LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 29 July 1982

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

QUESTIONS

TAX EVASION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Yesterday I asked the Attorney-General a question about criticisms of the State Corporate Affairs Commission in the McCabe and Lanfranchi Report on tax evasion prepared for the Victorian Government. The accusation was made that the Corporate Affairs Commission had struck off companies from its registers without proper investigation. I understand that the Attorney-General has a response to my question.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I was concerned about the suggestions made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, that in some way or other the Corporate Affairs Commission's practice had assisted those who sought to avoid or evade their Federal taxation responsibilities. Accordingly, I sought an urgent response from the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs as to the practice within the State Corporate Affairs Commission. The Commissioner told me that officers from the Taxation Department had attended the offices of the Corporate Affairs Commission in Adelaide to discuss with the Corporate Affairs Commission staff the appropriate strike-off procedures.

There is a continuing liaison regarding this matter and the Corporate Affairs Commission is at present deferring the strike-off of a number of companies to assist Taxation Department inquiries. About two months ago, the Corporate Affairs Commissioner, on his own initiative, and with a member of his investigation staff, personally attended at the office of the Chief Investigation Officer for the Taxation Department in Adelaide to discuss generally the position with respect to co-operation by the Corporate Affairs Commission with the Taxation Department.

The Commissioner informs me that the reason for this was that the commission did not in any way want to unwittingly assist in the avoidance of the payment of revenue that was properly due. The question of strike-offs was discussed at the conference and the position of the Taxation Department was noted. The Corporate Affairs Commissioner undertook on that occasion to ensure that the commission would not take steps that disadvantaged the Taxation Department in the enforcement of taxation legislation.

There are two procedures by which a decision is taken whether or not a company should be struck from the register: first, by way of request from the company and, secondly, on the initiative of the commission because of continued non-lodgement of required documents.

Where the company requests that it be struck from the register, the commission requires detailed financial information, in particular, the last balance sheet for the company, accompanied by a statutory declaration that the company is no longer in business, that it has no assets and that the balance sheet is correct. This declaration must be made out by an officer (either a Director or Secretary) of the company. The manager of the registration division then decides whether the company may be struck off. The basic determining factor is that no tangible assets exist and, therefore, there is no point in having the company liquidated.

The second course is where the commission decides to strike a company off. That is not done unless, first, the company has not lodged at least three annual returns, and no reason has been given for that default; secondly, notices have been sent to the company's registered office, and to the directors at their last known home addresses, stating that failure to respond within 30 days will result in commencement of strike-off proceedings, and no reply has been received; and, thirdly, checking that no communication from any interested party (for example, creditors, Taxation Office) has been submitted requesting that the company remain upon the register.

Having decided to strike the company off, the commission sends a notice to that effect to the registered office of the company and, failing a reply within one month, a notice is placed in the *Commonwealth Gazette*, formerly the State *Government Gazette* (the *Commonwealth Gazette* because we now have a co-operative national scheme for regulating national companies and securities), stating that, unless cause to the contrary is shown within three months, a further notice will appear and the company will be struck from the register.

So, there are quite extensive investigational procedures before deciding whether or not a company should be struck off, and there is a process for publicly notifying the commission's intention if remedial action is not taken.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What has happened in the past?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: That has been the practice in the past. The practice that I am identifying was the practice under the old Companies Act. I have indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that over the past few months there has been closer contact between the State Corporate Affairs Commission and the Federal Taxation Department to ensure that nothing is done in this State that would disadvantage the Commonwealth in the collection of outstanding revenue.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Before that, they were striking them off without consulting the Taxation Department.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: No. The procedure was that notice was given publicly of an intention to strike-off. One presumes that investigating officers in various areas of Government would check the various gazettes to see what action was being taken and, if there was an inquiry, it would necessarily be followed up by the Corporate Affairs Commission. However, if there was no comment by any person interested as a result of that notification procedure, the company would be struck off.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: In other words, they didn't specifically contact the Taxation Department?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There was no reason to do so prior to the past few months, when the difficulty was drawn to the attention of the Corporate Affairs Commission, which has responded quite quickly to ensure that adequate liaison occurs.

I can also say that, if a company is struck off, that is not the end of the matter, because it can always be reinstated on the register if there is a certain difficulty. So, although companies may have been struck off in circumstances where no-one made any representation to leave the company concerned on the register, notwithstanding the extensive notification procedures, if there is evidence of a particular problem, the company can be reinstated on the register; no-one has been disadvantaged by that procedure.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: These schemes have been around for a long time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: They have not been publicly, or even privately, brought to the attention of those who do not have a specific responsibility for administering the revenue legislation. Corporate Affairs Commissions in all States have a registration responsibility.

They are not there to administer revenue collection for other Governments: they are there to register companies and ensure that adequate information is available on the public register. There are adequate procedures which would

notify the intention of a Corporate Affairs Commission to strike-off by publicly giving notice of that intention. It cannot be suggested that it is being done by a Corporate Affairs Commission in ignorance. In fact, there are adequate procedures available.

No-one is disadvantaged because, if there is an adequate reason, a company that has been struck off can be reinstated to the register. I am reassured by the response I have received from the Corporate Affairs Commission (particularly in view of the public attention that has been focused on a possible problem within State jurisdictions) that the South Australian Corporate Affairs Commission is acting responsibly and is assisting the Federal taxation authorities in ensuring that nothing is done within this jurisdiction which would disadvantage the Commonwealth.

NATIONAL COMPANIES CODE

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Corporate Affairs a question about the new National Companies Code.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. H. DAVIS: Recently, I became aware of a small business letter put out by one Mr Phil Ward which, I understand, receives wide circulation in Australia. Mr Ward's newsletter makes certain allegations in relation to the new National Companies Code which came into effect in all States on 1 July. Mr Ward, in his small business letter dated 12 July 1982, makes the following allegations: as a result of the new National Companies Code which came into effect on 1 July it is impossible to ask one's spouse or brother to join in a business venture; it is not possible for a small business to start up, except as a sole trader; small businesses will be unable to merge; and existing small businesses are unable to expand by taking on new partners or shareholders.

These serious allegations are written in quite emotive language. In fact, they are so serious that Mr Ward has seen fit to include a draft letter with every copy of his newsletter urging subscribers to follow the draft format and write to their local M.P. and complain. In fact, the draft letter commences:

> The new companies code and securities code are probably the strongest attacks on small business in probably a decade.

In view of the comments made in this small business letter and the wide circulation it has received, I ask the Minister whether he is aware of the newsletter. Secondly, if so, will he advise the Council whether or not the allegations contained in the newsletter are true or false? Thirdly, if the allegations are false, what action does the Minister propose to correct them? Fourthly, has the Minister or the Corporate Affairs Commission received any private responses, for example, through local members of Parliament, from people who have adhered to Mr Ward's advice and written a letter of complaint? Fifthly, what is being done to ensure that these individuals are supplied with the correct information?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not sure whether Mr Ward was seeking to gain some public recognition for his newspaper by promoting this attitude in relation to the uniform companies and securities scheme, which came into operation on 1 July this year. If he was seeking to give it credibility, I think he has failed dismally. What he has said in that letter is quite false. It is a great pity that he did not bother to check the facts with the Corporate Affairs Commission in this State, in any other State or with the National Companies and Securities Commission before he went into print. I think most, if not all, honourable members would be aware that the Corporate Affairs Commission in this State is charged with the administrative responsibility for the new companies code under general guidelines promulgated by the National Companies and Securities Commission based in Melbourne.

The matters raised by Mr Ward are not correct. None of the allegations raised by him are prohibited in the new companies code. In this State we are not seeking to hamper private enterprise: we want to encourage it and encourage small business in every way.

Certainly, we would not be party to any State or national legislation which would in any way thwart or handicap small business. As I say, his allegations are false. I think he is under a misunderstanding about what is meant by an offer to the public as defined in the new code. The new code adopts in principle the same scheme as is in the existing law with respect to offers to the public.

In that context it ought to be said that generally the law is directed towards protecting members of the public from dishonest promoters and towards ensuring that prospective investors are fully informed. Offers to the public have to be, generally speaking, by means of a prospectus. So far as is relevant in this context, the existing definition of 'the public' has been amended in the new scheme by adding certain words, as follows:

> Notwithstanding that the offer is capable of acceptance only by each person to whom it is made or that an offer or application may be made pursuant to the invitation only by a person to whom the invitation is issued . . .

That takes account of a 1964 High Court decision which suggested that, to be regarded as an offer to the public, an offer would need to be made generally and be capable of being acted upon by any member of the public, not only by those to whom it is addressed. Whether or not there is an offer to the public is largely a matter of fact and has to be determined having regard to all the circumstances of a particular offer or what may purport to be an offer to the public.

I am concerned that Mr Ward's allegations are false and that they are mischievous and could be quite misleading to those members of the business community who might not have the benefit of independent advice from someone qualified to give that advice. The new scheme is complicated but the Commissioner for Corporate Affairs in this State has been undertaking a series of visits to various centres in South Australia to explain the new companies and securities code to members of the public and the business community.

He was at Port Lincoln recently and is going to the Iron Triangle cities in the not too distant future, and there will be other such seminars designed to allay the unnecessary and unjustified fears of members of the public, not only in relation to Mr Ward's comments but also concerning any other difficulty that they may believe they could experience. The letter has had wide circulation.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: A letter was sent to me by a constituent.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Hear, hear!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It seems that the Leader is not the only member to receive that sort of thing. The national scheme legislation was agreed to in 1978 when the predecessor of the former Leader of the Opposition was Attorney-General. It was agreed to by the Labor Governments of New South Wales and Tasmania and by both political Parties in the various States and Commonwealth. I will be ensuring that as much publicity as possible is given to the inaccuracies reflected in Mr Ward's statement both in the media and by personal communication with those people who have indicated that they have received such letters. The National Companies and Securities Commission has a copy of the letter and is also writing to Mr Ward to point out the grave errors that are reflected in that mischievous article.

PETROL PRICES

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs about petrol prices and retailing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Honourable members will recall the difficulty which arose last year in the area of petrol retailing and pricing. They will also recall the actions of this Government in connection with this matter in initially imposing a 3c reduction in the wholesale price of petrol, as recommended by the Prices Justification Tribunal, subsequently removing that price order and then, later, reimposing it. That order is still in existence.

I understand that, in recent times, there have been some further difficulties in this area and that the discounting which initially led the Government to take action is continuing. Because of this, some retailers are finding themselves in increasing financial difficulty. I further believe that a submission dealing with this topic has been made to the Premier and the Minister by the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce. That submission recommends the fixing of wholesale and retail petrol prices; a further reduction in the wholesale price; the setting of a retail price to provide a fair profit margin; the implementation of a divorcement Act requiring the oil companies to not have a direct interest in the retailing of petrol. Further, the submission raises the question of the right to purchase petrol supplies by a retailer off-brand—that is, from a source other than the company to which the retailer is tied by some contractual arrangement. Will the Minister say whether the Government considered this submission and, if so, what action, if any, does it intend taking in relation to it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government has considered the submission and responded to it. I propose to give answers in some detail and, also, to point out that when any trade organisation, trade union, or similar organisation approaches the Government, broadly speaking, it is best that the Government's response has some measure of confidentiality. At present South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth which has any measure of price control on petrol.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It is 5c a litre dearer than in Queensland.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is not 5c a litre dearer here than in Queensland at present. That is not accurate.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I was there a fortnight ago.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Very well, but that is not correct.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Are you calling me a liar?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No, I just said that that was not correct and, indeed, it is not correct. The price is still settling down after the recent price increase, but the most common price in South Australia is about 37.4c a litre.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Where do you get it?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the northern suburbs. I see that price every day while driving to work.

