

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Friday 18 June 1982

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

VERTEBRATE PESTS ACT

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Community Welfare an answer to my question of 2 June regarding a case at Berri some time ago in relation to a constituent's dog, which was to be destroyed under the Vertebrate Pests Act?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The statement by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, was that he 'had ordered a stay of proceedings against a part dingo pet of a Berri family until a further avenue had been explored'. He went on further to say, 'At this stage, the only feasible action to consider taking would be to proclaim the property currently housing the dog as a zoo. Study of the Vertebrate Pests Act passed in 1975 reveals no obvious flexibility.' My colleague is considering such action.

The Act is clear that dingoes or part-dingoes should not be allowed south of the dog fence; any found must be destroyed or placed in a zoo, a research institution or circus, while north of the fence pure dingoes should be allowed to exist as native fauna. The Minister is not considering any amendment that would change the intention of the Act from that presently applying, as suggested in the second part of the honourable member's question.

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question on liquid petroleum gas.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members may recall that some time ago I asked the Government to consider the possibility of wider use of liquid petroleum gas in Government vehicles in order to make significant savings in fuel costs. Will the Minister inquire of his colleague as to what progress the Government has been able to make towards greater use of l.p.g. in Government vehicles? Has it assessed the amount of savings in the cost of fuel that might be effected by wider use of l.p.g. in Government cars? I believe that experiments with the use of l.p.g. are already in train with S.T.A. buses. If I am correct in that assumption, can the Minister give details of progress in relation to those latter tests?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring back a reply.

PIE CART

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked on 8 June about the pie cart?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In response to questions asked by the Hon. Mr Foster, I have available for his perusal a volume of background correspondence on the siting of the Adelaide Railway Station pie cart, as supplied to me by the Town Clerk, City of Adelaide. If the honourable member

would like to see me, I will make this information available to him.

The Adelaide City Council is proposing an amendment to its by-law on street traders. It is currently awaiting the certificate of the Crown Solicitor and will be presented to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in due course. The amendment proposes three things: clearer definition of sites; three additional sites for pie carts; and codifies new licence fees already set by the council through exercise of the powers contained in section 680 of the Local Government Act. I do not see how the council has denied the right of the Joint Committee to hear evidence from any party. The proposed amendments are not yet before the committee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister be good enough to set in train a letter to Mr Oram to the effect that he now has the right to appear before such a committee? I appreciate that this right has been granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will certainly do as the honourable member has suggested.

STATE LIBRARY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Local Government an answer to a question I asked on 10 June about the State Library?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: This answer ties in somewhat with the answer I gave yesterday to the Hon. Miss Levy. Immediately prior to the introduction of the system there were 16.5 full-time equivalent staff. The present staff level is 22.5, with an additional three full-time equivalents being rostered through from the other lending services. The reason for the increase is that new rostering systems have been introduced that ensure a rotation of staff through the front desk enabling a proper sharing of work, and do not relate directly to the computer.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I direct my question to the Attorney-General, as Leader of the Government in the Legislative Council. In view of the fact that some employees of the State Government will be competing on behalf of Australia in the Commonwealth Games soon to be held in Brisbane, will the Government be prepared to allow these employees special paid leave for the period in which they are involved in these competitions?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The responsibility for co-ordinating the granting of special leave for these sorts of purpose is the responsibility of the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Recently, a special concession was made for a Mr Zerner, who was competing overseas in respect of a build-up programme for the Commonwealth Games. There are established guidelines for participation by public servants in national and international sporting events.

I do not have the details at my fingertips, but I will refer that question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport and bring back a reply. If that reply is ready soon, I will arrange to have it forwarded by letter to the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly, the Government recognises the contributions athletes make to the status of Australia in competing in these sorts of international events. This is one of the reasons why guidelines are established to ensure an even-handed approach to the question.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked on 10 June about under-age drinking?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government is already undertaking many education and research activities in the area of under-age drinking. The Drug Education Liaison Committee, which was established by the Cabinet Sub-Committee on Drugs, has developed a Community Involvement in Alcohol Education Pack to assist local communities in dealing with the problems of young people and alcohol. This was launched by the Minister of Health on 14 April 1982. There are also programmes on alcohol education in schools, alcohol education for social workers and community health nurses, and education courses for parents. The Health Promotion Services of the S.A. Health Commission is conducting research into drinking and driving, with particular attention to the 16-24 year age group.

As far as fun parlour machines in licensed premises are concerned, when licensing inspectors are on routine inspections of licensed premises, they can request that fun parlour machines be located in parts of the premises where the likelihood of under-age persons obtaining liquor is minimised. Specific complaints about particular hotels should be reported to the Licensed Premises Division of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: HON. N. K. FOSTER

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a statement regarding certain events in the last 24 hours.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yesterday, in this Council, the Hon. Mr Foster in the course of a personal explanation made a number of allegations about me and other Labor members of this Council. These allegations, which were reported by the media both last night and again this morning, were that his wife had been threatened by a member on this side of the Council, that I and my colleagues made a number of interjections during the course of his speech, even though we knew before he spoke that he was planning to vote with the Labor Party.

I believe that it is important that the record be set straight. Neither I nor any other member on this side knew what the Hon. Mr Foster was going to do when he rose to speak on Wednesday evening. This morning I discussed this matter with the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Assembly, Mr Bannon, who advised me that shortly after 7 p.m. on Wednesday evening, immediately prior to his leaving to address the annual general meeting of the Southern Vales Grapegrowers Association at McLaren Vale, he met with the Hon. Mr Foster, who told him that he had decided to vote with the A.L.P. However, this information was to be treated with strictest confidentiality, as had two earlier discussions, because the Hon. Mr Foster wished to announce his decision in the course of his speech in the Council. Mr Bannon thanked the Hon. Mr Foster and urged him to make clear that his decision was his alone and that it had not been the result of any pressure from his colleagues. Mr Bannon understood that the Hon. Mr Foster would make this clear when he spoke in the Council.

Certainly, there was no communication with me or with any other member on this side of the Chamber that the honourable member had decided to vote with the Labor Party that evening. The suggestion that any member on this side was responsible for threats against Mr Foster's wife, either in the corridors or on the phone at home, is simply

untrue. I can only assume the honourable member made the accusation as a result of the emotion generated by the occasion.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: With the indulgence of the Council—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Is the Hon. Mr Foster seeking leave?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to look at the *Hansard* proofs of Wednesday evening where he will discover that, during the first few minutes of my speech, I acquainted this Council with the fact that I was going to support the Party to which I then belonged and its policy. Therefore, why has the Leader stood in this Chamber 48 hours later—

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Hon. Mr Foster wishes to make a statement he must seek leave.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about unemployment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Over the last few days we have heard much from the Government about the possible retrenchment of about 200 workers associated with the Roxby Downs project at Olympic Dam unless the indenture Bill was passed. Yesterday, in a political stunt, the Premier said that he would fly to Olympic Dam and express his concern about the position of the 200 workers involved in the Roxby Downs project because, at the moment, their position appears to be precarious.

The Premier was going to go to the Iron Triangle to attempt to enlist the assistance of the civic leaders there in order to strengthen his attack on the Labor Party and to give him something else to say about Roxby Downs.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I treated this statement with a great deal of scepticism, and who could blame me for doing so, because in this Parliament on 10 February this year (page 2719 of *Hansard*) I detailed a programme that B.H.P. in Whyalla had to reduce its number of jobs in that city by 600 over a period of three years. In explaining that table I pointed out to the Premier that in 1981 B.H.P. had already reduced its work force by 400 and that it was to reduce it by a further 600 jobs over the next three years. Not one word was spoken or any action taken by the Premier on that occasion. There were no dramatic flights to Whyalla asking B.H.P. to reverse its policy. If the Premier had a genuine concern about unemployment in this State, one would have expected that the 400 jobs lost in Whyalla would warrant some attention by him.

Further, one sees in today's paper that 220 toolmakers' jobs are being lost at Woodville. What action will the Premier take in that respect? As far as we can see he is taking no action at all.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: He's been to Canberra.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: What action did the Government take at the end of last week when 97 workers were laid off at Gerard Industries? No action at all was taken! This Government's record in relation to unemployment is absolutely atrocious, and the 220 jobs at Roxby Downs about which the Government is now concerned involves nothing more than a political stunt.

B.H.P. has asked the Temporary Tariffs Board to consider imposing a quota on imported steel. The company states that, if it does not get that quota, the steel that is imported

is the equivalent of 3 000 jobs, a considerable number of which will be lost in Whyalla. These are jobs that exist now: they are not cargo cult or pie-in-the-sky jobs.

What action has the Premier taken to support B.H.P. in relation to this very reasonable request? I have had my differences with B.H.P. over the years. Anyone who has worked in Whyalla for the past 17 years would have to say that. However, B.H.P. has operated in a very efficient manner and has not had a great deal of tariff protection. Despite that, it has been able to compete on the international market, and the request that it has made is very reasonable and restrained. What action has the Premier taken? I would argue that he has taken no action at all.

Given the best possible scenario for Roxby Downs, as outlined in the Iron Triangle report (and without any hope of any action at all being taken in this matter), Roxby Downs will have little or no impact on the Iron Triangle area.

An honourable member: Rubbish!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is what the Iron Triangle report says. The best possible scenario is little or no benefit to the Iron Triangle as a result of Roxby Downs, and honourable members should realise that the report to which I have referred is a Government report.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Why has Bill Jones—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Why don't you stick to your explanation?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am doing so.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I thought that the honourable member was getting to his question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am about to ask it, Sir. Given that that is the case, what action will the Government take right now to protect the jobs of workers in this State? Will the Government consider supporting B.H.P. in its application for tariff protection to enable the Whyalla steel works to continue at least at its present reduced rate and, hopefully, at an increased rate?

Also, what action have the Premier and the Government taken in relation to the retrenchment, announced in Saturday's newspaper, of 97 workers at Gerard Industries? Will the Premier fly to Melbourne in order to assist the 220 workers at G.M.H. at Woodville who will be retrenched by that company?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Hon. Mr Blevins has ranged far and wide and related a number of quite inaccurate facts. The first is a reference to the Iron Triangle Report where, in fact, it was indicated that even on the best possible assessment there would be significant impact on the Iron Triangle from the Roxby Downs development. The mayors of the three northern towns are most concerned about the action of denying the opportunity for this development to go ahead by defeating the third reading of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. The unemployment situation in South Australia is considerably better now than it was in September 1979.

