement criticising jobs for the boys?"

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I probably have on several occasions.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have probably criticised jobs for the boys on occasions when that criticism was justified. In this case, for the reasons that I have just given, I do not consider that it can be properly said that this appointment is a job for the boys. The second question was, "How do I justify his appointment?" Before I even realised that he was available, I had thought about the area in which I would look for a Ministerial officer. At the moment I have only one Ministerial officer, apart from half a press secretary, who covers both of my portfolios. I decided that I would look for a young lawyer. The portfolio of Minister of Consumer Affairs, as the honourable member who asked the question would well know, involves mostly law, and I therefore considered that my adviser in that area should be someone who had legal qualifications.

A great deal of law is also involved in the other portfolio, namely, community welfare. I had already decided, before I knew that Mr. Robert Worth would become available, that I would be looking for a young lawyer. It had not occurred to me that I would be able to obtain the services of one as well qualified as Mr. Worth, and when I found that he was available—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Would you have taken Robin Millhouse on if he'd got the sack?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: When I discovered that Mr. Worth was available, there was a total of five candidates for the job whom I considered, and he was much better qualified than any other. I did not think it was possible that I would find anyone as capable as he is. He was the best bidder for the job, and that is how I justify his appointment. As to the third question, I do not suppose that Mr. Worth has any specific expertise in consumer affairs or community welfare except that, as a lawyer in general practice as he was, he is certainly likely to have come across, and will come across, the area of consumer

affairs almost daily and the area of community welfare from time to time. He had the legal expertise that I was looking for. On the question of political activity, what he wants to do privately and in his own time is up to him. As far as I am concerned, during his working hours—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What's the 10 per cent overtime for?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:—and including the 10 per cent overtime, he will be working for me and responsible to me.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister answer my first question, namely, whether he has ever, either in this Council or outside it, criticised or commented on the appointment of personal staff of Ministers or criticised Governments for providing jobs for the boys? Also, as the Minister agrees that the statement "jobs for the boys" should only be applied to retired people, does he believe that the appointment of Dr. Forbes, after his retirement from Federal Parliament to the staff of Senator Laucke, was improper?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am sure that I have. I cannot recall the occasions, but I am sure that I have criticised jobs for the boys—

The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:—on proper occasions. The matter concerning Dr. Forbes is entirely outside my jurisdiction, and I do not propose to comment.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about officers of the Department of Agriculture. Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Last week in Parliament the Minister of Agriculture assured the House of Assembly that he was not going to undertake any political witch-hunt in his department. However, he did say that if political activities by officers of his department interfered with their work he "would have something to say about it". I ask the Minister whether Mr. Ian Kaehne, who was advising the Minister of Agriculture when he was in Opposition on agricultural policy, is still advising the Minister and whether he considers this advisory work to be in conflict with Mr. Kaehne's ordinary job in the department as a plant breeder.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

MIGRANT VOTING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Attorney-General say what policy the Government intends to adopt on voting rights for unnaturalised persons at State elections, and can he also say whether the present voting position regarding British migrants will be retained?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is a complex matter on which there has not yet been a final policy decision. I will have the matter—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Mr. Hill said—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will have a report prepared and bring it down.

PRICES BRANCH

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Minister of Consumer Affairs say whether consideration is being given to the abolition of the Prices Branch of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs? Will he also say whether the Government is considering making any alteration to the role of the Prices Branch and, if it is, will he say what changes are contemplated; that is, what options the Government is considering?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answer to the first question is "No", and the answer to the second question is "Yes". The answer to the third question is that I feel that I cannot disclose that now. When the matter has been considered further, I will be pleased to answer the question.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment, regarding national park rangers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: One of the more bizarre undertakings in the platform of promises by the Liberal Party during the recent election campaign concerned the payment of voluntary rangers in the National Parks and Wildlife Division. Anyone who, for more than five minutes, has been acquainted with the work that the rangers do will know that it requires special skills and training and that the rangers are a rare breed. They are extremely dedicated officers. Matters that concerned me in the brief period that I was Minister of Environment were that they received poor pay and that their career structures were limited. I was trying to do something about these matters before the election.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You had 10 years in which to do that.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I had 4½ months. The Hon. Mr. Burdett, as a lawyer, will be aware that rangers have enormous powers under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. They have wide powers of entry and arrest, far wider powers than police officers have, and their powers must be used with discretion. I imagine that this promise to appoint voluntary rangers, given the position within the National Parks and Wildlife Division at present, must have had a devastating effect on the morale of the division, which the present Minister of Environment referred to so frequently when he was in Opposition. Therefore, I ask the Minister the following questions:

1. What action is being taken to appoint voluntary rangers?

2. When will the volunteer rangers promised by the Minister of Environment in his election policy statement be appointed?

3. Will they be appointed as wardens under the Act, with full powers of arrest, search and entry?

4. If not, what powers will they be given and will it be necessary to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

5. Is the appointment of such rangers a serious breach of the International Labor Organisation conventions?

6. Has their appointment been discussed with professional rangers and park-keepers?

7. Has their appointment been discussed with the Public Service Association?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the questions to my colleague and bring back a reply.

POLICE MOTOR VEHICLES

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I direct a question to the Minister of Local Government, representing the Chief Secretary, and seek leave to make a brief explanation.

The PRESIDENT: What is the subject?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Air-conditioning in police motor vehicles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: In March this year all members would have received a letter from the Police Association of South Australia stating that early in 1978 an approach had been made to the then Police Commissioner to have air-conditioners installed in police motor vehicles.

They were told at that time by the Police Commissioner that new motor vehicles would be installed with air-conditioners. However, some months thereafter the Police Association was advised by the Police Commissioner that the Government had not approved the installation of air-conditioners in motor vehicles and that, therefore, such installations would not occur. The letter also points out that the officers of other Government departments (the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Department of Aboriginal Affairs are mentioned) drove vehicles that were fitted with air-conditioners. In support of this case, I now refer to two or three paragraphs from the letter, as follows:

Police are required daily to travel at very slow rates of speed in dense traffic, patrol situations or on escort duties, and members have recorded temperatures in moving police vehicles exceeding 140° F. There are many occasions when a stationary police vehicle is the only suitable place in which to make notes or take statements. In these situations, temperatures soar even higher.

Police are required to spend the greater part of their shift in motor vehicles, and it is fair to say that to the police officer his patrol vehicle is his office. There would not be a Government employee working in an office situation in such extremes of heat without the benefit of air-conditioning.

I am sure that all honourable members would agree with that, and that our police officers deserve to work in the greatest degree of comfort possible in the circumstances. Will the Government reconsider the vetoing of this matter by the former Government, and once again examine whether it will be possible to install air-conditioners in police motor vehicles?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Attorney-General, as the Minister responsible for electoral matters, agree with the Premier's statement, as reported in yesterday's *News*, that during the life of the current Parliament there is bound to be a redistribution? Also does he agree with Mr. Tonkin's statement that there were two ways of correcting the position whereby some seats were now over quota, namely, by increasing the number of voters in each electorate, or by increasing the number of seats in the House of Assembly? Finally, does the Government intend to increase the number of seats in the House of Assembly and, if it does, by how many?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The statement that has been attributed to Mr. Tonkin is inaccurate. Under the Constitution Act, there are really two ways in which an electoral distribution affecting the House of Assembly can occur. First, the number of members in the House of Assembly could be increased, and, if that decision was

taken, it would require a redistribution. Secondly, within three months of a polling day, if five years or more has intervened between that polling day and a previous polling day on which the electoral redistribution made by the commission was effective, there shall be a redistribution. Under that provision of the Constitution Act, the redistribution would not be required until after the next election, the last redistribution having occurred on 5 August, 1976. The Government does not intend to increase the membership of the House of Assembly.

DEFICIT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I draw the Attorney-General's attention to a statement in this morning's press concerning a \$14 100 000 deficit. Was that a correct report of what the Premier said to the press?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The report mentioned by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris does refer to a \$14 100 000 deficit, but it is not correct. The answer is "No".

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Attorney-General's reply to my question on electoral redistribution mean that the Government will not be moving to increase or alter the size of the number of representatives in the House of Assembly during the currency of this Parliament, and that, therefore, there will be no redistribution during this Parliament?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have indicated that it is the Government's intention not to increase the number of members in the House of Assembly.