The Hon. G. L. Bruce: The common price is 39.9c per litre.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: A price of 39.9c per litre is about the highest price being charged.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is not the most common price at all: the most common price is about 37.4c a litre.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I will ask you a question on that now.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: You can ask me any questions you like. Since the recent increase introduced by the P.P.P.A., it has taken some time for retail prices to settle down. This is a problem at the present time. The increases were not all made at the same time, but were made separately in regard to different companies. One of the last companies to be granted the increase was Shell, which is the market leader in South Australia. I look at petrol prices displayed at service stations as I drive into the city and I am informed that super petrol is still available for 35.1c a litre in South Australia. When driving along the Lower North East Road, I find that prices start at 37.4c a litre and, when one gets to the Maid and Magpie corner, one sees that the price is 37.1c a litre.

Yesterday I was informed that there is still one petrol station which sells super petrol for 35.1c a litre, but I am not sure where that is. In the southern suburbs the prices for petrol are dearer, and the highest price is 39.9c a litre. In Melbourne the price is 40.5c a litre and is not cheaper than the South Australian price. Queensland petrol also is not cheaper than South Australian petrol.

At the present time we are carefully looking at the new increases by the P.P.P.A. to let the retail price at the pump (and that is what counts to the motorist) settle down. I emphasise that South Australia is the only State where there is any price control at all. In New South Wales there was price control and the Labor Government removed it. We fix the maximum wholesale price at 3c less than the P.P.P.A. wholesale price.

In South Australia there is some discounting, and I do not think that there is anything wrong with this discounting. In many areas and with all sorts of products if anyone says, 'No-one can sell at a lower price than anyone else', that is not the right way to go about it.

The Leader of the Opposition, when asking the question, referred to some service stations being in financial difficulties. I am sure that this is so and I have said this before—and it is perfectly true—that one of the problems in South Australia with the petrol reselling industry is the proliferation of sites: there are too many of them. The previous Government addressed that and held a select committee into the matter and, after it saw the outcome, decided not to do anything about it by way of legislation or any other Government measures. The select committee was chaired by the Hon. J. D. Wright and looked at the possibility of taking special action on the number of sites and decided not to do anything about it. I am sure that that was the correct decision.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Didn't that select committee have more to do with the hours when petrol stations could open?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was also to do with the number of sites: that was part of the terms of reference. What I am saying is that, because there is a proliferation of sites and because this is a matter which no Government, either the previous or the present Government, has been prepared to address, there will be some retailers in difficulty.

The Leader raised the question of whether we intend to fix prices. The answer is 'No'. No other State does this and no other State even has a maximum wholesale price, as we do in this State. This State does not intend to fix prices. This would have to be done by legislation and, if price fixing were warranted, it would not be a problem, but the Government does not believe price fixing is the answer. I think that the Leader's question was addressed to the retail price, but—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Wholesale.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government does not intend to reduce the wholesale price by 3c and extend it to 6c, as it has been asked to do by the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. On the other hand, the Government does not intend to remove or vary the present 3c reduction below

the P.P.P.A. justified wholesale price. The Government intends that the situation should remain as it is.

Regarding the question of divorcement, the Government, the Premier and I, have always made it perfectly clear that we support the full Fife package and 100 per cent divorcement on a Federal basis; we do not support it on a State basis. It does not apply in any other State and would distort the general Australian picture. This is a national industry. From the advice tendered to me it is clear that on a State basis it would be unconstitutional and, therefore, ineffective.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Mr Justice Millhouse thought it could be done constitutionally.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: When the previous member for Mitcham was a member of Parliament he did not say that: he said that, because it had not been decided, one might as well give it a go. The honourable member did not say that it could be done constitutionally. In my view it would be irresponsible for a Government to sponsor a measure where it has been advised comprehensively that it would be unconstitutional.

In regard to the right to purchase, the first thing that must be said is that, under the determinations of the Trade Practices Commission, what might be called a negative right to purchase has been granted. It is in this form: if an oil company seeks to impose on a lessee a condition that part of the product be purchased from the oil company, that will not be considered to be restrictive as long as it does not extend beyond 50 per cent. So there is presently, in effect, a negative right to purchase 50 per cent of a product from other than the lessee's oil company. The previous Victorian Government introduced a specific right to the reseller to purchase 50 per cent from other than the oil company concerned.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Twenty minutes; that is an outrageous time to take to answer one question.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The question was asked by the Opposition.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: I don't think you should give your Address in Reply speech now.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not. I strongly support the decision of the Federal Government that the positive right to purchase should be implemented on a Federal basis. It would not be satisfactory on a State basis. If the Federal Government will not do it, I am prepared to consider it.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I have a supplementary question. In light of the answers given, can the Minister state the number of service stations in the metropolitan area selling super petrol below 39c a litre and the number of service stations selling super petrol above 39c a litre?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will endeavour to obtain that information, but it is very hard to obtain. Officers are constantly trying to obtain those levels throughout the metropolitan area. I certainly can obtain the most common price and have an investigation made, as I have set this in train already, and I will give the honourable member the answer to this investigation. However, we cannot monitor every service station in the metropolitan area every day.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: I should like to ask a supplementary question on the same subject.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We cannot have too many supplementary questions.

The Hon. G. L. BRUCE: On what information did the Minister base his answer in reply to my earlier question?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Largely on the basis of the prices that I have seen on the boards.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: My observations lead me to believe that there is almost a 7c tolerance, and anyone who was not blind could see that. Will the Minister, with the best possible methods available to his department, make a check in respect of the industry in the next 48 hours and, between now and when the Council next meets, peg the price of petrol to a tolerance of 1c a litre?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question regarding drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In the issue of the *Stock Journal* published today is a review of the United Farmers and Stockowners annual conference, and a report that Mr Andrews, that body's Secretary, gave to the conference. The journal states:

> Presenting his report to the U.F.S. annual conference, Mr Andrews also strongly criticised both the Federal and State Governments for failing to recognise the disastrous economic effects of drought on the rural producer.

The report continues:

> 'We could well see a situation arise where farmers are forced to accept drought relief rather than be allowed to rehabilitate themselves,' he said.
>
> In other words, farmers were likely to become more regulated at a time when they needed the greatest monetary flexibility possible.

Mr Andrews is obviously referring to the situation that occurred before the 1976-78 drought, when the assistance that was available to farmers in the form of carry-on loans and other drought relief measures was highly regulated and inflexible. Indeed, it was considered by most farmers in the State to be of little value.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: A Labor Government was in office then.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I referred to the situation that occurred before the 1976-78 drought. During that drought, the whole scheme that had been in force for many decades was changed, and it became a much more flexible operation, which was widely used by farmers in this State and, indeed, was praised by most farmer organisations. It disturbs me that Mr Andrews, in his report, seems to believe that the Government will implement an old and outdated scheme that was discarded in 1976-78.

Will the Minister say whether the Government intends to return to that old type of drought assistance scheme where farmers were highly regulated by the Lands Department, or whether it is the Government's intention to use the type of scheme which was developed in 1976-78 and which was so successful?

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

REGENCY HOUSE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question regarding Regency House.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No, we are a bit short of time.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question regarding

equal opportunities staff in the Department of Technical and Further Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: The Equal Opportunities Officer in the Department of Technical and Further Education was appointed a couple of years ago after considerable public pressure, as I am sure the Minister will remember. Initially, the incumbent had no staff at all, although she was told that, if necessity could be demonstrated, some staff would be provided.

Eventually, a half-time assistant was provided, and I understand that currently two half-time assistants are working in the Equal Opportunities Office of the Department of Technical and Further Education. These people are not permanently assigned to the office but are, in fact, seconded from elsewhere in the department. Furthermore, they are both shortly to return to their original positions and are to be replaced in the Equal Opportunities Office by one full-time person, who is again being seconded for a period of five months only. This hardly seems a very satisfactory situation in the Equal Opportunities Office and must make it very difficult for the Equal Opportunities Adviser to plan programmes with any degree of continuity.

Will the Minister of Education say what steps are being taken to provide permanent non-seconded staff to the Equal Opportunities Office in the Department of Technical and Further Education, and when such a provision will be *(a)* announced and *(b)* implemented?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring back a reply.

COMPUTER CHECK-OUTS

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, a question regarding computer check-outs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: Although my Leader in this Chamber, the Hon. Mr Sumner, asked a question on this matter on 20 July, I am still concerned about it. With much publicity recently in the media, the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown), the latest champion of the computer check-out, told the public that 400 jobs would be lost with the introduction of this new system.

First, I ask the Minister on which side his crocodile tears are shed. Secondly, people would have been pleased to their hearts if the Minister's Cabinet colleague, the Minister responsible for consumer protection, had likewise informed and guaranteed the public, indeed our housewives, and all other harassed consumers in this State that this new automated coded system was not heavily loaded in favour of the ever-inventive retail traders and the hungry mouths of ringing cash registers.

Therefore, using my imagination, I ask whether it would be correct to assume that, apart from a detailed docket, hardly any other benefit will flow to the consumer and the large majority of our community. Can the Minister and the Government assure us that at all times the prices of goods will be clearly visible on the shelves to the potential purchaser, as the law prescribes, so that he will be aware of overt and covert variations of products within stores, as well as between one store and another, especially where those on low incomes are looking for bargains? Can consumers be assured that at all times the price indicated on an item or on the shelf will be the price charged when it is paid for at the check-out?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: As the Hon. Mr Feleppa said, a question has been asked about this matter before during this session. I have already replied in relation to the consumer aspect and I do not propose to reply again.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about individual price marking?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In my previous reply I said that at present the Government does not propose to take that step.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: There will be no individual price marking?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Government does not propose to make that compulsory, as it is not compulsory at present. Consumer Affairs Ministers throughout Australia are looking at a code of conduct, and I have explained this in some detail already. If honourable members would like a lengthy explanation I am prepared to give it, as I did in relation to the question about petrol prices. This question was addressed to me, as representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, whose investigation related to jobs. I will refer this question to the Minister of Industrial Affairs and bring down a reply.

ALICE SPRINGS COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICE

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the Alice Springs Department for Community Welfare Office.

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Last month, I asked a series of Questions on Notice about the functions, staff and cost of operating the Alice Springs D.C.W. Office. The Minister advised that that office is the base for welfare patrols and services for Aboriginal people in the North-West of this State. I take up this matter again because it concerns me that in times of financial stringency, when services are being curtailed all over the State (in fact, offices such as that at Oodnadatta are being closed down altogether), the office servicing the North-West of this State is situated outside the South Australian border. There is nothing in the Minister's reply to indicate that there were any special reasons for placing the office at Alice Springs rather than at another location inside the South Australian border.