In the last twelve months the number of unemployed has increased in every other State and Territory from April 1981 to April 1982 by a total of 60 200 persons. South Australian unemployment fell in that period by more than 1 600. That is a most encouraging trend. The A.B.S. labor force statistics for South Australia are quite clear: in April 1981 the number of unemployed in South Australia was 46 500 and in April 1982 the number of unemployed was 44 900.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What was it in September 1979?

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the Hon. Mr Blevins wants to ask a future question, he may, but he should listen now to this reply.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The same official figures show every other State and Territory having increased numbers of unemployed. If one goes further back, since this Government has come to office South Australian unemployment has fallen, while it has increased in every other State. From August 1979 to April 1982 unemployment in this State has fallen by 1 per cent but has increased in other States. It is up 39 per cent in Tasmania, up 24 per cent in New South Wales, up 17 per cent in Queensland, up 16 per cent in Victoria and up 4 per cent in Western Australia. Across Australia it is up by 17 per cent, but in South Australia it is down by 1 per cent between August 1979 and April 1982.

Since this Government has come to office, and as at April 1982, 16 300 jobs have been created in this State. That is 16 300 more jobs in this State than existed in August 1979.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How many have you lost? No-one believes that.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It is true. The policy of the Government is to encourage development, whether it is in the resources area, manufacturing industry, other areas of industry or in business and commerce, and it is that policy which has led us to the creation of these jobs. Whether it is the Cooper Basin and Stony Point development of over one billion dollars, whether it is the massive increase in resource exploration, on-shore and off-shore, whether it is in the considerable expansion which has occurred in manufacturing industry, there are clear indications that we are improving considerably the employment situation in this State.

The Government continues to be concerned about employment and unemployment, but its policies are the right policies to create more jobs and to ensure that unemployment is lowered in this State. The Hon. Mr Blevins raised some questions about the B.H.P. steel position. I understand that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has already had some discussions with his Federal counterparts. At the Premiers' Conference next week I have no doubt that the Premier will raise the issue with the Prime Minister and his Ministerial colleagues.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about Gerard Industries and G.M.H. at Woodville?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not the Minister of Industrial Affairs in this State so I do not have that detail at my fingertips. I will obtain the information and bring back a reply.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They are expanding in the Barossa Valley.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Yes, as the Minister interjects, they are expanding in the Barossa Valley. That is typical of the expansion taking place in many industries in this State.

PERMANENT HEADS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Attorney-General a question on permanent heads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Some roll and some stay on.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: That comment is very relevant to the question I am about to ask. Yesterday the Premier in another place indicated that a number of permanent heads would retire in the near future. I am not sure whether it is due to the early retirement scheme, improved superannuation, low morale, or merely reaching the retirement age. It is probably a combination of all those factors. It has been suggested that new permanent heads should not be appointed before the State election which is to take place in the not too distant future. Any incoming Government

would surely wish to have the flexibility of determining its own priorities in terms of appointing permanent heads. Who are the permanent heads who are retiring in the near future and from which departments do they come?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If there are any permanent heads retiring in the near future, they will be retiring because they have either reached retiring age or are attracted by superannuation benefits. There is no low morale that I know of amongst permanent heads. The Government appreciates what those permanent heads and other public servants do to keep the fabric of the Public Service intact and in serving the people of South Australia. I am surprised that the Hon. Anne Levy should even hint at the prospect of any vacancies being left open until after the next election, whenever that may be. That indicates some political involvement in the appointment of permanent heads. Fortunately we have been able to keep that influence out of the appointment of permanent heads in this State. If the Hon. Anne Levy wants political appointments, she can make them.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Ross Story makes every appointment—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That is rubbish.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Blevins will come to order. The question has been asked and members should listen to the answer.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Procedures exist for filling vacancies of permanent heads in the Public Service under the Public Service Act. I certainly see no reason at all for postponing the proper appointment of permanent heads to fill vacancies which may be created by retirement. The business of government has to continue whether or not there is an election. It would be quite unreasonable and quite impracticable if departments were left without permanent heads as a result of some possibility that at some time there might be an election. The business of government will go on. As to whether or not it is possible to prepare a list of permanent heads who might retire in the foreseeable future, I will refer that matter to the Premier as the Minister responsible for the Public Service Board. If it is possible to let the Hon. Anne Levy have a reply, I will bring it back. It has to be recognised that, although permanent heads might be eligible for retirement, if they have given no indication of an intention to retire it may create a difficult position for them and the board if a direct approach is made to them to ask whether they are going to retire on a certain date.

ETHNIC COMMUNITY

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on ethnic backgrounds of clients.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: With the indulgence of the Council, before going into the details of my question, I wish to thank the Minister for the prompt reply he gave to my question yesterday. I also wish to congratulate the Minister on the initiative undertaken by him and his department on behalf of the ethnic population. In particular, I wish to record my appreciation of his enlightened initiative to make it mandatory in law to take into account the cultural background of clients when providing a service to them. However, I reserve my right to comment in future on his answer and to ask for further details. In making an explanation I refer to the Mann Report, which, at page 115, states:

The committee did not obtain a great deal of evidence on the views of consumers or potential consumers from migrant groups.

Given that the report was concluded in 1980, one wonders why it took so long to realise the importance of having exact information on clients approaching the department. Given also the committee's blatant admission, which I have quoted, on the absence of exact information, it is somewhat surprising that their recommendations have not included one requesting that better statistical data be collected about the cultural background of the clients. I believe that the committee makes no comment on this omission. Perhaps it has something to do with the composition of the committee itself.

The Minister will certainly remember that, when the nominees on the committee were made public, I, amongst others, pointed out to him the imbalance and suggested that someone representing the ethnic community be also included. The Minister at the time seemed to give little importance to the request and replied that there was no need for such inclusion since the members were selected for their expertise in the field of welfare rather than being representatives of a particular group. The serious implication, although not stated, is that the ethnic communities do not have among their members persons of such calibre. Whatever the truth of their clear suspicion, it is, however, a fact that the committee has been shown to possess a dismal knowledge and understanding of ethnic communities and the concept behind the development of a multi-cultural society, something even this Government accepts.

Can the Minister say what steps have been taken since the Mann Report to ensure that proper statistics are collected about the ethnic clients of the department? If some steps have already been taken, do these include information on the ethnic backgrounds of the client; the cultural background; the language fluency of the client in English; the preferred language of the client; the nature of the need expressed by the client; who referred the client to the department; what service was provided to the client; and how the client responded to the offer of service? Finally, can the Minister say what the outcome of service was in terms of the need expressed?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The honourable member has referred to the Mann Committee and commented that there was no ethnic representative on that committee. Previously I pointed out, when the honourable member originally made this complaint—and I must point this out again—that this committee was not a representative committee; it was a committee chosen for its expertise, knowledge and academic and practical experience in the area of welfare. The Mann Committee was set up by this Government, as a result of an election promise, to inquire into the delivery of welfare services from the point of view of the persons who received those services.

The Mann Committee was a committee of experts made up of people who had the expertise to evaluate the delivery of welfare services. I have already said that the committee was not representative and it was not intended to be. The committee was made up of people who had the knowledge and ability to make that kind of assessment. The committee took evidence from people who were in receipt of welfare services, whether they were from the ethnic community or from any other specialised minority group, and it then commented on that evidence. As to the steps the Government has taken since, yesterday when I replied to the Hon. Mr Feleppa I mentioned the creation of a new position of Ethnic Welfare Adviser and that this person would be the person to whom the kind of things about which the honourable member is talking should be directed.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: What power will the department give to that person?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: This person is an Ethnic Welfare Adviser, and therefore his role is to advise the

department as to what further steps ought to be taken, if any, in regard to the specialised needs of the ethnic community. The detailed questions which the Hon. Mr Feleppa asked yesterday and the questions that he has asked today will be replied to.

TAX AVOIDANCE

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about Commonwealth tax avoidance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Recently, a Mr David Connolly, M.H.R., the Liberal Chairman of the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Public Accounts, and a member of the Government Members Committee on Treasury and Finance, put the total revenue loss as a result of tax avoidance at \$7 000 000 000. Mr Connolly was backed up by another Liberal, Mr Don Cameron, M.H.R. As the tax sharing entitlement for the States as a group is close to 20 per cent of total Commonwealth tax collections, that means that the States could be down \$1 400 000 000. South Australia receives over 10 per cent of the total tax sharing revenue and, as a result, our loss is likely to be about \$150 000 000 or \$160 000 000. Does the Premier agree that the State's loss of revenue as a result of avoidance on Commonwealth taxes could amount to \$150 000 000 or \$160 000 000 and, if so, will the Premier tell us when he will pressure the Fraser Government on tax avoidance and secure these funds for South Australia?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: All sorts of figures have been floated as to tax avoidance.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Connolly is a member of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I do not care who it is.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There is no way of telling with any precision how much money is being avoided as a result of tax avoidance schemes. The Federal Treasurer only last week made the point that he could not put a figure on the amount which might be avoided, because no information is available that would provide the basis for that calculation. Accordingly, even if I referred the first question to the Premier, he would not be able to agree or disagree with it,

because there is no factual information available on which to base that calculation. If the Commonwealth, with all the taxation office resources available to it, cannot make that assessment, then there is no prospect of any State being able to make any accurate assessment. The Premier has written to the Prime Minister regarding tax avoidance and indicated that the State is prepared to give any assistance to the Commonwealth that may be sought in respect of dealing with tax avoidance.

COMMUNITY WELFARE STAFF

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked on 10 June regarding community welfare staff?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Following the question raised last week, I have had the staffing statistics extracted to provide an up to date picture of the Department for Community Welfare with staffing. These statistics confirm that the resignation rate for the past three months is of the same order as the previous three months.