HOSPITAL LEVY

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: My question—

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I wish to ask a supplementary question of the Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Creedon is on his feet.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: It does not matter whether the question is supplementary: I must give the question to the member who has the call.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I desire to ask the Minister of Local Government several questions associated with a promise he made during the election campaign that local council levies for hospitals would be abolished. Will the Minister say, first, which councils pay the hospital levy? Secondly, how much did each council pay in its last payment? Thirdly, has the Local Government Association expressed a desire to its members not to continue paying the levy? Fourthly, have the hospitals concerned been consulted and advised on the likely cuts in their income?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is the Government's intention to fulfil the promise that it made at the last election in regard to this matter. As the question does involve some information and statistics that I will have to obtain from my department, I will obtain that information and bring it down.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Government intend in any way to alter the size of the membership of the

House of Assembly during the currency of this Parliament?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have already indicated that there is no intention to increase the number of members. There is no power under the Constitution Act for any decrease.

CHILDREN'S COURT

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the reporting of proceedings in the Children's Court.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Minister will be aware that the Annual Report of the Children's Court was tabled in another place on Tuesday, and he will be pleased that some of the figures in the report indicate a considerable reduction in the number of juveniles appearing before the court, contrary to the general propaganda put out by the Liberal Party, of which the Minister is a member, suggesting that juveniles are appearing more and more before the court and generally playing merry hell in the community. Of course, that was all nonsense, because over 90 per cent of children never appear before the Children's Court. However, that was not my question but merely a comment to the Minister. In view of the Minister's previously stated attitude about the publication of proceedings in this court, is he considering easing the present restrictions on press reporting of Children's Court proceedings?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member would be well aware of the provision in that regard in the Children's Protection and Young Offenders Act which was recently passed. I think that the honourable member, who was on a Select Committee on that Bill, will recall that the original suggestion regarding such reporting was changed and it is now incorporated in the Act that a short summary of proceedings may be published without in any way identifying the person charged, this being done only where there is a conviction. In answer to the honourable member's question, I do not have in mind varying the Act in any way in that regard.

LEAD CONTENT RULES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister representing the Minister of Transport say whether the Commonwealth Government has made any approach to the States on the question of revising the lead content rules on motor spirit? If it has, what policy will be adopted by South Australia relating to the lead content of motor spirit? If that is not the case, will the Government ask the Commonwealth Government to convene a meeting with the States to discuss this question?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring down a reply.

PRICES BRANCH

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Can the Minister of Consumer Affairs say whether it is probable that the proposed changes to the role of the Prices Branch will result in a lessening of power of the Prices Commissioner, and is the Minister prepared to make public the changes contemplated to the role of the Prices Branch to enable

the public and other interested persons to comment on them?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member's assumption that it is probable that changes contemplated to the Prices Branch will lessen its powers is not justified. That is not so at all. There is no suggestion to that effect. Where any changes have been considered—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are you going to increase them?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I did not say that, either. The assumption contemplated in the question was that the powers would be decreased. There is no suggestion at the moment of decreasing the powers in any way.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General a question about the possibility of altering the Constitution as it affects electoral boundaries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I direct my question to the almost right honourable learned gentleman because of the manner in which he answered the previous Attorney-General on the powers of the State Constitution. In responding to a question from the Hon. Mr. Sumner, the present Attorney-General, who should be the most learned gentleman in his profession, in a Parliamentary sense, anyway, said that the powers of the Constitution did not make any provision for a decrease. The Attorney apparently feels that those people in this Chamber who have not studied law, or do not have a great knowledge of law, should accept at face value that a decrease cannot occur. What the Attorney-General has overlooked (and, if he has not overlooked it, he is misleading this Chamber by withholding information) is that there is power to change the Constitution. That is the way in which the present boundaries are constituted. That has been done on more than one occasion to achieve the present result. That is much more equitable than what is suggested by those members who sit on the opposite side in Government and still walk the corridors of this building twice a day, looking at the ancient portraits that hang in the lobbies, to ensure that they do not stray.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he is not leading a debate on constitutional law. Would the honourable member please ask his question?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Many of those learned gentlemen depicted in those portraits filled a role that is now being filled by the present Attorney-General. If that escapes you, Mr. President, that is no fault of mine. Can the Attorney-General say whether there is a power within the Government to alter the Constitution, which could bring about a decrease in the number of seats in the House of Assembly? Secondly, will he answer the question "Yes" or "No"?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will answer the second part of the honourable member's question, but I will not answer it "Yes" or "No". The first part of the honourable member's question related to amendments to the Constitution. I agree with the honourable member that certain powers in the Constitution Act enable it to be amended. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that those parts of the Constitution that relate to electoral redistribution were introduced into the Constitution Act by the former Labor Government. The electoral boundaries criteria are established by that Part of the

Constitution Act. There are specific procedures set down in the Constitution Act under Part V, which was introduced by the former Labor Government. That part sets out the occasions when a redistribution can be made.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: The question was, "When can that be altered?"

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have already indicated to the Leader of the Opposition when those two possibilities occur. The other point I make, which the Hon. Mr. Foster has overlooked, is that section 88 of the Constitution Act relates to electoral redistribution and is entrenched.

MIGRANT VOTING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Attorney-General concede that it is unfair and inequitable for migrants from countries such as Cyprus, Malta, the United Kingdom, Canada and Uganda to be entitled to vote after six months residence in this country and without being naturalised, whereas migrants from Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries not formerly part of the British Empire must wait three years and also become naturalised? Secondly, during the election campaign, did the Liberal Party say that it would not give the vote to non-naturalised migrants?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not prepared to make that concession. The answer to the second part of the question is "Yes".

MINISTERIAL MEMO

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing to the Minister of Local Government a question concerning a Ministerial memo to staff.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: All members of this Chamber would know that the Hon. Mr. Hill is a man of considerable means, panache and style, albeit perhaps a dubious member of the nouveau riche. However it has come to my attention that, very early in his term of office as Minister of Local Government, a memo was sent out to staff concerning the standards of dress that would be expected and titles that would be conferred (members of the staff were to be referred to as Mr., Mrs., or Miss and the Minister would be referred to as Mr. Minister at all times). I also understand, and my source is a very good one, that there was a further direction that all female staff should wear pantyhose. First, have the directions I have mentioned been adhered to? Secondly, who polices those directions? Thirdly, from time to time, does the Minister make a personal inspection to check his Ministerial edict on pantyhose?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I treat that question with contempt.

MIGRANT VOTING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs agree that it is unfair and inequitable for migrants from countries such as Cyprus, Malta, the United Kingdom, Canada and Uganda to be entitled to vote after six months residence in this country and without being naturalised, whereas migrants from Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries not formerly part of the British Empire must wait three years and also become naturalised?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not prepared to make that concession at this stage.

RAILWAY CARRIAGES

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport on rubbish in railway carriages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I travel a great deal on trains; perhaps the Minister does not, or is unaware of what happens in railway carriages. I am aware that railway employees do their best to clean up these carriages, but the employees are usually fairly busy, and some passengers are very careless. These carriages often have fish and chip papers thrown about the place; cigarette butts are strewn in non-smoking carriages. Because these trains do not have any litter receptacles, will the Minister see that suitable rubbish receptacles are supplied in trains, along with large cigarette trays in the smoking compartments?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

MIGRANT VOTING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing a question to the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs supplementary to my previous question concerning voting rights for migrants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Minister said that he was not prepared at this stage to agree that it is unfair and inequitable for migrants from countries such as Cyprus, Malta, the United Kingdom, Canada and Uganda to be entitled to vote after six months residence in Australia and without being naturalised, whereas migrants from Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries not formerly part of the British Empire must wait three years and also become naturalised. At what stage will the Minister be prepared to concede that it is unfair and inequitable for that situation to exist? Secondly, what additional information will be required to enable him to come to that decision?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When the honourable member asked me a similar question the other day I indicated, as I indicated a few moments ago, that by adding the words "at this stage" to my reply I meant that the whole question is not fixed and settled. This is a matter that should be continually kept under review, and that will be done.

The honourable member fails to acknowledge, if I can assume that from his question, that there are many other aspects to that question that have to be considered. It is not just a question of black and white; therefore, a lot of thought and consideration have to be given to it. One other aspect which cannot be over-looked is that, if the law is changed here along the lines that the Labor Party would like, there would appear then to be very little incentive to encourage people from some countries to obtain citizenship of the country. That is a consideration, because surely we all as a Parliament want to give encouragement to people to become naturalised.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If one has to be naturalised

before being able to vote in a State election, there is a tendency for one to want to become naturalised to exercise that right.

