HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 2 June 1982

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

PETITION: CASINO

A petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling and reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILD-PARENT CENTRES

A petition signed by 210 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide for child-parent centres to remain under the care and control of the Education Department was presented by Mr Ashenden.

Petition received.

PETITION: DEMOLITION OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS

A petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia praying that the House stop any further demolition of residential buildings for the purpose of commercial expansion in residential and semi-residential areas of Adelaide and amend the City of Adelaide Development Control Act accordingly was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CASINO BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): As Chairman of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill (1982), I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In view of the events which took place in this House yesterday a special meeting of the casino Select Committee was held today at midday. As Chairman of the Select Committee, I must inform the House of a motion passed at the meeting.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes. The motion states:

That this committee views with concern the making of allegations by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that money was offered to the Government by unnamed persons, for the introduction of the Casino Bill into the South Australian Parliament. Further, these allegations were canvassed in the House by two members of the Select Committee. Further, the committee believes that it has at all times carried out its duties objectively, without fear or favour. Until these allegations are either substantiated in the House of Assembly or withdrawn without qualification this committee resolves:

(a) that it can no longer properly carry out its functions to collect and evaluate evidence on the Casino Bill, 1982; and

(b) adjourns its proceedings.

The text of this motion should be communicated to the House forthwith.

On 30 March in this House, the Leader of the Opposition asked:

Is the Deputy Premier able to give a categorical denial that any donation of money has been offered or accepted by the Liberal Party or by any Government members to facilitate the introduction of a Casino Bill to this House?

The Leader stated in his question:

It has been reported to me that one business interest has offered a sizable sum of money for political campaign purposes if a Bill were to be introduced to allow debate and a vote on a casino.

This allegation was categorically denied by the Acting Premier. The following day, in debate on the Casino Bill, the Leader returned to the subject, when he said:

I suggest most strongly that we have not really heard the full truth about what financial or other incentives have been suggested to the Government in return for introducing this measure. Those remarks and my question the other day have not been made lightly.

In his speech he also said:

It is well known that at least one company interested in these areas of casinos is prepared to provide financial or electoral campaign expenses to Parties that are willing to sponsor some measure of this.

The member for Hanson interjected, 'Name the company'. The Leader responded:

I am not saying that this is conditional on the passage of the Bill. However, I am saying that this is a wellknown fact.

Again, the Acting Premier denied the Leader's allegations. In the *News* on 23 April, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition called for an investigation of allegations that the Liberal Party was offered money to introduce the casino legislation. The *News* quoted the Deputy Leader as saying, 'We know there was money offered,' and, 'The Government's sudden and unexplained about-turn leaves a suspicion that the Liberal Party could have accepted the developer's offer of a campaign contribution before the Bill was introduced.'

The Deputy Leader repeated his allegations about the offer of campaign contributions on 20 May, and he also alleged in a statement on that date that the Government had been actively negotiating with an interstate hotel corporation about establishing a casino in South Australia. Again, these allegations were strongly denied by the Acting Premier. The Deputy Leader said he would be raising new information when Parliament resumed. It should be recognised that allegations were made on four separate occasions prior to yesterday's resumption of Parliament. On each occasion, the Opposition did not name the people or organisations said to be involved.

Yesterday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition named Federal Hotels Ltd, but that organisation had previously denied any involvement of a type alleged by the Opposition. Apart from that, members of the Opposition who spoke on this matter in this House yesterday produced no new information. This situation leaves the Select Committee with no option other than to report to the House in the manner outlined in the motion:

Until these allegations are either substantiated in the House of Assembly or withdrawn without qualification, this committee resolves:

(a) that it can no longer properly carry out its functions to collect and evaluate evidence on the Casino Bill, 1982; and

(b) adjourns its proceedings.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FEDERAL FUNDS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I wish to advise the House that I am seeking urgent talks with the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, about recommendations made by the Grants Commission for cuts in South Australia's allocation of Federal funds. Although the Grants Commission in its latest report

has recommended a reduction of $51 000 000 in funds to South Australia, as opposed to its 1981 figure of $91 000 000, this is still totally unacceptable to this Government. South Australia is not in a position to accept a reduction in funds of this level, and I will be fighting to ensure that this State's current levels of Federal funding are maintained.

The South Australian Government, more than any Government in Australia, including the Commonwealth, has made economic sacrifices to maintain firm control over its economic situation. These are factors which must be taken into account. I intend to see the Prime Minister as soon as possible to put South Australia's case in the strongest possible terms. A reduction of Federal funding of this size would have a detrimental impact on almost every area of Government responsibility in South Australia.

The commission has certainly followed the terms of reference set down by the Premiers' Conference last year and has presented information on different bases and taking into account different trends. However, the approach which obviously now it puts forward as its preferred option is based almost completely on fiscal equalisation. There are very many other factors which should be considered, particularly in developing States. The commission has totally ignored these in its recommendations.

Also, from South Australia's point of view, its continued failure to take into account the Railways Transfer Agreement is a significant factor in this recommended reduction in funds for the State. Again this points out the enormous folly of the Dunstan Government in not insisting on a formal and binding contract to protect the verbal arrangements which were made for an increase in the State's share of taxation. The Hospitals Agreement is another factor not taken into account by the commission, but in this case, unlike the railways agreement, there is an agreement, a legal document, and we will be arguing strongly that this should be taken into account, too.

QUESTION TIME

BOLIVAR TREATMENT WORKS

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say whether it is a fact that Cabinet has secretly approved a deal with a private company involving payment by the State of $15 000 000 over 20 years in order that the company can make free use of the Bolivar Treatment Works for the disposal of noxious trade waste? I have been advised that a submission was presented to Cabinet containing details of a six-part agreement with the wool-scouring firm of G. H. Michell and Sons, of Salisbury South. The firm is enabled to send its effluent to Bolivar for 20 years from 1 May this year without payment of a fee. Michells presently account for 25 per cent of the load on Bolivar and this, in fact, costs the taxpayer $600 000 annually. If the full capacity of Bolivar is reached, a pretreatment plant will be established without cost to the company.

The Government is to do its best to provide Michells with adequate power and the company has been advised that it is likely to get $300 000 under the Establishment Payments Scheme. The proposition was put to Cabinet by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and approved on 8 April. In other States—and I will not interrupt the briefing being given by the Minister of Industrial Affairs—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has the opportunity to explain his question.

Mr BANNON: I am attempting to do so, Sir, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! Explain the question.

Mr BANNON: In other States, such trade waste disposal is a charge on the industry itself, not on the State. I am advised that the consequences of the deal are believed to involve Bolivar in severe overloading, especially when the plant has to cope with winery wastes from the Barossa. Trade waste disposal fees are an important revenue earner, and to dispense with them absolutely suggests that, in fact, the Government seeks to attract so-called dirty or noxious industry in order to get development at any cost. I am further advised that the C.S.I.R.O. believes that Michells can cope with their trade waste themselves on site at an expense of $1 000 000.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that the Leader of the Opposition is either jumping to conclusions, or his source (because obviously he has a source) is not fully informing him or not fully aware of the facts. I will be delighted to get a detailed report for the honourable gentleman and bring it to the House. But I will say this: I find it extraordinary that the Leader of the Opposition should publicly, and in this place, stand up and malign—because he is maligning—a well-known South Australian company, an employer—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A large employer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A large employer—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Considering expansion.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is a South Australian-based company that is considering expansion in this State, and this will involve the creation of more jobs. Without having come to the Government to ask what the correct situation is, the Opposition seems to ventilate it and castigate by inference the company in this Chamber. I find that quite remarkable.

We are prepared to support existing South Australian companies. Indeed, we are exhorted by the Leader of the Opposition and others on occasions to support existing South Australian companies. I cannot understand what this sudden turn around is. If arrangements can be made to help the company concerned to expand its activities and create jobs, then there is nothing, in my view, that can be criticised in that. I will certainly get a detailed report on the matter and make it available to this House. But, more to the point, I would say that I wish the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition members generally would start to support companies that create employment in this State and not continually try to tear them down.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House about the latest figures on expenditure on mineral exploration in South Australia? The Minister will be aware of the many and varied statements by the Leader of the Opposition and members of the Opposition, which statements range from calculated guesses to stabs in the dark and to plain piffle.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will appreciate that he may state facts but may not comment in giving his explanation.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It is very important to the House that Opposition members as well as Government members be fully informed of the true facts.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would be delighted to inform the member of Glenelg of the true facts, and I hope that members of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We get things which are purported to be facts put before this House, of which we have had a significant example from the Opposition in relation to the casino question, but which have no basis in fact whatsoever. So, in answer to the member for Glenelg, let me put to the House some facts, using the true meaning of the word.

The expenditure on mineral exploration in South Australia during the calendar year 1981 was $51 000 000. It is pertinent to point out that this is about equal to the total expenditure during the much vaunted pace-setting decade of the Dunstan and Labor Administrations. The amount of money spent in mineral exploration during the last calendar year in South Australia was about equal to, or within, $2 000 000 or $3 000 000 of that spent in the 10 years under Labor.

I am sorry that the shadow Minister is not present in the Chamber because he challenged some figures I gave to the House some time ago. However, these are even more spectacular. The fact is that the number of exploration licences held at the end of December 1981 was 466, which is 343 more than at the end of June 1979. The number of companies—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is quite significant. In fact, that is the understatement of the answer: it is enormously significant. The number of companies involved in exploration was 92, more than double the number of companies at the end of June 1979, during the declining years of the Labor decade. In case people think that a lot of this is due to the Roxby Downs effort, which, unfortunately, has a cloud over it as a result of the views of the Opposition, I state that that accounts for only about 29 per cent of this expenditure.

This level of activity represents the most widespread and systematic search ever undertaken in the history of South Australia. I think that that is the intimation that the member for Glenelg is seeking. I point out that the South Australian Labor Party's enthusiastic support of one of its Federal colleagues (I think his name is Keating) for a resource rental tax, an excursion undertaken by the late Xavier Connell when a Labor Minister, would kill off the level of exploration not only in this State but in the whole nation. Let the Labor Party tell the public of South Australia what the effect of its policies would be on this record level of exploration which, in due course, could lead to further discoveries, and of its attitude to that enormous, world-wide resource at Roxby Downs.

TOP HAT CATERERS

Mr SLATER: Will the Premier request the Attorney-General to obtain a report on the activities of Top Hat Caterers Pty Ltd as to whether that company has any association with Abon Pty Ltd and Mr Abe Saffron? Top Hat Caterers is a foreign company registered in South Australia. It has sole catering rights and contract with the South Australian Jockey Club. It is interesting to note that this company provided capital improvements to the Morphettville grandstand to the value of $300 000 which improvements were installed by the caterer at its cost, although those improvements remain the property of the S.A.J.C. Top Hat Caterers, a company in Western Australia, changed its name to Hickson Holdings Pty Ltd and has a share capital of three $1 shares. The documents lodged at the Companies Office in South Australia for both Top Hat Caterers and Abon Pty Ltd were lodged by Mr Peter Vardon Fairweather, who was named by a former Attorney-General as an associate of Mr Saffron.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will be pleased to get a report from the Attorney-General for the honourable member. However, I must make the point in all seriousness that it is not long ago that allegations were made in this place about another restaurant proprietor in Adelaide. I do not intend to go into details because it was a most unfortunate naming, linking that name, potentially, with Mr Abe Saffron.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They're pretty good on the smear, aren't they.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A great deal of smear came from that. Whether or not the honourable member is accurate, I suggest that it would be better in future simply to make a direct approach to the Attorney-General so that, in fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no question but that the Attorney-General would follow through such a complaint and report back to the honourable member and, if necessary, take appropriate proceedings. I will certainly get a report for the honourable member, but I just sound that note of warning against naming names in this Chamber under privilege when there may not, in the ultimate outcome, be any justification for so doing.

MEAT INDUSTRY CONFERENCE

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether secretarial services to the meat industry conference will continue to be provided by the Department of Agriculture following the retirement of Mr Jack Kiley at the end of this month and, if not, why not.

I refer to a report which appeared in the country edition of yesterday's *Advertiser* in an article entitled 'No understudy to Secretary. Industry criticises Government Minister', on page 8B in the 'On the Land' supplement. In that report Mr Darcy Cowell criticised the Minister for not insisting that his officers carry on this service. I will briefly quote that article, as follows:

'... this year would be the last time with Jack Kiley as Secretary, and he himself has been hoping the department would be able to find someone who on a part-time basis could sit down with him until he finished and get a bit of expertise for next year's conference and for the carcass competitions.' Mr Cowell said ...

'I know the Chairman of the beef carcass competition committee, Mr R. Norris, went to see the Minister some weeks ago on this matter, and was told Mr Chapman would do something about it. The members of the pig carcass competition committee are worried too ... I really hope that before Jack Kiley finishes up the department gets someone to go and pick his brains as to how to run this conference next year, and also to pick up expertise for organising the two carcass competitions.'

Mr Langley interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I would not want to try to pick the brains of some people opposite; I could not find them. The article continued:

The conference gave Mr Kiley a standing ovation in recognition of his services to the meat industry in South Australia since 1966 ... Mr Chapman had said in reply that a minute 'had gone down about this weeks ago'.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The services to the meat industry will be continued. Frankly, there was never any intention to discontinue those services either before or subsequent to the retirement of Mr Jack Kiley. I am aware of the article to which the honourable member refers, and it was with some disappointment that I read the reported remarks made by Mr Darcy Cowell. I think it is appropriate to indicate to the House that Mr Darcy Cowell is a primary producer of very long standing in this State. Indeed, he makes an enormous contribution to the industry. It just so happens that, with the best of intent, he has been led astray on the facts surrounding this subject.

To further clarify the position, I point out that in January this year Mr Stehr from the School of Food and Catering at the Regency Park Community College, and also a representative of the livestock marketing group, which was referred to by the honourable member, communicated with our office bringing Mr Kiley's replacement to my attention.

A minute produced by my Secretary on 8 January, in response to these requests, was as follows:

> The attached report on the replacement of Mr John Kiley who intends to retire on 9 July 1982 was prompted by Gordon Stehr as representative of the Livestock Marketing Study Group. Industry members of the L.M.S.G. undoubtedly will want to seek your assurance that Mr Kiley will be replaced . . .

I noted on that minute that it would seem essential that the department maintain the secretarial service, and I went on to respond to that minute, by way of a direction to the department, the following:

> Arrange paper procedure so changeover is swift when the time comes.

I indicated that it would be desirable to advise the industry of that intent. Somewhere along the line poor old Mr Darcy Cowell got his wires crossed. He had an opportunity presented to him to vent his feelings, and the journalist in question took him up without checking with the department or me about the true position.

However, just to be on the safe side, I telephoned Mr Grant Andrews, that much celebrated Secretary of United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia, this morning. After I drew the matter to his attention, he quickly divorced himself and his organisation from the remarks made by Mr Darcy Cowell and expressed also his disappointment that dear old Darcy appeared to have got off on the wrong track. However, this does not take away Mr Cowell's credibility or his contribution to the industry: it is just that, on this occasion, remote as it is, he got the wrong end of the stick. The situation is well in hand, and the services undertaken by Mr Kiley will be provided by very appropriate and experienced personnel following his retirement.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Is the Minister of Health yet ready to reverse a statement made to the *News* several days ago that a shortage of funds was not the cause of the grave and scandalous position at the Government hospital in Mount Gambier, and that, as is the understanding of all those close to the problem, finance is indeed at the heart of the matter, not a lack of suitably qualified nurses?

The information that I give the Minister in explanation was gained first hand in Mount Gambier late last week. The question stems from a statement she made to the *News* on Monday, responding to my call for more money for the hospital, by calling it 'nonsense'. My first-hand information can be condensed, for the purpose of this question, into five major points. First, funds for the hospital have been cut heavily and, as a direct consequence, nursing staff has been reduced; staffing is 85 per cent of the hospital budget. Secondly, wards have been closed, services have been cut back, staff particularly in the medical wards are under severe pressure and the South-East community is rightly alarmed. Thirdly, hospital authorities, who ought to know, say they had to close wards because they were short of staff following Health Commission funding cuts. Fourthly, there is a growing State shortage of some specialist nurses but largely in the intensive care and neo-natal areas. However, Mount Gambier has no problems with intensive care and provides no neo-natal clinic. Fifthly, the hospital, I believe, is about to complain to the Health Commission about what it sees as the commission's blindness to the real needs of country hospitals that lack resident medical staff and many of the back-up services available in Adelaide.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I certainly do not withdraw from anything that I said in response to the allegations made by the Deputy Leader when I spoke to the *News* on Monday. I have subsequently checked with the Executive Director of the Southern Sector of the South Australian Health Commission, who has responsibility for the budgeting arrangements for the Mount Gambier Hospital, as to the accuracy of my response on that occasion, and he has confirmed with me the absolute accuracy of what I said. I should point out in the first instance to the Deputy Leader that the boards of all recognised hospitals in South Australia have a high degree of independent managerial responsibility under the policy of this Government. We do not believe in centralised control of hospitals, although obviously all hospitals must adhere to the Government's health, economic and industrial policies.

The decision by the board of the hospital to temporarily close certain wards was a decision taken by the board: it had nothing whatever to do with the budgetary situation, to which I shall return later. It was based on a staffing study conducted by the board and on the awareness of the fact that there is an imbalance of classification amongst trained staff in that hospital. The reason for this imbalance, in part, is that several members of the trained nursing staff have taken *accouchement* leave. The honourable member would know as well as I that it is difficult to attract trained staff to country contract, not permanent, positions. I think even he will appreciate that that situation has nothing whatever to do with the budgetary situation.

In regard to the budgetary situation, the hospital received funds for the current financial year based on the same formula as that which was applied to other hospitals in the Southern Sector. The funds were sufficient to enable the hospital to operate without any reduction of service for this current financial year. The significant thing that the Deputy Leader should know is that the hospital board did not contact the Southern Sector office of the commission to claim additional funds before it decided to close down those two wards.

I repeat, and the Deputy and his colleagues should understand this quite clearly, that, in criticising a decision to close two wards for reasons which are quite patently sound and sensible, the Deputy is not criticising the Government or the Health Commission: he is, in effect, criticising the honorary board of the hospital, which is charged with the responsibility of administering the hospital. Finally, it is most interesting to see the number of spokesmen that the Labor Party has on health matters. I suggest that all of them need a very thorough grounding and that they should do their homework much more thoroughly.

DAYLIGHT SAVING

Mr BLACKER: Will the Premier investigate the feasibility of changing the time meridian used by South Australia to the meridian nearest the centre of the State, or to Adelaide, so that the effects of daylight saving are not compounded in areas to the west of the State? Would the Government include this proposal as an alternative question at the referendum to be held at the forthcoming election? Members will be aware that the time meridian presently used for South Australia is to the east of the Victorian border, thus resulting in South Australia being on permanent daylight saving when compared with the Eastern States. The implementation of annual daylight saving further compounds the problems in areas to the west. This proposal has been raised in the House on many occasions, and many organisations and individuals have supported the idea, which has again been promoted by the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, which gave it unanimous support.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is committed to holding a referendum on daylight saving at the forthcoming election. That commitment, which was made in 1977,

will be honoured. As to changing the time meridian itself on which our time is based, that matter has received serious consideration from time to time. The Government has no strong view on it, but it is probably a matter which should best be considered when the results of the referendum on daylight saving are known.

CASINO

Mr McRAE: Will the Premier say in what circumstances a spokesman for him issued the statement which appears in today's *Advertiser* at page 8 under the heading 'Casino "will decide future of stock paddocks" '? In the article a number of things are indicated. First, four possible sites for a casino are referred to: the former West End Brewery, the Adelaide Railway Station, the Wayville showground and the Samcor stock paddocks, which, of course, are in my electorate. But the important thing about the article itself, about which I need an explanation from the Premier, is whether this represents the Premier's views. If it does, how is it that he was in a position to be able to say that a casino decision would probably not be made before next year? How was he in a position to discuss the question of developers being asked to indicate preferred sites for an entertainment centre? How was he in a position to talk about Government inquiries into noise level and environmental effects? If it was not the Premier, who was it and in what circumstances—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member asked a question, sought leave to make an explanation, and for the greater part of the explanation has been asking a series of further questions. I ask him to deal with detailed fact and not ask any further questions.

Mr McRAE: The facts are that the article, which is said to have been based on statements made by a spokesman for the Premier, refers, first, to the Samcor stock paddocks area in my electorate. We are told that the area's fate awaits the outcome of the Parliamentary Select Committee looking at the possibility of a casino. It then proceeds to refer to three other possible sites. I am seeking to ascertain the circumstances in which this information was given, by whom it was given and, of course, most importantly how it was that the Premier could be talking about such things as alternative sites—

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the honourable member not to be repetitive and not to move towards circumventing the direction he has already been given by the Chair.

Mr McRAE: Yes, Sir. If I could wind up my question by saying—

An honourable member: Perhaps you should.

Mr McRAE: If members do not want me to wind up my question, no doubt I can proceed to outline the article in detail, but I do not want to delay the House. What I demand to know as the local member is what is going on, because for a long time I have been trying to find out the fate of the stock paddocks. The Premier understands my position in this matter, and I am justifiably angry on two scores: first, as to the fate of those stock paddocks and, secondly, as a person who has been involved with the Select Committee and as one who may be involved in the future—I do not know—that certain information appeared to have been available to the Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: First, I do think that the honourable member has made approaches to me for a copy of the Samcor working party's report, and I suspect he has already received it.

Mr McRae: I have not got it; I have asked at least eight times, and you will not give it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It has only recently become available and been considered by Cabinet, and as a result of that I think that the honourable member will be able to get a copy. I was very surprised to read the story that appeared in the *Advertiser* this morning. I think it was a great shame that the journalist, obviously under some misapprehension or working under some misunderstanding, did not stick to the formal and official release made from my office yesterday afternoon concerning northern stock paddocks.

Mr McRae: Where is that?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That has been widely circulated throughout the media.

Mr McRae: You didn't give it to me, though, and I'm the local member.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not quite sure whether the honourable member is on my list for press statements, but if he would like to be on my list for press statements I would be delighted to add his name to that list. The matter was accurately reported in yesterday's evening newspaper. I said that I understood that there was some background conversation going on, and there had obviously been a very marked misunderstanding and confusion between an entertainment centre, which was being suggested in one of the working party's proposals for the Samcor stock paddocks, and a casino.

I regret that misunderstanding on the part of the *Advertiser.* The proper release puts the position quite clearly, and obviously in the discussion that transpired it was not made adequately clear that it was a site for the entertainment centre that would have to be decided upon. It has been suggested in the past that the Wayville showgrounds should be the site for an entertainment centre, that the West End brewery site could be an appropriate site, and I believe that members opposite will remember a former Government's proposal for an entertainment centre at the Adelaide Railway Station. I think that, if I can simply refer the honourable gentleman to the press release which was made and which I think was carried accurately by all other sections of the media, he will be reassured.

SOUTH ATLANTIC APPEAL

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier indicate to the House whether he and his Government will support the aims of the Naval Association (South Australian section) in its current South Atlantic fund appeal? I have been approached by the President of the Naval Association of Australia (South Australian section), Mr David Lea, a constituent of mine, seeking Government support for the aims of its current South Atlantic fund. He advises that the aim of the fund is to assist the next of kin and dependants of servicemen and merchant seamen killed in the present Falkland Islands dispute. He further advises that the A.N.Z. Bank will be assisting by providing its branches as centres for donations to be made. The President has told me that the Naval Association would particularly appreciate assistance in having the appeal and its aims made widely known.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am sure all members in this House will join with me in expressing a great deal of concern about the events in the Falkland Islands, and the fact that there is warfare, that people are being killed and wounded, and that they are suffering. That is a situation which no-one in this State, in this nation, or, I hope, in the world, wants to see. I have heard some reports of the appeal. I have not had any details, but if an approach is made to the Government for support in this matter it will be considered by Cabinet.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Transport release the highway engineers' report concerning the condition of the Birkenhead bridge? The Minister would be aware that the Birkenhead bridge, over the Port River, provides access from my electorate of Price to the electorate of Semaphore, and carries very heavy traffic, including many petrol tankers supplying most of the petrol to Adelaide and the country districts. I have been informed that the bridge operators have expressed grave concern that the decking on the bridge has deteriorated to such an extent that the heavy transport using it may cause a safety hazard and possible loss of life, especially if a petrol tanker should break through the rotting deck. I am also told that the operators who raise and lower the bridge have been prohibited from discussing the problems of the bridge with anyone. I remind the Minister that the Port Adelaide council has recently called for the release of the engineers' report on the condition of the bridge. Any information the Minister may be able to provide may help to allay the fears of many people that the bridge is not safe for heavy traffic and that restrictions should be placed on it until the decking is replaced.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have had strong representations on this matter from the member for Semaphore. It has been stated that the bridge is completely safe, but I will consider the honourable member's question when I receive the final detailed engineer's report; obviously, I have had a preliminary report. When I receive the detailed reports I will consider the honourable member's question.