The statistics for the three month period ending 1 June 1982 show that 31 staff resigned, five retired, 24 went on leave without pay, 17 transferred to other departments, six went on workers compensation, the contracts of 24 expired, the equivalent of 13 staff decreased their hours and four other staff either died, or were seconded. The number of officers transferred to alternative duties because their substantive positions have been abolished was seven.

This compares with the previous three months period ending 1 March 1982 where 26 staff resigned, four retired, 16 went on leave without pay, 13 transferred, three went on workers compensation, seven contracts expired, the equivalent of 18 staff decreased their hours and one staff died. As well, three staff were transferred to alternative duties.

The details of the classification and location of these staff are appended. As I assured the Council last week, the department is continuing with the ongoing process of filling vacancies with new appointments, transfers and so on. At 10 June 1982, 67 vacant positions were in the process of being filled. This action will fulfil the department's staffing target of an average of 1 264 positions by 30 June 1982. I ask that the statistical analysis of the classification and location of staff be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SEPARATIONS BY CLASSIFICATION AND LOCATION FOR 3 MONTH PERIOD ENDING 1 MARCH 1982

Classification	Central Eastern Region	Central Western Region	Central Southern Region	Central Northern Region	Southern Country Region	Northern Country Region	Magill Home	SAYTC	SAYRAC	Community and Planning Services	Resource Services Division	Other Locations	Total
SWO 1	3	3	9	1	1	6	—	4	1	—	1	—	29
SWO 2	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
SWO 3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
SWO 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CO 1	4	2	1	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	7	1	22
CO 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CO 3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
CO 5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	1	3
AO 1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
AO 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
AO 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
PS 3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Occupational													
Therapist	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Librarian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Property Services	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Weekly Paid	2	—	—	1	1	3	14	1	1	—	—	2	25
TOTAL	9	5	10	8	5	9	14	5	2	2	13	6	88

SEPARATIONS BY CLASSIFICATION AND LOCATION FOR 3 MONTH PERIOD ENDING 1 JUNE 1982

Classification	Central Eastern Region	Central Western Region	Central Southern Region	Central Northern Region	Southern Country Region	Northern Country Region	Magill Home	SAYTC	SAYRAC	Community and Planning Services	Resource Services Division	Other Locations	Total
SWO 1	4	3	7	7	2	4	—	2	4	1	1	5	40
SWO 2	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	3	5
SWO 3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
SWO 4	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	3
CO 1	4	2	—	1	6	2	—	—	—	—	9	1	25
CO 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CO 3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
CO 5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	2
AO 1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
AO 2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
AO 4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
PS 3	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
Occupational Therapist	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Librarian	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Property Inspector	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Weekly Paid	1	—	—	2	—	1	30	1	2	—	—	6	43
TOTAL	10	6	8	11	8	9	31	3	6	3	13	16	124

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Will the Minister provide comparative figures for positions becoming vacant during the past 12 months?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will undertake to do that.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, a question about financial support for political Parties.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The South Australian community has just witnessed yet again the spectacle of a secret clique of donors providing funds to support Liberal Party electoral propaganda, in return for benefits about which we know nothing. The Premier has said he is a supporter of the Westminster system of Government. Section 19 of the 1967 United Kingdom Companies Act requires that all political donations of £50 or more by companies be disclosed in companies' annual reports. The Act requires that the amount of money given be disclosed. It requires that, where donations or subscriptions are made to political Parties, the identity of the recipient Party be disclosed. The Act also provides for disclosure where a donation or subscription is given to a person who is carrying on an activity which could affect public support for a political Party. That particular provision would cover the quite disgraceful 'Job rot' campaign which occurred before the last election.

To stop large-scale electoral spending, the United Kingdom Representation of the People Act of 1969 requires in section 8 that candidates' election expenses be kept within specified limits. The Representation of the People Act also provides that election expense returns be published in the press by the Returning Officer. All political Parties in the U.K., including the Conservative Party, live within these rules. One would hope that they could be supported by the Liberal Party in South Australia. We will find out. Will the Government take steps to uphold the Westminster system in South Australia and to clean up money in politics by amending the Companies Act to provide for the disclosure of the amount of political donations by companies and the names of the recipient political Parties, and by amending the Elec-

toral Act to provide that the election expenses of political candidates be subject to upper limits? If the Premier will not support such action, will he say why?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: In 1979, in February, I think, amendments to the Companies Act came before this Parliament. One of those amendments sought to require companies to make certain disclosures in their annual accounts. That amendment was defeated following a conference of the two Houses. I believe it is quite inappropriate for companies to have to make this type of information available in their annual accounts. If they are required to do that, one could well ask where it would stop in terms of disclosing individual items in a company's accounts.

The Companies Act ensures that adequate information is available to the public about a company's financial status. I do not believe that the Companies Act is an appropriate vehicle for the proposition mentioned by the Hon. Mr Blevins. In any event, after 1 July 1982 the Companies Act will become the Companies Code, which will apply uniformly across Australia, except in the Northern Territory. If any amendments are to be made after that time, they will be made in the Commonwealth Parliament after approval by a majority of Ministerial Council. I certainly have no intention of moving any amendments to the uniform Companies Code at Ministerial Council level.

At one stage, the Electoral Act contained some rather ridiculous provisions in relation to electoral expenditure. As I recall, the Electoral Act was amended 10 or more years ago to remove that farce from the statutory requirements, because very few of those concerned could clearly identify expenditure incurred at election time. Of course, it is very difficult to do that when many people who want to have their say at election time may not have any association with a candidate or political Party. I believe it would be rather difficult, and perhaps a serious infringement on their liberty, to restrain them from spending such money or making their points of view known, if they wish to do so.

Some very real difficulties have occurred in Tasmania over the past 12 months in relation to political spending. In fact, I recall that a by-election was held because no information was supplied on electoral expenditure to satisfy the Electoral Act in that State. That provision still applies in Tasmania, and perhaps some people might say that it applies with some justification, because very little, if any, television advertising occurs during Tasmanian election

campaigns. I certainly do not support the proposition put forward by the Hon. Mr Blevins.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What have you got to hide?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have nothing to hide at all.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The Attorney-General—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Blevins has asked his question. He should now listen to the answer.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As I have said, there are many people and groups within the community that want to have their say about various issues, be it at election time or at other times. We have seen advertisements by the P.S.A. about industrial matters that come within the political arena, and we have also seen them on other sides, right across the spectrum, from all types of people who want to express a point of view about an issue. If that is their desire, why should they be constrained from doing so by the Hon. Mr Blevins's proposition?

TRADE

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Hon. Mr Griffin a question about trade.

The PRESIDENT: Is it a personal explanation?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He said, 'A question'.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If the Hon. Mr Sumner calls 'Question', I thank him for his courtesy.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Obviously there has been a misunderstanding.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT: Is that really necessary?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: You, Mr President, asked the Hon. Mr Foster whether he wished to make a personal explanation. I simply interjected and said, 'No, it's a question'. That is all I said.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the Hon. Mr Foster wish to make a personal explanation?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I apologise for the misunderstanding. I simply seek leave to explain my question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I have been concerned for some time—and I am sure all honourable members share that concern—about the inability of this State, particularly in the Riverland, to find suitable overseas markets for our products as a result of an E.E.C. decision about 20 years ago. I understand that the Soviet Union has become involved on a trade and economic basis, for a share of the profits, with the coalmining industry in the Eastern States. Obviously, the Attorney-General may not have had a chance to examine this matter. Indeed, he may not even be aware of it. I have not had an opportunity to telephone the appropriate legation over the past few days to obtain further details as I had intended. Will the Attorney-General ask the Premier, in the interests of this State and on behalf of growers in the Riverland, to investigate this matter and bring down a reply? Perhaps inquiries could also be made with the Federal Minister for Trade.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will certainly refer the question to the Premier, probably to the Minister of Industrial Affairs who is responsible for trade and industry matters, and also to the Minister of Agriculture, who would have a more direct interest. I will refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate Ministers and bring down a reply.

WHYALLA CLUBS

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Following the complaints made by Judge Grubb regarding the activities of certain clubs in Whyalla, has the Minister of Community Welfare asked the police to conduct an investigation? If so, has the Minister received a report on the matter, and would he comment on it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have not called for a report, as there did not appear to be any need to do so.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: Has any Minister opposite called for a report on the activities of clubs in Whyalla?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will answer on behalf of the Ministers on this side of the Chamber! I am not aware of any reason why any Minister has had reason to call for such a report. The only Minister who could perhaps have done so would be the Chief Secretary. I am sure that the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill), who represents the Chief Secretary in this place, will ask that question of the Chief Secretary and see whether he has called for such a report and, if he has, reply to the honourable member who has asked the question.

POLITICAL DONATIONS

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question regarding donations to political Parties.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We have just heard the Attorney-General say that he does not consider that the law in South Australia should be amended so as to protect the honesty of Parliamentary elections and of donations to political Parties; he does not consider, as his political counterparts in the United Kingdom do, that people in this State are entitled to know about this matter.

Another matter that concerns me when business firms make donations to political Parties is that those donations come not out of the pockets of the directors but, of course, out of the funds of the companies involved. The donations are hidden away and cannot be picked up in annual reports. We never find out how the donations are made, the size of the donations, and to whom they go.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What about the trade unions?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will tell you about that in a moment. When they make donations, the trade unions are compelled under their rules, which are authorised by the Industrial Registrar, to reveal those donations. They are there in the balance sheet that is lodged with the Registrar every year. The Labor Party merely considers that the same thing should apply to companies. An important point is involved in this matter, because, when companies make donations to political Parties, they load the cost of their product with the amount of that donation. They do not absorb it as a loss or anything like that, and everyone in the community pays for it. If Myer donates \$5 000, or its printing division is used for a certain campaign, any customer who shops at Myer pays for part of the campaign. Its customers may want this to happen; I am not arguing about the right of Myer or its customers to do so.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the time. Question Time has almost expired.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Yes, Sir. However, we should know about it so that people can decide that, when they buy a product from Myer, they want part of the cost thereof to go to the Liberal Party or to any political Party. Does the Minister of Consumer Affairs think that it is proper that consumers have the cost of products that they so purchase loaded because of the donations that companies

make to political Parties? If the Minister does not think that that is a fair burden for consumers to bear, what steps does he think should be taken to protect consumers from this disgraceful practice?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I cannot see any reason why my department should inquire into this matter. It is common for companies to make donations to all sorts of organisations, including charities, and whether or not the cost is passed on to the consumer is another matter. I can see no reason why I should conduct an investigation into this matter or differ from the extremely good explanation given by the Attorney-General.