The Hon. Anne Levy: That does not apply to people from the United Kingdom.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I did not say it did. However, it applies to some of the people to whom the Leader referred. There are many other considerations, though. If the Labor Party's policy was implemented, where do we go in connection with the common roll for Commonwealth and State elections?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C. M. HILL: What about the staff of the Electoral Office? If this change was made, a special roll would have to be kept for people who had not been naturalised. They are just two of the many points that have to be considered in this total question. I adhere to the view already expressed that, at this stage, I do not favour any change.

SALVATION JANE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief statement before directing to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question on salvation jane.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Minister of Agriculture, in a prepared answer to a question in the House of Assembly, said, "The advantages of biological control of salvation jane do, in fact, outweigh the possible disadvantages." The Department of Agriculture early this year prepared a cost-benefit analysis which showed that the advantages and disadvantages were very finely balanced, with possibly greater disadvantages than advantages. Cost-benefit analyses are necessarily based on certain estimates. Will the Minister explain what estimates he used to come to the conclusion which he so precisely gave and which I quoted? Has the Department of Agriculture's cost benefit analysis been revised? If so, what was the new data that justified the revision, and where did that data come from? At whose instigation was the analysis rewritten? Will the Minister make copies of any revised cost benefit analysis available to honourable members?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

TRAFFIC LANES

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question on traffic lanes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: At some time during the last couple of years I asked the previous Minister of Transport a question relating to the use, strictly as an overtaking lane, of the outside lane of a highway where there is more than one lane. I was singularly unsuccessful; it was one of my few failures since I have been here. I could not persuade the previous Minister that it was a good thing. I am sure that everybody who drives along our roads objects to somebody driving in the outside lane of a dual highway at an incredibly slow speed, thereby forcing others to overtake in the inside lane. I am sure that Dr. Ritson would agree that we should not have to legislate for things

like this. Good manners, courtesy and consideration should prevail. Where common sense does not prevail, the law has to step in. Will the Minister give consideration to introducing legislation to provide that the right-hand lane be used only for purposes of overtaking?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

POLICE WEAPONS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In view of the considerable public concern expressed about the decision of the Police Commissioner to allow or require policemen to wear exposed hand guns, will the Government accept the call for a review of the decision, which call has been made by me and other people in the community? In such review of the decision, will the public and interested groups be able to comment on the decision? If such a review is carried out, does the Government believe that it can direct the Police Commissioner on this matter, and, if it feels justified in doing so after a review has been carried out, will it so do?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: This is probably one of those matters within the responsibility of the Chief Secretary, who has the responsibility for the Police Force. I will refer the question to him; a report will be obtained and brought down in due course. In saying that, I also add that I am sure that, if interested groups want to make submissions, the Chief Secretary will be pleased to receive them.

RETRENCHMENTS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question on retrenchments.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: A report in the *Advertiser* of 11 October was headed "No retrenchment of Government jobs—Brown". Of course, "Brown" is the Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is a lengthy report and you would not want me to read it all, Mr. President. However, in it the Minister makes clear that, as he said during the election campaign, no Government employees will be retrenched. The report goes on to state that there is a surplus of employees in Government departments and that he will seek the co-operation of employees and the trade unions, in the event of workers having to be transferred from one Government department to another. The report also states that, where there is a human problem, the Minister will consider this. I was impressed by the proposition that he explained. However, in the past, Liberal Governments, especially the Ministers responsible for industrial affairs, have been notorious for going back on their word.

I have written to all unions concerned, asking them to let me know if the Minister does not keep his word, and I have asked the unions whether I can assist them. I think it is necessary to ensure that Mr. Brown does not say, "We will not retrench them: we just will not employ them." During the depression days, all Liberal Governments had a policy that was called one of not firing, but not hiring. When people left the work force when jobs were difficult to get, those people were not replaced. Where there had been 100 employees, later there might have been only 50. As I see the position, the Minister intends to cut down the work force in all Government departments and, so as to keep his word, say that the Government has not

retrenched. In fact, he will not replace those who leave.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: They do that in the T.A.B.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I am not interested in the T.A.B. The Hon. Mr. Cameron is always interjecting. I wish you would take action, Mr. President. I will be pleased to keep in close contact with my own union, the Australian Workers Union, which has many members in Government departments. I also will be writing to the other unions telling them how I feel about the matter, that I have discussed it with the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and that they will require to keep this matter in check. I hope that the information I am requesting will come, not next month or the month after, but in the next few weeks.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member had better ask the question. Otherwise, he will receive the reply later still.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, provide the following information: the number of daily-paid workers employed in Government departments? I am referring not to salaried employees but to those that I think are called daily-paid workers.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: You asked a question and—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the Hon. Mr. Dunford please ask the question.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: Mr. Hill is interjecting.

The PRESIDENT: Will you please ask the question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Dunford will resume his seat.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I have not finished the question. I have not asked it.

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

CRIMES OF VIOLENCE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My question is to the Attorney-General. He will recall that yesterday I referred to a Liberal Party advertisement that promised:

A Liberal Party Government will make the streets safe for your daughters without their being molested by all those thugs that have acted as if they owned the place for 10 years now.

Will the Minister specify what action will be taken, including legislative action, to fulfil the promise, and when this action is likely to be taken?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If the Leader of the Opposition wants me to look at the advertisement, I can check it. My recollection is that it was not a Liberal Party advertisement.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Yes, it was.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: In any event, yesterday, in reply to a question about crime and punishment and law and order, I stated some of the actions we would be taking to ensure that we did grasp the nettle on the matter.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Minister and other Ministers have referred to victims of crime. Will he consider the matter of the widows of victims of crime as people deprived by the crime, and will he consider the circumstances in which many of them, particularly those with young families, have been placed?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Mr. Foster would have read a report of an inaugural meeting held last week with a view to forming an association to assist victims of crime. I have had an interview with some of the people who are responsible for that, and I have said that we should be given an indication of the difficulties that the people concerned may face. Currently in my department a

working party is examining the matter of how victims of crime can be assisted. We are currently reviewing the progress made by that committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish to ask a supplementary question.

The PRESIDENT: The time for questions has lapsed. Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 17 October. Page 127.)

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, in doing so, I extend to you, Mr. President, my congratulations on your re-election as President of this Council. My congratulations go also to all honourable members on both sides of the Chamber who were successful at the recent State election, in particular the Hon. Gordon Bruce and the Hon. Bob Ritson who, like I, take their seats in this Chamber for the first time.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am very proud to represent the Australian Labor Party in this Parliament. I was attracted to the Labor Party initially because I believed it was a Party of principle. It opposed the Vietnam war when it was unpopular to do so, and this principled stand was vindicated by history. The Australian Labor Party has shown that it is a Party with a strong sense of decency and responsibility.

Another issue on which it has taken a principled stand and which will, without doubt, be one of the major political issues of the 1980's is that of the nuclear fuel cycle and, in particular, the mining and export of uranium in this State. The A.L.P. position on uranium is that the nuclear fuel cycle has not yet been proven to be safe. Until it is safe, we do not believe that South Australia should mine and export uranium.

The Government agrees that uranium should not be mined or exported unless the nuclear fuel cycle is proven to be safe. Two years ago the Liberal Party agreed with Labor that there were insufficient safeguards. In the intervening period the disaster at the Harrisburg nuclear plant and new information about the hazards of mining and plant operation have convinced members of my Party that there is no reason to change our policy. However, the Liberal Party has changed its view. The Premier and the Deputy Premier now claim that all problems have been solved. It is for this reason that I have decided to use the opportunity offered by the Address in Reply debate to examine some of the issues raised by the Government's decision to mine and export South Australia's uranium. I turn first to the mining of uranium, which the Government appears to believe is safe. Here the risk is from very low-level exposure to radioactivity, mostly via inhalation of radon gas, which is given off by uranium. It used to be thought that very low levels of radioactivity posed no health risk. This is no longer so. The *New Scientist* pointed out on 10 May 1979:

There is no threshold below which exposure to low-level radiation is safe, according to the U.S. National Academy of Sciences second report on the biological effects of ionising radiation.

This is relevant to both uranium mining and exposure to radiation in nuclear power and reprocessing plants and uranium enrichment plants. A number of important studies have produced evidence which strongly suggests

that very low levels of radiation, as low as the officially permitted exposure rate, may greatly increase the incidence of cancer among workers who are exposed.