What are the functions performed by the Alice Springs office which require it to be located in Alice Springs rather than at a suitable South Australian location, say, at Oodnadatta or Mintabie? If there is no particular reason for it to be situated at Alice Springs, will the Minister consider moving it to a South Australian centre so that more South Australians can benefit from the services it provides?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Alice Springs office was set up by the previous Government and not by the present Government.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: That's irrelevant.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is not irrelevant at all. It was set up in Alice Springs for a reason. At that time, Alice Springs appeared to be the location best situated to provide services to the Aboriginal community particularly and to white people situated in the area of the North-West Reserve. It was situated outside of South Australia because Alice Springs seemed to be the best place from which to conduct those services. The relocation of the Alice Springs office has been seriously considered recently and over a period of time.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Not to Mintabie, though.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No, not to Mintabie. The honourable member asked whether we are considering relo-

cating it. We are certainly considering relocating that office, very much so, probably to Coober Pedy, which is a suitable place from which to service the entire northern area of the State. That alternative has been given most consideration at present.

The office was established at Alice Springs purely for logistical reasons. Alice Springs was considered the best place to service the North-West Reserve. I have visited the Alice Springs office and I have accompanied patrols in the North-West Reserve. I can certainly see the advantages in siting the office in that area. I hope it can be relocated within the State, and the Government is certainly considering that possibility.

CONCRETE FOOTPATHS

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Housing a question about the Ombudsman's criticism of the Housing Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I refer to an article which appeared in yesterday's *Gawler Bunyip* (I think it is also referred to in this morning's *Advertiser*) headed 'Housing Trust is stubborn—Ombudsman', as follows:

The Ombudsman, Mr Bob Bakewell, has strongly criticised the South Australian Housing Trust for its 'unnecessarily stubborn' attitude over the building of concrete footpaths and entranceways at Elizabeth Field. The trust has refused to compromise with the Munno Para District Council over the thickness of the concrete to be used, despite a formal recommendation by the Ombudsman to the Minister of Local Government, Mr Murray Hill.

Mr Bakewell said this week the Minister had chosen not to direct the trust to comply with the recommendations. He said: 'I'm deeply concerned that two supposedly responsible public bodies could not agree to a compromise proposal and that local residents have unduly suffered because of the dispute.' While criticising the S.A.H.T., Mr Bakewell commended the council's subsequent action in backing down completely in the interests of ratepayers because the trust had 'dug its toes in and wouldn't budge'.

The dispute concerns the building of concrete footpaths and entranceways on the former South Australian Land Commission subdivision in Pix Road. The subdivision was sold to the S.A.H.T. in mid-1979. A provision of the sale was that the trust take over the S.A.L.C.'s responsibility for the building of footpaths and entranceways.

A proposal was subsequently submitted to the council by the S.A.H.T. for the construction of 60 mm thick concrete footpaths and 100 mm non-reinforced concrete entranceways. However, the council said that its standard for footpaths was for them to be constructed of concrete 75 mm thick and for entranceways to be of reinforced concrete 130 mm thick.

Mr Bakewell said that, after the two bodies had failed to agree, he was called to intervene. 'After some discussion the council agreed to reduce the thickness of the entranceway to 125 mm,' he said. 'Yet this was still unacceptable to the trust. The council argued that, where the trust had built concrete footpaths to its standard, it subsequently had to spend up to $20 000 a year to maintain them. The council provided photographic evidence of damage to footpaths built to the trust's recommendations.'

'The trust on the other hand argued that many other South Australian councils had accepted the trust's standard. Eventually, my investigating officer suggested a compromise of 75 mm footpaths and entranceways of 100 mm reinforced concrete.'

Mr Bakewell said the compromise solution had been calculated to cost only $50 extra for each lot, or a total of $2 100. However, eventually the negotations broke down and both sides refused to accept a compromise.

'As a result I made a formal recommendation under section 25 (3) of the Ombudsman Act that both the trust and the council accept the proposal to compromise. I further suggested that the bodies subsequently get together and negotiate for a standard to be applied in future subdivisions,' the Ombudsman said.

The council agreed to accept the recommendation but the trust 'dug its toes in' and still refused to accept a compromise. Mr Bakewell said: 'To its credit the council, recognising the impasse, has rescinded its motion accepting the compromise solution and has accepted the trust's standard so that residents don't continue to suffer.'

Here we have a supposedly responsible State body that should be in the forefront of meeting and making better standards. Many Housing Trust areas will be slums soon enough because of environmental conditions.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you still quoting from the Ombudsman's report?

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: No, I have ceased and am now referring to my own notes. Ordinary ratepayers have to meet the standards set down by the local council and usually compromise does not come into it.

Is it by direction of the Minister that the trust saves money by lowering standards? Is it by the direction of the Minister that the trust ignores the requirements of the council? If the trust undertook this action only to save this amount of money, can the Minister say why he has not required the trust to accept the compromise solution recommended by the Ombudsman?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think I can best answer the honourable member's question and also defend the good name of the South Australian Housing Trust by giving the honourable member the following facts:

In March 1979 the trust purchased 42 serviced allotments at Elizabeth Field from the South Australian Land Commission. As the construction of concrete footpaths and landscaping had not been undertaken, the total purchase price of the allotments was reduced by a sum of $9 359, the estimated cost of completing the unfinished works ($7 259 for footpaths and $2 100 for landscaping).

In January 1981, a standard trust specification for the construction of concrete footpaths was forwarded through the South Australian Land Commission to the Munno Para council for approval. The council requested that the extent of footpaths be increased over that proposed by the trust and also that the thickness of concrete specified be increased from 60 mm to 75 mm for the footpaths and from 100 mm unreinforced to 130 mm reinforced concrete for the driveway crossover. As it was believed that the standards requested were excessive, discussions were held with officers from the Munno Para council, with the view to gaining acceptance of the trust standard specification; however, couuncil officers continued to insist that the council's requirements be met.

The ensuing delay in the construction of the concrete footpaths in the Elizabeth Field subdivision resulted in a complaint to the Ombudsman by a local resident. A meeting was subsequently held at the Ombudsman's office on 12 August 1981, involving representatives of the Ombudsman, the trust, the Land Commission and the Munno Para council.

Arguments presented by the Deputy Principal Engineer of the trust were based on the proven performance of concrete footpaths constructed by the trust in many subdivisions. In the last 10 years the trust has constructed approximately 150 kilometres of concrete footpaths in both metropolitan and country areas. With the exception of short lengths of footpath at Semaphore Park, all other footpaths have been constructed to the standard trust specification. No council, including the Munno Para council, has previously objected to the quality of concrete footpaths provided by the trust.

The District Engineer of the district council of Munno Para was insistent that the council's requirements could not be varied. Following the meeting of 12 August 1981, the Ombudsman proposed to the trust a compromise solution of accepting the council standard of 75 mm for footpaths and adopting reinforcement in 100 mm thick driveways. This compromise solution was estimated by the trust to increase the cost of providing footpaths at Elizabeth Field from $10 000 to $12 400, an increase of $2 400. To meet the council's even more onerous requirements would have cost an additional $500. The compromise solution represented an additional cost of approximately $50 per allotment.

The solution proposed appeared to indicate that the Ombudsman was interested only in a compromise solution, regardless of the proven performance of footpaths constructed by the trust. The acceptance of either the standard proposed by the Ombudsman or Munno Para council was considered likely to be taken as a precedent by other councils. In such circumstances the trust in the future would incur an additional cost of at least $50 per allotment wherever concrete footpaths are provided.

At its meeting on 8 September 1981, the trust agreed to advise the Ombudsman that the trust's present standards are considered adequate and that it was unable to agree to either council's request or the suggested compromise. I was subsequently advised of the trust's concern over this matter, particularly in the overall context of the need to restrain building costs as discussed in the recent Committee of Inquiry into Housing Costs and the Ministerial Council on Housing Costs. The Ombudsman and council were advised that the matter had been referred to me.

Following these actions by the trust, the Ombudsman formally recommended in terms of the Ombudsman Act that his proposed compromise be adopted, since neither the council nor the trust was prepared to compromise. He forwarded a copy of this recommendation to the Minister, suggesting that I should consider directing the trust to comply with it, and asked to be informed of the trust's intentions by 22 January 1981.

The view of the trust remained unchanged, that present standards are adequate and proven in the field over many years. The standard of trust construction by contract is high and maintained by strict supervision. Furthermore, the trust, wherever possible, does not construct paths until building work is completed to avoid the considerable damage which may be caused by construction traffic.

The Ombudsman made reference to a statement by council that it was expending approximately $20 000 a year on maintenance work in areas where the trust has provided concrete footpaths, without indicating whether or not the statement has been investigated or confirmed in detail. It is very doubtful whether a significant proportion of this expenditure could be attributed to a 15 mm difference in slab thickness, which is that demanded by council. It is also relevant to note that the trust has constructed more than 100 kilometres of concrete footpath within the Munno Para council boundaries and considerably more than this within the boundaries of neighbouring councils, whose officers have advised the trust that they have experienced no significant problems.

The Ombudsman also stated that the proposed compromise was not to be considered as a precedent, but if it were enforced there is little doubt that councils would be well placed to demand such standards.

The Munno Para council, having at first refused to accept the Ombudsman's proposed compromise, subsequently rescinded its previous decision and agreed to the Ombudsman's request. The trust, however, requested that I not direct the trust to accept the compromise in consideration of the trust's strongly held views on footpath standards. This request was supported by me and the Ombudsman was advised accordingly.

In the meantime, the trust had continued discussions with council officers in an attempt to resolve the matter and a joint inspection of footpaths in the council area was held with council officers on 13 May 1982. A letter was sent to the council on 24 May 1982 requesting information on the actual percentage of footpath constructed by the trust in the Munno Para council area which had been deemed to have 'failed' in any one year for reasons attributable to pavement thickness.

The trust felt that this information, which council officers agreed could be assembled, might give a better perspective on the extent of council's problem. The Munno Para council has not responded to this letter. Although verbal contact has been maintained with council, the only written communication from council since 24 May 1982 is a letter dated 22 July 1982 advising the trust that council has accepted the trust's standard for footpath construction for this subdivision.

The trust immediately undertook arrangements for construction of the footpaths by contract. The contractor is expected to begin work on 9 August 1982. The trust has constructed footpaths in Munno Para council area to its current standard since 1965—a period of 17 years. Examinations by the trust suggest that, overall, cracking of trust-constructed footpaths for all reasons is less than 5 per cent of the total length of footpath laid, and in paths less than five years old less than 2 per cent. A substantial proportion of this cracked pavement does not require replacement under criteria agreed by trust and council officers.