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:
That this Bill be now read a third time.

The events of this week in this Parliament have been extraordinary, and, in view of the culmination of those events, the Government has a strong duty to all South Australians, particularly to those whose futures presently depend on the passing of this Bill, to bring the third reading of the Bill before this Council again. Standing Order 281, a rarely used Standing Order, allows this vote to be taken again. It is good fortune for South Australia that this is now possible.

We have already heard about the size of the development during the second reading debate, but let me repeat what I said about the development on that occasion:

Exploration at Olympic Dam began in May 1975, when Western Mining Corporation Limited acquired an exploration licence as part of an Australia-wide search for copper, based on theoretical concepts of ore occurrence in sediments. The Stuart Shelf was selected as a target since it was considered to have favourable characteristics analogous to the Zambian Copper Belt, which was regarded as the conceptual model.

Results of the first hole, sited on geophysical anomalies and drilled to provide subsurface geological data, are now legendary. It was not until the tenth hole was drilled, however, that the immense potential of the region was realised. Since that time, the tempo has quickened.

Over the past two years the exploration activity has been intense. A total of nearly 300 diamond drill holes have been drilled to outline a mineralised zone elongated north west-south east, with dimensions of 7 km by 4 km, at depths below the surface between 350 metres and 1 100 metres. Thus, the deposit ranks among the world's largest concentrations of both copper and uranium, with grades likely to average about 1.5 per cent copper and 0.05 per cent uranium oxide. However, there are significant zones of higher grades of these metals.

I went on to say:

This is a remarkable deposit in terms of size of contained metals and mineralogy, and it appears to be unique, genetically—it is quite unlike any known orebody. The strata containing copper-uranium-rare earth element mineralisation are widespread.

As mentioned earlier, the decision was made early in 1980 to sink a shaft to procure bulk samples for metallurgical tests to provide data for evaluation and assessment. Accordingly, a 6 metres × 3.2 metres shaft (Whennan Shaft) is being sunk to an initial target depth of 500 metres—it is currently at a depth of 420 metres.

Exploration is proceeding elsewhere on the Stuart Shelf as well as at Olympic Dam—altogether 15 drilling plants are being operated. A camp and facilities for 250 persons including prefabricated accommodation units, mess, ablution, medical and recreation facilities, power and water supplies, and a 1 600-metre airstrip have been established at Olympic Dam. A workshop, plant store, sample preparation block, and drill storage yard have also been constructed.

As I said in my second reading speech:

The indenture contemplates a project of up to 150 000 tonnes of copper per annum. It is estimated by the joint venturers that

commitment to such a project could involve expenditures well in excess of \$1 000 000 000, employment of 2 000 to 3 000 at the mine site and the establishment of a town of up to 9 000 people. This can either be at Olympic Dam or on the Stuart Shelf although, at present, it is considered that Olympic Dam is the most likely location.

The joint venturers are expected to complete their studies regarding the initial project by the end of 1984. In this regard, they undertake to spend an additional \$50 000 000 over and above funds already committed and referred to earlier. Thus the total prefeasibility expenditure will amount to at least \$100 000 000. This expenditure is far greater than any prefeasibility expenditure for a major resource development project in Australia, including the North-West Shelf of Western Australia, which was less than half that amount. Having completed their studies, the joint venturers are expected to commit to an initial project by not later than 1987, unless it is not economically practicable to do so at the time.

In such circumstances they have the right to postpone their obligations for successive two-year periods, subject to the overriding right of the Minister to refer the question of economic impracticability to an independent expert. In the event that the independent expert should disagree with the joint venturers' assessment and the Minister be of the view that the joint venturers should commit to an initial project, and they not do so, the indenture would terminate. In the event that there is no commitment to an initial project by 1991, all major elements of the indenture (e.g. water, power, roads, royalty) must be renegotiated.

The indenture makes provision for a wide range of matters relating to the initial project. These include environment and radiological protection, water and electricity, roads, infrastructure, exploration and mining licences, township and municipality, royalties and taxes and local government.

As I said on Wednesday evening, the decision we take on this Bill at the third reading, a decision whether or not the Roxby Downs project goes ahead now, directly affects the lives of over 200 direct employees and hundreds of other people—their families and those hundreds of people with jobs in servicing the project, plus the 60 joint venture employees in Adelaide. The project already involves: daily air charter, daily heavy haulage, daily water transport, and bus services three days a week; and transportable buildings, PVC piping, generating plant maintenance, general construction services, telecommunications, catering services, heavy engineering, electronic equipment, analytical laboratory services, medical care, and road construction.

As I have already pointed out, about 53 children travel to school in Andamooka each day, providing a significant proportion of total enrolment of the school. So, it is obvious that there is already a large group of people in our South Australian community whose futures depend on this project getting the approval to go ahead today.

There is one matter which requires special comment. Some concerns have been expressed for the rights of workers involved in the project. The Government is satisfied that their welfare is very well protected by the three codes of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Commission on Radiological Protection and the National Health and Medical Research Council as varied from time to time, and by the recognised and accepted ALARA principle—that is, that the joint venturers shall in any event and at all times use their best endeavours to ensure that the radiation exposure of employees and the public shall be kept to levels as low as reasonably achievable.

Our own Radiation Protection and Control Act passed earlier this year will also provide that protection. Also, I believe that section 48 of the Limitation of Actions Act preserves the right of workers to sue for radiation induced illness. But the Government does not want there to be any doubts about those rights. The issue is a complex one; it requires careful research; it requires examination of the experience and the laws of other countries, not only the United Kingdom, to see whether there is a better mechanism for protecting the workers' rights to sue. Accordingly, I will refer to the Law Reform Committee of South Australia the question of the proper recognition and protection of the

right to sue where there is a claim for damages alleging radiation induced illness. The Government will also study this question. I will ask the Law Reform Committee of South Australia to report within 18 months. Any legislative measure which results from these studies obviously should apply to all uranium projects in South Australia, without discrimination. This is not precluded by the indenture.

There are many other matters on which one could comment. That has been done. Suffice to say, this Bill is vital to South Australia. This new opportunity to vote on the third reading today gives this Parliament the opportunity to share in the confidence which this Government has for the future of South Australia. Over the past decade, we had fallen behind the progress of other States, we had turned our backs on opportunities to secure the future for the people of South Australia, we had lost opportunities which should have been addressed and grasped and progressed aggressively. There are many signs that since September 1979 we are now taking a confident approach to the future and in our State—\$1 billion Cooper Basin-Stony Point development, record levels of exploration, significant industrial, manufacturing expansion. I hope that this Council will now take this opportunity to vote for progress and security into the 1980s.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Foster.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: He's not the Opposition spokesman on this matter.

The PRESIDENT: He was the first honourable member to his feet.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I can see the frustration on the face of my colleagues, but I suggest that that question is best left to be determined by you, Mr President. If it is my right under Standing Orders, I intend to address the Chamber in respect to this matter. It is my intention to vote in support of the passage of this Bill. For the first time in my Parliamentary career, I have made a prepared speech. The reason is that this speech has been given to the press with an appropriate embargo on it.

The PRESIDENT: I must draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he can discuss the Bill only. No debate on other aspects can be allowed.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I respect your ruling, Mr President, and the information will be made available.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I will speak briefly in what must be described as unusual circumstances. Members will recall that the simple thrust of my contribution throughout this debate has been that the Roxby Downs prospect is most unlikely to become a project until the 1990s or beyond. Therefore, it was my submission and the consistent submission of the Opposition—it remains the consistent submission of the Opposition—that it is inappropriate for the South Australian Parliament, on behalf of the people of South Australia, to completely sign, seal and deliver all the conditions which would relate to that project as if it were to proceed as early as 1982. The reason why the final decisions should be reserved to the Government of the day, or at least the final notice of intention to proceed given to that Government, I have also outlined.

There are very grave uncertainties in regard to marketing at the moment. Copper prices are at an all time low. I have little doubt, given the long record of the old metals as they are called, including copper, that at some time in the future it will again rise. That is very likely.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And at some time in the future it will again fall.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Indeed, but no company at the moment would want to get into copper mining. It is quite unthinkable that any company would involve itself in

that area. Some copper mines in Australia quite recently have been closed down and put on a care and maintenance basis because of the disastrously low prices of copper. The second reason, referring to the economic prospects, is that there is enormous uncertainty about the future of the nuclear fuel cycle and, of course, the prospective prices for uranium. The spot price for uranium, which is now widely regarded as being close to the contract price, has halved in the last four years. Indeed, the journal which I quoted, put out by the Nuclear Export Corporation, says that because of Australian policy with regard to floor prices, further sales of Australian uranium are foreclosed at this time. So, the future uranium markets are highly speculative. A commitment by the joint venturers to proceed is therefore very unlikely to be made in this decade. A further very important point, which I will not labour as it has been made many times before, is that the nuclear fuel cycle is not yet as safe or as adequately safeguarded an industry as it could be.

There is reason to believe that, if uranium were to be mined at Roxby Downs and exported from South Australia under existing safeguards, it would make some contribution to the world arsenal of atomic weapons. I have a very deep conviction and feeling about this. I put it to the Council during the course of the debate and I reiterate that we are literally talking about the future of mankind. However, I also made it very clear on behalf of the Opposition that we certainly did not want to foreclose on the possibility of the development of the Roxby Downs project at a later date. If the questions of safety and safeguards are proven to the satisfaction of the majority of members of my Party at some time in the future, whether it be the immediate or the distant future, then all other circumstances being equal and if prospects become viable, we would be prepared to support the project. In view of all those circumstances and after deep consideration and an enormous amount of research and work by members of Caucus, particularly those on the front benches, we decided with absolute concurrence of all members of the Parliamentary Labor Party to move what we submit were very reasonable amendments which would have made it possible to pass the Bill in amended form and ratify the indenture.