One of these studies, by Mancuso and his associates in the U.S.A., claims that a considerably higher than normal risk of contracting bone marrow, lung, intestinal and pancreas cancers exists within the range of maximum occupational radiation exposure limits. This study suggested that the risk of contracting cancer from low-level radiation is 10 to 25 times higher than previously assumed.

Dr. Najarian in another study of U.S. Navy nuclear submarine workers reported a 450 per cent higher leukaemia rate among radiation workers than in the general population. Yet another study, this time of Swedish uranium miners, found that the miners affected suffered higher than average levels of lung cancer. A summary of this study notes that "even at dose rates well below the current United States standard an excess cancer risk is observed".

Finally, we have the on-going study of the Radium Hill uranium miners in South Australia. Preliminary findings strongly suggest higher than average incidences of cancer among the miners. In other words, the results so far are entirely consistent with the United States and Swedish studies. It may take until the mid-1980's before all the evidence is in, but, until then, the Radium Hill investigation provides still more cause for extreme caution.

The Deputy Premier's statement last week in Parliament that no risks were associated with uranium mining is incredible in the light of these studies. True, there has been some controversy about some of these studies, but, as Professor Karl Morgan, former Chairman of the International Commission on Radiological Protection, argued in the *New Scientist* dated 5 April 1979:

The controversy about these findings developed because many people in the nuclear industry and U.S. Federal agencies have been inadvisably proclaiming that there is no radiation risk at low doses. If the proponents of nuclear energy had been more reasonable in their claims about reactor safety, they would not now be desperately trying to save face.

It should be pointed out that these studies were on uranium workers, working under controlled conditions. According to John Hallam, writing in *Habitat* in April 1979, results of studies on uranium mining without safeguards show just how dangerous these occupations may be. In Schreeberg, Germany, and Jachymov, Bohemia, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, lung cancer accounted for 75 per cent of all deaths in the first case and 51 per cent in the second. Hallam gives evidence from yet another modern investigation as follows:

Studies done in Czechoslovakia and published in 1975 found about twice the expected rate of cancer at less than 50 "working level months", and they, like the U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health Report, suggest that U.S. studies may underestimate the risks at low level of exposure by misclassifying mines into higher categories.

Hallam goes on to argue that the proposals by mining companies in Australia to protect miners from the deadly radon gas emitted by the uranium will not protect them and will in fact increase the dangers. I urge the Minister of Health to read this article most carefully.

At this point in the argument, the pro-nuclear lobby usually introduces a huge red herring, namely, the great dangers of coal mining. It is pointed out that, for a given amount of power, the health costs of uranium *versus* coal mining are far higher in the latter case. Black lung deaths,

it is argued, are more likely in coal mines than cancer deaths in uranium mines.

This is quite true, and quite irrelevant. Why is there such a high death rate among coal miners, and, one might add, asbestos miners? The reason is obvious. Private corporations have put profits before concern for human life. In the United States and in this country, big government has colluded with big corporations to hush up details of the health risks. Far too little has been done to alleviate these risks, despite repeated efforts by trade unions.

The death toll in coal mines is a scandal, but what has this to do with uranium mining? The fact that coal mining is dangerous is an argument for improving the safety of coal mines, not adding to the health risks by introducing uranium mining as well. What the pro-nuclear lobby fails to add is that coal-fired generating plants do not run the risk of melt-downs, and that the disposal of coal ash will not create problems that will be with us for thousands of years.

Finally, I remind the Council that, just as coal companies and asbestos companies lied about health risks, so too will the uranium companies. This is not idle speculation; it has already happened. I now refer to a report in the *National Times* of 14 April 1979, as follows:

A three-year audit by the U.S. Federal Government recently found the U.S. miners' average exposure to radiation to be almost five times the figure reported by the uranium industry and above the maximum specified by law.

Furthermore, Dr. M. Eisenbud, a former official of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, says that the first attempts to enforce safety regulations in the U.S. were rejected.

There are already signs of alarming discrepancies between estimates of radiation levels provided by uranium mining companies in Australia and the actual levels. On 6 June this year the *Advertiser* reported that the Federal Minister of Science and the Environment said that the emission of radiation at the Nabarlek mine could be five to 10 times higher than that projected by the operator, Queensland Mines.

I have dealt at some length with the issue of the safety of mining because this is the health issue which affects South Australians most directly. In Parliament last week the Deputy Premier said, "No mining will proceed in this State until we are convinced that it is safe for miners to mine uranium." They are commendable sentiments. But what is the Government doing? Without any expert knowledge himself, without commissioning any studies and without waiting for the results of the highly relevant Radium Hill investigation, the Deputy Premier told the House of Assembly that he was sure all the problems were solved. Is the Minister prejudging the issue? Does his Government intend to research this crucial question, or does it believe all the pro-nuclear tales that the Premier was told when he went on his overseas trip? South Australians have the right to know the answers to these questions.

I turn now to the more serious radiation risks associated with the operation of nuclear power plants. First, there are the radiation hazards from normal operations. Some parts of these plants are so radioactive that the maximum dosage is reached in a matter of minutes. This leads power companies to employ casual labourers. The 23 April 1979 issue of the *Advertiser* reported that, in America's only commercial reprocessing plant, it eventually got to the point where unskilled unemployed workers were taken off the street to turn a bolt and, in the process, were exposed to radiation, and then sacked.

This process is known graphically as "burning out"

employees. Because these workers are unfamiliar with plant operations, dosages may be exceeded. Professor Karl Morgan writing in the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* in September 1978 said:

This process increases the overall cancer and genetic risk to the population and I believe that this is exactly what we should strive to avoid.

The plant in the United States, to which I have just referred, was later closed because of the dangerously high levels of radioactivity. It is important to realise that these are risks incurred in the normal operation of plants, not as a result of accidents.

When one turns to accidents in nuclear power plants, it is difficult for one to know where to start, there having been so many. Some accidents are caused by human error and some by equipment failure. The most dangerous, like the Harrisburg accident early this year, usually involve both.

The two most important reactor accidents in the United States thus far have been those at Browns Ferry in 1976 and Harrisburg in 1979. In both cases the failures which occurred were claimed to have been almost impossible by the so-called Rasmussen Report of 1975.

This official report was much criticised after its publication. Rasmussen suggested that the worst possible nuclear power plant accident—a China Syndrome nuclear reactor core melt down that could not be contained—would lead to 3 300 “early” deaths, 45 000 cases of cancer, 5 100 genetic defects and \$14 000 000 property damage.

The chance of such an accident, Rasmussen said, was one in one billion per reactor per year. The Browns Ferry accident of 1976 was one of the accidents that Rasmussen claimed could happen only once in a billion reactor years. Critics of Rasmussen claimed that the report grossly underestimated both the death toll involved in various accidents and the risks of such accidents occurring in the first place. The claims that the risk of major nuclear power accidents was grossly underestimated by the 1975 report are now admitted by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. As the *Sydney Morning Herald* pointed out on 22 January 1979, the commission’s “decision to disown the major conclusion of the Rasmussen Report . . . was considered a serious blow to the future of nuclear energy in America”.

The less wellknown power plant accidents are equally worrying. In 1961 in Idaho, three men died when a nuclear fuel core melted and exploded at the National Reactor Testing Station. In July 1973, 500 000 gallons of radioactive waste leaked from the United States Atomic Energy Commission plant at Hanford. In 1974, 10 000 gallons of radioactive waste was dumped into the Mississippi River. There are too many other examples to list here. In addition to the large numbers of accidents, there are also even larger numbers of safety regulation violations. The Atomic Energy Commission reported that it found safety violations in one in every three nuclear facilities which it inspected.

Following the Harrisburg accident, Government nuclear experts warned that operators of 43 other U.S. reactors might not be able to cope with similar breakdowns. And the *Australian* on 11 April 1979 reported:

The Three Mile Island plant and others of similar design have been plagued by problems affecting pumps, valves and other critical safety controls for more than a year according to official reports.

As the Harrisburg controversy grew, even more alarming information about plant safety began to emerge. A *Nation Review* article on 3 May 1979 pointed out that the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission had revealed the

following:

U.S. nuclear power stations reported 2 835 incidents last year and every nuclear power plant had to shut down temporarily at least once.