It is the trust's view that the proportion by which this cracking would be reduced if pavement thickness were increased from 60 mm to 75 mm is small, and it is also held that the proportion of present cracking attributable to pavement thickness is small. Trust calculations suggest that council's stated $20 000 per annum expenditure on footpath replacement represents an annual replacement of less than 2 per cent of the total trust-constructed path in the Munno Para council area, indicating at least a 50-year economic life of pavement—surely an acceptable standard. Since a substantial part of this replacement would, in the trust's view, be necessary whether the concrete thickness was 60 mm or 75 mm, the trust's opinion remains unchanged—that the Munno Para council's concern over footpath thickness is misplaced, and is not supported by evidence. The trust's rates payment to Munno Para council in 1982-83 will total $537 085.64. A $20 000 expenditure on footpath replacement represents 3.7 per cent of rate collections from the trust. Other points the trust has brought to my attention include: *(a)* to the best of the trust's knowledge the Ombudsman did not obtain any separate technical advice when framing his recommendation; and *(b)* the question of housing costs is of major importance but one to which the Ombudsman has paid scant attention.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: This is just a scandalous attack, under privilege, on the Ombudsman.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: According to the trust's building programme an extra $50 per house applied to the trust's current building programme would equate to the construction cost of, say, six cottage flats for pensioners for which some elderly people have been waiting up to five years. I hope that the Hon. Mr Blevins is interested in that.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: And you appointed him.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The trust reviewed the Ombudsman's intention to issue a press release at its most recent meeting on 27 July and recorded considerable astonishment at his intention to do so after the matter had been resolved between the trust and the council, and before the matter has been referred to Parliament, to whom the Ombudsman is responsible.

REPLY TO QUESTION

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* a reply to a question without notice, the honourable member having been informed previously by letter.

Leave granted.

TOXIC SHOCK SYNDROME

In reply to the **Hon. ANNE LEVY** (16 June).

My colleague the Minister of Health informs me that there have been no notified cases of toxic shock syndrome in South Australia this year.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 28 July. Page 217.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I support the motion. I would like to join other members in thanking His Excellency for the Speech with which he opened this session of Parliament. I take this opportunity of reaffirming my allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

I join other members in their expressions of sympathy to the families of the late members of Parliament, particularly the late Jimmy Dunford, whom I knew as a member of this Council, and other former members who died during the last session. I also join other members in their expressions of sympathy to the family of the late Ted Dawes, a messenger in this Chamber.

I wish to comment briefly on the very good contribution in this debate last week by the Hon. Mr Feleppa. I agree with his view that Australia today is indeed a multi-cultural society, and it is only unthinking, shallow-minded people who would still believe in assimilation or mono-culturalism for our country. In fact, Mr Feleppa referred to my reply to a certain newspaper writer recently regarding family conflicts, and I know he was as concerned as I was with that writer's misguided views about migrants and their contribution to Australian society. However, I do take strong objection, both as Minister and on behalf of my departmental officers, to remarks he made regarding the Community Welfare Department's approach and commitment to providing welfare support to people of non-Anglo-Saxon background in South Australia.

Mr Feleppa's views that I and my department discriminate against people of non-English speaking background is in direct contrast to his clearly stated appreciation, given in this House, of my 'enlightened initiative' (his words) to make it mandatory by law to take into account the cultural background of welfare clients. He was of course referring to a specific objective included in the Community Welfare Act amendments, which I introduced last year.

He also said in his address in reply that he had always believed that a member of a society acquired the right to the protection of society and a fair deal from it. I could not agree more. But that right extends to all members of our society, and when we are looking at the basic unit of our society, the family, I believe that right to protection extends to both parents and children. As I have stated on many occasions, and most recently in that published letter to which Mr Feleppa referred briefly, the Government, and my department has a clear policy of support for the family. Welfare workers within my department are well aware of this clear policy and their duty, where possible, to attempt to reconcile children who have left home to return to the family. This policy is regardless of the cultural background of the family. The question of children leaving home and being returned to the family is not as simple as saying the department should force children to return to the family. There are two points to be made in regard to this. The first is that when a child leaves home the reason is usually because of some conflict within the family. That conflict is not created by a Government welfare department, or an individual social worker. The conflict is between the parents and the child. The role of my welfare officers is to work with the child and the parents to overcome that conflict. The role is one of protecting the family and giving it support to find its own answers to the conflict. It is not to impose rules and decisions on how that family should or should not live.

The second point is just how would the honourable member force a child against his will to return to a family? There are times when it may be in the best interests of the family as a whole for the parents and the child to be away from each other for a short period while the conflict is sorted out. There are family situations which my welfare officers deal with where a child would be in real danger from physical, emotional or sexual abuse if a Government department insisted that no matter what, the child must live within his or her own natural family.

This whole issue is not an easy one to solve, and I am very conscious of this. Making laws or rigid rules to deal with family conflict is not the answer. In fact (and this applies to the whole issue of our multi-cultural society), I believe education, not legislation, is the best way of overcoming many of the problems in this area. My department has recognised the importance of providing support services and people to help people from different cultural backgrounds who are in need. We are currently increasing our efforts in this regard, particularly among staff who work in areas where there are concentrations of people from other than Anglo-Saxon backgrounds. For example, a new position of Ethnic Welfare Adviser is being created at a senior level within the department. This adviser will ensure the department is advised on how best the needs of ethnic background clients can be served within the available resources.

In particular, the adviser will provide support to staff working in difficult matters, such as serious family conflicts, training staff and maintaining contact with ethnic communities and other welfare organisations. We have also carried out a number of training programmes throughout the State aimed at increasing cultural awareness within local communities. This initiative has been pioneered by the department, and is expected to be developed by other organisations as well.

There is a small number (eight) of our staff who can speak in languages other than English and who are used as accredited interpreters. Besides these eight staff members there are many other staff members whose own background is of ethnic origin and who speak one or more languages.

The Department for Community Welfare is grateful for the use of interpreters. There is a strict rule that, where there is an ethnic element in any matter which is raised in the department, the officer who goes to resolve the matter takes an interpreter with him or her.

My department has a policy of recruiting and locating staff with multicultural or bi-lingual skills in areas of higher need. For example, in the western region, where there is a higher concentration of non-English speaking people, there is also a high concentration of these staff. Of the 14 staff at Thebarton, seven have a multicultural background.

The State Government also endeavours to support welfare services to ethnic background people through its community welfare grants. About 10 per cent of the funds allocated go to ethnic community groups. In working toward education rather than legislation within the welfare area, we are currently investigating the provision of information services to ethnic communities with a view to making these services more effective and responsive to the needs of ethnic back-

ground people. A series of talks on welfare has also been delivered through ethnic radio.

The process toward making welfare services multicultural in their approach is one that evolves. It is not something a Government department can simply impose on the community, but is one which we are working strenuously towards, and which I believe all South Australians, whatever their cultural background, will applaud.

The other matter to which I intend to address myself briefly concerns a matter to which the Hon. Mr Chatterton devoted the greater part of his speech yesterday, when he suggested that my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, had in some way denigrated him and his position on overseas trips. It was suggested that the Minister had downgraded Mr Chatterton's position and had not accorded him the courtesy which is due to a member of the Opposition in any Parliament.

I have not had an opportunity of obtaining a detailed reply to this, but it is worthwhile if I cite as an example something the Minister has done in regard to the Hon. Mr Chatterton. On 7 April 1981 the Minister of Agriculture forwarded a letter by telex to the Tunisian and Algerian Ministers of Agriculture on Mr Chatterton's status as a member of the Opposition in the South Australian Parliament and also highlighted Mr Chatterton's personal interest in agricultural matters. Both communications were similarly worded and sent in French. An English translation is:

> Your Excellency,
>
> You will be aware that Mr B. A. Chatterton and Mrs Chatterton intend visiting your country in the near future. Since our change of Government in September 1979, Mr Chatterton is a member of the Opposition in the South Australian Parliament. Accordingly, he is no longer able to speak for the South Australian Government. Any views, advice or commitments he may offer cannot therefore be construed as being those of the South Australian Government.
>
> Mr Chatterton, however, retains a significant knowledge of and interest in agriculture in your region, as he does in South Australia. I am sure he will find his visit informative.

This communication was signed by the Minister of Agriculture. I suggest that this does not indicate that there was any improper attitude on the part of the Minister in regard to Mr Chatterton.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs): I support the motion and, along with other members who have spoken, commend His Excellency the Governor for the manner in which he opened Parliament on this most recent occasion. I extend my sincere sympathy to the relatives of the deceased former members of Parliament whose names were mentioned at the opening of this session. I also extend my condolences to the relatives of the late Jim Dunford, and express my sympathy to the relatives of the late Ted Dawes.

The Hon. Mr Feleppa, when he spoke in this debate, criticised the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission and aspects of its role and its work. The Hon. Mr Feleppa said:

> The commission seems to have failed in its main task of becoming the authoritative voice for the migrant, of providing a viable challenge to existing situations, and of developing a comprehensive policy statement which would indicate and detail the manner in which it perceives its role and how it is going to achieve it. These words are spoken by many migrants in criticism of the Government which has created this body and then, with the greatest of cynicism, has ensured that it would become ineffectual through the appointments made, the limitations to its resources, and the lack of concern for its ineffectiveness.

I refute the allegations and accusations embodied in that criticism and wish to defend the Ethnic Affairs Commission in my submission today.

The South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission has now been in existence for 13 months and, contrary to the views of the honourable member, it has clear guidelines in its powers and objects and clear operational principles that guide its activities. These principles are:

1. To assist migrants to participate equally in the social, cultural, political and economic life of the State. This implies:
   - *(a)* equal access to services, programmes (including information, interpreting and translating services), cultural, artistic and leisure activities;
   - *(b)* equal opportunity in employment;
   - *(c)* equal opportunity in education, including the opportunity to learn English, and equal access to training schemes.
2. To promote the principles of multiculturalism. This implies:
   - *(a)* the right of individuals to express and maintain their own ethnic identity, if they so wish;
   - *(b)* the right of individuals to participate in activities which help retain and develop their own cultures and languages;
   - *(c)* the right and responsibility to acquire, develop and express an understanding of Australian institutions, values, traditions and cultural achievements;
   - *(d)* the opportunity to acquire, develop and express an understanding of other languages and cultures;
   - *(e)* the development of flexibility and diversity in established media, educational, cultural and artistic institutions and programmes in order to respond to the reasonable aspirations of all ethnic groups within the community.
3. To promote greater understanding and co-operation amongst all ethnic groups that constitute our community. This implies:
   - *(a)* the promotion of multicultural activities (such as multicultural education, multicultural television, festivals and other multicultural artistic activities) which foster and develop shared values, understanding and co-operation among all ethnic groups within the community;
   - *(b)* the promotion of educational programmes and conciliatory processes to remove any form of discrimination on the basis of race or ethnic origin.

These principles guide the activities of the commission both in the provision of direct services to community and in its advisory and co-ordinating role. Whether or not the services are 'insignificant' or 'valuable' but 'limited' as claimed by the honourable member is refuted by the facts. The following record should illustrate the magnitude and latitude of services provided by the commission as an important measure towards providing equal access to Government services and programmes.

The commission's Ethnic Information Service has been established in four locations—at the city head office, as well as at Felixstow, Whyalla and the Riverland.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: They were all there when you came into office.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They were there in a certain fashion, if I can put it that way. Client contact figures for the service were 13 651 in 1980-81 and 17 073 in 1981-82, an increase of 3 422 or 25 per cent. That is a significant expansion since the inception of the commission. The major languages requested, in order of demand, were Polish, Italian, Vietnamese, Chinese, Hungarian, and Greek. Telephone inquiries have increased 60 per cent over last year's figures.