Those amendments were in regard to protection and tailings disposal. We were attempting to insist that prior to the project proceeding the joint venturers had to make it very clear to the Government of the day (whether it be Liberal or Labor) what their scheme was in total for disposing of one billion tonnes of radioactive tailings in perpetuity. We did not accept that putting in an e.i.s. every three years and literally making it up as they went along, would provide adequate safeguards. We also moved an amendment giving the Minister of Health of the day the right to prohibit further mining operations under the special mining leases unless the joint venturers made good any default which might arise in meeting the obligations imposed on them and the undertaking that they gave in regard to how tailings disposal would occur. The penalty inserted would be the largest ever moved in the South Australian Parliament and provided that contravention or failure to comply with an order under subsection (3) of our proposed amendments would be an offence punishable by a fine not exceeding \$500 000. A substantial penalty it is and so it should be in the circumstances, because we were talking about the adequate permanent disposal of one billion tonnes of radioactive ore.

We were consistent in insisting that there should be a State register of all personnel involved directly in the mining, milling, transport or handling in any way of radioactive ores and that that register should be available for inspection by any member of the public. Again, that was an entirely reasonable amendment because we are potentially dealing with uranium and any other radioactive product. We are

talking about carcinogenesis, we are talking about the development of cancer and, in the case of uranium mine workers, we are talking about the development of lung cancer. The lead time normally averages about a generation of 25 years. In those circumstances it is absolutely essential from the viewpoint of workers compensation and from the viewpoint of epidemiological studies that a register be established and updated annually so that at any time the health authorities in this State would know where any person who had previously been employed in the industry could be located.

We also said, and I repeat, that there should be special workers compensation provisions. I do not need to reiterate that. Obviously there will have to be special workers compensation provisions, or there should be, because we are talking about people developing lung cancer as a result of working in an industry 25 years previously. It would be extremely difficult under the existing situation for them to lodge successful workers compensation claims. The Attorney-General, in a death bed confession, admitted that there might be some merit in the points we made. He merely talked about taking it to the Constitutional Convention. He certainly talked in an airy-fairy sort of way about the right to sue. I do not think that that is good enough for the workers, nor do I think it is good enough for their widows and the dependent children of those widows.

The Opposition cannot accept the Bill in its present form for that reason. The Opposition wanted to write in a requirement that there should be a full public inquiry prior to commercial mining proceeding. Again, that was entirely reasonable. I referred to the Ranger Inquiry, which was conducted at length before uranium mining was allowed to proceed in the Northern Territory. No-one has ever suggested that anything but good came out of the Ranger Inquiry conducted by Mr Justice Fox and his fellow commissioners. Again, that was an entirely reasonable amendment.

Finally, the Opposition attempted to insert an important amendment which said that final approval for the project (which first was a prospect and then became a project) should be reserved for the Government of the day. Again, I submit that that was an entirely reasonable amendment. The Opposition did not say that it must be referred to a Labor Government. The Opposition said that it should be referred to the Government of the day. I submit that that is part of the democratic process and is entirely appropriate in a prospect like this, which every informed source in the mining industry says has to be at least a decade away.

The prohibition against the joint venturers warehousing the prospect, in other words, not proceeding, even if world market prospects improved substantially, is already in the indenture. What the Opposition said in the suggested amendment is that we believe that it should be a two-way process, in other words, that both parties must come together and give each other very good reasons why the project should not proceed at any particular time. Under the terms of the indenture, in 1986, 1989 and 1991 (and possibly beyond) the joint venturers have to come to the Government of the day and either make a commitment to proceed or give very good reasons why they should not proceed.

What the Opposition was saying is that the Government of the day should also be able to act in the same way to give very good reasons why the project should or should not proceed. I will give a practical example. One can imagine the situation arising, if the indenture had been ratified with the Opposition's amendments, and there was a Labor Government of the day, where the joint venturers could come to the Government and say that they had been to the world capital markets, had \$1.5 billion, had marshalled this capital, were keen to go ahead and that tomorrow they would be calling a full press conference to announce to the people of South Australia what they wanted to do. Any Government

would then have to think very long, hard and seriously before it said 'No', that the joint venturers could go away, that the Government did not want the joint venturers' money and did not want to proceed with the project. That is the practical reality. That is what the Opposition's very reasonable amendments would have done. The amendments should have been accepted. The whole matter could have been put out of the political arena, back into the commercial arena and into the South Australian community where, at this point, it rightly belongs.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: In responding to one of the amendments—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Foster did not speak; he asked that he be allowed to make a statement.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not seeking leave to make that statement; I distributed that and am satisfied with it. I now want to address the Council on what the Attorney-General said regarding the health of those who may be engaged in the industry. I raised this matter during the course of the second reading debate and I have raised it consistently for some considerable time. I thank the Attorney-General for what he said. This was the reason why the Hon. Mr DeGaris and I spoke together when we both left the Chamber; we had some common ground to discuss.

Will the Attorney consider a further aspect in respect of what he proposes by way of putting this matter before certain law authorities within the State? The Leader of the Government in this Chamber may or may not be aware that there are certain industrial laws (I think 23e of the waterside workers award) regarding specific matters such as the dislodgment of beams which are not tied; they have clear distinctions in awards made by the Arbitration Commission that where such accidents occur it is *prima facie* evidence of negligence on the part of the employer.

The Attorney, being a person of the legal profession, does not need to speak for 10 or 20 minutes in respect to having an understanding of what that means. Such a provision would inhibit the right of an employer in many ways when that employer seeks to argue before a court that the employee was negligent, should not have been there (either left or right of a ship hold or wherever it may be). It also means that a widow, in such circumstances, has the comfort—if there can be any such thing as comfort after the death of a husband—that she does not run a risk in connection with compensation. As an example—and I also mentioned this yesterday—there was an instance where a matter was heard in a State court concerning the widow of a person who had died of asbestosis (a lung condition) and then she herself unfortunately died before the case could be heard in a higher court.

The PRESIDENT: I ask that the honourable member stay within the ambit of the indenture Bill.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Attorney-General, in the time suggested by the person who spoke before me in the debate, ensure that such a provision can be made for any registered worker within the industry? It is important to confine it to mining operations, but anyone in the nuclear industry may even be employed at the Institute of Technology at The Levels. I urge the Attorney-General to take note of this matter. Should he require any proof of the existence of such an industrial award, I will be only too happy to co-operate.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): I did not think it was generally possible for a member to give two speeches during a third reading debate. Perhaps that indulgence might be granted to other members in the future. The Bill has been brought back in quite extraordinary cir-

cumstances. It is certainly not unprecedented, but very unusual. There is little point in reviewing the argument at length. The past five days have certainly been the most extraordinary in my political career. I confess that it leaves me extremely disappointed.

I made the point during the second reading debate that the debates, controversy and arguments about this issue had been cheapened. People's motives were questioned. The Labor Party was accused of being political about the issue; claims were made that it was somehow or other, due only to politics, that this Bill was not proceeding. I found those arguments disappointing, as I found some of the other matters that have been raised in the past few days disappointing. My disappointment has been compounded over the past few days. Instead of a careful, rational debate on an issue of importance to South Australia, the situation has deteriorated to emotional arguments about extraneous matters.

The central issue in this debate relates to safety—not in a narrow sense but whether the world can cope with a future which involves mass destruction. The connection between the nuclear fuel cycle, the civil use of nuclear power and the increased possibility of nuclear weapons proliferation has been documented in the Fox Report, the Flowers Report and the technical report of the Select Committee into Uranium Resources. I read from each of those reports during the second reading debate. That connection has been established beyond doubt by those independent inquiries. Before agreeing to mine and sell uranium we should take every step possible to ensure that the threat of nuclear war by further weapons proliferation is minimised, even though nuclear energy might be needed at some time to meet the energy needs of some nations.

The fact is—and it cannot be disputed—proliferation safeguards in the world are inadequate. The orebody will not disappear. Indeed, the joint venturers themselves may not proceed at this time. Every time that question has been put to representatives of the joint venturers by the press and by anyone else they have studiously avoided giving a direct answer. In view of that and the safety issues involved I still believe that the correct and responsible course is to vote against this Bill. The jobs at Roxby Downs are not threatened by Labor's approach to the indenture. The feasibility study could continue under a Labor Government and the jobs would remain. We have made that patently clear to Parliament and the public over the last few weeks.

If this is a matter of controversy within Parliament it is not from a desire to oppose the Bill just for opposition's sake. It is a matter of controversy in Parliament because it is a matter of controversy in the community. People hold very strong views about this issue; they are deep and conscientious views. A large number of people in the South Australian community, the Australian community and throughout the rest of the world regard it as essentially a moral issue. The debate on this Bill and the vote that we will cast in a moment must be seen in that light.

In view of the lack of community consensus and the deep moral concern of many people in the community, particularly in relation to the outstanding safety issues and the problems of nuclear proliferation which could lead to the devastation of this world, I believe we should continue to maintain our opposition to this Bill at this time.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: History will record that this is the third time in 100 years that Standing Order 281 has been used.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: Third time lucky.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That remains to be seen. It is an interesting Standing Order. It was first used in relation to legislation dealing with the railways when two members

were informed that their vote would not be required, there was no problem and the Bill would pass. The two members left the Chamber for the day, only to find that the Bill was defeated. The Standing Order was then used by the Hon. Mr Chatterton to recommit the Criminal Law Consolidation Act Amendment Bill during the second reading stage.

I reiterate that when the Hon. Dr Cornwall spoke to the Bill he made three points which I believe have some merit. I dealt with those three points when the Bill was before the Council previously. The big problem is that any change to the indenture virtually means that it must be renegotiated with the joint venturers. It is a very difficult step to amend the indenture Bill. Nevertheless, the Attorney-General has given a very firm undertaking that the Hon. Dr Cornwall's proposal in relation to workers compensation will be referred to the Law Reform Commission for report, which must be made within 18 months. I believe that the Council should accept that undertaking in good faith.