MIGRANT HOUSING

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier, as Minister of Ethnic Affairs, seek additional financial assistance from the Federal Government to provide as soon as possible suitable housing for migrants, classified as refugees, currently located in South Australia? I understand that many migrants classified as refugees from Vietnam and Poland are housed at Pennington Hostel. A friend of mine, a constituent, responded to a recent Department for Community Welfare advertisement seeking volunteers for its hosting programmes. My friend and his wife were introduced to a Polish refugee, his wife and four young children, who have been in South Australia for eight weeks and who were residing in a small unfurnished house in the northern suburbs. The refugee was required to pay $80 a week rent and 16 payments of $20 a week to build up a $320 bond. The house is small—

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The honourable member's Government did not provide much in the way of housing for anyone.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: The house is small and unfurnished. There is only cold water in the kitchen; the taps in the laundry do not work, and the hot water service (such as it is) in the bathroom provides lukewarm water. My constituents, who offered their assistance in the hosting programme, have been amazed and frustrated, as they have been unable to assist with adequate housing. I am told that the migrants would have to wait two years for Housing Trust accommodation, and the waiting list of the Highways Department is even longer.

This refugee family, with four young children, is experiencing difficulties. The father has been told not to seek employment as a qualified mechanic because of his poor command of the English language. He is, therefore, forced to live on social security payments. When the children become ill he has difficulty communicating with medical practitioners. I understand the whole problem is compounded by poor accommodation and I believe that this family, along with many refugee families we are endeavouring to assist in this State, deserves better quality housing as soon as possible.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The plight of people who come to these shores from other countries as refugees is one which I think concerns every member in this House and, I hope, every member of the community. It is, I think, a proper time to place on record my very great appreciation of the fine work done, for instance, by the Indo-Chinese Refugee Association and by Father Foale in that regard. There are many other organisations which are concerned about this matter. I will do what I can, and I am happy to make representations to the Federal Government for additional funding. I commend to the people of South Australia yet again the various appeals being conducted for these people, both by the Polish community and the Indo-Chinese Association. Anything we can do as a Government within the funds available and within the welfare housing levels, which are reaching record levels this year because of this Government's programme, we will do. If the honourable member is able to give details of names and addresses I will be pleased to look into the matter for him.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr KENEALLY: In view of the criticism made by Professor Sandford Clark in his 1982 C. H. Munro Memorial Oration, delivered on 13 May 1982, will the Minister of Water Resources explain how he was able to protect South Australia's best interests at the Premiers' Conference of 16 October 1981 which discussed amendments to the River Murray Waters Agreement? Professor Sandford Clark is the Harrison Moore Professor of Law at the University of Melbourne. He is a leading Australian authority on the River Murray Waters Agreement and is used by all Governments concerned with that river as a consultant. I quote from his oration, as follows:

> Disconcerted, perhaps, by unaccustomed apparent unanimity between herself and New South Wales, South Australia, meanwhile, had learned of certain New South Wales applications for diversion licences, which it then energetically sought to block, by requesting the New South Wales Premier to place a moratorium on further irrigation licences, pending an assessment of their effect on the quality of River Murray waters. In some respects, South Australia was picking a quarrel with the wrong chap. The use of additional water for irrigation in New South Wales would not add appreciably to the salt load discharged by New South Wales tributaries into the Murray system. Indeed, compared to Victoria and South Australia herself, New South Wales is relatively blameless in this regard. But allocating more water rights in New South Wales would withdraw water from the system, which might otherwise dilute the saline contributions of Victoria and South Australia, leading to better water quality in South Australia.

I quote further:

> . . . South Australia was made to pay the price for its querulous, injudicious, and largely ineffective intervention before New South Wales Land Board hearings. Sobered, no doubt, by that experience, New South Wales first suggested that the power to make representations should be confined to proposed State works. This would, of course, rule out such matters as proposed private diversions, the projected wood-chip plant near Albury, or, indeed, any other private development. The other Governments, naturally, resisted this change.
>
> The clause before the Premiers and Prime Minister, at their supposedly momentous meeting to lay the River Murray question to rest on 16 October 1981, thus applied to any proposal which may significantly affect the flow, use, control or quality of any water under the control or supervision of the commission.
>
> In practical terms, however, the commission would not wish to have all proposed developments referred to it and block exemptions of particular types of proposals were envisaged. Accordingly, a dependent clause envisaged that the commission would consult with each Government to reach agreement on those proposals to which the clause would not apply. Manifestly, until that agreement

was reached, all proposals would have to be referred to the commission.

What actually transpired at that fateful meeting one can only guess at. But the subsequent trumpeting of triumph in press releases and Ministerial statements made no mention of one slight but sinister deletion. As if by magic, the word 'not' had quite disappeared from the dependent clause. That it was inadvertent, strains credulity. That the effect was understood by all those present seems equally unlikely, because that tiny alteration effectively undermined the powers of the commission and certainly is against South Australia's best interests.

The result now is that no proposals need to be reported to the commission, except those which each State agrees to report; and it is always possible that New South Wales, for example, will be unable to reach agreement to report any proposals to the commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart has not been called upon to repeat the oration. I ask him to come quickly to the end.

Mr KENEALLY: Certainly, Sir. I intended to read out only one more sentence, which is as follows:

The possibility that the commission would have sufficient independence to represent the national interest before State authorities thus, with a gelatinous plop, slid down the drain.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: As the honourable member has stated, Professor Sandford Clark is a professor of law, and not an engineer. His statement that New South Wales does not contribute significantly to salinity in the total Murray-Darling system is certainly not supported by engineers whose profession it is to determine where salinity comes from and what action should be taken to control it effectively. That statement might have been made by Professor Clark, but it is not necessarily agreed to by the engineers who have responsibility in this area.

Statements made in this House last year in answer to various other questions raised by the honourable member indicated quite clearly the percentage of salinity contributed to the total Murray-Darling system from various sources in the three States. As far as South Australia is concerned, the dilution flow that is available to this State is of importance; the fact that additional irrigation diversions use up that dilution flow that has been coming to South Australia historically in years gone by is of enormous importance to this State. South Australia opposed all further irrigation diversions in New South Wales, because it is in that State that major irrigation expansion was occurring in the total river system.

As a result of the meeting on 16 October last year between the Prime Minister, the Premiers and water resources Ministers of the three States concerned, an agreement was arrived at. I have confirmation of this in a letter from Mr Landa, the Minister for Water Resources in New South Wales, in answer to a number of questions that I put to him in a very precise manner following that meeting, because of my understanding of the agreement that had been reached between the three States and the Commonwealth. Mr Landa gave a very clear indication of the understanding of New South Wales in regard to that agreement and clearly spelt out that not only would New South Wales refer all future proposals for development and irrigation diversions to the River Murray Commission for its consideration but also that those proposals would be subject to the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act of that State. That legislation, introduced by the present Minister in New South Wales when he was the Minister of Environment in that State, is very strong, and until that time it had not been adhered to by the New South Wales Government.

There is a very clear undertaking by the New South Wales Government through the present Minister that that legislation will be adhered to, and that the provisions of the legislation will be strictly applied to all further development. That means capital works, the construction of further storages and irrigation diversions. Much has been achieved. What we are talking about is Professor Sandford Clark's view of it in strict legal terms. What I am talking about is the practical implication of that and the undertaking given by the three States, particularly the State of New South Wales.

If the member for Stuart has no faith or confidence in Mr Landa in New South Wales, I can only take the honourable gentleman at his word. He has put it quite clearly in writing to me. The letter is in my office, and it is available if the honourable member would like to have a look at it. I deliberately have not tabled that letter, as I believe that it is a letter of intent and that there is some degree of privacy as far as the correspondence is concerned. However, if the honourable member wishes to insist that that letter be tabled in the House, as a colleague of the Minister in New South Wales I daresay that I would agree to that request.

However, I can give an unequivocal assurance that the Minister in New South Wales has given those assurances regarding the future of the River Murray Waters Agreement and that is what is important for South Australia. The River Murray Waters Agreement has always been recognised as being a goodwill agreement in that much goodwill has to apply if it is to be effective. I can only say that all those present at that meeting recognised the goodwill that existed on that occasion, and the intention of the four Governments is to work closely together to make the new agreement work.

GLENELG TRAMS

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Transport consider names of prominent citizens being displayed on Glenelg trams?

An honourable member: Like Mathwin?

Mr MATHWIN: Mathwin, Becker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Morphett.

Mr Becker: What about Graham Cornes?

Mr MATHWIN: Cornes, Peter Carey if you like. Requests have been made over many years, particularly from the Glenelg Retail and Tourist Association, for this to be done. I think it would certainly be an advantage—

Mr Trainer: You could have your name on a bay window.

Mr MATHWIN: What did the honourable member say?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg should not seek a repetition of an illegal, in this House, interjection.

Mr MATHWIN: I apologise for being naughty, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I understand that there have been moves in the past to have the Glenelg trams named after famous citizens. I could not think of a more famous citizen after whom to name a Glenelg tram than the member for Glenelg. I accept, of course, that the words 'Mathwin for Glenelg' may well be suitable for that particular Glenelg tramline and that we could also paint the trams yellow and black.

Mr Trainer: The face that launched a thousand trams.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I get the impression that my answer is almost superfluous. Of course, we could extend it further. When the magnificent north-east busway is running in 1986, I could perhaps suggest the odd name or two that could go on that line.

Mr Becker: Virgo?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not know whether my old sparring partner, Geoff Virgo, would want to be associated with the O'Bahn bus.

Mr Slater: We could call it Wilson's wonderland.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Gilles mentions 'Wilson's wonderland'. We all have our crosses to bear. The idea is fraught with possibilities, some of which are very enticing.

STONY POINT SITE VALUE

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy again spell out to the Whyalla City Council and especially the Whyalla Town Clerk the site valuation of the land currently held and being developed by Santos at Stony Point? The Minister would be aware that I sought this information from him during the last session of Parliament, and his department was kind enough during the recess to correspond with me, outlining the site value of the property. I presume that a copy of that correspondence has been forwarded to the Whyalla City Council. However, the following article appeared in the Adelaide edition of the *News* on Monday:

The $450 000 was the value the Whyalla City Council would apply until the next general valuation. The unimproved value was only $2 500.

Mr Goldsworthy said the Whyalla council had the right to make its own valuation for rating purposes. When a copy of the letter was tabled at Whyalla City Council meeting, Alderman Aikman asked: 'Where do we go from here? What are we going to get in rates?'

The Town Clerk, Mr Menard, said the letter told him nothing.

I find that remark by the Town Clerk exceedingly surprising. I found the letter sent to me by officers of the Department of Mines and Energy self-explanatory and easy to understand. I wonder whether the Minister could do me an extreme favour by spelling it out again for the Town Clerk of the City of Whyalla?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer is, 'Yes'. I remember sending a letter to the honourable member, and I thought that it was as easy to understand, as did the honourable member. I am perfectly happy to accede to the council and the request and perhaps send a copy of the same letter to Mr Menard, who will then have the same understanding of the situation as the honourable member obviously has.

RURAL ECONOMY

Mr EVANS: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the recent rains have been widespread and heavy enough to guarantee a satisfactory beginning to the season for the rural industry in South Australia? A number of people in the metropolitan area have approached me and asked whether we appear to be on the threshold of a good season in the rural industry. Many of the people in small businesses in the metropolitan area are dependent on the rural sector for their income and their trade later on in the year, and their purchases or ordering are related to whatever hopes the rural sector has. They are also conscious that the rural sector depends not only on good rain but also on good prices, and they are conscious that the rural sector has to accept whatever price is offered when the produce is ready for marketing.

Can the Minister therefore say, from the reports that the Department of Agriculture have received, how hopeful it is for the beginning of the season, what benefits can be expected from the rain, and whether we are looking forward to a reasonable start to the season for the rural sector?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The honourable member would know that I am always optimistic about good seasons in the agricultural regions of the State, and generally speaking the rains have been fairly widespread. I was privy to a report from Eyre Peninsula recently that stated that extremely good rains had been received in some areas and yet in areas quite nearby they had missed out altogether.

That was so, for instance, in the Cambrai region of the inner areas recently. Where most of the State enjoyed some rain, that region, too, missed out. It seems that it might be appropriate for me as Minister more to regularly report on the seasonal conditions that prevail in the State. I notice that the *Advertiser* has provided quite a prominent column for one Grant Andrews to do this in recent months. So far, he has had a couple of bob each way with his weather forecasts, indications for the future of the rural industry, and so on. If, as I gather from the remarks that he has made, the honourable member and his constituents are keen (as they apparently are) to find out these things, perhaps we may be able to provide a service of that kind, so that reports that come into the department regularly are made more readily and more publicly available to those who are interested in them.

LONSDALE ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport say whether it is true that the successful tenderer for the construction of Lonsdale Road, via Christies Beach, MacMahon Construction, was unable to construct a crib wall at the Field River bridge and that the Highways Department had to be subcontracted by MacMahon Construction to build this wall? My information is that the Highways Department tender for this $4 500 000 contract was $25 000 less than the successful tenderer, MacMahon Construction, and that the contractor did not have the experience to build this type of wall to the Highways Department's specifications. The subcontract was then let to the Highways Department, and at the same time I understand that the department's construction employees were under-employed.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member has made this sort of allegation before in this place. I will certainly endeavour to get the details in answer to his question. The Highways Department does not subcontract to itself. Construction of Lonsdale Road over the Field River was an arterial road contract let by the department. The Field River crossing, embankment and wall mentioned by the honourable member are almost unique for that type of construction in the world. It is recognised as such by engineers throughout Australia.

However, I will get those details for the honourable member, but I point out that the Highways Department does not subcontract to itself. It lets a contract. If the honourable member means that the Highways Department constructed that section itself, I understand that that is true. But, I cannot quite understand the honourable member's reference to a price of $25 000 less than the contract price, because of course, the Highways Department does not put in a price for its own jobs when it is letting them out to contract. I expect that the honourable member is referring to the fact that there is a cost at which the Highways Department could have done a certain job, compared with a contract price. However, that cost does not usually incorporate the other costs, such as costs on money invested, costs on loan funds, and the like, which would normally be taken into account by a private contractor.

At 3.14 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to provide exemption for licensees under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947, from the payment of lottery licence fees. The Government recognises the community services performed by such groups and seeks to provide relief from the payment of fees that are currently payable under the existing legislation.

The proposed exemption will remove what is at present a source of irritation to the charitable and service organisations and will permit all proceeds derived from lotteries, other than approved operating costs, to be reprocessed to the community. This will be of direct benefit to those who receive aid from this source and will also encourage fundraisers themselves to greater efforts, as there will be no deduction from their revenue.

The Bill also provides for a clearer statement of the basis on which fees are charged. It does not in any way alter the existing fee structure prescribed by regulations in cases where fees continue to be charged. As the rest of the second reading explanation is formal, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 14b of the principal Act. Paragraph *(a)* makes a consequential amendment to subsection (1). Paragraph *(b)* inserts new subsections (3) and (4). New subsection (3) makes clear that the amount of a licence fee can be related to the total sums paid by persons who participate in a lottery. Although the passage removed from subsection (1) by paragraph *(a)* may have had the same effect, it is desirable to put the matter beyond doubt by the enactment of new subsection (3). Subsection (4) enables the Governor, by regulation, to exempt a person or members of a class of persons from the obligation to pay licence fees.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That the report be noted.

The Select Committee report contains, as well as a report agreed by three members of the committee, an appendix which is a statement by the honourable members for Baudin and Mitchell which, in effect, rejects the majority report. The majority report canvasses the arrangements set out in the indenture and makes a number of recommendations with regard to them. For the convenience of members, I will list the key recommendations of the report:

That, at or before the time the joint venturers commit to an initial project, the Government take steps to ensure that appropriate arrangements are made to ensure that the cost of the State's infrastructure contribution is satisfactorily controlled (paragraph 8);

That the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission and the Director-General of Mines and Energy in their annual reports from time to time report to the Parliament on the operation of clause 10 (the clause requiring the joint venturers to comply with existing and future codes of practice regarding radiological protection (paragraph 9);

That the Minister of Environment and Planning report from time to time to Parliament with regard to the operation of clause 11 (the clause dealing with protection and management of the environment) and as soon as possible in the event of an occurrence involving clause 11 (7) (the subclause dealing with a sudden and unexpected material detriment to the environment) (paragraph 10);

That the Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in his annual report from time to time report to Parliament on the use by the joint venturers of water from the Great Artesian Basin (paragraph 12);

That the Government and joint venturers maintain close and continuing contact with the residents of Andamooka as the project develops; and

That, with the exception of a textual correction, the Bill be passed without amendment (paragraph 16).

In formulating these recommendations and its views generally about the Bill, the majority had regard to the views of the various witnesses who appeared before the committee. These comprised three broad groups: representatives of State Government departments and authorities affected by the provisions of the indenture, the joint venturers and their advisers and members of the public responding to advertisements inviting submissions to the committee. This last group comprised the Friends of the Earth, the Stop Uranium Mining Committee (both represented by witnesses from Melbourne) and the Kokatha People's Committee. No other witnesses from South Australia appeared, other than the Aboriginal witnesses.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is staggering. It goes without saying that each witness was provided with the opportunity to discuss his or her views with the committee, at length if necessary. Questions from all members of the committee covered a wide range of matters directly related to the indenture.

As the work of the committee proceeded, it appeared that all members of the committee were satisfied with the information and answers they were getting. I have drawn attention to this overall approach and atmosphere of the committee because it was with some puzzlement that the majority of the committee was presented with the minority view at the committee's meeting to finalise the report. That surprise resulted from two factors: first, the general approach and atmosphere of the committee to which I have referred; secondly, many of the areas canvassed in the appendix were not dealt with at all in the evidence given to the committee, or where evidence was given to the committee which directly contradicted the views expressed in the appendix, that evidence was not challenged. Indeed, when one witness sought to discuss the so-called back end of the nuclear fuel cycle, the member for Baudin asked (paragraph 624), 'Do we really want to get into that whole area?' and the implication was that at least he did not.

However, before dealing with the appendix, I wish to say something further about the report. Members of this House and members of the public who study it will find that it represents a thorough, searching and sensitive examination of the agreement between the joint venturers and the Government. The thrust of its recommendations is that the project should proceed in the context of protection of the State's financial interests, the establishment of appropriate radiological protection requirements to protect the interests of workers and the public and the provision of information to inform Parliament and the public as to the operation of

key provisions of the Indenture and recognition of the special interests of the community at Andamooka.

The structure, content and formulation of the recommendations in the report were undertaken in the context of concerns within the community regarding uranium mining and the need to be assured that the indenture provided the maximum possible protection of the community interest. From the 306 pages of evidence presented to the Select Committee, to which reference is made in the majority report, and which is now available to members and the public to study in detail, that assurance is able to be given. In particular, the majority, if not the whole committee, was impressed by the satisfaction with, and degree of participation by public servants in the negotiations which led to the Indenture.

I now turn to the appendix requested by two members. As I mentioned, this report canvasses many matters either not raised at all before the Select Committee or on which witnesses commented but on which they were not cross-examined. It deals first with markets. The author's very pessimistic short-term predictions should be compared with the evidence of Mr Hugh Morgan which appears at paragraph 301 of the evidence, as follows:

Our perception is that there is no short-term immediate need for uranium above those levels that are presently held as stocks or presently held with long-term contracts. The timing of the change in the market place does not lend itself to easy definition. It is a subjective judgment. In the United States, the fall in the spot price (which is a price that is calculated by a private company, which reports sales that are greater than 1 000 000 pounds in volume) has been quite dramatic. That fall has been accompanied by a great reduction in production at mines in the United States and, in fact, some of the largest buyers have been those mines that are fulfilling their contracts.

The source of that material has tended to be the utilities that are offloading some of their surplus stocks. The definition of 'surplus stocks' must also be understood. In the United States, the utilities in most of the States have to have their pricing approved by the public Utility Pricing Commission. For good or ill, the U.P.C. does not permit interest charges on stock of raw materials as a cost to be charged out on current electricity charges. The credit ratings of the utilities in the United States have fallen dramatically. They were, in effect, triple A, and therefore borrow well, because of restraints on their revenue through charging. They have fallen heavily from grace. Their capacity to borrow and their ranking have slumped.

With increased interest rates and their lower grading in that structure of being able to call for loan funds, the utilities in the United States have been able to keep only one or, at best, two years of stock. It may be less than that for some of them. However, their earlier policies were to provide themselves with a much longer term security factor. It is that extra that is being turned off and sold in the market place, as well as that which would result from contracts for projects that have not gone ahead. It is not just a cancellation factor.

In the other extreme, perhaps one could consider Japan, where there is a much longer-term view about what it is sensible to hold. At present, on average, stock holdings would certainly not require them to buy any additional uranium for the next five to six years. I stress the words 'require them to do so'.

However, their intentions about holding stock levels and their capacity to do so, in our view, will make them uncomfortable at anything less than about three years. They wish to work off some excess stock. We believe, however, that they will continue to make contracts in the meantime. They will seek delayed delivery from today. They will go looking for delivery probably in the 1987 to 1989 period. They focus very strongly on long-term relationships of 15 to 20 years. That is what they are really seeking.

They understand and appreciate that the changes in the market place cannot continue for a long period. I believe that we will also find in the market place that a number of major utilities are concerned at the price, as reflected by the spot price for uranium; they are concerned that it will not provide them with long-term security, which they need. Uranium, as a cost element in producing nuclear fuel, is a very small part of the cost. While, like all of us, we like to get our costs down in all elements, it is silly to drive too high a bargain. Consequently we would expect contracts to be written at a price substantially above what is known as the Nuexco spot price, more in line with the Federal Government's floor-pricing arrangements. They are not far out of line with any prospect of markets today.

Those are Mr Morgan's views on uranium. However, this is principally a copper project (something which the appendix virtually ignores), and it might be of interest to members of the House to hear Mr Morgan's views on the copper market. These are expressed in paragraph 305, as follows:

Someone mentioned the phrase 'Sit and wait'. That is an appalling option, not only for us but for this State and for the project. Geologically, I have said that the ore body will be worked, whether it be this century or next century, because it ranks well. However, the present reduction in prices is stopping the commencement of other projects. We have an opportunity to complete our feasibility study without those other projects progressing. If prices were higher, those other projects would progress and might forestall our marketing opportunities. The depressed prices we presently face are actually an opportunity for us to complete our decision-making process. There is a lot of copper around the world in Chile, Panama, South Africa and Peru. It is of much higher grade, much of it is on the surface, and the feasibility work has been substantially or totally completed. The no-go/go decision at the moment is no-go because of the prices. If those projects proceeded, they would add substantially to the world's annual increment of required supply. The present price levels are actually an opportunity for us to get our act together without the opposition taking away our opportunities.

It is very clear from those extracts from Mr Morgan's evidence that the conclusion of the appendix with regard to the market prospects for the project is very clearly at variance with the views of the joint venturers, who, after all, will be required to provide more than $1 billion to establish the mine, who have already spent over $50 000 000 on feasibility studies and are required by the indenture to spend another $50 000 000. Sir Ben Dickinson, adviser to successive Governments on uranium questions, also presented a far more favourable view of the market than that offered in the appendix.