The office provides information and advice in areas of workers compensation, pensions, allowances, special benefits and other applications, legal referrals, immigration and settlement problems, complaints of discrimination, counselling in community languages, and so on. Inquiries for recognition of overseas qualifications and translations of overseas certificates and diplomas—an essential element in

ensuring equality of opportunity in employment—are in increasing demand.

The health interpreter service is provided by seven full-time and a panel of 179 contract interpreters in the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals covering practically all languages requested. In 1980-81, 10 190 were assisted. This increased to 14 505 in 1981-82, an increase of 4 315, or 42 per cent. The main languages in order of demand were: Italian, Greek, Vietnamese, Serbian/Croatian, Polish, Ukrainian, and Chinese. There were over 20 other languages.

The interpreting and translating service (legal) provides services, free of charge, to all State courts, tribunals and commissions. It also provides a translation service to all State Government departments, instrumentalities and local government authorities on a fee-for-service basis. The number of interpretation assignments carried out in 1980-81 was 1 644. These increased to 1 834 in 1981-82 representing an increase of 190 assignments, or 12 per cent. The six major languages requested were Greek, Italian, Serbian, Croatian, Vietnamese, and Polish. The service operates with three full-time officers and a panel of 179 contract interpreters and translators. The increased demands for all of these services are due to a growing awareness of the commission's work; and, as there has been no increase in service staff during the year, the figures reflect the effective management of service delivery.

Besides the direct services provided by the commission, another of its important functions is that of liaison with other Government departments and instrumentalities to ensure the provision of services that are equally accessible and relevant to all groups of our society, including recent migrants. Most Government departments provide some interpreting and information services to non-English speaking migrants. The numbers and languages provided by part-time interpreters registered with the commission is attached. These bilingual officers, working within the Public Service, can perform occasional interpreting duties, for which they receive a linguistic allowance ($317 p.a.) and a performance allowance for their services in accordance with the Part-Time Interpreters or Translators—Public Service (S.A.) Award. The number of such officers in the different departments are as follows: Department of Agriculture, eight part-time interpreters covering six languages; and Department of Community Welfare, nine part-time interpreters covering eight languages.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Are they interpreters with qualifications?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Leader should listen. I said that part-time interpreters were working under arrangements that I explained a moment ago when the Leader was not in his seat. The Department of Correctional Services has one part-time interpreter covering two languages; the Education Department has four part-time interpreters covering four languages; and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has 28 part-time interpreters covering 12 languages.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What qualifications have they got?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They are included in this award allowance, and they also receive their linguistic allowance. So, I should think that in the opinion of the Public Service Board their qualifications are reasonably good. The Department of Environment and Conservation has three part-time interpreters covering four languages; the Hospitals Department has eight part-time interpreters covering six languages; the Housing Trust one such interpreter covering three languages; the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science one part-time interpreter covering one language; the Department of Labour and Industry six part-time interpreters covering four languages; the Department of Lands one such interpreter covering one language; the Law Department four part-time interpreters covering two languages; the Department of Marine and Harbors six part-time interpreters covering four languages; and the Department of Mines and Energy has one part-time interpreter covering three languages.

The Hon. Barbara Wiese: Can't you have this inserted in *Hansard?*

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Does not the honourable member like to hear it? The Public Buildings Department has 12 part-time interpreters covering nine languages; the Department of Services and Supply one interpreter covering three languages; the Department of Tourism Recreation and Sport six part-time interpreters covering six languages; the Department of Transport has 17 part-time interpreters covering nine languages; and the Treasury Department has two part-time interpreters covering seven languages. That represents 114 part-time interpreters within the Public Service.

All departments and Government instrumentalities have access to the commission's translation service on a fee-for-service basis. It is, however, evident that some of the departments are not making adequate use of these two means of interpreting/translating services. I intend to approach the Premier with a request that the Public Service Board, in conjunction with the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission, review the effectiveness and adequacy of these services, in view of the fact that some of them are not being used as much as they should be used.

Some departments have their own interpreter service, namely, the Police Department and, to some extent, the Education Department, through a service established by the Multicultural Education Co-ordinating Committee. Many schools use their bilingual staff (teachers, aides, secretaries) as sources of information, interpreting and translating. The provision of interpreters by the police is the subject of the report of the Migrant/Police Working Party which currently is under consideration by the Government.

The Department of Community Welfare is about to appoint an ethnic liaison officer to co-ordinate activities in this area. In the area of access and equal opportunity in education, the commission's role is essentially advisory, although its vital work with the recognition of overseas qualifications has meant that its staff have taken on a counselling role in education.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: There have been ethnic liason advisers in all those areas for about four years.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Leader should listen to this. His back-bencher has caused me to put this on the record, because apparently he and the Leader do not understand what is happening.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: This was all happening in 1979.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was happening in a minimal way without a commission. Indeed, it was happening most ineffectively as far as the ethnic people were concerned. That is why they voted against the Leader's Party at the last election.

Nevertheless, the principal initiatives in the educational area have rested with educational authorities, with the Education Department, the Department of Technical and Further Education and the Tertiary Education Authority of S.A., which have a record unequalled in Australia for their commitment to the principles of multiculturalism.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It was all done before 1979.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Leader laughs at that. The commission's role and influence in this area has been provided through participation in key advisory committees, including the Advisory Curriculum Board, the Multicultural Education Co-ordinating Committee, the TAFE Languages Committee, interpreting and translating committees of the South Australian College of Advanced Education, and the State Panel of National Accrediting Authority for Interpreters and Translators (N.A.A.T.I.). Although the input of the

commission's officers on these bodies is significant, it is a co-operative effort, for which the commission does not get direct credit.

Similarly, the role of the Chairman of the Commission on the Fry Committee on the Recognition of Overseas Qualifications is one which has required consultations with virtually thousands of organisations in all States. This consultation could only be achieved by collaboration and not through any simplistic policy statements developed by the commission or any other single authority in this area. The commission has taken direct initiatives in the multicultural education area by its joint sponsorship with the Ethnic Communities Council of the National Language Policy Seminar. The papers of that seminar are in the process of being printed. An officer of the commission (Mr A. Gardini) will represent the South Australian view on the national editorial committee of the National Language Policy Conference to be held in Canberra in 1982.

A second initiative of the commission is a committee to look into the recommendations of, and submissions to, the Keeves Committee of Inquiry into Education in South Australia, with respect to all aspects of multicultural and language education. Dr J. J. Smolicz, a member of the commission, and the leading authority on multicultural education in this State—if not in Australia—will chair that committee. Membership of the committee will be announced in the next few days. Another important function of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission is to advise the Government on the needs and aspirations of the ethnic communities. In order to evaluate these needs effectively the commission has established advisory committees, such as the Aged Immigrants Facilities Committee, Council for the Ethnic Disabled, Migrant Womens Advisory Committee, Ethnic Grants and Festivals Grants Committees, and Human Services Committee. Details and composition of these will appear in the annual report of the commission. Part-time members of the commission and senior staff also serve the interests of migrants on several other committees, such as the Migrant Resource Centre, the Equal Opportunity Panel of the Public Service Board, the Ethnic Police Liaison Committee, and various other committees, including some in the areas of population and immigration.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The Ethnic Police Liaison Committee has been going for about five years and you have not obtained a report yet.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That committee has reported, as I announced in this Council this week. I had a further reply to give the Council on that matter today, but the honourable member who asked that question did not ask me for it.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You did not ask me to.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was the Hon. Mr Feleppa's question, not the Hon. Mr Sumner's. I will give that reply when I am asked for it. Another source of community input for effective policy making is the series of seminars organised by the commission. The Aged Immigrants Facilities in April evaluated the needs of aged migrants in areas of accommodation, health care, geriatric and domiciliary care services, etc., as revealed by the report of the commission's committee on Aged Immigrants Facilities. The Language Policy Seminar in May formulated South Australia's policy proposals to the national conference to be held in October in Canberra.

The Ethnic Arts and Festivals Seminar in June made recommendations about the effective ways of organising such festivals and about general ethnic arts policies. These policies are important as migrants do not want to be treated as a 'disadvantaged' group requiring only welfare and information. They want to participate fully in the social and cultural life of the community. Through these committees and seminars the commission remains sensitive to the community's needs, and ensures that its policy recommendations serve the best interests of the community. The commission does not work through the daily news headlines, but conducts its business in a quiet, yet effective, responsible manner, advising the Government and assisting the public with information, interpreting and translating in the hospitals and courts, representing and serving the interests of migrants well beyond the nine-to-five requirements of their office.

As an example, while individuals and pressure groups made headlines about their activities and views on the introduction of multicultural T.V. to South Australia, the commission canvassed opinions and sought expert advice in order to formulate policy guidelines which it submitted to the Government well before the recent campaign made the headlines. The roles and functions of the commission are set out by the Act of Parliament which sets the parameters to its scope of operation. Earlier today I elaborated on the main objects of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission.

This is a growing function of the commission. The newly appointed public relations officer will play a major role. I hope what I have said will give the lie to the implications contained in the Hon. Mr Feleppa's contribution to this debate. The honourable member was quite critical of the commission and its role. In my view the commission is accepted, supported and praised by a vast majority of people from the South Australian ethnic community. I take this opportunity to commend the Chairman, his Commissioners and the staff of the commission for the job they are doing not only for the people of ethnic origin in this State but for South Australia as a whole.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I rise to support the motion. In so doing I take this belated opportunity to express my sadness at the changes that have occurred in this place since I participated in this debate at this time last year. I refer particularly to the untimely death of my colleague, the Hon. Jim Dunford. I am sure all honourable members will agree that this Parliament is a less interesting, less balanced and less colourful place since his passing. I believe a part of Australian folklore and mythology has gone with him. I also express sadness at the passing of our head messenger, Ted Dawes, who was known and respected by us all. I pass on my condolences to the respective families of both of those gentlemen.

On a brighter note I welcome the Hon. Mr Feleppa to this Chamber. He is indeed a welcome addition to our ranks. I believe he will broaden the representation of the citizens of this State. I congratulate him on his performance so far and particularly on his thoughtful contribution to this debate. He is the only member of this Chamber, since I have been a member, who has attracted so much attention that Ministers feel moved to actually get up and make special defensive replies to the remarks that he has made in this Chamber.

When I was considering a topic to speak about today I was moved to respond to some of the outrageous statements made in this place last week by the Hon. Mr Cameron in his address about my Party's uranium policy as adopted at our recent national conference. I was moved to do this particularly since some of his most bizarre and intemperate remarks were made about me. As you will recall, Madam Acting President, I was sitting in your Chair at that time and was therefore placed in the frustrating position of having to sit through the Hon. Mr Cameron's drivel without being able to interject. I had originally intended to reply to some of the Hon. Mr Cameron's more ridiculous charges. However, on reflection and having read the *Hansard* report of his speech, I was dissuaded from bothering, because the points he made were really much too puerile and his speech was too inconsistent to be treated seriously.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: What do you think about what Senator Walsh said on uranium in the *Australian* this morning?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I did not read it. Suffice to say, in respect to the newspaper quotes attributed to me during the Hon. Mr Cameron's speech that were supposed to have come from my speech at the national conference, those quotes that were not totally inaccurate and improperly attributed to me were taken out of context and thus rendered quite meaningless. It is not my intention to waste any more time on that question.