As the *Wall Street Journal* noted some years ago, “the most dependable feature of nuclear power is its unreliability”. If the worst does happen through plant failure and/or human error, does the U.S. Government have well thought out emergency plans for dealing with the accident? It seems not. A United States Congressional investigation into the Harrisburg disaster found the Government’s own nuclear watch-dog, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, to have been highly incompetent in this regard. Emergency planning, said the report, was chaotic and inadequate at all levels. The *Advertiser* referred to the report on 30 July 1979 and stated that the N.R.C. had “given only minimal attention and resources to emergency planning and has allowed plants to be built in areas where evacuation would be difficult”.

Nuclear plants are even at risk from earthquakes. A U.S. Federal Government task force recently ordered five plants to be closed because new findings suggest they might not be safe in an earthquake.

Perhaps there will not be a nuclear power accident, but should we take the risk? Governor Brown of California made the following point about the risks of the nuclear power industry:

If we are wrong about the dangers of the nuclear fuel cycle, we can do something else. If they are wrong, we’re dead.

There is just one more point I want to make on this issue. Can any honourable member in this Chamber believe that there will be no more wars in the industrialised West? It is only 40 years since the last world war. I do not mean nuclear wars—nothing could be worse than that—I mean conventional wars. This point is highly relevant. If nuclear power plants had been operating throughout Europe during the Second World War, many would have been bombed and destroyed. Vast areas of Europe would still be uninhabitable and hundreds of thousands of cancer victims would have still been dying of radiation-induced cancers throughout the 1940’s, 1950’s and 1960’s.

I turn now to the controversial issue of radioactive waste disposal. The Government has reportedly claimed that the waste disposal problem is solved. The Premier believes that the solution to the waste disposal problem is the vitrification of the spent radioactive material and its storage underground. This is the technique being worked on in England, France and Sweden. The basic idea is that the waste is fused under great heat into a glass-like mass and then buried deep underground.

The Premier believes that the only reason that this allegedly proven process of vitrification is not being used on a commercial scale is that there simply is not enough waste around to make this worth while yet. Let me inform the Premier that there are more than 200 000 cubic metres of high-level waste awaiting safe disposal in the United States alone; 99 per cent of these wastes are, of course, from U.S. military programmes. But military or civilian, the waste disposal problem is just as urgent.

Furthermore, much of this waste is stored in tanks that are or have been leaking high-level radioactive wastes. Since the 1950’s there have been accidents at 10 per cent of the storage facilities. In 1973 at Hanford, America’s largest storage facility, 500 000 gallons of radioactive waste leaked unnoticed into the ground over seven weeks. There have been many other similar accidents.

So, contrary to the Premier’s assertions, there are huge quantities of radioactive waste awaiting disposal, and the problem of corroding and leaking storage tanks suggests

that the need for safe disposal is acute. Why then do not the Americans use the process which the Premier claims is tried and tested?

Newsweek magazine on 15 January 1979 ran an article on the waste problem. That article stated:

The future of nuclear electricity in the United States is under serious threat—the problem is the rising flood of radioactive waste that is now being produced in the nation's reactors.

By 1990, according to the magazine, the quantity of wastes would reach 37 900 tons. Despite half a billion dollars spent researching waste disposal technology in America in 1978 alone, no satisfactory solutions have been found. What of the much vaunted vitrification process? *Newsweek* had this to say:

U.S. scientists have dismissed the French technique of vitrification (locking the waste in glass) as too dangerous because it involves liquefaction of intensely poisonous wastes at high temperatures. Tests have shown the glass to be unstable and subject to cracking, which could lead to leaks.

That is an American view. In Australia, Professor Ringwood of the Australian National University has developed a process, as yet unproven, of making synthetic rock to store waste in. The A.N.U. process was developed because vitrification was believed to be unsatisfactory.

Even if safe techniques of fusing the liquid waste into solid form are found, there is still the problem of where to put it—and how to transport it there. No-one wants nuclear waste dumped in their local community, even if it is dumped deep underground. Furthermore, despite claims made by the Deputy Premier in another place last week, this waste cannot be buried safely anywhere. Professor Jim Morrison of Latrobe University certainly does not believe that safe storage places are found everywhere. Indeed, he believes that Australia is the only logical site for dumping nuclear wastes. The Premier told Parliament last week:

Waste disposal is now not a technical problem but basically one of public relations and reassurance.

Either the Premier is ignorant of the United States' negation of vitrification—which would be deplorable—or he is deliberately misleading Parliament—which would be inexcusable.

I do not have time to deal with the issue of nuclear proliferation: the failure of international safeguards in that area is too well known to require repetition. However, I will deal with the problem of terrorism. On 27 April this year the *Australian* reprinted that the F.B.I. Director had revealed that nuclear bombs "small enough to be strapped to a terrorist's back can now be built using information available in public libraries". Of course, bombs cannot be made without enriched uranium or plutonium. And one would imagine from the Premier's assurances about the nuclear fuel cycle that such materials would be stored under maximum security, quite inaccessible to unauthorised persons.

In fact, there is a long history of weapons grade material mysteriously disappearing from nuclear facilities. In 1960, 93 kilograms of enriched uranium disappeared from a plant in Pennsylvania. This material is thought to have ended up in Israel. In May 1979 (according to the *Advertiser* of 4 May last) the U.S. General Accounting Office reported to Congress that it had lost track of thousands of kilograms of enriched uranium and plutonium. Ten kilograms of weapons grade uranium is enough to build a bomb. One again we have heard nothing from the Premier about these alarming facts.

Finally, let me deal with the economic argument. The Government claims that Roxby Downs will provide the State with an economic bonanza. The Premier talks of

25 000-30 000 jobs. He provides absolutely no evidence for these figures, which the Opposition believes to be grossly exaggerated. But whatever the Government's figures, they are based on the assumption that there will be a profitable market for uranium when Roxby Downs comes on stream. So, let us look at what some of the independent experts and industry spokesmen say on the question of the future levels of demand and supply of uranium. At the end of last year *Business Week*, the prestigious and conservative U.S. journal, quoted a senior executive of General Electric (one of America's four makers of nuclear reactors) as saying:

... within 10 years the U.S. nuclear industry is apt to contract dramatically and it may collapse altogether.

The article pointed out that new reactor orders have dropped from 41 in 1973 to zero in 1978. The *Advertiser* reported on 12 May this year that 30 U.S. contracts for nuclear power plants had been cancelled and that dozens more had been postponed. In Japan, plans for new plants have been cut back by 40 per cent. In the U.K. not one new nuclear plant has been ordered since 1973. In Italy nuclear development is at a standstill. In Iran it has been aborted. In nearly every European country except France, nuclear programmes have been cut back. The reasons are obvious.

Governments committed to the nuclear fuel cycle are having to face growing public opposition in nearly all the major industrialised countries. Even in Australia, where the reactor accident danger does not exist, the trend against the mining and export of uranium is already marked. Morgan Gallup polls show an 8 per cent drop in support Australia-wide for the mining and development of uranium between 1975 and April 1979—from 62 per cent to 54 per cent. This State's anti-uranium sentiments are the highest in Australia.

In the youngest group surveyed, a majority opposed uranium mining. And no less than 67 per cent of the South Australian sample indicated that the people concerned were worried about some aspects of uranium mining. This concern for safety has forced the nuclear industry to spend vast sums on increasing reactor safety programmes. This in turn is rapidly increasing nuclear generating costs. Perhaps most remarkable is the latest local poll quoted in the 13-14 October *Weekend Australian*. Out of the 800 people sampled, only 44.1 per cent approved of uranium mining. The major reason for public disquiet and opposition is concern for the safety of the industry.

According to Morris Udall of the American Congressional Committee, which is responsible for overseeing the Nuclear Regulatory Committee:

... if you factor in all the true costs of nuclear, coal is now competitive.

The *Nation Review* on 4 October this year quoted analyst Charles Komanoff as saying that by 1986-87 nuclear generating costs will be double those of coal. Furthermore, while there is a very real prospect of a drop in world demand for uranium, there is a growing glut on the supply side. According to an article in the *Nation Review* on 4 October this year:

By 1985, when Australian producers hope to hit the world uranium market ... a glut of 20 000-30 000 tonnes of uranium a year will exist, forcing prices down from the present \$43 lb. to about \$28 lb. ... The most recent official A.A.E.C. estimates say that there could be a market for only 10 000 tonnes a year at that time, under half the projected capacity.

Therefore, we find that Government estimates of the revenue which the uranium mined at Roxby Downs will provide are based on the flimsiest foundations.