The appendix then canvasses uranium production and the nuclear fuel cycle. With regard to the disposal of high-level radioactive waste, members will no doubt be aware of the very real progress being made on this matter by the British, the French and the Swedish. Indeed, Dr Eric Svenke, President of the Swedish Nuclear Fuel Supply Company, who has been visiting Adelaide over the past few days, has been able to describe the very detailed arrangements and facilities that Sweden is putting in place, and constructing under its Nuclear Stipulations Law, to ensure that high-level wastes are stored securely and safely. I should add that this matter was not canvassed at all in evidence taken by the Select Committee.

The appendix refers to the related question of nuclear proliferation. Again, this matter was not specifically dealt with in evidence given to the Select Committee. However, it is common knowledge that Australian uranium can only be supplied to signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and only after a separate Bi-lateral Safeguards Agreement has been concluded between Australia and the customer country. These arrangements are generally regarded as stringent and among the toughest in the world. In this regard, it is of interest to note the assessment of the Bi-lateral Safeguards Agreement with the United States prepared by President Carter's United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in 1979:

Australia's own nuclear export policies are perhaps the most stringent of any country, and its requirement that a non-nuclear weapon recipient state be a party to the N.P.T. in the context of peaceful nuclear co-operation is virtually unique and highly commendable. Its efforts to halt the growth in existing nuclear weapons stockpiles have been no less intensive as it continues to emphasise the responsibility of the nuclear weapon states to engage in effective nuclear arms control through negotiations such as SALT and C.T.B. In general, its serious and sustained efforts to promote nuclear arms control have earned Australia the respect of the international community. It is entirely fitting that the first agreement for co-operation to be submitted for approval since enactment

of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act is with a state with such impeccable non-proliferation credentials.

That this is a matter to which the joint venturers are sensitive is demonstrated by Mr Morgan's evidence. At paragraph 302 he says:

The problems facing anybody wishing to use [uranium] for mischievous purposes are fairly difficult. There is a long way to go between that stage and the rest of it. We would support very strict Government surveillance of both that product and more so as the product is refined. The higher the refining process the greater the need for Government participation. Those influences are not common in the other metals.

It is very clear that these matters are far more effectively dealt with, and the joint venturers have a far more responsible attitude towards them, than is suggested in the appendix. The safety of the work force is then canvassed. In the section headed 'Radiation' the authors purport to deal with clause 10 of the indenture. I say 'purport', because it is my belief that clause 10 is misrepresented in at least two respects.

First, the authors take no account of the fact that, as well as three nominated codes and amendments of them, the joint venturers are required to comply with all new codes prepared by the International Commission of Radiological Protection, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the National Health and Medical Research Council. These bodies are regarded as having high standing in the fields of scientific and medical research and, as such, to be acquainted with the latest knowledge regarding low-level radiation. Certainly, that is the view of the South Australian Health Commission. The second misrepresentation of clause 10 is that no mention is made of the requirement in subclause (2) that the joint venturers keep radiation levels as low as are reasonably achievable, the so-called ALARA principle which can result in exposure levels very substantially below those prescribed in the codes. However, the misrepresentations do not stop there. The appendix cites a report from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Public Health, an agency of the United States Government. Honourable members should be aware of the status of that report. The question of its status was raised by the member for Mitchell in his questioning of Health Commission witnesses (paragraph 262):

262. The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The body that is known as the American National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health produced a report in 1980, I understand, expressing concern about the working level months to which persons should be subjected. I also understand that, in effect, it suggested a halving of the requirements that currently apply under the other codes that are listed in the Indenture. Has the commission considered that report; was it available to the commission when the Indenture requirements were settled? . . . (Dr WILSON): We have copies of the report and we have examined it. It was prepared by a working party of NIOSH and circulated for discussion. It seems that it was one of those occasions where there was an unfortunate leak, if that is the proper term, because it was circulated for comment. It was never endorsed by NIOSH. It was subsequently reviewed by the I.C.R.P. in the annual review of radition protection in mining and milling. It was discounted. We understand that NIOSH has referred the working party report back for further consideration. (Mrs FITCH): It is true that NIOSH is re-examining it and that a working party prepared the report. I believe that a number of working groups have been set up to examine the report in considerably more detail, and they are expected to report, hopefully, at the end of this year, but that is not definite. The attitude to that report (and I checked this out a couple of weeks ago by telexing NIOSH) is that it is a working document only and that further examination of the subject will be undertaken. It is not prepared at this stage to make a new recommendation for radon daughter exposure on the basis of the work it has done so far.

Since the June 1980 report, there has been further word on the subject of radon daughter exposure from the International Commission of Radiological Protection, presented in a publication (No. 32), called 'Limits for Inhalation of Radon Daughters by Workers'. Essentially, that body was examining the same information as was available to NIOSH, but it came up with a definitive recommendation, which is that the commission recommends for workers an annual limit of intake for the potential alpha energy of any mixture of short-lived radon 222 daughters (in other words, radon daughter exposure limit) of .02 joules. That is a different unit from the working level month that is used in the Australian Code of Practice and, to compare the two, one has to take into account a mean breeding rate, which has been done. It has been stated that this limit then corresponds to an annual limit of 4.8 working level months. That is the recommendation of the I.C.R.P., and it came after the NIOSH working party report. Of course, we will be anxiously awaiting the definitive NIOSH report, when it comes out.

The member for Mitchell again raised this matter with Dr Wilson when he reappeared before the committee (paragraph 828). A very similar answer was provided. I have quoted from the evidence at length, because the appendix clearly misrepresents the status of the so-called Report by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, and the record needs to be set straight.

The appendix gives the South Australian Health Commission no credit for the pioneering work that it is doing with regard to a register of employees employed in uranium mining. There are a number of references to this in the evidence and in the written submission of the South Australian Health Commission. At paragraph 826, Dr Keith Wilson described progress in establishing the survey as follows:

The situation is that the Commonwealth Department of Health, through the National Institute of Health, is developing an Australian wide survey. We believe that we are ahead of them. We have designed the survey form and procedure and have already agreed with Roxby Downs management to implement this. Our survey has already started in a sense. We do not have the first form filled out, but we are well on the way, whereas the overall Commonwealth survey has not yet started. What we are saying here is that our results will be made part of that Commonwealth survey, so that the whole lot can be pooled and make a far better epidemiological survey.

Since that evidence was given I have checked with the joint venturers and have been medically examined in accordance with the procedures agreed with the Health Commission. I should add that, with regard to radiological protection, expert evidence was sought from Sir Edward Pochin, former Chairman of the International Commission of Radiological Protection, and Professor Max Clarke, Professor of Biology at Flinders University and a member of the Australian Ionising Radiation Advisory Committee. This evidence confirmed the efficacy of the arrangements in clause 10 of the indenture.

With respect to the question of compensation, I think it fair to say that the appendix misconstrues the situation, both with respect to the United Kingdom and South Australia. Turning first to the United Kingdom, I note that the Nuclear Installations Act 1965 (as amended) makes provision for the liability of the holders of licences under the Act for certain specified occurrences. Outside those occurrences, the normal laws of the United Kingdom apply. With respect to those occurrences, the liability of the licensees is limited, in most cases, to £5 000 000, and, in other cases, to £1 750 000. I stress that the provisions of the United Kingdom Statute do not permit either common law claims or workmen's compensation claims for any injury arriving from a specified occurrence. In other words, I see the United Kingdom legislation as limiting the liability of nuclear operators in Britain, rather than extending it.

The authors of the minority report appear to have overlooked that we have common law claims in South Australia. If a nuclear operator in the terms defined in the British Act in South Australia is negligent in any way, he is liable for the full extent of the damages arising therefrom—there is no limit whatsoever. Such actions may be commenced by both employees of the nuclear operator and the public. I think it appropriate to point out that even if the United Kingdom legislation applied in South Australia, it would not apply to the Roxby proposals, as that legislation does not apply to the mining and milling of uranium.

I would also point out that the regulation-making powers conferred by section 43 of the Radiation Protection and

Control Act are sufficient to empower the Governor to make regulations requiring holders of licences under that Act to hold adequate insurance cover.

The authors then turn to the question of timing of the project. Their suggestions that the joint venturers will seek to delay the project is both at odds with the evidence actually received and commercial commonsense in view of the funds expended and the interest payable thereon. I have already quoted the joint venturers' views with regard to markets for the products expected from the project. There are other factors. Dr Keep, representing B.P., drew attention to the team that is currently developing the project. He said this (at paragraph 305):

> In my opinion it would be a tragedy if that talent were dispersed. A project of this cost is not really a collection of individuals as such. It is a team job where individual professional people rely on the expertise of other people. I have seen the team grow from relatively few people, and I think it would be an absolute tragedy to lose that. In fact, it would be rather like the Carlton Football Club dispersing its league footballers and replacing them with footballers playing in the parks.

Later Dr Keep commented on the possibility that B.P. might transfer its funds to other alternative projects elsewhere in the world (paragraph 309):

> It is a black and white picture. B.P. must weigh up the various projects it is involved in around the world and concentrate on finding opportunities. It is difficult to answer the question specifically. We would probably look for other opportunities if we felt that this one was going to be delayed for some time.

Mr Morgan also pointed out, at paragraph 310:

> This project is known throughout the industry and by bankers world wide. This project has created tremendous interest. I believe the world would regard it as an extraordinary event if South Australia said it did not want such a project as this. In fact, it would be unique. It would have a very direct effect on South Australia and a further and more damaging effect on Australia.

With regard to the interest payable, it is worth noting that once the indenture is passed the joint venturers' expenditure obligations will be at least $100 000 000, including at least $50 000 000 already spent. Assuming they pay interest at market rates, their interest costs alone will amount to at least $18 000 000 per annum. That, alone, is a strong incentive to develop the project and market its products at the earliest opportunity.

Royalties and infra-structure are the next items discussed in the appendix. In suggesting that the royalty rate be left for determination until after the feasibility stage, the report's authors are ignoring the need of the joint venturers to know the ground rules before they risk a further $50 000 000 on top of an expenditure substantially in excess of $50 000 000. Mr Morgan had this to say, at paragraph 294:

> We need the security and commercial comfort that having expended this vast amount of money we know what has been referred to as 'the rules of the game'. How do we convince our shareholders that the funds are not at risk and that eventually we will receive some reward? Over the last few years conditions attaching to these projects in Australia have been changed unilaterally by Governments to the serious disadvantage of the projects. Therefore, there will be less reliance on past practice in relation to the lore of the explorer, miner and Governments and more reliance will be placed on having the conditions spelt out in detail well ahead of time.
>
> I could refer to specific examples in almost every State where there have been significant changes in the terms and conditions attaching to projects from the time when the commitment to invest was first made. I believe that both the Government and the developers never contemplated that those changes would take place.

With regard to infra-structure, it is clear that the joint venturers understand the upper limit to the State's contribution to be $50 000 000. This is made clear in paragraph 329 of the evidence, where Mr Morgan says:

> That shopping list (the list of items to be provided by the State) is not expected to exceed $50 000 000.

That amount of $50 000 000 is calculated with reference to the real value of money as at June 1981. In that sense, and that sense only, it is correct to say that inflation will cause the amount to be exceeded. All things being equal, it can be expected that the State's receipts from taxes, revenues and royalties will increase at the same rate as inflation so that the real net cost to the State will not be increased. It should also be borne in mind that the State's infra-structure contribution will be phased in rather than being a total commitment of $50 000 000 at the outset of the project. These matters are comprehensively dealt with in the majority report.

The appendix has a number of conclusions appended to it. Some are not, as I have said and demonstrated, supported by the evidence. Others are not supported by the conclusions in the appendix itself. They appear to be a re-run of the proposals in the second reading speech of the Leader of the Opposition. In that same speech, the Leader said he would await the results of the Select Committee's work before finally determining his Party's attitude to the Bill. That process appears to have been undertaken with eyes shut and ears closed. For the sake of completeness, Mr Speaker, I will respond to the extraordinary series of proposals contained in the appendix to the report.

The first, that the decision to allow the joint venturers to proceed to production be reserved for the Government of the day, completely misses the point of the process that, first the Government and then the Parliament, have been undertaking. Very simply it is this: because the joint venturers are spending so much on their feasibility studies they need to be sure that, if they decide to proceed to develop the deposit, they do not put at risk that vast sum that they will have spent. For this reason they have asked not merely the Government but also the Parliament to provide the necessary security of title and conditions. To leave the decision whether or not to grant a production licence to the Government of the day is not to offer any security at all. There is no incentive for the joint venturers to spend a further $50 000 000.

The second proposal in the appendix is that the joint venturers be granted a 50-year lease, subject to the minority report's first proposal. If this proposal was accepted, it could result in the project being put on ice for that period, 50 years. In this context, it is perhaps worth considering the views of Mr B. P. Webb, Director-General of Mines and Energy, in his submission. He said:

> The indenture addresses the important question of limits to the tenure of the various exploration tenements and the related matter of progressive requirement to reduce the size of areas held. These aspects, which are particularly important in relation to the attitude of the industry to the indenture, were not covered in the preliminary arrangements made with the former Government.

To adopt such a proposal as that put forward in the minority report would make South Australia a laughing stock in the rest of Australia and the world. No other country would be so reluctant to develop its wealth.

The third proposal in the appendix is that the lease should be subject to periodic assessment by the Government. Again, on its face, this proposal appears to lead to all the uncertainty that the indenture negotiation and ratification process seeks to overcome.

The fourth recommendation in the appendix is that the radiological safeguards be amended to allow for properly endorsed requirements for radiation protection to be imposed. This recommendation ignores the breadth of clause 10 of the indenture which provides not only for the application of three existing codes to the project but also all new codes of the International Commission of Radiological Protection and the others mentioned. The fifth recommendation in the appendix is that special workers compensation leg-

islation be enacted, and I dealt with that in my earlier remarks.

The second last proposal refers to the need for adequate storage and disposal of tailings. This is a matter that was raised only once in the evidence when the member for Baudin indicated that he would like to make inquiries regarding this subject at Olympic Dam and did not follow it up. The final recommendation in the appendix is that the project be subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth's Environment (Impact of Proposals) Act, as of course it is.

Mr Speaker, I have dwelt at length on the minority report because I believe it should be exposed for the lacklustre effort that it is. Unfounded or unsupported by the evidence, in parts misleading, it does not come to grips at all with the details of the indenture. It merely, once again, peddles the dreary official Labor Party line. Quite frankly, I believe this House deserves better than a re-run of outdated and discredited dogma. Indeed, I cannot help wondering whether its authors believe what they have asked to be appended in their names, especially after their thoughtful comment and questioning of witnesses during the Select Committee hearings. Having heard the joint venturers they would know that their recommendations, no matter how they seek to dress them up, amount to rejection of the project. I understand that the member for Baudin, as Minister of Development and Mines, signed the original leases for the exploration by Western Mining Corporation which led to the project. He has now put his name to a statement which, if its views prevail, will defer indefinitely the development of the most exciting mineral deposit ever located in this State. Let me quote finally perhaps one of the most realistic views on this whole question, given in an unrehearsed answer to a question from the member for Mitchell by the chief geologist for the project.

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CARRICK HILL VESTING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 3802.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): The Opposition supports this Bill. What we are being invited to do here is to amend an Act which was introduced as a Bill into this House in 1971. The long title of that measure was as follows:

An Act to effectuate a certain generous donation of property by Sir Edward Waterfield Hayward and Lady Ursula Hayward to the State of South Australia; and for purposes incidental thereto.

The Bill related to Carrick Hill, which was defined as follows:

'Carrick Hill' means the residence and grounds known as 'Carrick Hill' situated at Springfield being the whole of the land comprised in certificates of title register book volume 1718 folio 159 and volume 2500 folio 57, or in any certificates of title which may be issued in substitution therefor, and any other property to which the deed applies that is, at the death of Sir Edward Waterfield Hayward such as would, assuming the creation of the trusts contemplated by the deed, be subject to a trust for the State of South Australia:

It was interesting to go back through the *Hansard* record and to examine the debate which occurred at that time because, if it illustrates nothing more, it illustrates that members of the Liberal Party have very long memories. What this Bill really does is to return us to the amendment in the Committee stage moved at that time by the then Leader of the Opposition, Mr Steele Hall. The Opposition remarked in that debate on the fact that clause 4 of the Bill was at variance, in a sense, with the deed executed between the Haywards.

The deed set out four possible uses for the property: a residence for the Governor, a museum, a gallery for the display of works of art, and/or a botanical garden. It indicated that any or more of the following purposes would be appropriate to that use. The Government of the day, in its wording of clause 4 of the Bill, confined its attention to only the first of those four uses, and that is the verbiage contained in the Act that we have been invited to amend at this time.

It is interesting to note what was said at the time. I have already indicated that Mr Steele Hall endeavoured to amend the Bill in the Lower House. When it went to the Upper House, the Hon. Mr DeGaris, as Leader of the Opposition, stated:

I draw attention to the second reading explanation, in which the Chief Secretary has said that the deed provides that Carrick Hill could be used as a home for the Governor, as a museum, an art gallery, or a botanic garden. Everyone will agree that there is a variety of purposes for which this magnificent property could be used in the interest of the State and yet clause 4 of the Bill provides:

Upon and after the day on which Carrick Hill is vested in the Crown, the Government of the State shall hold and maintain Carrick Hill as a residence for the Governor.

There is probably a very good reason why only this purpose is specified in the Bill, but as the deed mentions other purposes I think we are justified in asking why only one purpose is mentioned in the Bill.

Then, possibly, he answered his own question. He said:

I assume the Government has decided that the one purpose is as a residence for His Excellency the Governor. Can the Chief Secretary give some explanation of this? Apart from that I support the Bill.

He went on to place on record his appreciation of the magnificent gesture by the Hayward family. That was on 28 July 1971. It is interesting that, when the Legislative Council returned to its consideration of the Bill the next day, the first speaker was not the Hon. C. M. Hill, who had secured the adjournment (and of course that happens all the time when people secure the adjournment for someone else), but rather the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, who proceeded not to take up the matter that had been canvassed by his Leader but rather wanted to place on record his appreciation of the generosity of the Haywards. He had a good deal to say about the community service that Sir Edward had rendered and was continuing to render to the people of this State.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I take it that this clause widens the use of this land.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Obviously, the Minister has not been in the House for very long, because otherwise he would have been aware of my general attitude to this Bill, as I set out at the beginning of my speech. I will refer to that matter later if I have time. The Hon. A. J. Shard, as Chief Secretary, also did not take up the point raised by Sir Arthur Rymill, and therefore it was left unanswered. However, in the Lower House in the meantime, where, as you, Sir, would be aware, proceedings are often more blunt than in the other place, the matter had been raised and the Hon. D. N. Brookman, on 27 July, stated:

I cannot stress too strongly that we hope that this decision will not have to be taken for many years.

He was expressing a hope that Sir Edward Hayward would live for a long time, and one would not quarrel with that. He further stated:

Therefore, we should not be asked to take that decision now. By including clause 4 we are virtually ensuring that Government House shall be moved to Carrick Hill.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson, whose bluntness, of course, is well remembered by many of us, said, by way of interjection:

That's right, and it's the right decision.

This opens up a matter that has been strong opinion rather than policy in the Labor Party for a long, long time. In fact, we can go back to the Gunn Labor Government of the mid 1920s, when this matter was raised by Dr P. A. Howell in an article titled 'Varieties of Vice-Regal Life'. In a footnote to that article, he stated (and because of its great interest, I will quote it in full):

Many attempts to move the Governors from their official residence on North Terrace have been made in the last ninety years. Radicals have wanted to use Government House for some other purpose, and throw open the grounds for perpetual enjoyment by the public.

He was referring, of course, not only to Labor politicians but also to small 'l' Liberals of the Kingston type of the 1890s. He continued:

Plutocrats have used similar arguments. However, in their case, there was sometimes the additional hope of advantageously disposing of some suburban residence that their families had come to find redundant. Thus in 1925, W. G. (Sir Walter) Duncan, as trustee of the estate of his father, Sir John Duncan, came to a private agreement with the Premier, Gunn, that Sir John's suburban house should be purchased by the Government as the new Vice-regal residence. The diligent Administrator, Poole—

the Governor and Deputy Governor were out of the country at the time—

noticed that this transaction would be in violation of the *Contractors and Parliament Act,* because W. G. Duncan was an M.L.C. Accordingly, a special Bill was introduced, without any publicity, to exempt W. G. from the provisions of that statute. To Poole's great delight—

he was supposed to have been a neutral umpire, of course, as, in effect, the Viceregal personage of the time—

the Bill was thrown out in the Legislative Council, on the casting vote of the President, Sir Lancelot Stirling, Stirling held that removal of the Governor to the suburbs could tend to derogate from the importance of the office, and that such a Bill should not be passed without adequate public discussion. Poole agreed, and added that if the removal were effected the Governor would find it harder to maintain close contact with public affairs, have difficulty in keeping a contented domestic staff, and be hampered in carrying out social engagements.

There was a footnote reference:

These problems had been experienced by the Governors of Victoria, who had had to live in the suburb of Malvern in the years when Melbourne was the Commonwealth Government's home and the Governor-General occupied the Viceregal mansion in the Melbourne Botanic Gardens.

That is a fairly long quotation, but I was glad that I found it, because it saved me a good deal of research. My private research indicated the incident involving the Gunn Government, and by finding the footnote I was saved a lot of research in *Hansard.*

It is true that from time to time Labor Governments in this State and the sort of small 'l' Liberal Governments which, in some way, were their ancestors, have expressed a desire not so much to shift out the Governor as to open up these grounds for what effectively, I suppose, would be the city's fourth botanic garden. An argument certainly could be maintained that, for a Viceregal home these days, that amount of land is not really appropriate, and that therefore the gardens and the land generally should be available to the public of South Australia. On the other hand, I must express the private opinion that I do not know that removing the Viceregal personage to what I would regard as the somewhat artificial environment of Springfield is altogether a democratic move, either.

In any event, we are being invited to extend the options that are available to some future Government as to the use of the property, and I see nothing wrong with that. If some future Government, be it Labor, Liberal, or something else, should decide in its wisdom that Carrick Hill is an appropriate venue for a Viceregal residence, nothing that we are being invited to do today would inhibit that move. On those grounds, we see no point in offering any opposition to the Bill.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): On behalf of the Premier, who is in charge of the Bill, I express my appreciation of the support given by the member for Baudin on behalf of his Party and look forward to its speedy passage in order to serve the purposes set out in the second reading explanation.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 3803.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I am sure the Minister is finding that he is having an easy time of it this afternoon. I think it is fair enough for me to say that it is not so much that the Opposition is in a mellow mood, but rather the innocuous nature of the legislation that the Government is placing before us. There is no reason why we should detain ourselves for long in respect of this measure, because it is purely a machinery measure.

Once upon a time there was a Planning and Development Act, and under that Planning and Development Act there were such bodies as the State Planning Authority, the State Planning Office and the Planning Appeal Board. As a result of legislation carried by this Parliament earlier in this session, those bodies are in the course of being replaced by certain other bodies: by a Planning Bill, for example, by (let me make absolutely certain I get the names right) a Planning Appeal Tribunal rather than the Planning Appeal Board, by the South Australian Planning Commission rather than the State Planning Authority, and so on. What the legislation does, as that Bill and those various bodies are listed in many other pieces of legislation, is to systematically go through those pieces of legislation, striking out the old verbiage and replacing it with verbiage pertinent to or arising out of the new legislation.

It is a purely machinery thing, something which it is perhaps unfortunate that we have to do, something which perhaps could be better done by regulation or by some sort of administrative act, because there is no policy in this at all. The closest I can come to even finding anything about which anyone should argue (and I guess there is an extent to which Oppositions have this responsibility) is in clause 4, which provides:

The Red Cliff Land Vesting Act, 1973, is repealed.