The matter which I intend to take up today in some way relates to some of the comments which were made by the Hon. Mr Feleppa in this debate. It is a matter that I have recently begun to take a greater interest in. I refer to language courses in our educational institutions and, more particularly, the moves currently under way in Australia to develop a national language policy.

I say from the outset that a national language policy should not be restricted to consideration of the teaching and use of so-called foreign languages, because it must be a comprehensive policy which deals with matters relating to the usage and development of the English language in Australia as well. A national language policy should not deal only with the use and effect of languages on people in our community whose mother tongue is not English. It must also address itself to Anglo-Australians and their needs.

I have recently read an enlightening paper on this subject prepared by the Commonwealth Department of Education and published in May this year. Entitled 'Towards a National Language Policy' this paper describes some of the features which may be incorporated in such a policy and also canvasses some of the obstacles. The move towards establishing such a national policy on languages has broad support in our community. It comes from the Commonwealth Government through the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts, which will later this year undertake an inquiry into the development and implementation of a co-ordinated language policy for Australia.

It is also supported by the Ethnic Communities Council which this year, as we have already heard from a previous speaker's contribution, convened workshops in each State of Australia to discuss the development of a national language policy. It also has the support of professional language associations in Australia.

The post-war migration programme brought about 3 500 000 migrants and refugees to Australia, and today there are more than 1 000 000 bilingual Australians who regularly use languages other than English when talking with friends, families or on religious or social occasions, and in many cases their children also are growing bilingually. There is growing concern that there is not a comprehensive, balanced and co-ordinated approach to language matters in Australia. There is a need to develop policies on the use and maintenance of migrant languages, and policies on the support and extension of Aboriginal languages which are both internally consistent with the existing policies on English and take into account Australia's total communication needs at the local, national and international levels.

The Commonwealth Department of Education's paper traces three stages in Australia's attitudes to community languages since our migration programme began. The first stage recognised language as an agent for communication. It was assumed when migrants first started coming to Australia that everyone would actually speak English on all occasions, so 'English as a second language' programmes were developed. However, it was soon discovered that for a variety of cogent reasons not all migrants would always use or master the English language adequately to be able to conduct all their business in that language. This then led to the development of a range of other services, minimal as they have been, despite the Minister's suggestions about development of such programmes here in South Australia. The sort of services that have been developed are things like the translating/interpreter service, employment of bilingual personnel in Government departments and other places and provision of multilingual information on health, welfare and legal matters. These steps have been designed to provide greater equality of access to facilities and services in Australia for non-English speakers.

The second phase which was identified by the Commonwealth Department of Education's paper was marked by a growing belief in the Australian community that ethnic groups had a right to maintain their languages and cultural traditions, and this has led to the use of public funds being devoted to such areas as multilingual libraries, ethnic media services, support of ethnic schools, increased community language teaching, and bilingual education.

Therefore, the first two phases have concentrated on the 20-25 per cent of Australia's population which is non-native English speaking and have emphasised the major languages of the approximately 130 languages other than English regularly spoken in Australia. The third phase is the most recent one and sees language as a valuable national resource which can benefit not only domestic communication needs but also Australia's international needs as well. The Australian Government is now coming to realise, as did the United States Government, in a report prepared in 1979 by the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, that:

> Our vital interests are impaired by the fatuous notion that our competence in other languages is irrelevant.

Various reports by Government bodies, community groups and professional organisations have pointed out that Australia's language capacities are now inadequate for its domestic and international needs. The Commonwealth Department of Education's paper points out:

> The nature and extent of formal language learning in Australia's schools and tertiary institutions has repeatedly been characterised as having failed to keep pace with the growing demands arising from diversification of Australian business and commerce, the emergence of a multicultural society, the intensification of international communication and co-operation, and the overall personal education of individuals living in a multilingual world.

In terms of business and commerce alone, there has been a major shift in recent years away from our traditional English speaking trading partners in the United Kingdom and Europe to the non-English speaking countries of the Middle East, North Africa and Asia. Professor Ross Steele from the University of Sydney has pointed out in relation to the United States the following:

> The Commission of International Understanding and Global Awareness established by President Carter gave as one of the explanations for the amazing success of Japan's economic penetration of the United States the fact that Japanese business men are able to conduct their negotiations in English. It was claimed that American business men would be much less disadvantaged if they could understand spoken Japanese and knew how decisions are reached within Japanese culture.

I suggest that the same applies in Australia. It was recently claimed in Adelaide that the South Australian business community is losing millions of dollars of Japanese investment every year for the same reasons as were identified in the United States in relation to American business prospects.

As I have already said, Australia has the opportunity to develop lucrative trading links with the Middle East, North Africa and countries in the Asian region. This would be considerably enhanced if Australians could speak the appropriate languages. As Professor Steele has pointed out:

> This enormous potential will come to nothing if the Government has no coherent guidelines for its decisions on the best way of stimulating the growth of this resource and planning its use. A

national language policy would supply these guidelines, just as a minerals and energy policy supplies guidelines in the economic sphere.

I now want to turn to the question of planning and then to look briefly at what is currently being done here in South Australia. One of the major obstacles to developing a national language policy is lack of facts and figures on what is already happening in Australia with regard to language learning and use. For example, there are no readily available figures on language programmes, other than Matriculation examination figures, which obviously do not give a reliable measure of the total numbers of people learning languages. However, we do know that 26 languages were offered somewhere in Australia as Matriculation subjects in 1981.

We do not know enough, however, about language needs. Planners need better data to determine, for example, whether teaching English as a first language meets demands for basic functional literacy in the community; and whether the English as a second language programme provides adequately for the needs of Aboriginals and immigrants. There has not been enough research into the level of demand for and the changing nature of multilingual services in public institutions such as hospitals, courts, and Government offices. In this regard, I would like to acknowledge the recently released report entitled 'Ethnic women patients in South Australian Government hospitals' as an important and timely contribution to this research in this State.

Neither do we know what the demand might be in business and Government circles for language courses for business and trade purposes if such courses were offered in sufficient numbers. What is happening in South Australia in relation to all of these questions? Here I want to concentrate particularly on the Department of Technical and Further Education because in most respects this department is the most appropriate of all tertiary institutions to provide the kinds of language programmes to meet the needs of the various groups I have been discussing.

Apart from TAFE, the only other institutions providing language courses are universities, which have restrictive entry qualifications; the South Australian College of Advanced Education, which is largely confined to providing certificated diplomas or degree courses; and limited courses run by the W.E.A.; and continuing education. TAFE, on the other hand, has the widest and most flexible range of vocational and access language courses of any post-secondary institution in South Australia. In 20 of its 28 colleges and centres it provides vocational access and enrichment language and language related courses for approximately 4 500 students.

However, most of these programmes are concentrated in the enrichment area. These enrichment courses cater for approximately 3 000 of the total 4 500 students who take the courses each year. They cater predominantly for Anglo-Australian students. Until recently, they were mostly Anglo-Australian women doing courses for personal enrichment. Recently, the composition of classes has changed to include more men, and also an increasing number of young, unemployed people and pensioners. In addition there are also students from the professions, such as teaching and social work, who are looking for courses which will enable them to better communicate with people in their employment.

Vocational courses (and by this I mean the interpreter courses and languages specifically for professional courses) currently cater for about 540 students and approximately two-thirds of those students are Anglo-Australians. These courses are taught in only one college in the metropolitan area. Access courses, which are taught only in the metropolitan area (with one exception), include language development programmes, mother-tongue programmes and Matriculation programmes. Even in these courses, which one would expect would cater primarily for non-native English speakers above all others, about half the students are Anglo-Australians. About 900 students a year enrol in those courses. In the words of the A.A.C.E. in its 1979 report on adult education in Australia, ethnic communities are 'staying away from TAFE in droves'.

It seems that this is happening for two major reasons; first, the lack of awareness of ethnic communities that such education is available to them beyond the end of formal schooling; and secondly, the failure of colleges to offer programmes relevant and attractive to ethnic communities. For example, in the TAFE area, at the moment there are no bridging or transition courses to supplement the on-arrival and post-arrival courses currently being sponsored by the Commonwealth Government. There are no language and cultural support programmes for elderly migrants in our community. There are no opportunities for migrant women courses or parent education courses, etc. These are all the types of courses in which one might expect newcomers to Australia would be interested in enrolling to help them in their daily existence.

I come back to Australia's national needs in terms of trade and international relations. We find that there are no language and cultural courses at all in South Australia specifically for business people and Government officials who wish to maximise our economic potential overseas. What is more, TAFE seems to be doing little to change the position; it does not even collect suitable data to assist in its task to meet community needs. For example, there are not accurate statistics on non-native English speaking participants in TAFE programmes overall. This obviously makes it difficult for TAFE to plan such programmes. The department has not even compiled a list of all its staff members who are able to speak a language other than English in order to ensure the best use of resources and to facilitate transfers and secondments and expand the range of programmes available.

We are all aware of the financial restraints operating in all areas of Government these days. Of course, none of these matters that I have been talking about can be considered without also looking at the human and material resources which would be required. As the Commonwealth Department of Education's paper points out, extensive resources are already committed to these areas, although I would argue that by no means enough has been committed. The paper goes on to say:

> The immediate concern is one of assessing the present scene and, when appropriate, assigning new priorities and reallocating existing resources. Such an exercise can be undertaken without the diversion of energies which would be involved in a continuous search for new funds.

It seems to me, in conclusion, that organisations like TAFE, with back-up and encouragement from the State Government, can and should play a crucial role in helping to create an awareness in our community about our language needs, and in helping to create the sort of public discussion which will eventually lead us to recognise that our diversity in languages is a truly valuable natural resource which requires comprehensive planning and co-ordination through a national language policy.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: First, I wish to congratulate the Governor on his Speech. Most other members have said the appropriate words in respect of this matter. Governor's Speeches are written by the Government of the day; there is no resiling from this fact. The Governor's Speech is written in accordance with the wishes of the Government. People who have been in Government and are now in Opposition should bear this in mind when making criticisms.

I wish to compliment the Governor on the Speech he gave, in accordance with what I have just said.

There have been Governors and Governors-General of various political persuasions in this country. We recently went to a farewell for a Governor-General who must have had a most arduous task to perform, following the resignation of the previous Governor-General (Sir John Kerr). I do not want to dwell for one moment on what he did. I did not agree with it, and would not expect many people in Australia to agree with it.

From a constitutional point of view, there is little for the members of Parliament in this State to be concerned about in the role that a Governor with a military background will perform. In the history of the Commonwealth, we have only had one departure from that—a fellow in New South Wales during the 1930s in respect of the Lang Government. Such people seem to be more disciplined and understanding than do lawyers, such as Sir John Kerr.