This is a very difficult problem. It is not easy to decide in a few moments the question of limitation of actions and the question of workers compensation in relation to industries which handle radioactive material. Therefore, I accept the Attorney-General's undertaking in the hope that we will achieve some changes in the law in relation to the question of radiation induced injuries in workers. With those few remarks I support the third reading and thank the Attorney for his approach to the question of workers compensation, because I know that that matter is very important to many members of this Chamber.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): A few points need to be noted about the debate on the third reading. The Hon. Mr Foster has raised the question of protection for workers who are exposed to radiation. I have undertaken to refer that matter to the Law Reform Committee for report within 18 months. The Government itself will undertake a study of this matter. Not only will it look at the strict question of the limitation of actions but also a method by which radiation induced illnesses can be related back to the original cause.

I believe that the matters raised by the Hon. Mr Foster will be taken up by either one or the other of those two inquiries or both of them. I see it as an integral part of determining an appropriate mechanism to establish the right of a worker to sue, whether in three years, 15 years, 20 years or 30 years. I believe the Hon. Mr Foster's proposition will be an integral part of the two studies that I have mentioned.

The Leader of the Opposition referred to the safety question and said that it was an integral part of this debate. However, during my reply in the second reading debate I identified the Government's attitude to safeguards at Federal level, the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and Australia's participation in it. They are strict safeguards and in no instance have they been diminished. As I said during my reply, the press commented about the agreement with Japan and said that there had been a watering down of those standards. In March this year Mr Tony Street categorically denied any watering down of the strict safeguards required by Australia. The Hon. Dr Cornwall referred again to the various issues relating to his amendments; they were explored in detail during the Committee stage of the Bill. I do not think it would profit anyone for me to repeat the Government's view on those amendments, because they are adequately expressed in *Hansard*.

It is important to recognise that, if those amendments were passed, it would have had the effect of rejecting the indenture, and the project would have been put on ice, unless an extension of the 30 June date could have been negotiated. It is all very well to say that the decision whether

or not this venture should proceed after the feasibility study has been conducted should be left to the Government of the day. The point is that the joint venturers have a right to expect some certainty now, both for the purposes of their own objectives in developing this potentially massive project and for the purposes of raising finance.

There are in the indenture provisions to which I have already referred and which require the joint venturers to meet recognised and established standards as they may be upgraded or varied from time to time. There is also a provision that a decision to mine could be deferred for periods of two years. That decision by the joint venturers is subject to review by an independent expert, at the Government's instance. So, there are already established in the indenture mechanisms that will ensure that there is adequate Government involvement in decisions affecting this project.

But, above all, there is certainty for the joint venturers, who have a right to expect that there will be some certainty. I hope that this indenture will be passed at the third reading, because it will be a significant step forward in the development of the project for that to occur.

The Council divided on the third reading:

While the division was being held:

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I supported you the other night, and you all rubbished me. It would have been all right, but you—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Look at the *Hansard* pulls. You heaped the most vile abuse on me.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Foster to desist.

Ayes (11)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, N. K. Foster, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (10)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall (teller), C. W. Creedon, M. S. Feleppa, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move: That this Bill do now pass.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (11)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, L. H. Davis, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, N. K. Foster, K. T. Griffin (teller), C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (10)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall (teller), C. W. Creedon, M. S. Feleppa, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Bill thus passed.

[Sitting suspended from 12.55 to 2.15 p.m.]

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 17 June. Page 4729.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: When I last spoke on this matter, I indicated that I believed that the move towards perpetual pastoral leases could only be of assistance in the management of pastoral land. Despite the many purported allegations that have been made, pastoralists are good man-

agers. True, the odd individual may transgress the conditions laid down, but such instances have been rare and, while the Hon. Mr Chatterton may say that no pastoral lease has been subjected to forfeiture, the fact is that negotiations do take place constantly on the number of stock that are to be carried on properties, and the Pastoral Board has negotiated reductions in numbers on many occasions. These are followed through by the board, which either checks through newspapers on the sales in the areas to see that the number of stock has been sold by the station concerned, or it checks physically. To my knowledge there have been no instances where pastoralists have ignored the directions or requests of the Pastoral Board.

The big problem, and the problem covered by this Bill, is that animals other than stock have not been subject to those controls. Considerable problems arise from animals other than stock ('stock', of course, means sheep or cattle). The problem of goats, as I indicated previously, is enormous in certain pastoral areas, and it is increasing and causing extreme devastation. Goats are gross eaters in comparison with normal stock. They are not selective and, being very agile in their ability to get at the bush country, they damage the bush to a higher degree. Goats take not just the outside of blue bush or salt bush—they eat the whole of the bush and cause irreversible damage. This Bill covers that problem and gives the board for the first time the opportunity to insist on a reduction in the number of these animals.

The problem of kangaroos arouses much emotion in people who tend to see kangaroos as something native to Australia that should be left untouched. There are ways in which I fully support that view. In fact, on my own property we have had a ban on the shooting of any such animals for about 20 years. A group of neighbours has had a similar ban. Thus, when I say from time to time that a reduction in the number of these native animals must be considered I do not want members to get the impression that, like some people in the country who are against kangaroos, I am against them. That is not the case.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Very few people in the country would hold that attitude.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: True, it tends to be people from town who are keen shooters and who take that view. I do not know of any people in the pastoral areas amongst my friends (and the Hon. Mr Chatterton must vouch for his friends), or in the bush country who would not hold that attitude, but such animals do become a nuisance. The principal reason is that water supplies these days are so reliable, because pastoralists install and maintain them, and this has caused a large increase in the number of these animals in pastoral areas. Certainly, they would be in larger numbers than they were before the white man first came to this country. A reduction is required. Figures have been quoted to me of up to 20 kangaroos to the square mile, 30 sheep and 40 goats.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: How many rabbits?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is another problem to which I will refer. They are an enormous problem and a more difficult problem to cope with, because there are not so many people in that area in the business of professional rabbit trapping.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Don't you think there should be a better return from kangaroos?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is something for pastoralists to decide; I do not wish to get involved in the economics of kangaroo shooting. It is not a subject that attracts me greatly, I must admit. One of the great problems is that, if kangaroos are reduced in numbers to a certain degree or are in bad condition due to drought, the professional kangaroo shooters tend not to want to go into the area, because they get insufficient return for their labour.

That is another reason why it is necessary to give the Pastoral Board the power to direct that numbers must be reduced to ensure that the station owner does not just rely on the professional shooters to do this for him; the pastoralist himself, if he can find no-one else to do the job, can be forced to follow a direction of the board.

As I have said, this country has been held under terminating lease for a long period. Many leases are now running towards termination. Some have a shorter period to run than others, and one cannot expect people to make improvements to the country with only a short tenure in front of them. For instance, fencing can last in this country for up to 50 years. If a lease has 10 years to go one would not expect a pastoralist to install fencing with no certainty about future tenure, and there is no certainty at the moment.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Doesn't past practice show that there has never been a lease terminated, and that pastoralists are quite safe?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is not the case entirely. The fact is that these people do not have security of tenure in the future. The honourable member must admit that. One cannot expect people to say, 'I will be going to the year 2008 and after that it will be all right.' That is not the way it operates.

Certainly, that is not how banking institutions see it; they have a different attitude. If banks have to lend money they look at the situation and say that the lease has 10, 15 or 20 years to run—the lending has to be based on that. This creates a severe restriction on a person's ability to borrow. If the Hon. Mr Blevins does not believe that, I suggest he approach the banks and ask them that specific question. The Commonwealth Development Bank will lend, but only on improvements, items that are going to improve the country. In fact, the Trustee Act specifically denies the right to use this country as a security, whereby the trustee companies can lend on the basis of pastoral leases as security.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: One of the reasons that not as many young people stay on the land is that they are worrying about the retention of a lease.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is exactly right. It is a very real problem, and I am sure that this is a matter that has not been addressed by the Opposition. There is a tendency to look on the people in the pastoral industry as big business or big operators, but a large proportion of pastoralists are small operators, and they do have family problems. Their children have to go away to be educated. When they go away they have to look at whether or not they will return and whether they have some security in their future. Such is not the case at the moment, and there can be no absolute guarantee that that is the case. It is essential that we give these people a better security of tenure so that their sons and daughters can look to the future and believe they can go back to that land that their father—and grandfather in some cases—set about developing and raising to a level of productivity whereby it is a viable entity.

The Hon. Miss Levy was not in the Chamber yesterday when I talked about the contention that banks only looked at a lease in terms of economic viability. That is probably quite correct. However, she missed one point, that a pastoral lease that is economically viable can run into a five-year drought. That does not mean that it will not be economically viable again in the future. People have to borrow at present on stock numbers. That is the only source of security that will be accepted by the financial institutions, either by the banks or the stock agents. Stock agents are only interested in the return they get. Any money that is brought in from the sale of stock in a drought situation goes straight to the stock agent and comes off the indebtedness of the place. If people cannot get another form of security, they will have

to continue to rely entirely on stock numbers for security. That is not good enough in my view.

I believe it is essential that we provide a reasonable form of tenure, and the only reasonable form of tenure that will be acceptable will be a continuous tenure that provides the pastoralist with security for himself and his family, something that is necessary to ensure the continuance of their pastoral enterprise. I support the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr Cameron has prompted me to make a few remarks on this Bill. Some of the remarks he made should be answered. I state unequivocally that I am opposed to this Bill and will vote against it. The purpose of the Bill is very clear. It is to give 50 per cent of the State to a handful of people—probably around 20 or 30 people. That is one of the most outrageous propositions that it has been my misfortune to hear. To take 50 per cent of the State and give it to a handful of people, then deny the rest of the State access to the area or allow access only on the whim of the handful of people to which half the State has been given, can only be described as absolutely outrageous. I would not, in any shape or form, be a party to that proposition. I have a fundamental objection to the freeholding of land.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: What about your own?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I told members yesterday my position, but obviously the Hon. Mr Dawkins was not listening. I have a fundamental objection to it. I am sure you, Mr President, have heard before in your many years on the Eyre Peninsula that a very good case can be made out to show that land is the source of all wealth. Given that that proposition has a certain amount of appeal, I am not at all pleased with the idea of giving half the wealth of this State to 20 or 30 people. The Hon. Mr Dawkins interjected about my land. I responded to that query yesterday when the Hon. Martin Cameron was speaking in the debate. I said that I would not have any objection to my small freehold block of land in Whyalla, which is owned by the bank anyway, going to leasehold. It will be another 25 years before it is freehold. After paying in for six years, I have only paid \$400 off my mortgage. Be that as it may, I state quite clearly that I shall be more than pleased if that block of land was changed to leasehold. It would not bother me at all. If all land was leasehold we might have a substantial reduction in the price of housing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A terminating lease or a perpetual lease?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: It would not bother me. If the Government said that I could build a house on the land and stipulate certain obligations in doing so and also stated that it would review those obligations every 42 years, I would be happy with that. I would accept merely being a steward of the land for 42 years. It is not unreasonable that I would be expected to treat it properly.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about access to your land?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: If my land was in a position where the public could reasonably expect some access to it, I would be happy to accede to that. If the public had a specific reason for being on my land and it was a valid reason, I would not object. To attempt to use that argument in relation to a suburban block is rather nonsensical. If the Hon. Mr DeGaris thinks about it for a while he may be able to frame a better question.