It is obvious, on the reading of the context of the legislation, that that retains that land in the name of the Minister of Environment and Planning. In other words, the land remains in public ownership. I am a little interested in that because the Redcliff land—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are not arguing that it should remain in public ownership?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is not pertinent to the question before us. I simply make the point that that is the effect of it. It still remains as public ownership, vested in the name of the Minister of Environment and Planning rather than, as I understand it, in the State Planning Authority, which was the point of the 1973 Bill introduced in this place by someone called Hopgood. As to what the ultimate use of that land should be, that is something that in another context we could debate, because I am aware that immediately to the north of the area that was to have been used for a petro-chemical plant and incorporated in the area

defined in the legislation is an area of mangroves, a fish spawning and breeding area, and it seems to me that some sort of marine park could well be an appropriate use and indeed may have been so designated even if the Redcliff proposal had proceeded in its original form.

I take the opportunity to raise one matter with the Minister at the table, because I am a little concerned about it and it does impact on the matter that we are debating. His colleague, the Minister of Environment and Planning (who is not here for good reason, because he is at a meeting of Ministers in Hobart) was good enough to call me in recently and give me some briefing on the machinery that was taking place in relation to the proclamation of the Planning Bill. This is something which is occurring in stages as is provided for in the Bill and as is necessary in view of the complicated nature of the legislation involved. I was given to understand, and I do not believe that this was said in any sort of *entre nous* context, that it was to be public knowledge, that there were two things that had to happen soon.

One was the proclamation of that part of the legislation which dealt with the setting up of the South Australian Planning Commission, and that should proceed fairly soon because without it much that was envisaged in the legislation, including the conclusion of the State Plan which is the basic document of the new Bill, could not really proceed. Following that it was necessary that this Parliament come to grips with the amendment written into the legislation in another place at the instigation of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, with the support of the Labor Opposition and the Hon. Lance Milne. The Minister at the table may recall that the burden of Mr DeGaris's concern here (and in this he is entirely consistent with all that he ever said or did in Opposition) was that the State Plan involved documents originally not brought down as legislation, be it prime legislation or be it subordinate legislation, but rather policy documents, but nonetheless under the legislation they were, under a scissors and paste operation, being incorporated in a document which would then have the force of law. The Hon. Mr DeGaris's concern about this was that this document would not have received the scrutiny of the Parliament. Accordingly, it was agreed in the legislation that a motion would have to pass through both Houses validating the plan, once prepared.

I do not know how long we will sit. I rather gather from the lack of a great volume of legislation before us (certainly very little is being introduced this week) that we are sitting purely as long as it takes somehow to resolve the matter of the Roxby Downs indenture Bill. I would imagine that, whatever its fate, that is this week and next, and that is the finish. I would be interested in the Minister's taking up with his colleague what he intends to do about that motion, which has to go through both Houses. If, in fact, the session is to finish at the end of next week, and we are then to come back late in July or early August, or something like that, we will have the Address in Reply debate (and the next thing we know we are into the Budget), where are we in terms of the time table for the Planning Bill?

I do not raise this in any spirit of criticism. I have long been of the opinion that, if anything, the Minister has been over optimistic about the capacity of everyone involved to be able to meet these deadlines. It is a big job. The section of the Minister's department that has to deal with this is not lavishly staffed, and I would not be at all surprised if things are running a bit behind time. But, it would be most unfortunate if the stages of the proclamation of the Bill were held up not so much by the logistics of getting this enormous amount of paperwork out of the way but simply if the sittings of the House were not convenient for being able to entertain that motion, which really must go through both Houses before very much else can happen. So, I would appreciate the Minister's taking that matter up with his absent colleague. With those remarks, the Opposition supports the Bill.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): Again, I appreciate the support for the measure given by the member for Baudin, acting for the Opposition. I undertake to draw the matter that he raised during the debate to the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Environment and Planning, on his return. It was noteworthy that the honourable member should recognise the level of consultation that my colleague has entered into, as he did when citing the opportunity extended to him, which I understand was taken up, wherein discussions between the Government Minister and the Opposition took place. That practice has been adopted wherever possible and practicable by members of our Cabinet. This augurs well for good relations within Parliamentary procedures and should, if it does not already, show publicly that a great many matters of legislation which come before this House do receive the full and wholehearted support of the Opposition and are not in conflict, as are those items that are cited in the media.

The only other point I raise in conclusion is that the honourable member implies that there is not sufficient business before the House for it to remain open for more than this week and next. I understand that the planning organised by the Leaders of both sides of the House is such that we are to sit for more than two weeks, in fact to extend at least into the third week. I am not privy to the detail of legislation before the House. I have enough on my plate handling my own, and other Ministers, in their absence, appear to have a full plate. I have enough with which to exercise myself without determining what other Ministers have to do in their own right. I repeat that I appreciate the support given me on each occasion so far, and I look forward to similar support for legislation yet to be tabled in my name.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 March. Page 3804.)

Mr McRAE (Playford): The Opposition canvassed this measure in very considerable detail in the Council. I simply refer honourable members to the debate in that place and support the Bill.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and as it provides for an alteration to the constitution of Parliament, it is necessary under Standing Order 298 for the bells to be rung and for the second reading to be carried by an absolute majority. Ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Is there a right of reply to the second reading debate before the debate is closed?

The SPEAKER: Order! No action was taken to exercise the right at the appropriate time. The bells having been rung, the opportunity lapses.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: With due respect, Sir, the Acting Speaker in the Chair at the time waved me back to my seat and was seeking instructions on procedures at the time that you entered the House.

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept that as a point of order. In conformity with Standing Order 298, I will proceed to count the House. I have counted the House and, there being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question, 'That this Bill be now read a second time'. Those for the question say 'Aye', against 'No'. I hear no dissentient voice and there

being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I declare that the motion is carried.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: I declare the second reading to have been carried by the requisite statutory majority, and it may now be proceeded with.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

New clause 9a—'Provision in respect of salary and superannuation where term of office affected by avoidance of election.'

Mr McRAE: I move:

Page 2, after line 36—Insert new clause as follows:

9a. The following section is inserted after section 55 of the principal Act:

55a. Where, whether before or after the commencement of the Constitution Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1982—

(a) a person has been elected to be a member of the Legislative Council or the House of Assembly at an election held in consequence of the voidance of an earlier election; and

(b) the person stood as a candidate for that earlier election,

the term of office of that person as a member of Parliament shall, for the purposes of determining his rights and liabilities in respect of salary and superannuation, be calculated as if he had been elected at that earlier election.

This amendment clarifies the proposal as outlined in the Bill with respect to the Legislative Council. It extends the provisions of the clause to the members of the House of Assembly. It provides more clearly superannuation and salary provision of a member disadvantaged by a voided election. It is an equitable provision with respectable precedent in the Westminster Parliament and the Commonwealth Parliament. Both Parliaments have accepted for many years that a member in such circumstances should not be disadvantaged, and common sense and equity strongly support that view. To leave the clause as it is would differentiate between the two Houses in a most undesirable way. The provision for retrospective application would, in fact, refer only to the position of the member for Norwood. In any event, the clause in its present form provides a retrospective mechanism in the case of Legislative Councillors to overcome obvious problems that have come to light. I commend the new clause to the House.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am aware of the amendment which has been circulated in the honourable member's name. My information from my colleague in the other place is that regrettably we are unable to accept the amendment.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes—(19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, McRae (teller), O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (24)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman (teller), Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Tonkin and Wilson.

Pair—Aye—Mr Bannon. No—Mr Wotton.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 10 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank the Opposition for their support of this measure and their acceptance of the Government's view in respect of the amendment moved by the member for Playford.

The SPEAKER: As this is a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and as it provides for an alteration of the constitution of Parliament, it is necessary under Standing Order 298 for the bells to be rung and the third reading to be carried by an absolute majority. Ring the bells. I have counted the House and, there being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I put the question, 'That this Bill be now read a third time.' Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'. I hear no dissentient voice and, there being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I declare the motion carried. I declare the third reading of this Bill to have been carried by an absolute majority.

Bill read a third time and passed.

DRIED FRUITS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March. Page 3407.)

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): The Dried Fruits Act Amendment Bill, which is before us, is not the desiccated subject that it might seem. It has significant meaning, I suppose, for the electorate held presently by a colleague of a name similar to my own. I am sure that he may well participate in the debate later in order to bring the interests of his own constituents before the House.

The Bill is essentially not a very long one, and it may transpire that the speeches that surround the Bill, both from this side and from the other side, exceed the length of the Bill, and that really is to highlight the importance of the industry to South Australia. The Bill touches on only one area. That raises in its own right questions as to why it does not touch on other areas that could well arise from a perusal of the ambit of the Act. It touches, principally on the decision of the Commonwealth Government to require full recompense for all inspection charges of dried fruit retrospective to 1980. As I will outline shortly, that will pose a considerable impost on the finances of the Dried Fruits Board.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Don't get too locked in, because they've agreed to it willingly.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I understand that the board has agreed to the increase. Nevertheless, it has required legislation to enable that to take place if the Dried Fruits Board is not to go seriously into deficit and draw on its fairly limited accumulated funds.

A smaller amendment is included in the Bill, namely, the decision to include dried apples under the definition of 'dried fruits'. I ask the Minister what is the legislative definition of 'dried' in terms of dried fruits. We have no specification in the parent legislation on this matter. I have been through section 5 of the Act, the interpretation section, and I can find nothing that actually defines what dried fruit is. Are we to believe that dried fruit incorporates products such as glace fruit? Are we to believe that it incorporates types of preserved fruit other than those canned, or in bottles, and, if so, that may raise the question of whether or not other fruit varieties should be included in the definition, and whether the inclusion of dried applies is sufficient? I will return to that in a moment.

First, with regard to Commonwealth fees, the Minister advised the House on 23 March that the decision of the Commonwealth Government would, in fact, result in an increase in inspection costs of about 300 per cent. He suggested that the total cost for 1982 could well reach $37 000. That is a significant increase on what is presently being paid. In the financial year ended 28 February 1981 inspection

costs were $18 500, so we see, on that year, an increase of over 100 per cent. Previous to that, in the financial year ended 28 February 1980, inspection costs were $13 616.

We could ask the question: why is it felt necessary that the entire burden of the inspection costs should be borne by the growers? The Dried Fruits Board is entirely financed by the grower. In any operation involving Government expenditure, revenue is provided from a number of sources. Until now, of course, revenue has been provided both by the grower, through levies to the Dried Fruits Board, and by the taxpayer in general (by implication the consumer), by means of the subsidy offered by the Commonwealth Government through the short-fall charged on the actual costs of inspection fees. A decision has now been made that that should no longer be the case.

We know of a number of other primary product boards where the full inspection fees are expected of the grower or producer and this, I suppose, can be considered to be one of the industries coming within the same category as all the others. It could be worth while having further information on that point from the Minister when he replies to the second reading debate. Failure to allow for an increase in fees to be charged to growers on the fruit they produce could result in serious financial difficulties to the Dried Fruits Board which would somehow have to be met. It is not a particularly wealthy board in its accumulation of assets, and I read from the balance sheet as at 28 February 1981 (I note that that is a most interesting date for its balance sheet and financial accounts to be concluded—an unusual time of the year and probably quite out of step with 95 per cent of all other Government accounting bodies—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It's very close to the Japanese financial year, I think.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I appreciate this international measure of goodwill. The accumulated funds total net assets as at 28 February 1981 were only $35 714. Given the fact that in that financial year the body operated on a deficit of just over $2 500, on the old inspection fee rate one could anticipate that, all other things being equal, this year it would operate on a deficit well in excess of $20 000. Thus, the accumulated funds of $35 000 would seriously fall in this year and be totally wiped out in the succeeding financial year. In other words, the financial year we are presently embarking on would see those fees totally wiped out, and recourse would have to be made to the State Government Consolidated Revenue, which would mean the State taxpayers through the charges they pay. That cannot be countenanced, and I appreciate that.

Whether or not the set amount provided for in the Bill is sufficient to cover all possible increases that may take place in the years ahead is something that I suppose also deserves further examination. It must be pointed out that the increases are quite considerable—up to $16 in the case of dried fruits other than vine fruits, and up to $8 in the case of those vine fruits, as opposed to $3 and $6 respectively at the moment.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You appreciate the opportunity to levy from time to time in the future.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. There is a need for the legislation before us now. It must be pointed out that, even though the dried fruit industry is not perhaps as well known within the State as it might be for its contribution to the State's economy, it is a significant revenue raiser for the State and also provides income for a substantial number of farmers in this State, and, by consequence, adds to the health of the economy.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: And a delightful product for the consumer.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Absolutely. It also provides a contribution to the export revenue of the State. Perhaps I might give some indication of the production figures pertaining to the industry. The figures I have available are, unfortunately, not the most recent ones, but I am sure that they reflect recent trends. They are contained in the Fifty-second Report of the Dried Fruits Board for the year ended 28 February 1981—they are the 1979 season figures. Processing of the total production of dried vine fruits from South Australian producers was 5 912 tonnes for the season. There was also some processing of interstate produce of 2 671 tonnes, totalling 8 583 tonnes in that year.

Dried tree fruit products were as follows: 2 990 tonnes plus 33 tonnes interstate, totalling 3 023 tonnes. That makes a total pack of dried vine and dried tree fruits of 11 606 tonnes. That produce was handled by seven packing houses in this State when, in fact, there are nine registered packing houses. I have noticed, in going back through annual reports of the Dried Fruits Board, that the number of operative packing houses has remained static at seven for a number of years, even though the actual registered number has been in excess of that. Why is that so? Are there, in fact, producers or packers who are maintaining registration with no interest at all in actually proceeding into that industry? Why should that be the case? Is it because the industry is on a downturn, has been so for at least the past six years, and there is thus this excess capacity, or is it that these packers are basically engaged in other industries and are keeping their options open so that they can, if need be, earn extra revenue from the dried fruit industry? Whatever the case, I think that some answers to that might well be of interest.

Coming to the point I mentioned before of the actual products that we consider in this matter, it is only right that we should incorporate dried apples in this, but I ask again (maybe by means of permitted interjection) whether we could have some understanding of the definition of 'dried' and whether, in fact, it does include preserved fruits and fruits that are not preserved by the addition of fluid. Does it include glace fruits?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Sugar is another one that is included. I will answer that during the Committee stage.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: If it does include those, citrus products become a quite important possible additive to the work of the board. The glace fruit industry is a very popular export income earner for this country in Europe and America. A significant part of that industry is the citrus products that go into it. I was reading an article in a magazine just today, I think called *Farm,* which suggested the possibility of a lime-growing industry in this State and mentioned the contribution it could make in its own small way. I think it is to be regretted that the lime industry is not a healthier one; in fact, I venture to suggest that it is almost a non-existent industry, although we do have some lime trees in this State. Limes are a fairly easy citrus product to grow. They do offer the possibility of diversification for the citrus industry in South Australia and are, of course, a very palatable product (I am very partial to limes and I know a lot of people are).

Limes also have a significant part to play in a number of other food production processes. While much of the lime flavouring in many food products bears about as much resemblance to the lime fruit as chalk to cheese, it is certainly true that the product is used in other food additive processes. Some years ago I was somewhat disappointed, when travelling through the Riverland and buying products in that area, after asking a person at a stall whether he grew or sold limes, to be told that he did not sell them but that he grew them on a tree in the back paddock and let the crop rot every year. That crop could have added some income to the farm.

If that is to happen, given the fact that the general consumer market is not prepared for the eating of raw limes and that perhaps the food processing industry basically relies

at this stage on lime concentrate that may well be imported, perhaps the major virtue that limes could offer is in the glace fruit industry, for inclusion in glace fruit ensembles for export or local sale. I commend to the House that argument in the magazine *Farm,* and I hope that it results in an increase of the production of that fruit.

The Dried Fruits Board does not merely provide positions for its members: it has a distinct purpose. The board consists of a number of members, some of whom are growers. There is a Chairman, a Deputy Chairman, and three grower-elected members, so that growers represent a majority of the members of the board, and are therefore able to exert control over their own industry from their own experience, and I do not criticise that. The growers come from two sources: two are nominated from the irrigated areas of the State, and one is nominated from the non-irrigated areas of the State.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The dry area.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. In addition to that, there are observers, one from the Department of Agriculture and one from the Department of Primary Industry, which is quite logical, given that inspection processes are handled by the Commonwealth Government. One would expect the Commonwealth Government to have observer status on that board. In addition to its functions of inspecting dried fruits, the board also has responsibility for interstate collaboration. I understand that meetings are held at least once a year between the various boards of dried fruit producing States in relation to a number of matters that affect not only the volume of fruit produced which is capable of being preserved in this form but also the methods of preserving such fruit, controlling the sulphur content of fruit, and so on.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The practices and future of the industry are discussed on an international level when it is desirable. The relationships at a consultation level—

The SPEAKER: Order! It would be most unfortunate if the honourable Minister's reply was deficient because it had already been stated.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Interstate consultation is commendable, and it would lead to the maintenance of a much better national front in overseas markets, so that the products of each State adhere to set standards and the name of Australia's dried fruit exports overseas is not damaged by one errant State which may not adhere to similar standards. This type of operation is fully supported by the Opposition and, I accept, also by the Government.

Will the Minister say how the inspection procedure is carried out? When I was a member of the Select Committee on meat hygiene, we looked at the way in which meat from interstate was inspected. Although I know that the Deputy Premier is eager to hear about the meat-washing processes at certain Hills slaughterhouses, I do not intend to go into that matter this afternoon. Nevertheless, the point was made on that occasion that not all inspection processes are entirely adequate. Sometimes, as was stated on that occasion, the inspection process amounted to the opening of a refrigerated van door; according to what odour came out, the meat was no good (if the odour was strong enough), or it was all right (if there was no odour). What is involved in the inspection of dried fruit? How many inspectors are there? What are the salary and support costs of those inspectors? Are investigations under way by the Dried Fruits Board, or by national consultation of the various boards, into more effective ways and, dare I say, cheaper ways of inspecting the fruit?

Two solutions could naturally be found to the extra impost that is being put on the Dried Fruits Board, resulting in $37 000 inspection costs this year. One solution would be to increase the levy and the income of the board; another solution would be to find ways of reducing that amount so that the Commonwealth Government, the State Government or the growers were not subjected to that cost. Some work in that direction would be worth while.

It is in that context that, while I was investigating the Bill, I was somewhat unhappy to find that little attention is paid to the dried fruit industry in the various agricultural journals and economic authorities. Almost no attention was paid to this sector of the industry in some recent publications. Yesterday, in regard to the dairy industry Bill, I commented on the failure of such authorities to refer to non-cow dairy products, and I repeat that comment today. Their relative obscurity does not remove their contribution to the economy.

I have asked a series of questions about this matter. One matter raised, in regard to quality standards, was that we end up with variegated products, such as what is referred to rather quaintly as the dry tree fruit salad, an interesting product that I have not come across, but the mind boggles a little at such culinary delights. The Act should be sufficiently flexible to enable quality control of such a product.

Subject to the requirements of other items on the agenda this afternoon and to the extent of answers given by the Minister in his reply to the second reading, I indicate that the Opposition fully supports the proposal before the House and hopes that it receives support in another place. We look forward to hearing the Minister's responses to that matter. I ask again what inspection processes are involved in the dried fruit industry. How many inspectors are involved at State level? Is there a cheaper, more effective way of inspecting fruit? What is the definition of 'dried', given the fact that there is no explanation in clause 5 of the Bill? Does it include fruits preserved without the addition of sugar, or those preserved with the addition of sugar? I have a related series of questions which could be examined in the Committee stage.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I wish to refer to some of the points raised by the honourable member and thank him for keeping the subject alive. He has not only shown interest in the subject generally but has also demonstrated a degree of research into the detailed procedures associated with the drying of fruit, the inspection of that fruit and its marketing in South Australia.

The report to which the honourable member referred, that of the year ended February 1979, from which he drew certain financial details for the benefit of members of the House, is somewhat out of date. In fact, I tabled a report in this House on 10 November 1981 which was the report of the financial details for the year ended 28 February of that year. The honourable member might use that material or make the necessary amendments in *Hansard* to get the subject up to date. The honourable member asked about the definition of dried fruit. Frankly, dried fruit is clearly defined within the terms of the Dried Fruits Act, 1934-1972, as follows:

'dried fruits' means—

(a) dried grapes, including dried currants, dried sultanas, lexias, dried muscatels, dried Waltham Cross, and dried doradillos;

(b) dried tree fruits, including dried prunes, dried peaches, dried apricots, dried nectarines, and dried pears; and

(c) such other dried fruits as are declared by proclamation to be dried fruits for the purposes of this Act;

That is precisely what we are doing on this occasion. Because of the demand for dried apples, the availability of these fruits to our processors in South Australia and apparently the consumer demand for that product, we are accommodating the industry by proclaiming apples to be incorporated under that Act.

The honourable member asked for a definition of dried fruit: dry is as dry as a chip without moisture; it says what it means. It is as clear as a neon sign for the purpose of describing (fruit): it is not wet fruit or fresh fruit but, indeed, dried principally for the purposes of marketing.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Is glace fruit 'dried'?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Glace fruit is dried—

Mr Lynn Arnold: Is it dried fruit?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: —in that it is not fresh fruit; it is without moisture. It has had sugar added to it. It has had a preservative added to it in the same way as apricots are treated and are a dried fruit for the purposes of this Act—dried of their moisture, with sulphur added, together with whatever other ingredients are required for colouring and/or presentation for public storage in the interim and until public consumption takes place. My interpretation of 'dried' is 'without moisture'—precisely what it says.

In order to clarify this question for the honourable member, I have asked my department to ascertain whether in addition to what I have conveyed to the honourable member there is any other information relevant in describing more fully what 'dried' means. In my view, dried is without a drink, without moisure (and I am getting dry now carrying on with this subject, which I appreciate really has been raised for the purpose of having the debate), but the interest factor will be upheld and any added information I can obtain will be passed on.

The matter of inspection costs is something that the dried fruits industry has accepted as part of its own operational costs, and it is in that context that the dried fruits industry has accepted that the industry, and not the State at large, should pay any increases in inspection charges. It is in that context that it has come to the Government and said that, in recognition of its obligation to pay the inspection fees and indeed as a result of a call for higher inspection fees by the Department of Primary Industry, it wants the Government to facilitate through legislative machinery the opportunity for it to levy its growers to cover those costs. Whether in fact the levy for 1981-82 or 1982-83, or indeed any subsequent year, is going to be sufficient is really a responsibility of the industry. It is for the industry to do its homework to ensure that its expenditure is at least covered by its income. Whether or not it has a deficit, or in other years a slight surplus, is entirely a financial management matter for the industry.

In my view, it is not an area in which we as a Government or a Parliament should dictate the level or extent to which it should be levying the industry's own members. I repeat that the call for this measure was initiated by the the industry, and it is a matter in which the Government is facilitating the industry after it has demonstrated a need for these provisions. It is in that way that as a Government we have been successful with our legislative programme and, might I say with some pride, extremely successful with respect to all of the Bills associated with my portfolio of agriculture.

It is not a practice, policy or pattern of my department to go out and dictate to the rural industry of this State what is shall or shall not do but, indeed, to have due regard for its expressed desires, after demonstrating its needs and after demonstrating that there is industrial support for those needs, and then it is the Government's job to facilitate the required measures. It is in that way that we have worked on our Bills for this Parliament and accordingly introduced then with the support of the industry that we purport to be supporting.

There is no exception in this case. The dried fruits industry went through that process and indeed demonstrated beyond doubt that it had a responsibility and an undertaking to meet costs, and as the costs had gone up so the levy needed to go up to keep in line with it. The details, the ups or downs by a dollar or a cent here or there, are a matter for the industry's concern, not mine. It is for those several reasons that I have not bothered myself to ascertain the costs of the inspection charges applicable to the dried fruits industry, it is for those reasons that I have not ascertained the salary payable to those Department of Primary Industry officers; and it is for those reasons alike that I have not bothered myself to find out precisely how many personnel carry out the inspection process.