I wish to pay regard to Sir Walter Crocker to whom I have not spoken at length, but a person whose speeches on current topics I have read as much as possible. He has written a book with extracts from his life. As the previous Governor's Deputy, he has now been replaced by the Senator from the Barrossa Valley, Sir Condor Laucke. I thought that the previous Governor's Deputy carried out his duty to this State in a proper and unobtrusive manner and was cognisant at all times of the complexities of the Government and different Parties. They are very real.

It is unfortunate that the State Governments of South Australia have not availed themselves of that portion of the constitution where it is permitted to speak with at least one voice on common matters. I do not wish to weary the Council with that part of the constitution, nor do I wish to weary the Council with the report of the Constitutional Review Committee of the late 1950s in respect of the inter-state commission, but that is the aspect to which I refer. It has been neglected and, from memory, has not been raised for the benefit of a State since the mid-1940s, back in Senator McLeay's day.

I refer sadly to the abrogation to the Commonwealth of the responsibility of the States—and I agreed with it as a much younger person—for collecting taxation, rather than its being with the States, in those early days of the war years. It came under challenge as you would be aware, Mr President, in relation to the sale of wheat by the National Australian Wheat Board in Victoria. That was the only time which brought it into any form of conflict.

Rather than members scorning me for what I have done in respect of Roxby Downs, they ought to reflect on many of these vexed matters because this is at the root of all this State's evils, in respect to Party politics, innuendo and fall-out, as a result of being too small or regarding a political Chamber as being too large. I qualify that by saying that there are occasions when matters have been before not only this Council, but before the Parliament, where we have regarded the Party as being larger than this State. I say emphatically that the State is a hell of a lot larger than this Chamber or the House of Assembly. I ask members to dwell on that.

I am not having a shot at my previous colleagues in that once great Party to which I belonged for nigh on 40 years. I am saying positively, as a voice in the wilderness in political terms, that that is the proper course that we, as politicians, well heeled in comparison with a very large percentage of those outside this building, ought to consider, but we do not, have not, and, unfortunately, will not. Before going any further, I wish to join other honourable members in respect to condolences. I have written to the union of the late Jim Dunford, who was a valued member of the A.W.U.

It is no secret that there was a difference of opinion before us, and unfortunately the Hon. Mr Dunford's untimely death forces me to stop short of conveying to the Council the results of a 1½ hour conversation between Jim and myself. However, it most certainly resulted in my knowing that the instigator of the matter was not the man who went to too early a death.

I should also like to make a special mention of the late Ted Dawes, one of the persons who run the nuts and bolts aspects of the Chamber and who worked long after members have gone home. Ted worked in this Chamber right up to the end of the last session, which, as we all know, became rather hectic. One now realises in hindsight that Ted must have had great personal suffering and endured a lot of pain to carry out the duty that he considered he should carry out not only for members but also for the Parliament generally. I can say nothing less than that. I regret his passing, and I express my condolences to his son and daugther on Ted's untimely death.

There were, of course, others. I refer to the death of a former Speaker of the House of Representatives. No doubt later the Council may deal with the fact that a second Speaker was laid to rest at Centennial Park, the two gentlemen having died within a month of each other. In this respect, I refer to the late Norman Makin. If one did not have a chance to speak to Mr Makin or to hold him in conversation, one's experience was under-valued as a result. Mr Makin was a very bright personality and, indeed, a great man. He was, however, an awful motor vehicle driver, and I am sure he would have loved to hear me say that. I had a long and close contact with Mr Makin as a politician.

I should also like to refer to the entry to this place of the Hon. Mario Feleppa, whom I have known for over 20 years, having been involved as a Federal member representing the eastern suburbs. Mario, who has had to work as a toolmaker in a machine shop, is an untiring worker and a perfectionist in everything that he does.

Mario is more than a welcome addition to this place. More important, his presence here shows that a breakthrough has occurred in relation to his appointment, and I sincerely hope that he continues in office in this place. I think that all members will find that Mario Feleppa will be a valuable member.

I regret that I must perhaps refer later to other matters that may not be as palatable to members. I regret, too, that the Hon. Ren DeGaris cannot be with us because of an unfortunate accident that occurred just a week ago. I think that he would have liked to hear what I am saying. If he did not, I am sure that he would have loved to interject and say that I was wrong. I wish Ren a speedy return to this Chamber.

I will say what I am about to say because it relates to what I intend to utter later. I had little regard for Ren DeGaris before I entered this Chamber, quite simply because I did not know the man or his personality. Members will recall that I led a team that came into this place in 1975, when in another place the Labor Party had to face almost the embarrassment of having to rely on an Independent, a person who ran against an endorsed Labor candidate, to cling to office for two years.

In that year, because I was able to prevail and impose my will on certain members, six members were elected to this Council. That had not been the case before, and I venture to say that it will probably not be repeated in future. There was scant regard for the great amount of work that I personally put into that matter, particularly in relation to the Hon. Mr Sumner, who reluctantly agreed that I was correct on the infamous night of 16 June. I do not want to quote from the pulls, as permission was steadfastly refused to alter them. I am astounded to think that two individuals in this place who now sit on the front bench carried on in

a manner that has had no parallel in any areas of the Westminster system of government, including this country.

Mr Sumner may well take false protection behind his smirk. However, I remind him that I had one shortcoming in respect of the honourable gentleman, about which I might tell the Chairman on the way out. Mr Sumner shirked his responsibilities when he was a senior member of the staff of a senior Minister of the Whitlam Government, when he disappeared not for a day or a week but, if my memory serves me correctly, for a year and a half. Is that right, Mr Sumner?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You're telling the story.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: And the story is true. I remember taking your spot late on a Sunday afternoon. I am sorry that I must mention this.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Unfortunately, your recollection is completely erroneous.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It is not erroneous. It is a fact, and I thank you for your interjection. You left and went overseas for 18 months with a table full of work behind you. Mr Sumner can describe that action with any word that he likes, but in my opinion it was irresponsible. I was not then in office or a member of Parliament. However, Mr Sumner has asked for it and has got it. Within five minutes of my address on 16 June 1982, which he may examine, I said (indeed, I said it on more than one occasion) that I was supporting the Opposition Party in its view. You stood up, but only a skerrick of what you and your colleague, Cornwall, said appears in the official document.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Are you talking about Roxby Downs?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am talking about the official document—*Hansard*—for that evening. Less than a skerrick appeared. You subjected me to the most vile type of innuendo and abuse (for which I should not and will not forgive you), because of my honesty on other matters. In this respect, I refer to the way in which you, and particularly Dr Cornwall, positioned me in relation to the select committee.

The Leader of the Opposition in this place has been a member of the Standing Orders Committee since 1975. Over the years, I have not had a great deal of regard for that book. If the Leader looks at Standing Orders he will find that there is no provision at all, as I told the Hon. Dr Cornwall time and time again, for a minority report. I suggest that the Leader take this matter up with those in authority to confirm in his mind that what I have said is absolutely true. The Hon. Dr Cornwall can make as many allegations as he likes and tap his head (making sure that he taps the left side of his head so that you, Mr President, cannot see it) as he has done over the past few weeks.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I am a left—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Dr Cornwall has never been a left winger in his life. The Hon. Dr Cornwall belongs to a unique breed of people who consider that they have no wings at all. I point out to the Hon. Dr Cornwall that he needs two wings to fly. In fact, he often flaps both of them, one at a time, when he thinks it will help him. However, the Hon. Dr Cornwall will find that a bird that flaps only one wing at a time is often unbalanced. That is exactly what the Hon. Dr Cornwall did. I make no apology for saying that, because that is exactly what he did.

I will not repeat what the Hon. Mr Bruce said yesterday. He made a fair comment; that is how he saw it and he was honest. However, I will make one or two corrections. I have sat upon select committees before, one of which was aborted and eventually brought down the previous Government. I have spoken about that matter before. Members of that select committee were summoned to appear before prominent members of the then Government. We were asked to resign from that committee because it was thought that we could win an early election. I asked eight questions at that Caucus meeting and did not receive one answer. I believe that a select committee's evidence and findings, even when they are made public, should be sacrosanct. It came as a great shock to me to learn of a subcommittee of the shadow Cabinet. The Leader can deny that such a subcommittee existed, but I could not care less if he does. The Hon. Mr Sumner admitted to me, when we were on speaking terms, that such a subcommittee did exist, yet he is holding his arms in the air like an Arab on the canal.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Give me a chance.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The Hon. Mr Sumner can have as many chances as he likes. If the Hon. Mr Sumner looks at the Notice Paper he will see a private member's Bill. I will give evidence against this learned lawyer, the Hon. Mr Sumner, at a later date.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: I was just about to confess that there was such a subcommittee.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I thank the Hon. Mr Sumner for that. That emphasises my point. The Hon. Mr Sumner abrogated every Standing Order as a member of this place. The next time he thinks about lawyers he should watch Rumpole of the Bailey—that is about the Hon. Mr Sumner's level. It is incredible that people will sometimes tell the truth when it suits them and sometimes they will tell lies. Why did you, Mr Sumner, tell lies on the night of 16 June? The Hon. Mr Sumner and the Hon. Dr Cornwall thought they forced me into voting for the Bill that night. I had no intention of voting for the Bill that night, no intention whatsoever. The Hon. Mr Sumner and the Hon. Dr Cornwall goaded me and hurled every insult imaginable at me. I suspect that one of them urged a fellow to telephone my home and threaten my wife. I could say more about that matter if I wanted to.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Come on!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: It was not the Hon. Mr Sumner.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It certainly wasn't me, either.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I would not believe the Hon. Dr Cornwall, even if he were lying prone. I will not call the Hon. Dr Cornwall by the name that he used yesterday, because I am not yet ready to walk through the door of this Chamber just to satisfy him. As I have said before, the Hon. Dr Cornwall should be in intensive care; he is going around the bend. I consider that I have more nous than the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Members should not treat my remarks with hilarity; this is not an hilarious matter. I have been misjudged as a person and as a member. The Hon. Dr Cornwall never had the courage to follow my stand, and that is his business. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has longer to live than I in relation to the average life span. I suggest that he takes more care and treads more carefully if he wishes to attain the age of three score years and 10, or perhaps even more. I hope to live to a ripe old age myself.

Caucus had no right to meet in relation to this matter. I have the report of the select committee with me. The select committee reported in November. Well before that time, in September or October, the Hon. Dr Cornwall produced the select committee's report at that Caucus meeting and said that it was about 100 pages in length. Does the Hon. Dr Cornwall deny that?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: You're telling the story.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, he did. The Hon. Dr Cornwall said that he would start at page 75. I then queried his actions. There are some members who will continually say that I did not convey to Caucus or to anyone else my final intentions. They must have thought that I was really dumb or as dumb as some of them. Cornwall said that he would start at page 75. I then referred to a body of men

sitting around a table at a proper meeting—I never said 'properly constituted meeting', because Caucus has no constitution or rules other than very obscure rules within the Party. I hammered that point the whole time that I was a member of Caucus. I admit that. However, I also admit that I did not attend the first meeting that I called about rules. Those members who did not want a constitution and rules never forgave me for that.