The Hon. Martin Cameron said that we could not expect a pastoralist to put up a fence which would last 50 years when there was only 10 years left on the lease on that property. I do not believe for one moment that if any fencing requires attention on Commonwealth Hill, McLachlan, one of the owners of the Liberal Party, will be lying awake in Tusmore, Springfield or wherever he lives,

worrying about a fence to be put in at Commonwealth Hill which may be a 50-year fence, when his lease has less than 50 years to run. The case just does not hang together. I am sure that the McLachlans and the McTaggart, and all the other people who are to be beneficiaries of the largesse of this Government, at the expense of the people of this State, are worrying about the 42-year terminating lease. I do not believe they operate their property on a basis of only making investment decisions in relation to the date the lease terminates. That is nonsense. Decisions were made at Commonwealth Hill and other properties on the basis that the lease will be renewed as it always has been in the past. So, the arguments of the Hon. Mr Cameron were, to say the least, puerile.

Members opposite have argued that to change these leases from 42-year terminating leases to 99-year leases will add no value to the properties. I am inclined to agree with that; I do not believe it will add too much value at all. However, if it does, and all of a sudden these properties are being sold on the market for a considerable amount more than the sum at which they are valued at the moment, the Government will have been wrong. Government speakers have stated that there will be no increased value on these properties. If that is the case, there can be no question of compensation when this legislation is repealed, if it goes through the Council, on this occasion. If the legislation does not increase the value of the properties, the question of compensation when the leases are altered does not arise. That would be logical. That is certainly my position after listening to the debate. I do not know whether the bankers who lend money on these properties are aware of the Labor Party policy. The policy of the Labor Party is quite clear on 42-year leases.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Would you revert to perpetual leases?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not saying that I would do that at all. I am saying what is the clear policy of the Labor Party. The bankers should take a look at it because, if they are lending on the basis of the change the Government is attempting to make, they are kidding themselves. If the security is a 99-year lease, then that security will not last beyond the time when the Labor Party can get a Bill through this Parliament to repeal this Bill.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: You'd have to repeal the leases.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Whatever machinery is necessary.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: So you would interfere with leases?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Whatever is necessary to repeal this Bill will be done. If anyone, after the next election, says that he did not know and that he lent money in good faith on these 99-year leases, then he should have made himself aware of what he would be in for. In a press statement issued yesterday, the Hon. Dr Hoggood made perfectly clear that the legislation would be repealed. Any question of compensation does not arise. The McLachlans and McTaggart, through their spokesmen in this Chamber, have stated that this Bill could add no additional value to their property. Therefore, when the position is reversed, there is no question of compensation.

There are a whole host of other reasons why this Bill should not pass. As those reasons have been comprehensively outlined by the Hon. Mr Chatterton, the Hon. Anne Levy and the Hon. Mr Milne, it is not necessary for me to go through them. I thought that I should make my position clear on the question of giving half of the State to these wealthy Liberal Party supporters. I also thought I would make my position clear on the question of the repeal of this legislation and the compensation I am sure these people will claim. I give warning that I will be doing everything in

my power to see that there is no compensation payable on the basis of the argument put forward by the Liberals that there is no increase in the value of properties if this legislation is passed. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): Opposition speeches in this debate have unfortunately been characterised by a number of unresearched and misleading assumptions in respect to the intentions and effects of this Bill. Typical points made by opponents of the Bill are, first, that the granting of permanent pastoral tenure will cause an immediate land desertification trend. Do these speakers really believe that pastoral management techniques developed over 150 years will be dramatically changed overnight because of a change in tenure? Such an assumption is preposterous.

Secondly, it is argued that the granting of permanent tenure will result in windfall increment in pastoral land values, to a selected group of pastoralist families. This claim is also quite incorrect, and has been clearly refuted by facts, figures, and the market place. Values for pastoral lands are determined exclusively by productivity, availability of water and services and the values of livestock, plant and improvements. These facts also refute suggestions that the acquisition costs of pastoral lands held under permanent tenure will be greatly increased by the provisions of this Bill.

Thirdly, the provisions of the Bill are said to severely restrict public rights of access to the State's outback. This is incorrect. This Bill seeks only to control the traversing of the lands by vehicles, and does not in any way preclude the public from enjoyment of the lands on foot or horseback from an adequate network of public access roads, which will be determined by an advisory committee representative of public interests. In the same context the Bill also does not affect the access rights of traditional Aboriginal residents of the State's outback. I could go on and provide rebuttals to virtually every point made by opponents to this Bill. However, they have all been dealt with by speakers either here or in other places, who have shown quite clearly that the Opposition's arguments in fact border upon dishonesty and outright misleading of the public in these matters. I therefore believe that in closing this debate it is more appropriate for me to summarise and emphasise what the Bill enables and does, rather than spend time in correcting the futile and misleading assumptions of the Opposition.

This Bill, in summary, provides: first, a 'world first' in security of tenure whilst retaining the discretionary alternative of expiring tenure, and existing powers of resumption; and introducing the flexibility of 14-year covenant review and lease management planning to meet changing needs and protect the public interest in arid land resources. The tenures proposed thus bear no resemblance or relationship to perpetual leases under the Crown Lands Act; secondly, a statutory policy framework to guide future management of the lands on a joint use and sustained yield basis; thirdly, a statutory forum for presentation, discussion and consideration of all public and land use interests; fourthly, the authority to delegate Ministerial powers to the Pastoral Board thus enhancing that board's management role; fifthly, repeal of archaic procedural humbug and hitherto valuation and development-based land management conditions and criteria; sixthly, redirection of the land management philosophy of the legislation on the basis of land and renewable resources, condition and trend; and, finally, the potential, subject to Government policies, to recover into Crown ownership, at no cost, areas of conservation, Aboriginal heritage, and other public interest significance.

In relation to public access to pastoral lands, it should be noted that the Bill only precludes public use of private tracks and cross country traversing by vehicles. The provisions of

the Bill do not in any way preclude public access to the lands by bushwalkers, birdwatchers, fossickers, photographers, and so on, travelling on foot or horseback from a proclaimed network of public roads. The Bill also provides for lessee and Ministerial permission, and exemptions of classes of persons and areas of the lands, together with differential proclamation. This latter provision will permit establishment of the Outback Management Advisory Committee and its involvement in the determination of adequate public road and access routes, together with management regulations, prior to proclamation of that section of the Bill. Clearly this subsequent involvement of the advisory committee will accommodate public views and result in the determination and annual review of an adequate public road network and regulatory protection of all land users interests in an equitable manner. Therefore, it is quite obvious that it is not proposed to preclude the public from their use and enjoyment of the State's outback, but rather to clarify and establish the rights of all outback land users in an equitable manner.

In presenting this Bill to Parliament the Government has provided the first major proposal in over 40 years for amendments to the Pastoral Act, which have long been sought and advocated by a wide range of outback land use interests, including those of conservation. In my view, it is sad that those who oppose the Bill as introduced have based their opposition on unfounded assumptions and factual inaccuracies provided from sources of undoubted skill in scientific disciplines, but devoid of expertise in the statutory administration and management of land resources through the tenure system. Regrettably, these circumstances have resulted in uninformed, inaccurate and misleading statements regarding the Government's proposals. I also consider it unfortunate that opposition to the Bill has been characterised by an attitude of confrontation, rather than one which is directed towards compromise. Opponents of this Bill are apparently anxious to slam the door on the current rare opportunity for amendment to the Pastoral Act, turn the clock back to 1936, and condemn outback lands to the continuation of a legislative and management system of which conservation interests have been outspokenly critical for many years.

In closing this debate I point out that the provisions of this Bill have been carefully co-ordinated with the requirements of the Flinders Ranges and Far North Authorised Development Plans. It is therefore the view of the Government that the Pastoral Act Amendment Bill of 1982, coupled with these development plans, constitutes a concise, complementary, flexible legislative and planning package which will henceforth strengthen and enhance the statutory and administrative ability of the Government to manage the State's outback lands in a manner which will benefit those resources and also the people of South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And also give it to McLachlan.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Mr Blevins should not let his left wing attitudes override his good sense.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: McLachlan hasn't got enough yet.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Anne Levy: Left wing attitudes are good sense.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was pleased to hear the Hon. Miss Levy say that left wing attitudes are good sense. It is nice to hear the truth coming out from members opposite. I would have thought that members opposite have had so much to do with the left wing recently that they would put it back in the drawer for a while. However, this is a very serious matter. The Government has been endeavouring to compromise with those interests that have opposed parts of this Bill over the past few weeks. Many conferences have

been held, and I am pleased to see that the Opposition, through the Hon. Mr Chatterton, has amendments on file which, no doubt, will be argued in detail if the Bill passes the second reading stage.

The third Party represented in this Chamber, the Australian Democrats, has also been holding discussions with those who favour the Bill and those opposed to it. If the Democrats place amendments on file they will also be argued at length during the Committee stage. However, to reach that stage of democratic discussion in a genuine endeavour to improve the Bill, which is what those members intend when they place amendments on file, the Bill must first pass the second reading stage. I urge all members to support the second reading of this Bill.