There is in the financial details submitted to the House by way of an annual report some reference to the costs under the various subheadings in the income and expenditure balance sheet which I think would broadly demonstrate the general levels of inspection-type applications to the industry in this State.

I again appreciate the interest which the honourable member has shown and which is invariably demonstrated by him on agricultural matters. I am absolutely amazed that he should be saddled with the shadow portfolio of education when he appears to have little interest or involvement in that area, except from time to time when there is a strike around the traps. Other than when there is some sensational issue, we seldom hear from him on that subject.

Perhaps he is suffering from some shadow portfolio responsibility thrust upon him from a Party, a matter over which he has had little control. I know that we all have to share the load, whether in Government or in Opposition, and he has to be admired for that. In my view, the interest that he demonstrates, the hard work that he shows he is capable of doing, and his general ability and capacity to deal with the subject of agriculture and agriculture oriented matters spell out to me that he is a good man wasted in that field. Should his Party at any time choose to reshuffle its shadow portfolios, I would look forward to agriculture, from a Government and Opposition point of view, being located in this, the people's House. I can think of no other member opposite more suited to that role. I assure him that, if the signs I read are the right ones, as I believe them to be, his future as a shadow Minister of Agriculture would be long and worth while. I appreciate his contribution and the general support for the measure before the House.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): It is pleasing to see that the Bill went through so quickly, and I thank the Minister for his answers to questions I raised in my second reading speech. May I also disabuse the Minister. My intense interest in matters agricultural is indeed heartfelt. I feel that it is an important industry and I have done whatever I can to advance that, partly because of the agricultural interests in my own electorate. But, I must disabuse him inasmuch as my prime loyalties in this Chamber were, are, and will be in the areas of education, after those of my constituency are attended to.

The Minister, with some embarrassment, I suppose, seems to notice that perhaps I have not always been publicly firing shots in the education arena, and he would rather that they be fired at him. I am happy to do so. There is an old adage that one does not fire until one sees the whites of their eyes. In matters educational, and in public firing, that is precisely what one does. I suggest that the Minister watch with good and close interest events that transpire.

Bill read a third time and passed.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (1982)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[Sitting suspended from 5.17 to 7.30 p.m.]

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 4247.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In speaking to the motion before the House, to begin with I would like to point out that the Minister, in his remarks to the Chamber, seemed to find it somewhat strange that the two members who appended their names to an appendix to the report itself had chosen to use information that was not necessarily presented to the committee. I am not quite sure what the Minister was on about, because I should have thought that it was the duty of a person serving on a Select Committee to use any and all opportunities to gain knowledge about the matter before such a committee.

However, the Minister pointed out and since has publicly attempted to show that the report from the two members concerned, that is, myself and my colleague, the Hon. Don Hopgood, is of little substance. In attempting to show that, the Minister (and I think I was correct in observing the time span) took 16 minutes of his allotted 30 minutes. I do not believe that it is necessary for me to develop my discussion on that any further, other than to ask why, if the appendix was of no account, it took 16 minutes for the Minister to endeavour to show that that was the position?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Put the record straight.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister says 'Put the record straight.' I will leave it to the readers of *Hansard* and to the listeners to decide which of the records is straight. The Minister seemed to think that a Select Committee with a proposition before it involving decades of the State's future should simply rely on the information provided to it by the major proponent in that matter. Of course, that is absolute nonsense. As far as my colleague and I are concerned, obviously there is a need to make sure that information is made available from other sources.

In relation to markets, the Minister then endeavoured to point out that, because in some way we had referred to a certain publication and cited it as a reference, there was something wrong with that. Why did my colleague and I do that? When one of the people who came before the committee, Mr Peter Hill, who has had a long association with the working group involved with the long and protracted negotiations on the Roxby Downs indenture and who, I understand, is a director in the Department of Mines and Energy, I asked him what market research on metals was done in the Department of Mines and Energy. His answer was, 'Really, in the Department of Mines we do not have anyone looking at the marketing side in any great detail. It is probably not one of our functions.' That is what was said. He went on to say that there were staff shortages and that it could be difficult to justify doing that. That is not my view on the matter. The State is asked to commit rights, tenure, and for a long period of time commit special rights to a consortium group, and yet we were told in evidence that the Department of Mines and Energy, which ought to be the advisory body on this matter, does not do anything in the vital area of market research.

I noted that on the committee and decided to do some of my own research, and as a consequence, together with my colleague, the appendix that is now before the House was brought forward with the references it contains. The references referred to Nuexco. The Minister is saying that Mr Morgan said that and Mr Morgan said this, and asks why I do not listen to that. I did listen to it, but I thought it might not be unreasonable in the circumstances to ascertain what other people were saying about the same scene, that is, the world uranium market. I did not go down Hindley Street to see whether there was someone down there flogging a thousand kilograms of it, but decided to go to the best source I could find, which was Nuexco. Nuexco is the world's principal uranium brokerage and market monitoring company. It has been serving the nuclear industry since 1968. A publication of that body states in part:

> Nuexco utilises its expertise and market knowledge to assist in uranium transactions. From an impartial brokerage position, Nuexco seeks common ground for agreement between buyer and seller.

So it goes on. That body does not have a direct interest in the matter before the House and in point of fact it costs $500 to obtain the regular information sheets issued by Nuexco in Australia. My thanks go to Nuexco which, on approach, made available to me and my colleague information that I believe is vital in this matter. The Minister in some way tried to be derogatory about the fact that we had quoted from a publication issued by a body which is the world's principal uranium brokerage company. I do not believe that I need say any more about that matter.

In addition, let us consider the scene in relation to copper, the metal to which the Minister quickly switched when he noted from the report, that is, appendix C, that there is little profit in working too much on the uranium scene and when he decided to call it a copper prospect once again. It fluctuates somewhat, depending on who is speaking from the Government side, but on this occasion the Minister said that it is not really a uranium mine anyway, that it is a copper mine. That is what he said. What are the prospects for copper? Once again, I am not speaking about persons directly involved in the scene, but I will quote from the *Miner*, a journal which circulates in the area involved and which should be directly associated with the mining and marketing of metals, and so on. In the *Miner* of April this year, on page 43, the following heading appears: 'Horror year is looming'. It states:

> Australia's major copper producers face yet another horror year [may I stress that] in 1982 and most will be struggling to trade in the black, even if the long-awaited upturn in world prices for the metal begins soon.

The article goes on to show that things are not too bright in the copper area, either. That is why my colleague and I decided to look for infomation from a body not directly involved in the project. I do not think that that is an unfair approach to the matter; that is why we have quoted such sources in our report. I refer the Minister to a paper presented by Nuexco to the Society of Mining Engineers at Albuquerque, New Mexico, U.S.A. in September 1981. This is a very interesting statement, because it cuts a little on both sides of the question. However, I am not afraid to throw it in for people to make their own assessment of it, because it is directly concerned with the uranium market now and in the future. It states:

> The important new production of the free world will come from high-grade deposits of Australia and Western Canada. Since consumption and inventory accumulation cannot absorb this new production, other free world production—mainly in the U.S.—must be displaced.

As I said, it sort of cuts both ways; there is a little bit of hope there for Roxby. But, one should listen to the clinching phrase from the broking firm concerned with its handling. In the final sentence it says, 'A low market price will probably be the market displacement mechanism.' There is the quote from Nuexco, but the query might arise with that that it is 1981. Let us look at 1982. Nuexco, again in 1982, presented a statement at the Atomic Industrial Forum Fuel Meeting on 22 March 1982 in New York City. George White, Junior, Senior Vice President of Nuexco, said:

> At the risk of stating the obvious, it must be observed that the long-term health and development of the uranium business depends on the long-term health and development of nuclear power as a source of electric generation.

One would agree that that is stating the obvious. It continues, 'I make this point because there has been a tendency by many of us to pay close attention to the trees and lose sight of the forest.' I think that is perhaps what has happened to the Minister; he has lost sight of the trees and he is in the middle of the forest. It continues:

We focused our attention on the existing uranium supply agreement. We talked about uranium demands generated by enrichment contracts by convert contracts and by fabrication contracts.

I will skip a little, to save the time of the House. It continues:

We ignored the realities. Utilities were getting into financial trouble. Low growth levelled out. Reserve margins increased. Regulating constraints and nuclear opposition extended completion dates and nuclear plants were being cancelled. We ignored all this because we are the true believers in nuclear power.

That is what George White said. I think there are a few of them in South Australia who perhaps might have to reconsider their position. He went on to say:

So where are we now? We have a world-wide uranium industry that expanded vigorously to meet a market characterised by a continuing erosion of future demands. Somewhere along the line we took our eyes off the target.

Here is the crunch: 'There is an imbalance between uranium production and uranium consumption. It is no secret that more uranium is being produced.' This is this year, before we even get the show off the ground. It continues:

It is no secret that more uranium is being produced than is being consumed in reactors. It is true today, both for the U.S. and the world at large, on a world-wide basis. It will still be true in 1990.

That is what is said by a gentleman who has a fairly close contact with and interest in the industry. If we like to go back to 1981 for a moment, we find the following, in a further quote under the heading, 'What Happened to the Uranium Boom', by M. J. Reeves, who said:

That ordering rate was expected to continue and accelerate throughout this century. In 1975 through 1980 there were 56 more reactors cancelled than ordered.

Members should take note of that. These are the people at the heart of the scene. They have some knowledge. It continues, 'The net growth of our only customer since 1974 has been a negative 56.' He is talking about the U.S. and, as we have shown in our appendix, he has also stated that Nuexco as a whole has said that what is happening in the U.S. is a world scene picture also. I do not believe we were wrong in trying to make sure that we on the committee were well informed to ensure that we had access to information from the levels where the knowledge is—not where the estimation is, where the hope is, or even where the wish resides. We are talking about hard cold facts of money and the sale and purchase of a commodity that is involved, in this case uranium.

Figures are available, and members are welcome to look at the information that I have been quoting. I have not got the time to go into it in further detail, and certainly I do not need to do so to indicate what is the current—and even to the end of 1990 and onwards—prognostication for the commodity uranium. The Minister might say, 'That is O.K. It is Nuexco, and so on.' He cited Mr Morgan. What did Mr Morgan have to say as recently as 21 May in an address to the Securities Institute of Australia and the Australian business economists in Adelaide? The speaker was Hugh M. Morgan. This is what he said about uranium:

Perhaps it is overlooked how common is the element of uranium in the earth's crust. It is certainly more common than tin and as exploration continues I believe it is even easier to find.

That is hardly a supportive statement in relation to the future market prognosis for that very commodity. He must have thought about it while he was speaking, because he then went on to say, 'The distribution of the mineralisation is widespread (speaking of Roxby Downs) and, given prices two or three times the present levels, many millions of tonnes of uranium could be classified as mineable reserves.' Given prices two or three times the present level, Nuexco does not believe, as it can foresee, that the prices will get to the levels that have been cited by Mr Morgan. So much about marketing. I now introduce another authority, as follows:

The framework of the international uranium market remains uncertain, but it is important to recognise that there is likely to be scope in the 1990s for Roxby Downs to exercise an influence on price when it is anticipated that Australian production of uranium will be significant in world markets and thereby exercise a stronger voice in the pricing and marketing of uranium.

That statement was by Sir Ben Dickinson in evidence to the committee, and I suppose that Sir Ben is entitled to put his own connotation on it. But let me put my connotation on it. Mr Morgan says it is more common than tin; it is all over the place; and it is getting relatively easier to find. Surely in the market place that is going to mean that the price will never go up. It must be that the price is going to become lower: surely, when more of it is available, market forces will take care of the fact, and, in a time of falling demand, the price will be reduced.

That is enough on marketing. I think that dismisses anything that the Minister tried to raise, even though he did it so badly, about Nuexco and the fact that we had the temerity to go outside the committee and to get information other than what came directly before it. The Minister also tried to show that there was something wrong about appendix C. when it suggested that there ought to be proper provision for possible injury, illness and death for people who might become involved in the work force in a uranium mine.

The Minister said, 'There is a common law approach to this matter. There is no need for special legislation.' It sounds plausible, and it comes from a Minister, so that ought to have a bit of weight. But what did the Minister really say? I believe he really said, 'There is no need for workers compensation at all. There is no need for legislation in that area, because common law exists in parallel.'

Let me tell the Minister, in case he does not know, that there are such things as the statute of limitations, which states that, in relation to common law, if one is working in a uranium mine, one had better get cancer within six years, because, after that time, one is subject to restrictions. Of course, the Minister knows, but did not say, that the problem with possible illness, injury and even death in this industry is that it can take a long time to occur. That is why my colleague and I incorporated in our appendix the requirement that there should be special legislation, and we cited a precedent. Let the Minister explain why common law, which exists in the United Kingdom, which in fact began there and has always existed there, was not thought to be sufficient in that country. Why was it that, as far back as 1965, the United Kingdom legislated under the Nuclear Installations Act for protection for the workers concerned? That legislation is still in force.

The legislation to which I refer provides protection for the workers concerned by providing compensation for any radiation-induced injury or disease that was brought about by the working environment of a nuclear installation. Why did not the United Kingdom leave it to common law? Obviously it was because of the reasons I have outlined. There is no real degree of protection, and the Minister should know that the total onus of proof 28 years along the track, for example, for cancer in a matter such as this devolves on the worker. Just think of the task involved in trying to prove what happened, who got what dose, and so on!

Of course there is a special need for protection. We have not said it all in the report: we tried to produce a statement which was easily assimilated by the non-directly interested

person but which showed that there is a need for compassion, humanity and genuine legal protection for workers in this circumstance. What are the details of that arrangement? There is common law in the United Kingdom, but the actual details involve compensation for the victims of any occurrence in a nuclear installation, paid out of a special fund. The contributions are made by the holders of Government licences. This is required by the legislation. To operate a nuclear installation, each holder of a licence must ensure, by way of third party insurance or by other means, that he can meet claims up to £5 000 000 sterling. The Government contributes £50 000 000 sterling, which is a back-up to cover compensation for workers at Government installations, and in the case of some inadequacy occurring in the private sector.

That is what the United Kingdom Government thinks about the situation: it did not introduce an Act and say, 'Stiff luck for the workers; they can go to common law.' The Government saw the need and acted accordingly as far back as 1965. We do not ask for more than that. Something that has been in force for a long time and could be reasonably adapted to protect workers who are engaged in mining, as has been done to protect the people who work in nuclear installations, is what we require. The Minister should know (and I suspect he did know, but did not say) that in South Australia the time limit that applies to an application for compensation for an injury under the Workers Compensation Act is six months. What a shabby way to treat people who might be working in this industry and whose livelihood depends on their being employed!

What is the real heart of the matter at which the committee was asked to look? For a number of years since 1979, the joint venturers latterly, and earlier Western Mining, were prepared to spend, and spent, $50 000 000 on the total security of certain letters from two Premiers and the interchanging correspondence between Western Mining Corporation setting out what W.M.C. and any joint venturer that it took into the game would have in this matter—tenure and prior right. What else is needed for feasibility studies for pre-production work? At this point, someone might interject if you, Mr Speaker, allowed them, to say, 'Wait a minute; $50 000 000 is involved, and that is a lot of money. There is a need for further expenditure of that order, so perhaps they want to go a little further.' Western Mining has said this, and that statement has been supported in a qualified way only by B.P. It has been said that that is a real need.

We are talking about risk capital in mining. Mining has always been an area of high risk, and companies have been prepared to take the step, because of the bonanza that may be at the end of the rainbow. Figures are available to suggest why a company or a group might be prepared to do that. Sir Ben Dickinson told the committee that $30 billion worth of metal with a price of $60 per tonne of unrefined ore is in that deposit as presently known. Sir Ben, I suppose, would be subject to the same limitations as are members here. That is probably a few months behind what Western Mining already knows.

Therefore, there are very large possible returns for the risk capital. Why was it all right to risk $50 000 000 on the basis of two letters and associated correspondence, involving assurances from two Premiers, when now there is a need for a much more secure arrangement (in the words of the joint venturers)? Obviously, as I have explained to the House, the market scene is such that there cannot be any real action (to use the vernacular) in this matter for a number of years. Western Mining can see that that is the situation, and I do not blame it for that. It is the job of Western Mining to look after its business interests. The company is anxious to tie it up for the possible good times that might lie ahead in the next decade. If it can do that, who can blame the company? However, it is not the Government's job to view any contractual arrangement in that way: it is the Government's job to view contractual arrangements on behalf of the people of South Australia.

That is the real nub of our appendix to the report. The State should not be tied up in the feasibility and pre-production stages. We should not give away all of the State's interest before it is necessary. That is best done at a time when the full scope of the project can be seen and when all of the preliminary work has been done. Then, and only then, should negotiations of this nature be entered into and concluded.

They should not be in the form they are now in at this stage of the project. If members care to look carefully at appendix C, which is before them, they can then see that this is a carefully reasoned document, which we have prepared and which takes cognizance of the way the matter ought to be handled, looks at the likelihood of injury and death or illness to the workers, and provides in a suitable manner, as will be disclosed by amendments which will be coming later, for the progress of this project to its next stage. It provides for the Government of the day, when it is time, to make the decision to proceed or not to proceed to production, as is presently allowed for in the Mining Act. When an application for production is put forward, it is up to the Government, through the Minister of Mines and Energy, to decide whether a production licence will be issued.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): In rising to support the motion, at the outset I want to say it is a pity that the member for Mitchell, as the lead speaker for the Opposition in this matter, has not indicated to the House where the Labor Party stands on this issue. It is about time honorable members stood up and were counted. Let us not have any more of the flag-waving and diversionary tactics which they have employed to attempt to hoodwink the people of this State. Let them tell us where they stand on the issue.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I will say something later about the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition and what his colleague the member for Elizabeth had to say a few months ago. I believe that the Select Committee gave this matter very thorough consideration. It had the opportunity to hear a large number of witnesses, experts in the field, who gave the committee the great benefit of their knowledge. It was unfortunate that the member for Mitchell did not address himself at great length to the evidence put before the Select Committee. He went on at great length about the market place. It would appear that he has more knowledge of the market place and the commercial decisions that have to be made than have Western Mining Corporation and B.H.P. They will not invest their money unless there is a return.

The Hon. H. Allison: They are taking the risk and he is doing the worrying.

Mr GUNN: Yes. Let us get back to a few basic economic facts. They will not invest these large amounts of capital if they do not believe that it will be economic for them to do so. In my view, it would be a very sad day for South Australia if we turned out backs on one of the largest developments in the history of South Australia. We have the opportunity of being a very large and complex development. Unfortunately, South Australia at present has little mining activity. We have a small copper mine at Mount Gunson, which is operating at a low level. Its financial position is not as strong as we would like. Mining has ceased at Burra.

What other large-scale mining activities have we operating in South Australia? We do not have any. The attitude adopted by the Opposition on this issue is very similar to that which they adopted in 1970 when we were considering another matter of great importance to the people of this State: whether we should build a dam at Chowilla or at Dartmouth. On that occasion it took a course of action for a few months which it thought was politically popular, and then did a complete turnaround when it came to Government.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: So it was politically popular if we became the Government.

Mr GUNN: It knew very well that the information it was putting to the people of this State was inaccurate and grossly misleading. That is the attitude which it is adopting on this occasion. Whatever this Parliament finally determines, it will not have any effect on the nuclear fuel cycle taking place in many countries. We all know that large quantities of uranium are being mined and being used for nuclear energy. It is also clear that, no matter what we do in this State, there will be a continuing demand for nuclear energy for electricity, and it is absolute nonsense for certain people in this State to think we can close down those operations.

We have an opportunity to be part of that industry, to have some influence on it and to reap the benefits of it, because if, through some stroke of luck on the part of the opponents of nuclear fuel, the nuclear stations were turned off in those overseas countries, economic chaos would result. Anyone who has taken the trouble to make a cursory study of what is happening in the major countries in Asia and in Europe, knows that those countries rely heavily on nuclear fuel to generate electricity. If any State needs to be able to diversify its economic base, it is South Australia. Surely, Parliament will not turn its back on this tremendous development.

I am amazed that, on the one hand, we can have the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues continually talking about unemployment, lack of job opportunities, lack of investment, and yet, on the other hand, we have before Parliament tonight one of the most detailed and complex indenture agreements ever put before it and to this stage the Opposition has not indicated support for it. Is it going to say to these people who are currently employed at Olympic Dam, 'Sorry boys, that is it. Your jobs are finished'? Anyone who thinks people are going to continually invest money without a secure contract have little knowledge of how the financial market place operates. It reminded me of someone wanting to build a house, but, when they had built it, not being able to live in it. That is the sort of logic the Opposition have adopted on this issue.

I also find it amazing that there are people in this Parliament who want to turn their backs on the great expertise and experience that a company such as B.P. can bring to South Australia; it is one of the largest developers of oil and other mineral deposits in the world, a company with vast financial resources and great experience. It has the capacity, the know-how, and the financial backing to come to this country and make these resources available for the benefit of the people of this State, not just in the short-term, but in the long-term. Yet members opposite are saying, 'We want to turn our backs on that company. We do not want them to come.' What effect would that decision have on the people who are going to invest in this country? I think everyone is aware that this project is known throughout the world, wherever one talks to people involved in energy production and distribution. They are all talking about Roxby Downs. They know about it, and they cannot understand why people want to stop the project. They find it absolutely amazing.

Before addressing myself to some of the evidence, I must say that I find it amazing that there are some people who, for various reasons, want to deny the people of South Australia the great benefits that would flow from this project. We are talking not only about the operation at the Olympic Dam site, there are other very interesting and significant areas within the Stuart Shelf itself where currently a great deal of exploration work is taking place. If we deny those companies the right to develop the Olympic Dam area, we are probably denying them the opportunity or incentive to proceed with those other areas, and that in itself would be an absolute disgrace.

It would be an act of gross irresponsibility, and it would be taking a course of action which will have an effect on the future of this State for many years to come. Daily, we have people clamouring to have more money spent in various areas. Unfortunately, we are not in the position of Queensland and Western Australia, which have benefited from the massive mineral resources which they have encouraged and allowed to be developed. Now we have that opportunity and we are attempting to put up the shutters and say, 'We do not really want you—go away.' I find it absolutely amazing that people can adopt that attitude.

It was interesting that, of all the witnesses who came before the Select Committee, only two people gave evidence which we could say was strongly opposed to the project, but they were not South Australians. The Friends of the Earth, who claim such support in this State, had to get people to come from Melbourne to give evidence. The United Trades and Labor Council was invited to give evidence, and they declined. That was a fair indication, in my view, that a considerable number of people within the trade union movement support this project. There are members of the union happily working at Roxby Downs, some of whom made very clear to the committee their views on this project. I think the member for Mitchell would agree that they believe the project ought to continue and they were not particularly happy—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Some of them did.

Mr GUNN: One, in particular, made it extremely clear to all concerned. I think, from my knowledge of the area, that he was speaking for the overwhelming majority of people employed there. I think I have been there a lot more than has the member for Mitchell.

Mr Langley: How did you go in Mitcham about the same thing?

Mr GUNN: For the benefit of the honourable member, the member for Mitcham said that the by-election was not about Roxby Downs, so I am looking forward to having her support on this matter. I do not want to be sidetracked. I am waiting with bated breath for the contribution from the member for Unley, and the great words of wisdom that will flow from him.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: If you sit down you will hear from him.

Mr GUNN: I do not wish to be advised by the Deputy Leader how I will address this subject. I understand that his former trade union, at the Federal level, supports the development of the industry, so it will be interesting to see what he has to say and where he stands. It is my understanding that the Federal body of the A.W.U. strongly supports this industry on an Australia-wide basis.

We have heard a lot tonight about the financial effects of this legislation. I think I would like to quote what was said by the Under Treasurer, Mr Barnes, who summarised the arrangement in paragraph 74. He said:

> ... the rationale behind the two-tiered royalty arrangement is one to ensure that the State gets something out of the project no matter whether it is profitable or not. ... Secondly, it is to see that if it turns out to be a very profitable undertaking that there

is an opportunity for the State to participate in those much higher profits, hence the two-tiered arrangement. The two-tiered arrangement is quite unusual and is probably a first in Australia.