On the demand side, we have growing opposition to the

nuclear fuel cycle, slowing nuclear power plant growth dramatically, while evidence about the accident-prone nature of many plants is leading to so much money being spent on plant safety modifications that nuclear power is losing its cost advantage over coal. On the supply side, we have the nuclear industry's one undeniable success: the discovery of new high grade ores, especially in Canada. But increased supply means lower prices and a cost disadvantage for Australia, since according to *The Miner* newspaper of 26 November 1978, the cost of mining Canada's uranium is 20 per cent less than that in Australia. Once again we find a marked discrepancy between the official optimism displayed by the Government and the far more pessimistic estimates of outside experts.

In the United States, which has more nuclear plants than any other country, it is not even clear that nuclear power is needed. An article in the *Canberra Times* on 22 August 1979 reported:

The American Institute of Architects calculated in 1975 that by using energy-efficient systems in old and new buildings the U.S. could save in less than 20 years energy equal to one-third of its current energy use at half the cost of providing new energy supplies. The size of this energy saving is thus about 10 times as large as what is now supplied by nuclear power.

In conclusion, I point out that I am not an economist or an expert on the nuclear fuel cycle, and neither is the Premier or the Deputy Premier. However, I can read, and in researching this question I have found that on every issue—mining, power plant safety, waste disposal, and so forth—there is expert testimony which flatly contradicts the glib optimism that characterises Liberal pronouncements.

I hope that the questions put to the Government by my Party will cause it to reconsider its precipitate decision to go ahead with uranium mining. But, I fear that the Government's philosophy is probably best summarised by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Chapman), who said in the uranium debate in Parliament last year, "Let's rake it up, pack it up, and get some money." The safety of the nuclear fuel cycle is an issue on which the experts disagree. The Liberals have presented a totally one-sided case to the South Australian people, and they have completely ignored many questions of grave concern. I have tried here to present some of the arguments for the other side.

As California's Governor Brown pointed out, if the anti-nuclear lobbyists are wrong they can do something else. If the pro-nuclear lobby is wrong the results will be catastrophic. It is for this reason that I believe that prudence dictates that we should wait until there is a scientific and popular consensus, one way or another, on the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I thank his Excellency for his Opening Speech. I commend the Hon. Barbara Wiese for her maiden speech, if not on its contents. I wish to refer also to the Hons. Jessie Cooper, Dick Geddes, Don Banfield and Tom Casey who have departed from our midst since the last Parliament. Each of them befriended me when I entered this Chamber in 1975, and I wish them well in their future pursuits. They are far too active mentally to retire.

His Excellency stated, *inter alia*, that the new Government will stimulate industrial expansion. I believe, and many share my view, that the principal deterrent to development by the private sector in this State has been the oppressive manner in which the previous Government controlled the prices of commodities and services under the South Australian Prices Act. It became essentially profit control rather than price control, and I wish to speak

today about its effect on our development.

Many companies, wherever based, preferred to expand in other States where profit was not a dirty word and free markets existed. Some executives of local companies developed a negative attitude because of the method of controlling prices in this State. To give but one example, I recall a senior executive in the chemical industry, who is now deceased, saying to me some years ago in reply to my suggestion that he should rebuild and modernise a works; "What's the use? If we improve productivity and increase profits the Labor Government very soon will set lower prices in order to prevent us making higher profits."

Before proceeding, I wish to say something of past efforts to freeze, control or justify prices, especially during the periods of war or inflation. History records that in 19 A.D. Tiberius took steps to fix the price of basic foodstuffs, as did Nero after him, but it had the result of increasing the scarcity and worsening the inflationary trend rather than curing it. Despite these discouraging experiences, in 301 A.D. Diocletian, confronted by public outrage at rising prices, enacted the "Edict of Maximum Prices" to cover all commodities in the Empire without exception. The penalty for dealing in any commodity above the scheduled price was death for the vendor, death for the purchaser, and death also for any third party who tried to hoard the commodity in question, and there was no provision for leniency. Despite the sanctions imposed, this edict once again was unsuccessful in stopping inflation.

Moving forward about 1 600 years to Australia, the Federal Government first imposed price control in 1916 during the First World War, pursuant to the defence powers in the Constitution. This was challenged but the High Court upheld the Government action with the proviso that "any attempt by the Commonwealth Parliament to fix the price of food in time of peace would be a trespass upon the assured powers of the States".

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Mr. President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: Price control lapsed after 1918 but was revived by the Federal Government at the start of the Second World War, through defence and then specific prices regulations. At first, prices of essential goods were controlled, then commodities generally, and later services as well. These included real property transactions, mortgages, interest rates, raising of share capital and share transactions, whilst profit margins were pegged to the actual margin of profit existing in 1942. Because of war time, the community accepted these all-embracing controls even though the penalties for breach had been reduced from those imposed by Diocletian in the main to monetary fines. Since a breach of price regulations probably falls within the category of white-collar crime, the lessening of the penalty from death to a fine doubtless would be repugnant to the previous Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan.

Federal control over prices continued for some time after the war, because the High Court held that the defence power in the Constitution included the right not only to operate during the war but also to wind up after a war and restore a condition of peace as circumstances may require. The Labor Party attempted to acquire permanent control over prices and rents, but this was rejected in a referendum in 1948, and by the end of the following year, after the Liberal Party gained power, Federal control over prices expired.

The States in the meantime had entered the field, and by 1948 each had passed legislation on the subject of prices, much of which remains in force today, although in

some States it has not been used actively.

In New South Wales, under the Prices Regulations Act only bread and petrol are controlled, although other Statutes cover milk, coal, gas and electricity. In Victoria only the prices of electricity, eggs, milk and a few other primary products are fixed by Statute. Various Statutes exist in Queensland to regulate land sales as well as primary production, liquor and electricity. There is no general statute controlling prices in Western Australia although some regulatory powers exist over milk, flour, bread and eggs.

In contrast to the other States, South Australia, by its Prices Act of 1948, introduced by the Playford Government, enacted a comprehensive Statute which continued the principles and administrative approach of the Federal war-time legislation. Hundreds of goods and services were proclaimed. Throughout the balance of the Playford, then the Walsh, Hall and Dunstan Administrations until 1974, the Act operated on a year-to-year basis. Thereafter, it was given a degree of permanence in that it operated on a three-yearly basis.

Price control in South Australia became a sacred cow, and, even when my Party had a 16 to four majority in this Chamber, it was still maintained. Some products have been decontrolled over the years, and I refer in particular to such diverse items as tomato sauce, poisons and sheep dip, cooking utensils, glassware, and galvanised iron.

However, the deletions are minor compared to those that still remain under price control in South Australia. Of these, Division 1 covers liquors and tobacco; Division 2, groceries and foodstuffs; Division 5, clothing; Division 13, leather and rubber goods, including tyres and tubes; Division 14, paper and stationery; Division 15, drugs and chemicals; Division 16, paints, adhesives and plastics; Division 17, packages and containers; Division 18, miscellaneous items, such as, gelnite, sand and gravel; Division 19, services covering such items as funerals and plumbing; and Division 20, non-intoxicating drinks.

In all, this is a formidable list. The above items are subject to a maximum price. In contrast, wine grapes produced in the main by small planters are subject to a minimum price below which a winery may not buy such grapes. A few other products, such as cement, are not proclaimed under the Act but by agreement the manufacturers do not raise their prices except with the consent of the Prices Commissioner.

Although price control has been maintained by both Liberal and Labor Governments, there has been a difference in the method of administering the Act. Demonstrable movements in the cost of materials, wages and overheads have been approved by both Parties, albeit with some delay, but the granting of margins of profit has depended much upon a particular political philosophy, because of the essence of established guidelines.

For example, if there is productivity increase, how does a Minister allot, with justice, the attainment of increased productivity? Who is the proper recipient, the company, the employees or the community in the form of reduced or non-increased prices; or all three and, if all three, in what proportions?

Consider also the need to make profits. A company, in order to expand, must have funds, and these will come from retained profits, calls upon shareholders or borrowings from institutions. It goes without saying that, whichever method is used, the company must make adequate profits in order to provide the source of funds or give the shareholders or lending institutions confidence to invest.

For some years past during the previous Labor Government, the amount of profit allowed in price

increases was either deleted altogether or restricted below the percentage previously earned by particular companies. This had a devastating effect, especially during the Whitlam era of rapid inflation. No wonder companies so affected looked elsewhere to invest. With some products the price applying in other capitals is up to double that allowed in Adelaide. Stone is a case in point. The ex-quarry price of 20 mm concrete aggregate in Adelaide is \$4.02, in Perth \$6.57, in Melbourne \$7.25 and in Sydney \$8.35.