The Council divided on the second reading:

Ayes (9)—The Hons J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, K. T. Griffin, C. M. Hill (teller), D. H. Laidlaw, and R. J. Ritson.

Noes (10)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G. L. Bruce, B. A. Chatterton (teller), J. R. Cornwall, M. S. Feleppa, N. K. Foster, Anne Levy, K. L. Milne, C. J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Pair—Aye—The Hon. L. H. Davis. No—The Hon. C. W. Creedon.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendment.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendment.

I am curious that this message is going backwards and forwards between the two Houses over the name of one person out of 12 delegates to the Australian Constitutional Convention. The argument has been well canvassed whether Mr Blacker or Mrs Southcott, the recently-elected member for Mitcham, should be the eighth nominee to the delegation.

I have put the point of view that Mr Blacker is the senior of the three members of the House of Assembly who occupy the cross benches in that place. Mr Blacker has been a member since the early 1970s; Mr Peterson has been a member since the last election in 1979; and Mrs Southcott has been a member for only three weeks.

There is some logic in the longest-serving cross bencher in that place being the eighth member of the delegation. One could put a number of arguments for or against that, but I hope that this Council can resolve the matter rather than send it back to the House of Assembly. The ultimate consequence is a conference of managers of both Houses, and I am sure that no-one really wants that to happen on an issue such as this.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It's part of the democratic process.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have no difficulties in accepting that, but it does not seem to be a matter of such major consequence—

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: It's a bit difficult to think of a compromise, isn't it.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I suppose there are a number of compromises, one of which is that Mr Peterson, the Independent Labor candidate, should be the nominee. We have tried to avoid any suggestion that politics is involved in this by taking the logical conclusion that the longest serving member should be the eighth member of the delegation. I suppose that, if Mr Peterson had been nominated,

one could perhaps allege that it involved an attempt to use the delegation for political purposes. We certainly do not want to do that, and that is why we are maintaining the structure that was established by former Governments.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): I do not want to give the impression that this matter is of great moment as far as the Council is concerned, but the Opposition took the view that the third Party in the Parliament is the Australian Democrats, that it has two members and that, therefore, it should be entitled to a place on the Constitutional Convention delegation before the Country Party member, Mr Blacker, who is the only representative of that Party in the Parliament.

I suggested to the Attorney-General that this matter should be able to be resolved and that he should hot foot it to the Premier and get him to talk to the Leader of the Opposition in another place, so that they could fix up their problems, which are not our difficulty. However, for some reason the Attorney-General has not been able to do that, although I am not sure to what extent he tried.

The alternative is that we leave the matter until July and discuss it informally. If we can reach agreement in that way, we can advise the convention secretariat regarding the delegation that has been agreed on, and it can then be approved formally when Parliament resumes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A further option is that Mr Milne should go as the senior Democrat.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: That would need the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think that it would agree.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Does the Hon. Mr DeGaris think that the Hon. Mr Milne is a more worthy member of Parliament than is Mrs Southcott?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: More experienced.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yes. He is a former Agent-General in London and a former Chairman of the State Government Insurance Commission. I suppose that, if the Hon. Miss Levy was not present in the Chamber, I could say that Mrs Southcott is merely a housewife. Personally, I do not appreciate the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, because I think that Mrs Southcott would be a far better representative on the convention than even the Hon. Mr Milne. However, thinking out aloud on this matter is certainly not getting us far. I do not want to have to go through the procedure of voting. Is there any point in the Attorney's reporting progress on the matter and discussing it with the Premier?

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: I do not think that there is much point. Your Leader has spoken very much in favour of it.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: We have this important decision to make, so I will have to listen to the debate and consider my decision, bearing in mind the arguments that are advanced.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It seems to me that this matter should be fairly quickly and easily resolved, because from my experience I think that this Council would resent any attempt by the House of Assembly to tell us who its four representatives should be. We are getting a long way past the democratic process when we try to dictate to the House of Assembly who one of its eight members in the delegation should be. That being so, I support the motion that the Council do not insist on its amendment and state that we should observe the democratic process by accepting the decision of the House of Assembly regarding its own delegation.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I do not think that this should get to the undignified stage of debate at enormous length. Mrs Southcott feels that she has been overlooked and is

upset about it. She is interested in this subject and has studied it a great deal. She would be a good representative. The argument is that it would give the fairest mix of attitudes to the delegation. On the other hand, I can see the Hon. Mr Dawkins's view and I do not know how we would feel if the House of Assembly tried to change a decision made in this Council. It is unfair and unfortunate and I wish that we could have another discussion on the matter or get the Attorney to discuss the matter with the Premier.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:
That the Council at its rising adjourn until 8 July 1982.

That is the date, I have been informed, by which all the procedural formalities can be complied with before Parliament is prorogued. The next session will commence at the end of July. This is an appropriate occasion to record specific appreciation to all those people who have worked so hard during this session, which started in July last year. It has been a particularly long session in terms of sitting times. Whilst I have not done any calculations, it seems that it has been a longer period of sitting and involved more frequent sittings than has been the case for many years, if not for ever.

We have certainly sat for longer periods of time. There have been many late nights, and all of that brings much pressure, not only on members of the Council but also on those who provide services to the Council and Parliament. There is special pressure on *Hansard* reporters and their typists who, behind the scenes, work so hard to ensure that *Hansard* pulls are ready on the next day and, between sessions, not only do they service committees but also they work hard in getting ready for the next part of the sittings or the next session. I want to pay a special tribute to the *Hansard* staff and their typistes and those who work with them.

In addition, I want to say that we very much appreciate the work that has been done by the officers of the Council, the table officers and those who service the Council behind the scenes, the messengers and others such as Parliamentary Counsel, Library staff, caretakers, catering staff, telephonists and a whole range of people who play an important part in making Parliament tick and who often spend many more long hours than we do ensuring that this place runs satisfactorily. I want to record our appreciation to all those many people who provide those services. They are often unrecognised because they do not appear in the public spotlight. It is important that we note on the record, officially and formally, that their services are not unnoticed by Council members.

We have already recorded a vote of sympathy for the family and relatives of the late Hon. Jim Dunford. It was a very sad event in the life of this Chamber. I have already congratulated the Hon. Mario Feleppa on having taken his place in this Chamber. I suppose that in many respects he may be wondering, after his impressions of the last three weeks, exactly what he has let himself in for. He has already demonstrated his capability during Question Time to cope with all of the exigencies, contingencies and uncertainties of Parliamentary life. I do not want to make any special reference to the events of this week, other than to say that it has been a time of considerable pressure for many people but particularly on one member of this Council, and it is appropriate to at least note that that pressure and tension has been recognised and, whatever people might say, that member—the Hon. Norm Foster—has made his contribution

under considerable public and private pressure in this Chamber.

Whilst there is little formal business remaining, it is appropriate to make those comments about this session and to say that we look forward to having everybody back in reasonable spirits in the next session. I have been handed a note which probably applies to both sides of the Chamber and that is that I should not forget to thank the unpaid Whips. Many honourable members have certain views on the unpaid Whips. They, too, should be mentioned at this time. I am pleased to be able to make those comments.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): It is traditional for the Leader of the Opposition to agree with the Leader of the Government and to concur in his remarks of thanks to the Council, the staff and other people who work in the Parliament. I do that. I do not intend to say any more than that I endorse the Attorney-General's remarks. The fact that I do not intend to speak at any length should not be taken as any indication of a lack of warmth. There were certain other remarks made by the Attorney-General with which I would emphatically disagree, but I will not go into those.

The Hon. K. L. MILNE: I support the remarks made by the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition, both of whom have covered the situation adequately. I join with them in the thanks which they gave. I thank the Attorney-General for his courtesy and restraint in the very difficult session which we have had during which emotions ran high, and deep seated beliefs came to the fore. It was traumatic at times but it is good for Parliament to have a session like that to remind us that we have differences of opinion and can handle the situation with dignity. I congratulate the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition on guiding the Parliament through this difficult time. The note of sadness was the tremendous pressure which was brought on the Hon. Norm Foster for what was really a democratic decision. We have to be careful when these occasions arise, and they will arise for most of us at one time or another. I understand Mr Foster's feelings very well. We must realise that sometimes somebody may have a deep seated belief and feeling on a matter and he should be allowed to express it. I thank my colleagues for their courtesy and wish them well during the break.

The PRESIDENT: It would be remiss of me not to take this opportunity to thank the many people who have helped me. I am sure they have helped with the running of Parliament, too. I refer to the *Hansard* staff, the messengers, officers within this Chamber and the catering staff. Each and every one has had some obligation to service the Par-

liament throughout the year. I thank the Leaders, the Attorney-General and the Hon. Mr Sumner, and the Whips for their co-operation during this session. We have already referred to the sad event of the Hon. Mr Dunford's passing. Regarding the last and most controversial debate that we have had—probably one of the most controversial in my time in Parliament—I would compliment the speakers. Their contributions in general were excellent.

I thank members for the amount of decorum they showed during the debate. Each of the contributions was to the point and explained clearly the dangers and values of uranium mining. I was saddened to see the distress that this issue placed upon the Hon. Mr Foster—a man whose integrity is unchallenged. I thank honourable members for their assistance during this session.

[Sitting suspended from 3.21 to 3.45 p.m.]

LIBRARIES BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendments:

No. 1. New clause 19, page 7—insert new clause as follows:
19. Borrowings.

(1) The Board may, with the consent of the Treasurer, borrow moneys for the purposes of this Act.

(2) The obligations of the Board under any loan contracted under subsection (1) are guaranteed by the Treasurer.

(3) Any moneys required to be paid in pursuance of a guarantee under subsection (2) shall be paid out of the General Revenue of the State which is appropriated to the necessary extent.

No. 2. New clause 30, page 10—insert new clause as follows:
30. Exemption from land tax.

No land held by, or on behalf of, an institute and used by the institute for the purposes of the institute shall be liable to land tax.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

These two clauses are the additional money clauses which were printed in erased type in the original Bill as it was first seen in this Chamber. The Bill went to the other place, and these clauses have now been inserted in the Bill.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I support the Minister. It is obviously necessary for this legislation to have money clauses. These amendments are entirely reasonable.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday 8 July at 2.15 p.m.