That is a unique proposition in itself. Let me quote another passage. Much has been said by the member for Mitchell in relation to safety. I quote paragraph 252, a question from me, and the reply of Dr Wilson:

Mr GUNN: Is Dr Wilson and the commission satisfied that the general welfare and safety of the community and employees who would be engaged in this operation is adequately met by the provisions of this legislation and the radiation protection legislation?

Dr WILSON: Yes. Personally, that is so, and commission officers generally believe that both pieces of legislation give ample ability for controls to be imposed and monitored and to ensure adequate protection of employees and members of the public.

That is the comment of a senior person in the Health Commission who is unequivocal in his views on the safety measures which will be put into effect by this indenture.

I think I should refresh members' memory in relation to the views of the Opposition. Some time ago the member for Elizabeth was quoted as follows:

It was unlikely that uranium would ever be mined in South Australia, the Minister of Health, Mr Duncan, said yesterday. He said this was his own personal view. He also believed the Western Mining Corporation was 'wasting its money'. He said the dangers associated with the nuclear fuel cycle were too great, and if Western Mining thought it could change A.L.P. policy by massive injections of funds into Roxby Downs it was wasting its money.

Then, a little later we had the Leader of the Opposition replying to a number of questions that I asked him during a speech in this House. These were the questions and answers:

Mr Gunn: The honourable member says he does not support it.

Mr Bannon: No.

Mr Gunn: He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

Mr Bannon: Yes.

Mr Gunn: As Premier, you would stop that project?

Mr Bannon: I am opposed to it.

The honourable member made his views very clear there—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What is enlightening about that? We all know about that.

Mr GUNN: I want to refresh the honourable member's short memory. We are all aware that the honourable member has caused a great deal of trouble over that statement. He then made some other comments and had to retract them. I wanted to raise that. The member for Elizabeth, we understand, is the leader in this field in the Labor Party; he seems to have the numbers. I think we are dealing with the credibility of the Labor Party. We have had the member for Elizabeth saying clearly that the Western Mining Corporation is wasting its money. We have heard the Leader make a number of different statements, and I think we should see what the member for Elizabeth had to say about credibility. I have a further quotation:

Labor M.P. Mr Duncan threw the ALP into turmoil yesterday when he accused the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon of "treachery" and "impropriety". He made his claims in a four-page statement read to a Press conference at Parliament House yesterday morning. Mr Duncan told reporters he no longer regarded Mr Bannon as a suitable leader for the A.L.P. and that Mr Bannon did not have his support.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Sir. It seems to me that the member for Eyre has strayed away from the subject.

THE SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member for Eyre is referring to evidence given before a Select Committee, and the specific motion before the Chair is the noting of the report of the Select Committee.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would dispute that with you, Sir, if you will allow me. I think I am entitled to clear your mind, at least. He is not referring to any Select Committee report at all. He is referring to previous debates in this Parliament. He is talking about press reports, about the member for Elizabeth, what he said, and what the Leader of the Opposition has said from time to time. He has not mentioned any evidence about the Select Committee report at all. In fairness to you, Sir, you may not have been listening; you may have been listening to the member for Victoria, but the allegations being made by the member for Eyre are nothing to do with the Select Committee report. I ask you to reconsider your position as to whether or not he is in order.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre would assist the decision to be made by the Chair if he indicated whether he was referring to evidence before the Select Committee.

Mr GUNN: No, Mr Speaker. I was referring to matters that I believe relate to the decision that the House will eventually have to take.

THE SPEAKER: Order! The Chair obviously was in error in sourcing the material from the honourable member of Eyre. It does not alter my position that we are seeking to debate the noting of the report and the matters relative to it. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition having raised the point that he believes the honourable member for Eyre is straying from the subject, the Chair will consider that matter in the further utterances by the honourable member for Eyre and any other member. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr GUNN: I believe that the Select Committee was a most worthwhile exercise, and I obtained much valuable information. I sincerely hope that all members of the House will take the trouble to read the report and to consider the evidence given. I now turn to an assessment of the proposals contained in the appendix produced by two members of the Select Committee. As the Deputy Premier did not have the opportunity to completely cover this area, I think it would be useful if I were to fill in some of the matters that he did not have time to deal with.

The first proposal, that the decision to allow the joint venturers to proceed to production be reserved for the Government of the day, completely misses the point of the process that first the Government and then the Parliament have been undertaking. Very simply it is this: because the joint venturers are spending so much on their feasibility studies they need to be sure that, if they decide to proceed to develop the deposit, they do not put at risk the vast sum they will have spent. For this reason they have asked not merely the Government but also the Parliament to provide the necessary security of title and conditions. To leave the decision whether or not to grant a production licence to the Government of the day is not to offer any security at all. There is no incentive for the joint venturers to spend a further $50 000 000 on feasibility studies on top of the $50 000 000 plus they have already spent and, if I understand their views correctly, if the Opposition view prevailed they would not do so.

The second proposal in the appendix is that the joint venturers be granted a 50-year lease, subject to the minority report's first proposal. If this proposal is accepted, it could result in the project being put on ice for that period. In this context, it is perhaps worth considering the views of Mr B. P. Webb, Director-General of Mines and Energy, who, in his submission to the Select Committee, drew attention to the need to ensure that lease arrangements led to early development of the deposit.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the proposition that the Leader's colleagues put to this House were to be put into effect the project would not go ahead.

Members interjecting:

THE SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I do not intend to be distracted by the irresponsible interjections of the Leader of the Opposition, because he is going to have to address himself soon to the realities of the situation, and the Labor Party will have to come clean and tell the people exactly where it stands on this issue. Honourable members can attempt to shout me down as much as they like, but they will have to carry the decision they make. I do not mind how much they interject, but they will not be able to run away. It is obvious that they do not want to hear what Mr Webb had to say, because it does not give any comfort to the arguments that they have been addressing, in particular to one of the recommendations of the appendix. Until I was so rudely interrupted I was saying that Mr Webb said at page 5:

> The indenture addresses the important question of limits to the tenure of the various exploration tenements and the related matter of progressive requirement to reduce the size of areas held.

I wonder what effect the proposition that they have put forward would have upon the exploration that is taking place in other parts of the Stuart Shelf. Certainly, there would be no incentive for the Western Mining Company to continue with the extensive exploration work that is taking place.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You do not think you will be in Government three years from now. That is what you are saying.

Mr GUNN: I am quite confident where we will be, but commercial decisions cannot wait. They have to be made now. If the honourable member had any experience in the commercial world he ought to know that. Someone who has been a Minister, who puts himself forward as the alternative Minister of Mines and Energy, at least should know that basic reality of business. I have watched this project grow. It has always been in my electorate. It would be a very sad day for the people who work there, and it would have had a considerable effect on the small township of Andamooka, where some 30 people currently gain employment from that area. It was fairly obvious from the evidence given that, if this project goes ahead, that small town possibly will reap considerable benefits from the facilities to be provided. That is just one small effect that will benefit those people in that part of my electorate.

Mr Hemmings: I'll bet you will not send that speech out to your electorate.

Mr GUNN: I am not interested in the illogical views of the honourable member, who interjects like a parrot. He will have to face the situation soon. It is a pity that he cannot address himself to this matter in a logical and responsible fashion. All he has done has been to interject in a quite illogical and nonsensical fashion. I am amazed that he would treat this matter as lightheartedly as he has at this stage.

Mr Hemmings: I am very serious indeed. Wait until you get my contribution.

Mr GUNN: We will be waiting with bated breath for what the honourable member has to say. I believe that the Minister and his officers can take a great deal of credit for this legislation. The officers who gave evidence to the committee obviously were fully aware of the benefits, and were people of great knowledge. In all the work of preparing this very detailed agreement they have acted in a manner which can only benefit the people of this State. The Select Committee was most fortunate to have available to it people with such knowledge.

It would be a crying shame if all that work were to no avail. I do not think that the people of South Australia would be prepared to allow this project to be put on ice for any length of time. I believe that it is a general consensus of the community that South Australia needs this project, and that the people are determined that they will have it. I believe that, whatever happens in the next few weeks in relation to the passage of this Bill, this project will be put into effect in the relatively near future and this Indenture Bill will be enacted because no responsible group of people could, in all sincerity, deny the people of this State the benefits that will flow from it.

An honourable member: Which are what?

Mr GUNN: If the honourable member believes that a project that will create a town of 9 000 people will not benefit the people of this State, it is obvious that he does not understand what has been taking place at Roxby Downs. I suggest that he should take the trouble to go up to his office, shut the door, get the evidence and have a good quiet read of it. Then he might understand it. It is obvious from his interjections that he has not briefed himself on the subject at all.

I strongly support the recommendations of the Select Committee. I completely reject the appendix produced by the two Opposition members, as I believe that that is not an appropriate course of action for the House to accept, denying the people of this State their due right. I believe that South Australia is fortunate to have an area of mineralisation situated within its boundaries. We will be damn fools if we do not exercise common sense and proceed with the project as rapidly as possible.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I support the motion before us, which is that the report be noted. Serving on a Select Committee such as this is a little like being under sentence of execution—it wonderfully concentrates the mind and produces a learning process and I, together with other members of the Select Committee, have undergone a learning process, and the fruits of my learning process are incorporated in the dissenting statement. Perhaps I can best summarise the learning process I have gone through in this way. Either in the second reading stage of this measure, or at some other time when the House was debating the uranium issue, I believe that I likened the State of South Australia to a Baptist teetotal Sunday School teacher who wakes up to find that his elderly and somewhat reprobate uncle who owned the biggest pub in town has left it to him in his will.

Mr Evans: Why a Baptist?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: They seemed to be even more teetotal than my lot in the Uniting Church, so I thought it was worth quoting. What does such a person do when the whole of his life experience has been to tell him that alcohol is something which creates problems for the human frame, and therefore should be abhorred, but on the other hand he could probably make a million dollars for himself as a result of the windfall he has received? Put in that rather peculiar way, I am raising a moral problem, which is largely as I saw this matter. Let me push this analogy a little further: what if as a result of agonising over this decision he has to take, he does a little bit of market research? What if he finds out that, suddenly because of everyone reading medical reports about the deleterious effects of alcohol on the system, the market for it is running down or that, suddenly because people fear industrial disruption and have been hoarding various alcoholic liquors and there is an enormous inventory around the place which has effected the demand for it, another factor enters the situation? He is concerned not only with the moral question but also whether he is going to make a quid out of the thing at all.

That enormously transforms the problem; it may simplify it for some people but may complicate it for others. The Minister, in speaking to this motion, said that evidence had been received indicating that the real price that one should be looking at in relation to uranium was somewhat above the Nuexco spot price. The point is what is happening to the Nuexco spot price, and that was the point to which my

colleague and I sought to address ourselves in that relevant portion of our dissenting statement. Since writing that, additional information has come to hand. I draw the attention of the House to yesterday's *Financial Review*, page 17 of which is headed 'United States nuclear power industry shows little recovery.' I shall quote from a couple of points in this interesting article by Judith Miller of the *New York Times*. It begins as follows:

> The American nuclear power industry, already crippled by soaring costs, depressed energy demand, and public opposition, has been dealt a new series of blows in recent days. Experts now see little hope for a revival of the business in the United States for at least 10 years, and possibly not until the next century.
>
> In terms of new orders and construction, there is no industry to speak of any more, concluded Louis Perl, an economist and nuclear analyst with National Economic Research Associates, a private economic research group. 'And no recovery is in sight.'
>
> As John F. Ahearne, a Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) member, sees it, 'I do not think the American public is going to come around to support nuclear power.'

Why are we concerned about this? Why is it that our concern has drawn the wary interjection from the Minister of Education that we are worrying on behalf of the producers? A person who makes that type of interjection, of course, has completely missed the point of our submission and report. The point of our report is that on all the evidence we have available to us there is and will be no project. The member for Eyre likened what the Labor Party was inviting this House to do to allowing someone to build a house and then not allow them to live in it. Of course, that is completely inappropriate; what in fact is happening is that blueprints are being drawn up—that is all: there is no house. There is no way that one can stop the production phase of a project once it has got going, but that is not the situation we are in. We are in the second stage of the evaluation of a project that will be concluded in 1984. The Government is asking the Parliament to commit this State to a project which on present market indications will never get off the ground. We simply say, 'Why put all your cards on the table at this point?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Why sell the State short at this point in the light of those particular figures? There are other matters to which the Minister addressed himself which are important and which we have got to take note of. For example, he endeavoured to downgrade the so-called NIOSH report. I believe that the evidence which we obtained from the various witnesses who came in and who were able to comment on the NIOSH report was reassuring to the viewpoint which my colleague and I are putting forward. But the point remains that in any event our recommendations do not adopt NIOSH any more than they adopt the various documents and standards which are laid down in the Indenture document.

I invite Government members to examine the dissenting statement and see what it says. What it says is that it should be left to the Minister of the day to determine what the standards shall be in the light of the state of the art—that is all. It does not suggest, as the present Government suggests, that we tie ourselves down to a particular approach. For example, it denotes certain agencies that bring down certain standards, but other agencies may arise. Is it suggested that if new forms of dealing with information in relation to the regulation of this industry arise it will not be possible to adopt those new forms because we have tied ourselves down to a particular approach in a particular document in a year which is two years prior to whether we know we have got any sort of project at all?

Mr Ashenden: That is not true.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Oh, yes, it is true. That is what the Liberal Party and the Liberal Government are inviting us to do, and that is simply not good enough. I turn to the matter of environmental impact and the environment generally because, again, there has been misrepresentation or misunderstanding by the Government in relation to what our stance is here. We were particularly concerned, for example, about the fact that there was nothing in the indenture or the Bill in relation to the ultimate fate of tailings from the milling process. It may well be that, as a result of what the Government, or at least the members of the Liberal Party, have to say in the body of their report with regard to the Commonwealth's Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act, the operation of that Act could not as a matter of law be affected by any State legislation. However, again that completely misses the point of what we are saying. What we are saying is that, indeed, that form of environmental impact should be adopted for this project, in view of the nature of the project, rather than the form of environmental justification which usually takes place in this State. I would urge that point of view and that approach to the whole project by the Government. There was of course unfortunately a paucity of witnesses on either side of this argument. The member for Eyre said that there were indeed only three witnesses who came forward and who were strongly opposed to the project.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Three or two?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I believe that under interjection the member for Eyre corrected himself to three, but it does not matter whether it was two or three. I invite the speakers from the other side of the House to indicate how many people came forward independent of either the proponents of the project or the Government through its various departments to put another point of view.

I believe that this is one of the problems the Select Committee had in coming to decisions on this matter. Naturally there will be the spokesmen from the proponents who will put forward a point of view, and they will bring and muster what evidence they possibly can to support their project. Naturally, public servants are constrained by the Public Service Act and by the desires of their masters, and they will endeavour from their professional background to be as detached as they possibly can, but you would hardly expect the Minister of Mines and Energy, whose department's performance, after all, is largely judged by the number of projects that get off the ground in this State, to come before a Select Committee and make significant criticisms which might tear down a mining project.

We can proceed to the various other departmental people who came forward. They were appearing before the representatives of their political and constitutional masters. One naturally would have some feeling for the position in which they find themselves, and one would naturally expect that there might be a particular slant on the way in which they give their evidence. As a matter of fact, while at one level I would want to compliment the Minister on the way in which he chaired the committee, and his courtesy to all members and his endeavours to be as co-operative with us as he possibly could, at another level, having now served on two Select Committees in relation to significant developmental projects for this State, I am beginning to question the form which is adopted for the assessment of these projects through the Select Committee.

My experience on Select Committees is fairly limited. In Government my portfolios were not the sorts of portfolio which tend to produce large numbers of Select Committees, so I guess I come to the matter with a reasonably unclouded mind, but let us look at what we have got here. When a Bill such as this comes into the House, it is as a result of an agreement that has occurred between a proponent of a particular project or development, which for the most part

is a private company, and the Government of the day. You then set up a Select Committee.

In a sense the appropriate Minister is as much a proponent for the project as is the private company. He is the person who steered the legislation through the Cabinet, he is the person who obviously felt that it was worthy of Government support, he is the person who introduced it in Parliament, and yet he sits in judgment on what in effect is his own proposal. This could lead to all sorts of things. Because he is in the Chair, naturally he will tend to initiate questioning; he will be able to lead questioning in a particular direction, and there may be difficulties for other members of the committee to get the line of questioning back into the sort of direction they would see desirable after a long list of what often are very leading questions from the Chairman. I may have some time to illustrate this before I sit down.

I am not without some suggestion in this matter, and I indicate that I am speaking purely privately and not suggesting any policy initiative from my Party, but I invite the Government to consider the form under which we now examine the Budget Estimates. In that form the Minister becomes not the chief inquisitor, but the chief witness, and I see no reason why before a Select Committee the Minister, who is, as I say, as much a proponent for a project as is the private company, should not be subject to cross-examination.

Time and time again, when a public servant appeared before either of these Select Committees and a person asked a question, the Chairman would chip in and say, 'I think I can answer that', and often it was more appropriate that the Chairman answered it because what we were talking about was a political decision, a Government or policy decision, which had been taken at Cabinet level and not at the level of the Public Service at all. Should that not be subject to cross-examination as much as the evidence which is coming forward from the Government departments and the private company?

Mr Lewis: You had your chance at the committee stage. What's the matter with you?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am afraid that the honourable member is completely misled. You are in a situation where the Minister is there, having back-up from various departmental people, and the proponents are there, because they have lawyers and other people like that and are able to afford to pay the salaries of people to sit in the gallery at every meeting. The Minister is able to call, at a moment's notice, one of these people to attempt to rebut a piece of evidence that has come forward. It is not possible for the Friends of the Earth or somebody who has come from the north of the State to represent Aboriginal interests to be hopping back and forth and doing that sort of thing.

There was an example of that at Andamooka, where a person came forward to give us evidence in relation to the concerns of the Aboriginal people, and as soon as he stepped down, without any warning or notice, the Minister said he wanted to call Mr so-and-so from the mining company to get a rebuttal of that evidence. Of course, that was possible because the company was there all the time.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: What page of the evidence?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Is the Minister denying that that was in fact said?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: I am saying that evidence was called with the concurrence of the committee.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Other members of the committee were not going to argue that; we were not going to say, 'You are not allowed to call that evidence.' As a matter of fact, the Opposition would not have had the numbers at all. I am not suggesting that the Minister was being particularly unfair in that course of action. All I am suggesting is that, for the reasons I have already outlined, in this form of investigation the proponent has an enormous advantage over those with other viewpoints that one should be entertaining.

I intend to raise this again at a later date, but I must say that, in view of the experience I have undergone on these two Select Committees, I am increasingly of the view that a Minister who is the proponent of a project should not be the Chairman of a Select Committee. By all means, the Government of the day has to have a majority on the Select Committee, but let the Minister be called to give evidence as a witness and let him be called three, four, or five times if the committee thinks that that is a reasonable way of approaching the whole matter.

I promised the House (and I think I just have time to get this in) that I could give an example of leading questions that occurred and how they can sometimes come unstuck. This is pertinent to our attitude on radiation hazards. On page 319 of the evidence (and this relates to the extraordinary meeting that occurred yesterday), the member for Todd asked Sir Eric Pochin the following question:

> In reading I have done as a member of this committee I have found a number of documents which indicate that presently in many coal mines the level of radon exposure is greater than in some uranium mines. To assist the committee, are you in a position to advise us whether . . .

Sir Eric stated:

> It is to the effect that radon levels in most coal mines are substantially less than in most existing uranium mines—not more.

The Government then returned to the attack, believing that there was another approach it could make in relation to other metal mines. Sir Eric Pochin had gone on to say that the difference between the coal mine and the uranium mine, other things being equal, was a factor of about one in 10. The question of copper mines came up. The Chairman asked:

> What about in other metal mines, not coal mines?

Sir Eric's answer was as follows:

> In metal mines, the radon concentration, as I have read it, is substantially higher than in most coal mines.

A further question was:

> How would that relate to this particular mine, which is described as a radon/copper mine? Would the radon levels in any other mine be of the same level as in this mine?

I interjected and said:

> Do you mean a straight copper mine without the uranium?

The answer was:

> I think it might be. In old metal mines, the radon level is typically about half that in old uranium mines. If the radon level in the new planned uranium mine was half that in old uranium mines, then it could be as low as in many metal mines.

The Chairman returned to the attack with the following:

> We are saying that radon is not peculiar to a uranium mine such as Roxby Downs: it occurs in other metal mines that are not described as uranium mines, and in some mines, from what you say, the radon level could well be as high as it will be at Roxby Downs.

The answer to that was, 'Or higher.' I interjected as follows:

> That is a factor of housekeeping, rather than nature.

The Chairman said:

> I am comparing mining operations and what has been accepted around the world.

The answer was, 'Accepted rather than acceptable.'

Mr Ashenden: Very selective quoting.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am quite happy to read the whole thing out for the member for Todd. What Government members were trying to get out of the witness was that all we have to do is not be any worse off than anywhere else in the world and we have acquired our objective. That is all! They were not prepared to distinguish between the intrinsic radiation that results from the actual amount of radioactive materials that were present on the one hand,

and on the other hand the housekeeping—the ventilation of the shaft and other protective measures that have to occur. Of course, in the bad old days, in a lot of those hard rock metal mines, there was a high exposure to radon because of the very poor housekeeping and the almost total exclusion of ventilation. For heaven's sake, are we to compare ourselves with that? Do we see that as a reasonable bench mark against which we should gauge our own performance?

In relation to that extraordinary meeting, I simply return for a moment to the suggestion that I threw out recently in my remarks in relation to the conduct of Select Committees and just adduce that extraordinary meeting in evidence. First, I refer to the reasons for the meeting, which can be found in paragraph 839 of the evidence, where the Chairman said:

> Members will need to know why I have called this meeting of the Select Committee. You will recall that a submission came from the Health Commission about a fortnight ago which was subsequently withdrawn and another submission put to the committee. There was a request that Dr Wilson appear before the committee to answer some questions relating to that submission. It has been explained to me outside the committee that there is dispute within the Health Commission relating to the validity of the subsequent submission which came before the Select Committee.

In fact, most of us never saw the first submission: it was withdrawn before it actually got to us. The second submission arrived 1½ hours before we were to consider it. Dr Wilson had to be dragged down at what I believe was personal inconvenience at short notice to answer our questions. There was some sort of ruckus within the Health Commission, and we were called together to examine the matter. From what I can see from the contents of the first report (which I am afraid I have not read), if anything, Sir Eric Pochin's evidence favoured the contents of the first report rather than the second report. My colleague and I were only told that the meeting was to be held at 5 o'clock—that is all the notice we got. I do not know what notice the member for Todd received. It would have been nice to be given some notice as to the content of the meeting so that we could do a bit of reading up and prepare ourselves.

Otherwise, we knew in advance who the witnesses were to be, whether their expertise was in relation to markets (and for the most part that was not the case, because that information was not forthcoming) or to do with radiation hazards from the infra-structure, and so on. In this case, we had no idea. As a matter of fact, my colleague and I entertained the thought that maybe the Government was sufficiently concerned about our dissenting report, an advance copy of which it had seen, that it decided to stiffen up its own report somewhat and, therefore, we were drawn together. That appeared not to be the case. Therefore, I make the point that this was another illustration not of the unfairness of the Minister concerned but of the structure under which Select Committees tend to operate. I urge the House to support the Bill with the amendments that will be forthcoming from my colleague in the light of the recommendations that we have incorporated in our dissenting statement.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Have you circulated them?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, but they will be circulated well in advance of the Committee stage. Naturally, the normal courtesies will apply. I remind the House once again that those recommendations will be introduced (as set out on page 10 of the dissenting statement) as follows:

> The conclusions above clearly indicate that the Bill and the indenture in their present form are premature.

I related my remarks at the beginning of my speech to that matter. It continues:

> However, the ore body is of such potential significance that we believe the feasibility stages of the project should continue.