Companies producing commodities under price control have been denuded of adequate profits. If the companies are public ones, the price of their shares on the Stock Exchange is often far too low, and they are vulnerable to takeover by predators from elsewhere. These predators usually wish to sell the local products in eastern markets, where higher prices prevail. It can be argued that local companies themselves can sell interstate, and this they do, but in many instances the large Melbourne or Sydney based companies have better market outlets to dispose of such products.

Before concluding, I wish to make a brief reference to the Federal prices justification legislation. Honourable members will recall that, after Mr. Whitlam came to power, he held a referendum seeking power to control both prices and wages federally but, as in 1948, the proposal was rejected.

Following this rejection, the Whitlam Government set up the Prices Justification Tribunal whose validity depends upon the Federal power with respect to corporations. The tribunal may inquire only into prices charged by companies. There is no penalty for failure to conform to its findings but, because of fear of adverse publicity, only one company to date has refused to comply.

Initially each company with an annual turnover exceeding \$20 000 000 had to notify the tribunal of its products and the prices charged for same. Subsequently this minimum annual turnover was raised to \$30 000 000, but the tribunal was given the power also to initiate inquiries into the activities of companies of lesser size.

The tribunal had difficulty from the outset because of lack of guidelines to determine acceptable price levels. Whilst it strove to establish criteria, there were inevitable delays. Preparing briefs to present to the tribunal was costly and time consuming, and many criticised its activities. Eventually the Fraser Government reduced the scope of the Prices Justification Tribunal so that now it has a monitoring function; that is, it initiates inquiries where it believes that prices have risen disproportionately to movements in the costs of raw materials, the consumer price index, and the like.

At the outset South Australian companies with products proclaimed under the Prices Act, and with an annual turnover exceeding \$20 000 000 and later \$30 000 000, had to obtain consent from both the Federal and State authority before increasing prices. It was common for approvals to be delayed for months, during which time local companies could not recoup increases in material and wage costs. This was most unfair.

I hope that my colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs will see fit to review thoroughly the operation of the Prices Act and set new guidelines on profit. No-one doubts that officers in the Prices Branch act conscientiously, but it is an unenviable task. Hundreds of products are proclaimed still as being subject to price control. Many of these could be deleted, especially in instances where there is an ample number of suppliers to provide competition.

If the Minister feels that it is necessary to maintain an apparatus to control prices, surely it should have a monitoring role similar to the Federal practice rather than

continue with a system which was devised to meet the needs of the Second World War and has been continued almost unaltered for more than 30 years in South Australia, but in no other States.

I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: It is an old and honoured truth among politicians that one must always try to be magnanimous in victory and gracious in defeat. It is also true that most new Governments deserve and almost always get a honeymoon period of varying duration. Unfortunately, there seems to have been a somewhat less than magnanimous approach by some members opposite, particularly regarding the allocation of accommodation on this side of Parliament House. Nevertheless, I congratulate the Government, especially the new Cabinet Ministers in this Council, on their very good victory.

At the same time, I warn them that the honeymoon is now over and the trials and tribulations of real marriage have begun. There are already signs emerging that some members of this Government are incompetent. We intend to exploit that incompetence. There are also clear signs emerging that theirs is a winner-take-all approach which will further divide a frightened and demoralised community and leave little room for a bipartisan endeavour. We intend to resist that approach.

There are already queries regarding the application of their blinkered conservative ideology, which may quickly lead to confrontation and division in the South Australian community. We will try to restrain their excesses. In the case of at least one Minister there are already queries regarding conflicting pecuniary interests.

I have already begun that. I have been accused in some quarters of playing gutter politics. It is completely legitimate for the Opposition to probe the financial background of Ministers, if there is any suggestion that they may influence decisions that might be made. I make clear that I intend to continue that role. I believe that our role in Opposition is already well defined. It is three-fold: to oppose, construct and reconstruct.

We will oppose all Government initiatives that we conscientiously believe are wrong. This is not only a legitimate role: it is also our duty. This does not confer on us any right to act as knockers at all times as the present Government did when in Opposition. However, it does impose a continuing duty to analyse and dissect.

State Government, despite political nuances and thrusts, is basically about good administration. State Budgets must, as near as practicable, be balanced. The use of smaller statutory authorities for semi-government borrowings is a legitimate tool condoned by the Federal Treasury. However, there are limits to their use, and they can only be used in a responsible way to provide public sector finance that otherwise would not be available. Despite its promised ill-conceived sunset legislation, the Tonkin Government will find it essential to maintain most of them.

The great policy thrust in any Federal system, however, will always come from the national Government. Economic policy must reside with it, just as responsibility for its effects on the nation must rest with it.

For these reasons, of course, the central theme of the recent election campaign run by the Liberal Party and its third Party compatriots and front men was based on deceit and lies. That they were successful is no reflection on the collective intelligence of the electorate. Unfortunately, we have now been in a period of recession for almost five years. As we approach the 1980's, there are many indications that, unhappily, this may deepen to depression

levels. It is understandable in these circumstances that the electorate is frightened, demoralised and destabilised.

Sadly, the great visions and altruism of the early part of this decade have been replaced by selfishness and cynicism, fed and nurtured by the so-called new conservatism.

In this environment it is easy to adopt the lowest common denominator approach, to play on the fears and uncertainties of the electorate, to come as false prophets, and to offer superficial panaceas. The basic flaw with this approach, however, is that irresponsible promises cannot be matched by deeds. The first of a series of promises by the new State Government is already broken. The first hint of disillusionment is already evident in the electorate. The first cracks in the temporary facade of unity are already clear.

It is significant that, on the first day of the first Parliamentary session of this Government's term, its Party room nominations for Speaker of another place and President of this Council were defeated on the floor of both Houses, which was hardly an auspicious start. Nevertheless, this strange coalition of pharmacist and farmer, orchardist and ophthalmologist, bookmaker, barrister and broker does have a majority in its own right on the floor of the Lower House and, therefore, is entitled to govern without undue obstruction. On the other hand, the people of South Australia have shown through the ballot box that in 1979 they have changed course and, for the time being, accept and endorse the principle of a House of Review.

For these reasons a heavy burden will fall on all A.L.P. members, and particularly on the Hon. Lance Milne, to review all legislation and to oppose vigorously proposals that are not in the interest of the State, and occasionally to reject or submit for reconsideration schemes that are clearly against the interest of the majority of our citizens.

One of the most important things that we will have to consider in the three to 3½ years that lie before us is that of electoral matters. It was significant today that the Attorney-General, under persistent questioning, shifted around and evaded a great deal but did not give a clear "Yes" or "No" answer to continued questioning regarding a redistribution in the Lower House. I believe that an early redistribution would be about as popular in this State as an early election. Indeed, I think that more politicians at present would be considered by the electorate to be as popular as the plague. I cannot read the Hon. Mr. Milne's mind regarding these matters, but I have a strange feeling that he would be inclined to endorse my sentiments in this regard.

We will also be faced with some changes in the system of electing this Council. Again, I believe that Mr. Milne will have a heavy responsibility. I am heartened by the fact that a friend of mine wrote to Mr. Milne shortly after his election to congratulate him, and took the trouble to point out that, in the event that proposals were brought in to change to something more akin to the Senate system, he hoped that it would not involve the exhaustive numbers process. He pointed out that, once people had indicated their choice from No. 1 to No. 11, they should be able to put down their pencils, and that any other scheme that involves filling in 40, 50 or 60 squares becomes extraordinarily confusing and, therefore, quite undemocratic, as the substantial proportion of people in the electorate become so confused that they are virtually disfranchised.

The Hon. Mr. Milne wrote back to my friend, thanking him for his congratulations and suggestions, and stated that changes would be made and that he would do as he was asked. I am pleased to know that the Hon. Mr. Milne

has given that indication that he will not support any scheme that might deliberately or otherwise tend to confuse the voters.

For my part, I will always oppose incompetence, patronage and dishonesty wherever I find them. I will resist attempts to redistribute wealth to the brokers of power and privilege. I will reject all endeavours to turn back the clock. Question Time will be used in the best traditions of the Westminster system to expose the weaknesses of this strange conglomeration of individuals that comprise the Liberal Government. On the other hand, there will no doubt be many occasions on which we on the Opposition benches can be entirely constructive. All reasonable legislation will be treated reasonably. I am sure that the experience and ability available on this side of the Chamber will produce many worthwhile amendments.