That is perfectly in line with what former Premier Corcoran did in 1979, or a former Minister by the name of Hopgood did in 1974, when the exploration leases were first issued to Western Mining Corporation. It continues:

> Accordingly, clause 6 (1) of the Bill should be amended to provide that the project can proceed to the end of its feasibility stages under the following conditions:
>
> (1) That the decision to proceed to actual production following the completion of the final pre-production assessment be reserved for the Government of the day.

That is the normal procedure under the Mining Act, and under which the Honeymoon project will proceed. It continues:

> (2) That the joint venturers be granted a 50-year lease subject to (1) above.

The third condition is very important in the light of the second, and it states:

> (3) That the lease be subject to periodic assessment by the Government and the companies to show why commercial mining should or should not proceed and on what basis.

There is the insurance against warehousing, if the Government of the day believes that it should proceed. It continues:

> (4) That the radiological safeguards contained in the Bill be amended to allow for properly endorsed requirements for radiation protection to be imposed by the Minister without the statutory limits contained within the Bill.
>
> (5) That special workers compensation provision similar to that enacted in the United Kingdom, covering short and long term exposure to radiation of workers, be prepared urgently and passed and a State Register of all persons involved in the mining, milling, processing and transport of uranium and uranium products be drawn up and maintained.

Of course, I am well aware that the United Kingdom legislation relates to working in reactors, and so on, but we believe it is important that that same safeguard should apply to the mining and milling process. If the Government intends to have a register anyway, why not incorporate provision for that in the legislation? Why was it left out in the first place? The recommendations continue:

> (6) That adequate arrangements be made for the storage and disposal of tailings through the drawing up for the approval of the Minister of Health of an appropriate plan.
>
> (7) That the project be subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth Environmental Impact Statement Legislation requiring that there be a public inquiry into all aspects of the project.

As I have said previously, we have no objection to the project continuing on the basis on which it has continued until now, a basis that was approved by a former Labor Government, whose policy in relation to uranium was no different then from what it is now. I ask the Government whether it should be committing this State here and now to something that may never occur:

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): First of all, I must address myself to some remarks made by the previous speaker. Frankly, it is a little frightening to realise that the honourable member has been a Minister of this State, because what he has indicated in the past few minutes is a complete lack of understanding of commercial reality. Does he really expect a company to spend $100 000 000 and have absolutely no guarantees whatsoever? If he does, it indicates a complete lack of commercial expertise. I will be devoting considerably more time to that point later in my speech.

However, there are some other aspects that I would like to take up in relation to the honourable member's speech. I believe that he has reflected against public servants most unfairly. He has indicated that, in his belief, they compromised their positions before the committee by providing answers to the committee that, as he put it, their bosses wanted. I believe that public servants are professionals, and

it is an absolute insult to them for the honourable member to indicate to this House that he believes that they would have provided answers that, as he put it, their masters wanted rather than what they truly believed. He then went on to reflect against the Chairman of the committee.

I am sure that neither he nor any other member of the committee could deny that towards the end of any evidence the Chairman always asked the committee members, 'Are there any more questions?' He would always pause before the witness would be dismissed. So, for the honourable member to state that they were not able to pursue a line of questioning is absolutely false.

He also used the favourite trick of the Opposition by using extremely selective quoting, but then we must forgive that, because there is so little evidence to support the Opposition's argument that obviously they can only be selective. When he quoted an answer to my question to Sir Eric Pochin, the honourable member conveniently did not go on to point out the rest of the answer that Sir Eric gave, which of course threw a totally different light on my question to that which the honourable member intended to be inferred.

It would also be interesting to record comments made by the previous speaker, which are in the record of the House of Assembly of 6 February 1979, where a quotation was provided from a report given in one of the daily papers in South Australia.

Mr Becker: Is this from the member for Baudin?

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes. He said:

The potential of uranium at Roxby Downs was hailed today by a South Australian Government Minister as a 'Major, rich mine by any world standards'. The discovery at Roxby Downs could provide a much needed revival in the State's mineral industry, the Education Minister and former Mines Minister, Dr Hopgood, said.

Speaking at the opening of an Australian Drilling Association symposium at Adelaide University, Dr Hopgood said South Australia's mineral industry declined after an exploration boom from 1967 to 1973. 'However, recent events have altered this gloomy situation, at a time when the State again would benefit from a growth industry to combat economic difficulties. In the Olympic Dam Cooper uranium deposit discovered by Western Mining Corporation Limited on Roxby Downs Station we have potentially the basis of a major rich mine by any world standard,' he said.

It is my intention now to do something those members opposite have just not done, namely to refer to the report from the committee and to evidence that was provided to the committee. Members opposite have been noticeable by the fact that they have not done that. The reason for it is quite simple. There is virtually no evidence that they can use from the witnesses that appeared before the committee to support their stance.

The minority report that has been brought out by the two members opposite is not based on evidence given to the committee. It could not be. They have provided a minority report that talks about everything except the information that was brought in evidence by witnesses to the committee. Therefore, there is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that the House should consider only the report of the committee and ignore totally the addendum that has been brought in at the request of the two members of the Opposition.

Let us have a look at some of the evidence that has been brought forward to the committee. I quote from the report, as follows:

It is clear to your committee that the Roxby Downs project is of major Australian, indeed world, significance.

When we refer back to the quotation from the honourable member for Baudin, made on 6 February 1979, we can see that he then agreed with that. The report continues:

This significance arises as a result of the size of the ore body, and the challenge involved in developing it. The size of the deposit and the time scale required to develop it are such that it is likely that it will be able to take advantage of improvements in metal prices and markets expected in this decade.

There is plenty of evidence that I will quote shortly to support that. No evidence was given to the committee that would support the minority report and the points that have been made by the two members opposite this evening. In fact, if the members opposite would like to refer to page 126 of the evidence, they will find the following question that I asked Mr Morgan of Western Mining. The report continues:

Reference has been made to the world demand for copper, uranium, gold and rare earth minerals, which have been found in the ore body at Roxby Downs. It has been alleged in this area that the demand for uranium is decreasing and probably will continue to decrease. At the moment, copper prices are well down; in fact, all prices are well down. Opponents of the scheme have used this to say that the State of South Australia may well be committing itself to provide funds to a project which will never go ahead. Would you like to comment on this?

His reply was:

Can I deal with the part of your question concerning the suggestion that the State is committing money towards this project that might no go ahead? In fact, there is no committment on the Government to provide a cent towards this project unless it does go ahead. If it goes ahead on the infra-structure commitment alone, the safety net for the State is that, for every dollar of infrastructure that is committed, we will be committing ourselves to $7.

He subsequently goes on, on the same page, to state:

If I can go on to the second part of your question concerning marketing, at the present time there is a problem around the world for all commodities. If you know of a good one, please tell us about it. We are all struggling at the present time. We have a major metal complex in Western Australia, but gold-mining operations are all marginal right now.

However, they are marginal on a world scene, where there are disastrous financial results for other operators. Quite frankly, this can only by definition be temporary; the world will continue to consume 7 000 000 to 8 000 000 tonnes of copper.

When I asked whether that was per annum, Mr Morgan said:

Yes. It will continue to consume 11 000 000 to 13 000 000 tonnes of aluminium. It is our belief that the world will need to consume increasing quantities of uranium. We are seeing a swing in product prices.

Mr Morgan then goes on to state that in his opinion the swing at the moment is as low as it will go. However, he does go on to stress that, in his opinion (and let us face it: it is his company and the joint venturers that are putting up the money), the prices for the products that are going to come from this mine will increase, and it is because of his confidence in this area that Mr Morgan wishes the exploratory programme to go on. Mr Morgan then refers to the size of the deposit and how important it is. He says, as far as Roxby Downs is concerned:

Maybe you could say it is in the best quarter of the world and, if anything, is in the best quarter of the world's productive capacity. So, do not get confused by temporary market circumstances; they cannot last in those conditions. Having regard to the tremendous life span we forecast for Olympic Dam, you cannot be diverted from the task of proceeding just because market prices are abnormally low today. We do feel that even with market prices at or near to those prices, this project has a good prospect of proceeding, and, if that were not the case, we would not be wishing to press on with the Government to spend another $50 000 000.

In other words, he is referring to the $50 000 000 extra that the joint venturers would be spending. Mr Morgan continued:

Instead, we would be out there saying we want to stand still. Our committment in this indenture agreement is to spend that $50 000 000 within the next three years so that if the indenture Bill passes we have no option but to go on and not slow the project—it is a commitment.

The report brought down by the committee then goes on to state:

The Treasury witnesses gave evidence with regard to the royalty arrangements set out in the indenture, State revenues generally.

I wish to address myself to this area because of comments brought forward by the Australian Democrats where they have been completely misleading or trying to mislead the

public in general in South Australia. Certainly, the candidate in Todd has been completely at pains to mislead the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. I believe that my colleague, the member for Newland, has answered extremely well the very shallow arguments that she has brought forward. I believe, for the record, that we must go on to deny completely the arguments that the Democrats are trying to bring forward to justify a position that I do not think they like being in.

Relating to the evidence of the Treasury witnesses, the report states:

Their evidence indicated that arrangements for surplus-related royalty as well as *ad valorem* royalty represented a major benefit to the State.

Mr Barnes, the Under Treasurer, summarised the arrangements in the following way:

The rationale behind the two-tiered royalty arrangement is, first, to ensure that the State gets something out of the project no matter whether it is profitable or not. This is something directly out of the sales of the product. Secondly, it is to see that if it turns out to be a very profitable undertaking that there is an opportunity for the State to participate in these much higher profits, hence the two-tiered arrangement. The two-tiered arrangement is quite unusual and is probably a first in Australia.

So much for the allegations by the Australian Democrats that this mine is going to cost South Australia and South Australians money! The report continues:

The Treasury witnesses emphasised that in addition to royalty arrangements specified in the indenture the joint venturers and their employees would be required to pay all normal taxes; thus, additional revenues from pay-roll tax, licence and registration fees could be expected as a result of the project. In addition, the project would also have a positive impact on revenues received from the Commonwealth under tax-sharing arrangements.

It cannot be more explicit than that, and that is from a public servant—an independent person who has studied this and has come forward with those statements. One should remember, that the royalties that the Government will get are over and above the matters that I have outlined. The report goes on to state:

The clauses specifying the range and cost of infra-structure to be provided by the State were exhaustively examined.

Once again, I must refer to statements made by the Australian Democrats on this, because they have attempted again to mislead the residents of the north-eastern suburbs by indicating that the State is going to be paying out a fortune to have something going on at Roxby Downs.

Let us have a look at what the evidence brings forward. First, the $50 000 000 that is indicated under the agreement in 1981 terms is the full cost of the listed infra-structure items, and that need only be spent once the town reaches the population of 9 000. It then states:

The limit for the cost of the Government's contribution is to be $50 000 000 in 1981 dollars.

Once again, that will be committed only in areas in which the Government would be required to spend money for any community. Surely, the Australian Democrats are not saying that schools, hospitals, water supply, and electricity are not the responsibility of a Government to provide to residents of this State, because that is the only inference that I can get from their statements. Let me go on further. It says:

The State is not obliged to supply any items of infra-structure until the joint venturers have given notice of their intention to proceed with the initial project.

Let us go on. It says:

The joint venturers will be expending a substantially greater amount on infra-structure than will be the State on the provision of water, power, sewerage, and certain roads.

In other words, unlike in every other community in the State where we would have to pick up every cent of that expenditure, here the joint venturers will be paying a lot of what is normally regarded as State expenditure.

Mr Goldsworthy: It is seven times as much as we will.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is true. I thank the Minister for that interjection. The statements of the Democrats are completely false in that area. The report goes on to say:

Provisions in the indenture regarding the supply of water and power to the project ensure that the State recovers all of its costs in supplying these services to the joint venturers.

My goodness. The Government really is being bled dry by those nasty joint venturers! It is so incredible for members of the Opposition to come out and be critical of an indenture which is obviously something that will be held up throughout Australia for years to come as the best indenture that has ever been negotiated by any Government with any development company.

Let us look at further aspects of the report. It goes on to refer to compliance with codes, which relates to radiological protection. This was also exhaustively examined by the committee. Let us see what has come out of evidence. First, in relation to safety, the joint venturers are obliged to comply with three current codes relating to mining, milling and transport of uranium as amended from time to time, and any new codes promulgated by the International Commission of Radiation Protection, the International Atomic Agency and the National Health and Medical Research Council. The member for Baudin had the gall to say that the indenture agreement did not bind the joint venturers to any future constraints that might be regarded as necessary.

What else did the committee report say in relation to safety? Again, the joint venturers are obliged to use their best endeavours to minimise radiation levels to as low as reasonably achievable—the so called ALARA principle. It goes on to state:

It is clear that the ALARA principle could lead to worker exposure levels being substantially below those specified in the codes.

Once again where does that leave the member for Baudin and his scare tactics? Again, I quote from the report, and remind honourable members that this is something that no-one from the Opposition has yet done. It states:

The South Australian Health Commission representatives indicated that they had been involved in negotiations with regard to clause 10 and were satisfied with the outcome. This is indicated by the following exchange. 'Mr Gunn: Is Dr Wilson and the commission satisfied that the general welfare and safety of the community and employees who would be engaged in this operation is adequately met by the provisions of this legislation and the radiation protection legislation? Dr Wilson: Yes.'

One cannot get anything much clearer that that. The report continues:

The committee received details of radiation measurements taken by the Health Commission at Olympic Dam. These indicate radiation levels at the exploration stage that are only a fraction of those permitted by the codes.

I would now like to address myself to the reasons for the indenture being brought forward at this stage. Let me quote from the report:

Your committee has given consideration to the question of the need for an indenture at this stage of the project's development. The joint venturers emphasise the need for security as to title and the ground rules for the project in order for them to commit a further $50 000 000 to feasibility studies.

That is not unreasonable. Again, I ask members opposite whether they would be prepared to put up $100 000 000 of their money with no guarantees? There is just no guarantee. They say that the company should spend $100 000 000 not even knowing the ground rules. That is incredible. Dr K. Keep of B.P. put it this way:

The level of expenditure that we require on the feasibility study is more than we anticipated when we joined this venture. We expected by now that by spending $50 000 000 we would have got a firm hold on financing plans for the future, but nature is a bit precocious, and the mine is not a simple ore body that might occur in some parts of the world: it is a very complex technical geological problem to unravel the details of that body, so we fully recognise that something like another $50 000 000 needs to be

spent on it. We need to do that which we feel we cannot do in the first instance solely on $50 000 000 itself, but it does not make economic sense to be spending that sort of money which is laying the foundations for billions of dollars to be spent if we don't know (and I think Mr Morgan called them this) the ground rules.

Again, I would like to refer to the efforts of the A.L.P. in trying to play down the importance of the reasons for bringing up this indenture now to give the members of the joint venture some idea of just what they are committing themselves to. Plenty of evidence has been brought forward in the report to support this. Let me refer honourable members to it.

I note that my time is rapidly going, and I probably will not be able to quote all to which I would like to refer. However, I refer members to page 132 of the evidence, paragraph 302, where I asked a question of Mr Morgan in relation to the reason for the feasibility study being brought forward at this time. I pointed out to him that statements had been made that there were all sorts of risks and that perhaps it should not be going ahead. Mr Morgan's reply was as follows:

Well, I think the constraints are fairly clear in that, first, we do not have an option, just by the nature of the ore body, to mine one . . . to do other than commit ourselves to further investigation into the ore body itself.

He made it quite clear in an answer to Mr Gunn when Mr Gunn asked, 'What is the future of the project if the indenture doesn't pass the Parliament?' Mr Morgan said:

I ask for your understanding of our position in that we have made it clear that if we are prepared, jointly with B.P. to take on the obligations of spending this money that we say is necessary to bring forward the feasibility study, we need the indenture agreement. Without the indenture agreement we are not prepared to commit that money and we would have to rapidly scale down the effort.

I think that that is worth repeating, because he makes it quite clear:

. . . we need the indenture agreement. Without the indenture agreement we are not prepared to commit that money and we would have to rapidly scale down the effort. Clearly, there is a hole in the ground up there which would be maintained, and we would, in effect, sit and wait in the hope that circumstances would subsequently change.'

But in the meantime the rest of the world is passing us by. Mr Morgan went on to point out that Western Mining had experience in another State where they had difficulty in getting approval to mine, and the South Africans stepped in and were able to obtain the benefits of a mine that were missed out on here in Australia.

Mr Bannon: What project was that?

Mr ASHENDEN: The Leader can read the evidence. Obviously the Leader has not read the evidence, because it was quite clearly stated by Mr Morgan.

Mr Bannon: It was tabled about three hours ago. You were on the committee. What project was that?

Mr ASHENDEN: Sir Ben Dickinson, a former Director-General of Mines and Energy and adviser to successive Governments on uranium questions, had this to say (paragraph 617):

As to the financial backing, it is extremely rare for a mineral development of this nature—

this is Sir Ben Dickinson. He has nothing to do with the joint venturers—

to have a commitment of foreign money both for exploration and eventual development at such an early stage.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Labor Party members asked for him to be called.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is correct. The evidence continued:

Such a commitment demands an unbroken sequence of activity as there is reason to believe that the further money commitment will be spent after the exploration money. Once spending starts there is no turning back, nor will there be repayments of money without a successful outcome.

The point is that there are many, many other examples within the evidence which show quite clearly that the joint venturers cannot proceed unless they have the protection the indenture is designed to give. But it is not all one way. The indenture Bill that has been brought forward by this Government is the toughest of any indenture that has ever been agreed to by any mining or development company, certainly anywhere in Australia.

The committee then goes on to point out that there is regard for the Bill to be passed without delay. The committee states, 'Your committee draws the attention of members to the evidence of Mr Morgan.' It then goes on to expand on the point that I have already made. But, once again, in paragraph 319, Mr Morgan makes it quite clear that the joint venturers cannot proceed if they are not given the protection of this indenture. I would like to stress a point that has been made by the Minister and by the member for Eyre, in that Mr Morgan states:

This project [Roxby Downs] is known throughout the industry and by bankers world wide. This project has created tremendous interest. I believe the world would regard it as an extraordinary event if South Australia said that it did not want a project such as this. In fact it would be unique. It would have a very direct effect on South Australia and a further and more damaging effect on Australia.

I refer members to evidence given to support that on pages 124 and 125 of the evidence. Mr Morgan also, on page 132, paragraph 302, outlined very clearly why uranium must be mined if the mine goes ahead. He makes quite clear that it is an impossibility to mine the ore body without extracting the uranium and that the cost involved in extracting the uranium is such that they could not proceed unless they were able to sell that ore to supplement the profits from the copper, gold and rare earths.

Unfortunately, time is running out, and I have agreed to cut my remarks short to ensure that the Leader of the Opposition is able to speak for his full 30 minutes in this debate. However, I would like again to remind members of this House that members opposite as yet have not referred themselves to the report of the committee or the evidence given before the committee at all. The reason for this again, I stress, is because the evidence given to the committee just does not support their arguments. It is as simple as that.

Many organisations and persons could have come forward to give evidence. We did not close off the hearings at any time. In fact, we specifically issued invitations to bodies that have and hold opinions differing from those of the Government to come forward. They did not come forward. I guess we should ask why. The thing is that the members opposite have therefore ignored all the powerful arguments put forward by the public servants of this State, the joint venturers and other independent witnesses (and I stress that). I fully support what this Government is doing. The Opposition has not been able to rebut any of those arguments. They have gone to outside articles. They have referred to everything but the evidence that was brought to this committee.

Opposition members know full well that all they can do is agree with the committee recommendations because of the evidence, but they will not say so. So, we are going to be subjected to yet more of their dogma, more of the left wing strength of the Labor Party imposing its will on the many members who would like to see Roxby Downs go ahead. Make no mistake about it: there are members of the Labor Party in this House who would like this project to go ahead, but they cannot say that. The evidence is all in support of the Government. Therefore, I completely support the motion.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I am the first speaker in this debate who has not been a member of the

Select Committee. All the previous speakers have had the advantage not only of being very familiar with the report but also of having sat on the committee and heard all the evidence, and thus seeing the way in which the report itself was shaped. I think that it was certainly a bit rough of the member for Todd to suggest that I should have read all the evidence as well in the time that has been available. I would have thought that when I asked him the simple question, after he cited a project that apparently Mr Hugh Morgan had referred to, what the name of that project was, he could have provided the information, instead of rather churlishly suggesting that I should have sat down and read the evidence. That aside, he has had the advantage, and so have all the other speakers, of studying the report. What is apparent from the debate so far and from the report itself is that there is a clear division of opinion on the committee.

It seems to me that the Government members of the committee, as I understand particularly from the contribution of my colleague from Baudin, have tended in their consideration of the project simply to brush aside the objections and the material contained in appendix C to this report. I wonder whether this Select Committee really could have achieved terribly much in view of the fairly rigid attitudes and the commitment with which the Government members went into it.

Let me put that in perspective. It is certainly true that members from this side sat on that committee with a background of very strong reservations about the indenture and the project itself. Those reservations had been spelt out very clearly in the second reading debate, and prior to that at times had surfaced in debate in the public press. They had clear reservations, and it was canvassed in the second reading speech that it may well be that amendments to the indenture would be required. Obviously, those members went into the committee with a view to testing some of the hypotheses about the project, to gather information, and to raise questions about it.

On the other side of the matter, Government members, and particularly, of course, the Chairman of the committee, the chief protagonist of the project, the man who had in fact been the leading light in negotiating the indenture itself, went into the committee in order to try to simply secure the passage of the indenture, because, after all, that is what one of the clauses of the indenture requests, namely, 'That the Government should attempt to secure the passage of this indenture by 30 June.' That is what the Minister and other members of his Party set out to try to do.

We have already had considerable evidence tonight about the way in which the Chairman intervened very frequently indeed during the deliberations of the committee, where witnesses were often led, and I thought that the points made by my colleague, the member for Baudin, were very valid indeed. He pointed out the problem of the Minister in that situation, as the chief Government negotiator, coming into this House as the Minister with a Bill and an indenture that he had prepared. Naturally, he was committed to it; naturally he would see the evidence before the Select Committee as simply reinforcing his views, because he had heard most of it before, but as Chairman of that committee he had an extremely important role to play. I thought that the points made by my friend the member for Baudin were valid points and deserved serious consideration, instead of the scoffing we heard from those on the other side. It is indeed a more general point that ought to be considered not only in relation to this measure but in relation to other measures that go before a Select Committee: is this the right way of conducting them? Would it be better to have an inquiry which was based around the Minister appearing as one of the witnesses before the committee to explain what he had negotiated, how he went about it?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Proceedings have always been conducted in that way, but the Minister is interjecting and expressing his opposition to what I think is a reasonable proposition, one that deserves consideration and not just dismissal. Unfortunately, that attitude has typified the approach of the Government throughout on this whole issue. Government members dismiss, they scoff, they sweep aside any of the objections, any of the very strongly felt objections that large numbers of our community have about this project. There are moral objections to uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle. There is concern about radiation hazards, about problems of waste disposal and nothing that experts like Dr Svenke, who would probably be a leader in this field, has said can allay the fears that we have about those problems, problems such as nuclear warfare and weapons proliferation.

All of those problems are felt very strongly indeed by members of the community. It is not sufficient to say, 'Well, that is a lot of nonsense; we need the project; there might be dollars in it for us, let's get in there and do it.' That is simply a totally irresponsible attitude for a Government Minister to propound. It carries with it rather grave consequences, I would suggest, in the negotiations that a Government must enter into, but I will come to that in a moment. The polarisation of views evident from this committee in some senses is not surprising. The Minister and his Party colleagues are determind to erect this project and this issue into an election issue, into something which they can make a symbol of whatever it is in their fuzzy and faltering way they have in mind for the future of South Australia.

I tend to agree that it probably is not a bad approach to have as a symbol of their approach and their non-delivery. Again and again the Government has argued about this project in the most upbeat and hysterical way. There have been vast claims made about it and publicised; there have been headlines about thousands of jobs, billions of dollars. On and on this propaganda warfare has gone until it has culminated in the report before us today.

I feel concerned about this aspect of the debate because it is one of great importance at the moment. We are witnessing a campaign being waged by a group of employer organisations, a campaign again which is characterised, I regret to say, by naked emotionalism and also by a number of wrong facts. One of the defences given by those groups, and no doubt the Minister will be very keen to make this defence, is that there is a lot of naked emotionalism on the other side of the debate. For some time we have seen anti-nuclear demonstrations, uranium mining demonstrations. As I say, people feel very strongly about this issue and so they carry placards, march and meet and dress up, which is done in a traditional and very democratic way to express a point of view.

Equally, those in favour of the project have a right to do that. I would suggest that, if we are to carry out this debate and assess in a sober and serious manner the value of this project for Australians, together with the terms and conditions under which it might go ahead, it ill behoves bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce and Industry to approach their campaign in the way they have done, in, as I say, a very crudely emotional manner, full of misleading facts. Indeed, even if—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I will give a very good example. I refer to the list of employer organisations which have subscribed to the campaign. At least one of those organisations has already said that it was not consulted and does not agree with it. The advertisement says that these advertisements speak for a quarter of a million South Australians; that is an outrageous and unsubstantiated figure. It is that sort of

hysteria which the anti-nuclear lobby has been criticised for, *ad infinitum,* by the Minister, as he attempts to raise the political temperature. It is that sort of hysteria that makes it very difficult to consider this project in its proper perspective. It is very regrettable indeed that the present Government has chosen to politicise this issue to the extent that it has done to try to hang on it all its hopes for development, all the symbols of what it stands for, in a way that has made it impossible to carry out a cool and rational discussion about it in the community. I feel strongly about that, because one of the newspapers has pointed the finger at me with some strictures about an overreaction to this employers' campaign I was talking about a moment ago. I suggest to the House that I have in fact not overreacted. In fact, I was indeed sustaining the very principles that the same newspaper espoused the day before in its editorial, namely, that this matter must be looked at soberly and in perspective to allow the debate to be carried out in an orderly manner, and not under this emotional pressure that the Government is applying because it sees it as its only hope in the election.

That has made it hard for the companies, in one sense, and it has certainly made it very hard for the community to assess just what this project is about. I refer to the extravagant claims that have been made about it, and the vagueness which has often accompanied the questioning of those claims makes it very difficult indeed. The Select Committee exercise should have brought those facts out. Certainly, it has canvassed some of the matters that have been of public concern but I would suggest that, unless people look at appendix C, unless they look at the analysis made by my colleagues, the member for Mitchell and the member for Baudin, they will get a very distorted view indeed of the indenture Bill.

That is not surprising, because the Government is a 'develop this project at all costs' Government, at all costs to the State, at costs to our future, at all costs to community concern, at the cost of community division—all of those elements, and the Government simply does not care about it because it sees in this a possible key to its political survival. That is treating all of us very shabbily indeed, and it is most regrettable.

In 1979, the partners were prepared to undertake a feasibility study of this deposit on the basis of a letter of intent supplied by the previous Government, which included a quite clear reference to the A.L.P. policy on uranium. What has changed since then? What has changed that has made this indenture so absolutely necessary, here and now, in 1982, or the whole project will be abandoned?

One suggestion is that it is the cost and length of time of the study, the cost and scope of that study. It was thought it would cost only about $50 000 000. It looks as though a further $50 000 000 needs to be spent. There is more work to be done through that feasibility stage. That is a large amount of money, but dear me, today Mr Alan Bond sold off a holding, a very minor holding in the Cooper Basin, and collected, we are told, $188 000 000. If this deposit is of the size and scope and value suggested, the billions of dollars the Minister has been telling us about for some considerable years, the further $50 000 000 to be spent in feasibility development shrinks to a very small proportion indeed. Let us get that in perspective right from the outset. That is what we are talking about because, if we look at this indenture, that is the only commitment under which the companies, the partners, are required to operate.

What has changed? I do not believe it is the cost of scope. I can certainly appreciate the company's wishing to have some form of certainty. Obviously, the more cut and dried the agreement it can get, the better, but it is the responsibility of the Government to act in the interests of the State and the community in determining the terms and conditions. What has changed that makes the 1979 undertakings and feasibility study no longer adequate for the partners? It has been (and the answer is simple) the change in Government, a Government that came in politically committed to the project in such a way that the partners are in a position of getting any sort of agreement they want out of it. In fact, I suspect they have probably had to take great care to ensure that any bargain that was driven was reasonably fair, despite the eagerness of the Government, because if it was not they know it could not possibly stick in the long term.

They are realistic on that sort of point, but nonetheless the very great temptation would be there, faced with a Government that was putting all its political eggs into that basket, that so desperately desired that project and wanted it kept alive as some sort of political issue rather than a rational assessment of a mineral development project that they were in a position to bargain very hard indeed and to get out of the Government what they wanted. Unequal bargaining, very much so in this instance, has resulted in the sort of indenture we have got.

That is not to say that this indenture is necessarily bad in itself. It may be that at some time in the future, if the operation goes ahead, those terms and conditions would be appropriate, but the very important point that has been made constantly from this side of the House, and is continued very strongly in the minority report in appendix C, is that now is not the time to determine those issues and those conditions. Let the feasibility study be completed; we have never objected to that. In fact, it should be facilitated and assisted so that we know precisely what we have got and what it does mean in actual and in real terms for the State, so that the community can actually judge what it is it is being asked to do and asked to commit itself to, but surely not until the time that those things are known and the companies are in a position to say, 'We have a production mine here, we have the possibility of contracts of this nature and this value.' Surely not until then should the State set down the terms and conditions under which the community might benefit from or participate in the project.

That is the irresponsible and hopeless position that this Government has got us into over this project. Let us look at the indenture—and I will put this challenge to the Minister; let him tell us clearly, if this indenture passes, when the project will go ahead. What is the date, what is the timing of it, when will production mining begin? That very question was put to a representative of B.P. last night, and B.P. is supplying all the money for this project; let us remember that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They are not from now on.

Mr BANNON: They have to date. They have supplied $50 000 000.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, Western Mining are up for money from here on in.

Mr BANNON: I do not think it alters the argument at all, because B.P. have supplied the money to date and will be required to supply some more. The representative of B.P., one of the co-partners in this venture, was asked that very question last night and was unable to answer it. He was not able to say, 'Yes, this guarantees that we will be going into production once the feasibility stage is finished'—not a bit. He had to say in all honesty that they need the feasibility stage before they can decide anything more. That is what the partners need, their feasibility project, before they will decide something, but apparently the Government is not worried at all. The cheque will be written now, the terms and conditions will be given away now, the community concerned will be overridden now in its desperate eagerness to get this, as it sees it, election-winning project off the ground.

That is totally irresponsible and cannot be accepted by any responsible member of our community. I would like to hear from the Minister. I would like him to point to those clauses in the indenture which guarantee that production mining will start. He cannot, and the report of the Select Committee makes that quite clear, just as an examination of the indenture itself makes it quite clear.

What do we do instead? What alternatives have we got? According to the Government, none. It suits it to say that. Of course, at present the companies will support it on that, but they have not been put to the test. At the moment they are in a very strong position indeed. They have a Government absolutely and abjectly committed to the project, and so really they can afford to sit pat until conditions change. I do not think we should place too much stress on that aspect, but let us look at what alternatives there might be.

The first alternative is embodied in the first recommendation of the report in appendix C: that the decision to proceed to actual production, following the completion of the final pre-production assessment, be reserved for the Government of the day; that is, that the feasibility stage of the project continue, and it will continue with community support, but at the time that the companies are prepared to say, 'We want to go into production' or, 'We are making that pre-production assessment', then let the terms and conditions be laid down, then let it be determined whether or not the mining and processing of uranium is safe. It may not be or it may be, but that is the responsible time at which to do it.

In answer to that proposition the joint venturers would say, 'We have to put up quite a bit of money for that. We would like to test this feasibility, but we would like to have some indication that we could go ahead with the project.' On the one hand, they have what this Government is offering them: cast iron obligations from the Government. When the button is pressed by the companies, they are the ones who activate it, they are the ones who make the decisions—completely one-sided, I would suggest. But there is some middle ground. If the project is as vast, as valuable, if the world market inevitably is going to improve, if the hazards of waste disposal, and so on, are to be solved over the next generation, then surely all the companies need to have confidence in their investment is confidence in their tenure over that deposit.

The second point of our proposition provides that certainty of tenure. Other features in relation to assessment of radiological safeguards, workers compensation, arrangements for storage and disposal of tailings, and proper environmental surveys have already been covered quite adequately by my two colleagues. All of those are sound and responsible measures that can be taken now, in 1982, in relation to this project, but now is not the time to commit ourselves irrevocably and finally to whatever the venturers decide will be the manner and method of developing this deposit, if indeed they do.

Where is the *quid pro quo* for the State? Where are the guarantees? What is the community getting in return for signing away its rights in the way this indenture Bill proposes? Again, I suggest that the Minister cannot point to those benefits or advantages except in the abstract, except by crudely talking about 15 000 jobs or billions of dollars, and so on. We have had enough of that nonsense, and the Select Committee examination has not been able to give us any more facts or figures to change the responsible view that has been expressed by my two colleagues who were members of the committee. I commend their views to the House and I suggest that, in that, lies the most responsible treatment of this project on behalf of all South Australians and our community which, after all, owns that asset at Roxby Downs.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would like to address myself to an issue that many members on this side have encountered over the past 2½ years: the question of unemployment. In my district, unemployment ranges between 10 per cent and 14 per cent, which represents a considerable number of unemployed people, excluding the West Lakes area, in which unemployment is about 2.3 per cent.

During the past 12 months, in going around my district, I have come across the common problem of the frustrations of people, whether young people or people in their thirties or forties, in regard to applying for jobs in response to articles in the press. One of the common trends that I have found is that employers say to prospective employees, 'We will call you after the interview if we need you.' In many instances, these prospective employees wait at home for an expected phone call, which never comes. If they decide to go out and look for other employment, they find in some instances that the employer has telephoned. In that case, the employer gains the impression that the person is not interested in the job.

Only last week, when talking to a constituent and his daughter in the West Lakes area, I once again encountered the same problem. My constituent was laid off from his employment in the white goods industry. He waited at home all day for a phone call from a firm, which had indicated clearly that it would telephone him that day to indicate whether or not he had the job. That call did not come. My call the following day revealed that the telephone call from the prospective employer never came. Quite clearly, the employers in this State have a clear responsibility to people who are looking for jobs. They should indicate to the prospective employees whether or not they have the job, and not have them hanging on a thread.

I believe it is irresponsible for employers not to let unemployed people know whether or not they have a job. Frustration is built up in families, and we all know about it. Much has been written about the frustrations of the unemployed. The psychological effect of being rejected by employers has also been written about at length. Employers should let prospective employees know whether or not they have the job.

In the same vein, in the *News* of 2 April this year, an article headed 'Youth "not jobless long enough" ' quoted the case of a 17-year-old lad who went to the Commonwealth Employment Service to apply for a job. He was told that he had not been unemployed for long enough, and he indicated in that article that he was shocked. He went on to say:

I didn't say anything. I just walked out of the office.

This lad, and I suggest there are many others in this category, will no longer go to the C.E.S. to apply for jobs. The frustrations of hanging around or being rejected in this manner are typical of the feelings of many youths in my area who are sick and tired of going to the C.E.S., trying to get jobs, and being treated in this manner. Is it any wonder that we find many youths or people in their twenties and thirties taking out their frustrations on society by anti-social acts? Employers should act in a responsible way when they

indicate to people that there is a prospect of their obtaining a job.

Another matter common to most districts, particularly those in the metropolitan area, is the problem of noise control. I raised the question of music noise levels from rock bands earlier this year. I asked the Minister a number of questions, and he replied that there was a problem, although he said that no studies had been conducted in South Australia into hearing impediments suffered by musicians in modern rock bands. It was stated:

> However, the following studies have been undertaken in the U.S.A and the U.K. In 1970, World Medicine . . . conducted a small preliminary investigation into the hearing loss of some prominent rock musicians and could not positively say that there was a problem. However, the New York League for the Hard of Hearing gave tests to a group of D.J.s at their request and found that half of the group of 30 tested had a 'significant loss of hearing'.
>
> F. Darcy, of the Washington State Department of Labour and Industries, conducted a study to determine time weighted exposure to musicians and waitresses in rock music venues. He reports in the American Industry Hygiene Association Journal 1977 that:
>
> a substantial hearing loss would be expected to be prevalent in musicians who are involved in playing rock music.

Further on in that reply, the Minister stated:

> There are a variety of noise level limiters at present available on the market. These devices monitor the noise levels and give visual warnings once pre-set levels are exceeded. Furthermore, a switching device can be set to cut the main supply to the audio power amplifiers if the maximum permitted level is exceeded for more than the pre-set time. Hence these devices can contain the performance of amplified music within a pre-determined range if used correctly.

The Minister also went on to say in that reply that the Federal Executive of the Liquor Trades Employees Union had initiated the survey to ascertain the effects of loud music on members' hearing but that at this stage it was not proposed to introduce noise level limiters into hotels, cabarets and places of public entertainment. Quite clearly, the Minister has a responsibility not only to residents in areas surrounding these venues, be it hotels, clubs or wherever they may be, but also to the musicians concerned to ensure that they are adequately protected, because we have heard a great deal from the Minister of Labour and Industry about hearing losses. Only yesterday a petition was presented by me from a number of residents in the area surrounding Woodville Football Club complaining about the problem of noise control. I recall the member for Norwood and many of my other colleagues complaining about the same thing.

Quite clearly the Minister has enough evidence to introduce these noise limiters in various clubs and hotels. The Noise Control Act has been in operation since 1976, and it is a clear responsibility of the Minister to introduce these limiters to reduce noise. It is hard enough for the police these days to do their job without being called to the homes of residents who complain to them about the outrageous noise emanating from many of these clubs. Even then, the police can merely say that it is not really their problem and that the matter should be taken up with the local member of Parliament or the local government authority.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I wish to take the opportunity to express my concern at some of the attitudes that have developed in our society over a considerable number of years. I think it is true to say that never in the history of mankind, whether in a tribal state or what we might call a civilised state, has the human race been able to handle affluence for more than a certain period of years (and here I talk of decades). If we look at the history of the modern world, we find that roughly at the turn of the century we had a depression period, followed by an affluent period, then a period when one particular country wished to dictate and take control of the world and attempted to do so by warfare, later involving other countries, followed by a period of affluence after that war, and then within a decade a period of depression.

There was then again an opportunity for a dictator to exploit a particular race, attempting to destroy that race, which he believed had a close affiliation with finance and the control of money. There was another war and then another period of affluence which lasted longer than most of the earlier periods of affluence. Then, because of greed, which always occurs with affluence, there was apathy, laziness and dependence on Governments and Government agencies, and we find that when we should have better education, better control of finance and, in the main (in most countries of the world), better democracies, the human race tends to fail again.

I believe that the world at the moment is in the same situation. I speak on a world-wide basis because when Australia, a country with vast resources and a small population, and living in an era of possibly the greatest affluence in the last 15 years, in any sense of the history of the human race, finds itself with economic problems, one then has to sit down and try to assess the situation. Those with a socialist view would say it is because business men and others outside the country are exploiting the situation. Those who have a tie with the people who provide the money, whether it be through raising it from share-holdings or directly through their own financial resources, argue that it is because people have tried to exploit employees through different conditions that might be argued by somebody better, or through exploiting the situation to obtain higher rewards for their term of employment (not necessarily, may I argue, by more work effort).

I want to speak in this area by saying that I believe this situation has been created in our country in the main by most of us in my generation, having been born in the depression years, understanding some of the problems of depression and recession and a lack of resources within the home and the struggle of people trying to feed their children. People went away to fight what they thought was the final fight for freedom in a war that was to be the end of all wars, the end of all problems, with society free from conflict on a world-wide basis. Those men who came back to this country thought that that was the end of the problems and because many of them had suffered depression, lack of resources, and war, they made life for their children virtually a honeymoon.

They did not see the need to make their children, perhaps, what one might call dedicated to work, by mowing the lawn at home or working within the home. I am not saying that they all did this, but a larger percentage than ever before took the approach that if children asked for an icecream or a trip to the pictures, or something else, it became available. We developed an attitude that it was going to be an easy road. There was a free feed at the end of the line if you did not want to contribute. So, there was greed on a grand scale, and we were virtually saying to the teenagers of that era, in particular during the 1960s and 1970s, 'If you do not want to contribute, some Government agency will pick you up and look after you, and that is your right.'

We failed to talk about the responsibilities until we developed within our society, in many cases, a race of people who became, in my view, slaves of interest rates and working agents of money lenders; people who believed that it did not matter about tomorrow—spend all you have today and yesterday, and hope that tomorrow somebody will pick up the bill for you. I am talking not just about people in the work force or the teenagers: it involved business, local government, the State Government and Federal Government,

until after 1962, in particular in the 1970s, the local government, State and Federal debt rose to such astronomical figures that people will still be paying decades from now.

We heard the Hon. Mr Hudson in this House say that that did not matter, because you are investing in the future and they can afford to pay it in the future. The thing that was overlooked in that era was that we were developing an attitude of mind that you did not have to contribute to succeed. Unfortunately, we developed an attitude that nobody wanted to contribute. There was no national identity and a country or a community (whether it be local government, a community club, family, or whatever it may be) cannot succeed unless people contribute. So, in the main, whether we like it or not, we had a greater number of people in our society who failed to contribute to the success of their community, whether locally or on a national basis.

So our country found itself in the same difficulty as that experienced by many other countries. Affluence destroyed us, to a degree. Unless we are prepared to accept the challenge, I do not believe that we have a right to say we have total control, or that we should have total control, of the resources in our land. If I lived in a neighbouring country lacking resources and there were 15 000 000 people in a country with massive resources that they were unprepared to develop, work or make available to the rest of the world, I believe that I and my neighbours would have the right to say, 'We will intrude upon your country, if need be by force, but it can be done by peaceful means, to make use of those resources for our people.' We in Australia have lived through one of the most affluent periods in the history of mankind. Some of those people who have travelled overseas have seen the benefits we have here and acknowledge our affluence and they come back and talk about it, but very seldom are they prepared to work towards changing it.

While we remain a country that spends all we have, slaves to interest rates and working agents for money-lenders, not worrying about tomorrow, and spending all we have today and saving nothing to buy, with no interest in our own national development and national resources, condemning multi-nationals and not being prepared to invest in our own resources, I believe we deserve what we get, that is, a form of depression.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I was particularly intrigued recently when I read in the *Bulletin* of 25 May, at page 118, an article entitled 'The Modest Farmer', written by Mr Bert Kelly. For a former member of the House of Representatives and an ex-Navy Minister, this gentleman, I would have thought, would be far more up to date with his ideas on the modern concepts of Parliaments around the world. I would like to quote, for the benefit of the House, extracts from that article, as follows:

> When I was elected to the House of Representatives in 1958, the Senate was regarded by us commoners as a kind of stately red club, with benign and elderly senators lolling languidly around, looking ornamental and sounding sonorous, but not doing anything much. But it is not like that now.

Mr Kelly went on to say:

> As an example of the way that modern senators work, and think, Senator Austin Lewis, of Victoria, has come up with a bright idea which is described in the Senate *Hansard* of March 11. He moved a motion which, if passed, would make it obligatory for all Bills introduced into Parliament to be accompanied by what he calls 'a financial impact statement' which would spell out as accurately as possible the financial costs and benefits of the legislation, not only to Government revenues but also to the ordinary citizen. The information about the cost or benefit to Government revenue can usually be obtained, if sometimes it has to be wrung out of the Government by some judicious arm-twisting, but no-one has ever thought that it was desirable that the cost to the ordinary citizen should also be spelt out.

That is an interesting statement by a former Minister, and that is one criticism that probably all members of Parliament have, that is, the difficulty in obtaining precise information from a Minister irrespective, of which political Party is in office. Mr Kelly continued:

> Let me give an example of how Senator Lewis' fine new idea would work. If the Government decides to protect an industry using the bounty method instead of tariffs, then the cost to Government revenue is spelt out in the second reading speech for all to see. And each year, if the bounty is a continuing one, the money appears annually in the Budget, again for all to see.

Kelly then gets on to his favourite subject in relation to tariffs, with which I do not necessarily agree, but before he completes his argument he states:

> I know that Senator Lewis is pretty bright, even for a Senator, so I do not find it surprising that he should give birth to such a splendid idea. But I am quite excited to find that he was supported by Senator John Watson, from Tasmania. Eccles says that he thought that Senator Watson was a rabid protectionist, but I don't think that is a nice way to talk about a Senator. I think it would be safer to say that Senator Watson seemed to believe in protecting everything that moves anywhere across the nation.

That is a typically modest farmer's statement. The point I want to make is that this idea of Senator Austin Lewis, lauded by Bert Kelly, is not new. In fact, I have not had a chance to read the speech of Senator Lewis, but I would bet pounds to peanuts that Senator Lewis, like most Federal members of Parliament, enjoys the opportunity of going overseas every Parliament.

When I was overseas recently I had the opportunity to discuss the financial arrangements that the various American Governments have for controlling waste and mismanagement. I found that the American Parliaments have what is referred to here as a financial impact statement. It is nothing new at all; it has been operating for many years. When I came back I suggested to my Premier and my colleagues that we ought to be considering the same thing. If I remember rightly, with regard to random breath testing, information was sought from the Minister; we warned him in advance that we would want an exact costing of it, and questions came forward at the Committee stage. I believe that this is one of the best methods of looking at legislation as far as taxpayers are concerned, or as far as consumers are concerned, as Kelly mentions.

The British system goes even further where there are committees established. A Minister has a committee in a particular portfolio area and it is a matter not only of looking at policy; if legislation is brought forward then the relevant committee is fully versed in all ramifications of it. In the American system, which appealed to me, the Budgets of the National Parliament or of California for the next financial year are brought down by the President or the Governor on the first working day in January. In the Federal Parliament the Congress and the Senate have to pass the Budget before the last working day in June so that it can take effect from 1 July. Included in that Budget is the provision to finance all new programmes or legislation. That means that the legislation has been previously passed and costed, and it is revised when the Budget is brought in. Therefore, the Congress and the Senate have two opportunities to look at the cost of any one project.

The other system that I like in the American Parliaments relates to their ability to amend the Budget. The old-time practice in our system is that Budgets cannot be amended. The Governor or the President, whether in the State or National Parliament, brings down the allocation and seeks specific loan funds, etc. The end result cannot be amended; programmes can be amended and can be adjusted, but must not have an overall impact on the Budget. Furthermore, in the case of the President, he must then get majority support of the members of Congress and Senate to get his Budget through. It does not necessarily mean that members of his

own political Party will support his Budget. That is what appeals to me, if we are going to be cost conscious.

I would like to see the freeing up of politicians, so that they are given the opportunity to review all Budget allocations, and that it not be mandatory for politicians to toe the strict Party line in that respect. In other words, the Treasurer would have to get the support of the majority of politicians to get his Budget through. That appears to be the more democratic way of ensuring value for taxpayers money. But, of course, it is too radical for the straight Party political system we know in this country. However, the time will come when taxpayers insist on far more description and comment in relation to how their money is spent.

Furthermore, I believe that we should be looking at the extension of the work of the Public Accounts Committee in areas concerning local government. For many years I have believed that local government should also be accountable to the ratepayers. We find many efficient organisations within local government. In others, we have continual outcries from ratepayers about increasing rates and generally increasing costs for services supplied. Somewhere within the network of the third tier of government, local government, there must be a review committee with the opportunity to oversee or investigate complaints from ratepayers in relation to value for money from rates. I would not envisage a Public Accounts Committee as such in every country area; probably one in every region would suffice. The day will come when there will be an extension of the role of the Public Accounts Committee, with greater accountability and more information provided to the members of Parliament, so that they know exactly what the various programmes will cost and their effect and impact on taxpayers.

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 3 June at 2 p.m.