During this time there will be a healthy and robust period of reconstruction within the South Australian Labor Party. I have never been impressed by political theories or absolutism. Attitudes and policies constantly change. We must always be flexible enough to meet the needs and aspirations of the people at any given time, while avoiding a simplistic, populist approach. It will not be enough for us to wait for the Tonkin Government to self-destruct, although I believe that it has the capacity to do this at a record rate. Nor will it be enough for us to rest on the undoubted achievements of the Dunstan decade. We have just had overwhelming evidence that simply promising more of the same thing and standing on a record will never be sufficient for a Party of reform. That is a lesson which we have learnt and taken deeply to heart.

The Labor Party in South Australia is currently going through a healthy, brief but deep period of introspection. Much to the dismay of our opponents, this has not resulted in any blood letting or faction fighting. There is ample evidence that the process is one of active, intelligent reconstruction. In the short term, it has already produced a spirited, cohesive Parliamentary Opposition. Next year, it will have reproduced a revitalised, reinvigorated grass roots based Party structure.

It will also provide a true alternative Government vastly superior politically, practically and morally to the conservatives. The new Labor Government that will be elected at the end of three years will be sensitively in touch with the people of the State. It will be led by the most able and attractive person in State politics, John Bannon, amply and adroitly supported by a team manifestly more competent than our political opponents. It will demonstrate that social democratic principles are what will meet the aspirations of the community in the difficult times that lie ahead.

We will explain these principles, based on economic reality and tempered with humanity, equity and compassion, in a crusade throughout the State. Never again will we allow the myths, the lies and the derogatory propaganda of our opponents to overwhelm us, no matter what support they receive from the faceless third party sources or the Murdoch press.

While referring to the media, I make it clear that, as far as I am concerned, the treatment that the former Government received during the election campaign from the *Advertiser* and from the electronic media was very fair. I have absolutely no criticism of them at all, but I do believe that the campaign which was run by the *News* was the most scurrilous that I have ever seen, and I would include in that the 1949 Federal election.

Our policies will look forward to the needs of the vast majority of South Australians in the 1980's—policies based on the realities of our times and not on the rhetoric

or dogma of the past.

I turn now to the specific issue of uranium mining, enrichment, storage of nuclear waste products, and disposal. My personal stand over the years that I have been a member of this Council has been essentially a pragmatic one. In an area that is extremely emotional, I have always tried to base my decisions on logic and facts rather than on political or gut reaction. Recent events have convinced me that I should adopt the strongest possible stance against uranium mining and enrichment in South Australia.

The first reason is based on purely economic grounds. Here I take this opportunity to commend the Hon. Miss Wiese for her excellent contribution this afternoon. I do not expect to match that contribution, nor do I intend to go into the process step by step, but it is based on economic grounds.

I do not believe that the world community currently has the technology to use nuclear power on the massive scale necessary to make it economically feasible. In addition to the much publicised large-scale and potentially disastrous accident such as that at Three Mile Island, there are innumerable day-to-day problems in maintaining reactors. For every Harrisburg incident there are literally hundreds of malfunctions of various kinds. Expert reports from around the world suggest that maximum performance is only obtained from any reactor for from five to six months in any 12-month period.

For this reason, particularly, the growth in the number of nuclear reactors around the world has recently been very tentative and slow. There is a real possibility that in the foreseeable future the world price of uranium will slump dramatically. It could well become the "fool's gold" of the mid-1980's—about the time that Roxby Downs would come into production.

The second reason why I cannot ever see uranium being widely accepted as the major source of static power generation is the fear factor. The whole nuclear industry has its origins in the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Very few communities will now accept a nuclear reactor in their region without massive civil disturbance. The fact that the uneasy peace in the world still rests on the balance of terror of a nuclear holocaust surely bodes ill for any wide-scale community acceptance.

The third reason is that adequate safeguards for the transport of wastes on a global scale do not exist, nor does the technology, as yet, for safe disposal. When there is widespread evidence and global consensus that all of these problems have been overcome, I may change my attitude. In the meantime, I believe that as a legislator with some scientific background, as an environmentalist, and as a human being concerned not only for the future of my children but for all the children of the world, I have a duty to warn the citizens of South Australia to proceed with great caution. They should not look for the pot of gold that may well not exist: beware of the terrible dangers that at present certainly do exist.

Finally, let me warn all citizens of South Australia about what this State Government is up to regarding uranium. The indecent haste with which the Government is getting into the nuclear club is most alarming. Within 48 hours of being sworn into the new Cabinet, Mr. Goldsworthy, as Minister of Mines and Energy, issued his first major press statement. In it he stated that construction of a nuclear enrichment plant in South Australia could begin in 1980 (at that time only three months away), without any reference to a specific site, without any reference to firm plans, and certainly with no consideration at all of an environmental impact study.

That was surely one of the most irresponsible statements

I have ever heard in my life. It was typical of the cavalier, totally irresponsible, ill-considered and headlong rush approach which the Government adopted to uranium mining in its early and heady days.

This week, however, something even more frightening and much more sinister has emerged. The first warning came in yesterday's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Plan to Dump Wastes in Old U-Mine". The report, sourced directly from Mr. Goldsworthy, states:

South Australia's old uranium mine, Radium Hill, may soon be open again—as a dump for radioactive wastes . . .

According to the Minister, the Mines and Health Departments were looking at the feasibility of using the mine for wastes.

I was very disturbed, and immediately began investigations into the proposal. The further I investigated, the more uneasy I became. The only waste which was referred to directly in the story was "core samples and material from the site", that is, Roxby Downs.

My information (and I can assure the Council it is from reliable sources) is that the core samples (amounting to approximately 10 tonnes) are so innocuous that they could be buried in a suburban backyard. Some of the other material from Amdel, relatively small quantities, is somewhat more radioactive but falls simply into the "handle with care" category. Its disposal certainly does not warrant a feasibility study at Radium Hill, where background radiation levels are significantly higher than those of the waste material.

What is the real motive behind the feasibility study and the gentle, obscure statement reported in the *Advertiser*? I believe that the Government and the Minister may be making contingency plans to make Radium Hill an international dumping ground for high-level radioactive waste from potential customer countries! The prospect is appalling.

Let me take the story further. Last night at 8.30 p.m. I debated the subject with Mr. Goldsworthy at the A.B.C. studios for a *Nationwide* segment. That has not yet gone to air but I am able to give members a sneak preview.

The proposition was put that the Government was contemplating using Radium Hill as an international dump for nuclear wastes. The argument was that, if sales were becoming increasingly difficult, they could be made much more attractive if the Government would enter into agreements to take and store nuclear wastes at Radium Hill.

On at least three occasions during the debate I sought an absolute assurance from Mr. Goldsworthy that at no time

during the life of this Government would it enter into any contract or agreement to use Radium Hill or any other area in South Australia as an international dumping ground.

He dodged, ducked and weaved. He dissembled and prevaricated. But he declined to give any firm assurance at all. All South Australians should be warned that, beyond doubt, this Government, this Minister, are contemplating turning Radium Hill into an international dumping ground for highly toxic nuclear wastes. No matter what their views are on uranium mining, every citizen of South Australia must be appalled at this development.

I understand that this afternoon Mr. Goldsworthy, having some second thoughts about his performance at the A.B.C. last night, and having been given, presumably, some advice from his team of advisers, has made a statement in another place accusing me of scare tactics.

Apparently, the Minister has given some sort of qualified assurance. From that, I can only draw one of two conclusions; either the Minister is grossly incompetent and was unable to follow the tenor of the debate last night and was therefore unable to handle himself as one would expect from a Minister of the Crown, or alternatively he is being extremely devious.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It sounds as though you got done last night.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: If the Hon. Mr. Dawkins watches the debate tonight, I assure him that he will derive no pleasure from it at all. In either case the Minister is not fit to hold the very important portfolio of Minister of Mines and Energy. I want to make it clear that in raising this matter I intended no mischief at all, but sought unqualified assurances. However, I did not receive unqualified assurances. I repeat for the benefit of Government members, that I can only draw two conclusions: either the Deputy Premier is a gross incompetent or, alternatively, he is being rather devious and is keeping something up his sleeve. Either way, he loses. In conclusion, no matter what denials the Minister issues, I urge everyone to watch the debate and judge for themselves. I support the motion.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 23 October at 2.15 p.m.