I did not attend that meeting because it was my wife's birthday on that day. The Hon. Mr Sumner need not frown, because there are letters in my office which will confirm that. I can show the Hon. Mr Sumner my files; I suppose they are not my property any more, anyway. My sons had organised a surprise party and realised that at 6.15 they had not told me about it. I then left for the birthday party and that is why I did not attend that meeting.

I will now relate a story about the time that only two people showed up for a Caucus meeting. It was decided that a Caucus meeting would be held before the election of the shadow Cabinet (it was the shadow executive before). Peter Duncan and I arrived at the meeting at the appointed time of 8 o'clock. We waited for 10 minutes and then decided to write the rules for election of office. Someone stuck their head in the door at about 8.10 and realised what we were doing and raced away. Six people then appeared at the meeting very quickly to make sure that Peter Duncan and I did not sit there alone drawing up rules for the election of the shadow Cabinet.

There were then repeated attempts to get them together, and response was made by Chris Sumner and Frank Blevins who were members of the committee, but few other members responded.

I now refer to a document bearing my name and encompassing over 100 pages. I referred to my rough notes in the light of events of 18 June, when the Roxby thing was given passage. I subsequently moved office because I was in the Labor Party office and felt it was an impossible situation to remain there. Whilst I was in Melbourne I requested that my belongings be moved. Some members have referred to the excellence of the report. It was stated that it was a balanced report, but my note on the report indicates another question mark.

Another comment was that it reflected and recognised the evidence to the committee. The comment that I wrote was that it failed to recognise or reflect that evidence. I want to go no further than that in respect to that document. I refer to the accusations of my colleague Dr Cornwall, yet he refused to second my motions on seven or eight occasions in select committee meetings. The Chairman of the committee can speak about that. I suggested that we visit Honeymoon, Beverley and Radium Hill, but that was not seconded by my colleagues. Here we were entrusted as a committee to look at the uranium fuel cycle, yet the committee refused to visit the only mine that was operative as a uranium mine since the 1940s and 1950s—Radium Hill. That is true.

Either at that meeting or afterwards the Hon. Mr Milne said he would support me if I dropped Radium Hill from the motion. How fair dinkum were we? One cannot run a select committee on Party-political lines when one tries to come to a decision in the best interests of the State. One cannot do that. If this Council has any future at all then the bar before which people can be called without a chance to defend themselves should be lifted to allow experts to give evidence to this Council. There should be a more dignified system to provide for the operations of committees of this Council, and I hope this matter can be resolved before the next election.

There would be nothing wrong in having experts from the rural industry give this Council evidence about the predicament facing that industry today. If such action were taken we would get better expertise from the industry than from members here who are merely sufficiently skilled to obtain election to this Chamber. That is how Parliament should have operated in the 1970s let alone in the 1980s and 1990s. I do not want to say any more than that or rehash what was said that night—they are scurrilous. I have heard members take points of order on what has been said, yet not one had the guts to make an apology.

Those honourable members who have been wrong have attempted to suggest that I was wrong. Like hell I was, like hell I am, and like hell I will be! That will be supported when I tell the Council what I saw in regard to the operation at Roxby Downs and in regard to what I considered to be a matter of conscience and propriety in respect of an undertaking given in writing for a company to explore and carry out a feasibility study.

It went no further than that in my mind, because all the other matters in respect of that indenture Bill can be challenged by an incoming Government of either political persuasion. I confirm that point by asking the Hon. Mr Sumner and any other member present at Caucus whether I did not ask repeatedly in regard to the Royal Commission in respect of the small problem of the lights at Football Park whether, because of the decision of the Royal Commission, a re-elected Government could alter an indenture Bill.

I refer to the situation in 1979, not 1982. In recent weeks people of a certain political persuasion have agreed with me. I raised that matter continually in Caucus until finally there was agreement that I would drop it. A new Government would have the opportunity to alter the situation. The feasibility study should have continued, and I am pleased to say that I do not resile from my earlier position, despite the Labor policy to which I will refer again later. I have no regrets about the stand I took on that day.

I was convinced on the Wednesday night that my stand was correct. It was a last-ditch stand to convince the Government to settle this matter once and for all at an election. If there were questions in the minds of my colleagues and other members that there was not a mandate from the 1979 election, I suggested that a mandate should be obtained one way or the other. It would have been the right of the electors. Elections have been called in this State and in the Commonwealth for much less reason than that. I now refer to my changed attitude. I handled yellow cake in the 1950s, and I doubt anyone else in this Chamber has done that.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: I have.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I did not know that. I handled it in the crudest conditions, especially involving the shipping of material to the United Kingdom, including tonnes of earth and mangled metal. I refer to the shocking charade that went on unknown to most people of the testing of atomic bombs within a few hundred miles as the wind blows and not as the crow flies: a crow has brains enough to change direction in a time of danger. People in this city were subject to fall-out, as we have ascertained with the benefit of hindsight, and were ignorant of the dangers of fall-out. This was beyond all expectation of what would occur from properly constructed chamber mining which I thought existed at Mount Isa and which I read about and asked about in regard to Roxby Downs.

I attended in the past more than my local assemblies and sub-branches. I spoke to anyone and I will engage anyone in conversation. I only wish more Parliamentarians would do that, particularly on this side of the Council, where I still choose to sit until I am tossed out or re-elected. Despite my public statements that I will not be seeking re-election, in the interests of this State and the politics of the 1980s (whether I am successful or not is up to others to decide and not me) I will again consider the matter.

I will make up my mind about that in good time, one way or the other. The fact is that I looked at the matter squarely. I had refused for 20 long years to cast aside literature that hit my desk from people I knew in the nuclear industry. I did not say, 'They'll be pro-nuclear, that is it.' I think that is wrong because one only has to take a map out these days to see the proliferation of generation plants—and I emphasise the generation of electrical power from nuclear armaments.

Some of the dirtiest, lousiest bombs every made were hydrogen bombs because they were coated with almost tonnes of cobalt, a most sinister substance designed to make a filthy, dirty bomb. Did we protest about the mining or use of cobalt? I did not even know about it. I read about it 20 years later, and am still reading about it. What we did not know was absolutely disastrous. Let me come back to where I started to change my mind.

The select committee was a matter I raised initially at a Caucus meeting. I insisted for three months that the matter be brought into this place. It was finally moved by my then colleague, the Hon. Mr Sumner, when the terms of reference (those amended by the Government through the Leader of this House, the Attorney-General) were brought into this place and amended. We went on to hear expert opinion in respect of that matter.

From that evidence there has to emerge in the minds of thinking people today the thought that the nuclear cycle is dangerous (and there is no question about that). I say as a further aside that we had a radiation Bill before us. I moved heaven and earth to have that Bill split into two parts. I believe that that Bill should have had a part dealing with medical isotopes and industrial substances for that limited (or perhaps not so limited) area, and a part dealing with the direct mining of uranium. Nobody would agree with me. So be it.

I sat here in absolute silence and did not participate in that debate until one afternoon when it had reached, I think, clause 36. The previous clauses had provided for registration of premises where nuclear substances would be kept. Clause 36 dealt with the aspect that, where there had been negotiation on the part of an owner-occupier of a building that was not registered, the commission had the power to inspect the building, register it, insist it be made safe and pass on the cost to the owner-occupier. I was astounded as I sat here to hear the Opposition spokesman for the Minister of Health say that he was completely and absolutely opposed to that clause. That is on record in *Hansard*, that attitude taken in respect of that Bill.

I turn back to the nuclear cycle. We have gone so far in respect of this matter that there are now sufficient atomic weapons to decimate every man, woman and child 43 times. Why anyone wants to die more than once is beyond my comprehension. I cannot understand that. However, that power is there, and it is a danger which is not going to pass. If there is no uranium taken out of the soil in Australia at Nabarlek, Jabiru, Mary Kathleen (and that is winding down), Radium Hill (if they ever start there again), Honeymoon, or anywhere else, there are still enough atomic weapons to destroy this earth over two score times.

It is when one knows that that one starts to contemplate whether or not the percentages referred to in the *Age* of Tuesday of this week in a report by Hugh Morgan may well be produced at Roxby Downs. If so, then its comparison with copper pales into insignificance.

I am saying that we will not do away with the nuclear generation of power and that we in this country cannot afford the luxury of living in the southern hemisphere and saying that we will deny heat, power and resources to the people who live in the northern hemisphere because some of those countries are relying on nuclear power for 20 per cent of their energy. There is nothing new in that, because there is a known technology to do that. An Italian scientist discovered it before the Manhattan project and before the bombs fell upon Japanese cities with the resulting terrible loss of life that occurred (and I was an ex-serviceman at that time).

If the members on this side of the Chamber think that they are correct in this matter then let them ban all imports and exports which rely partly or solely on atomic power for their production and then see what sort of position we will be in. Let me narrate some of those countries. This is a catastrophic set of events. I will not name all of the countries involved. First, there is Japan, our principal trading partner and neighbour. There would be no export of meat, wool or other goods. I drive a car that was made partly with nuclear power—there are not too many people who do not. Anyone who has a car from France or Great Britain certainly does.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Stick to the Holden.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I cannot stick to a Holden and dodge nuclear power because, these days, the Holden Gemini and the Ford I drive are Japanese cars—one cannot do that any more.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Get one five years old.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: If the honourable member wants to go back to an FJ Holden we will pick up a good one for him for a couple of hundred bucks. The United Kingdom, West Germany, Russia, Holland, United States, Canada, France all use nuclear power. Should we, in fact, cut ourselves completely adrift from the Northern Territory and Queensland, where they can mine uranium? Should we cut off the Beverley and Honeymoon deposits and say that they no longer belong to South Australia because of our policy (or the policy of the Labor Party, I should say)? The cycle, of course, is the reason why people are demonstrating. Anyone who thinks they might see people protesting or demonstrating in Holland, Germany or New York against nuclear power is wrong (and the same now applies to Russia). People are protesting about the proliferation of nuclear bombs, and so they should—rightfully so. In fact, I have belonged to the Peace Movement on and off for 30 years or more. I think that is only correct, and more strength to their efforts. Indeed, I will not hesitate for a moment to say that that is bad enough, but we have survived for over two score years since the first atomic bombs were dropped, but we have not survived where an excess of casualties has resulted from so-called conventional weapons. Has anyone dwelt on the effect of the oxygen bomb (the 'O' bomb) which was experimented with in Vietnam?

That bomb causes all the oxygen to be taken away and all life is lost. Is it any wonder that protests are held over this bomb, as it is considered that the lives of people are less important than a building, which the bomb allows to remain standing? That is what you are faced with. The people of Berlin, Bonn, The Hague, London, Rome, and wherever, can all be exterminated with material that they created. That is no way to live, coming up to the twenty-first century. This concerns me greatly.

Whilst agreeing with digging this out of the ground and processing it to the extent it ought to be processed in this country, I want to deal with the next cycle, too. I commend to members the reading of the Report from the Joint Committee on Constitutional Review, 1959. The Hon. Dr Cornwall might remember that I requested a principal witness to come before the select committee, Professor Ringwood, regarding the Synroc process, and he put his views on that and went further. I think that he was out to make a quid, and I do not blame him for that. I questioned Professor Ringwood about that after he raised a further matter of how far the fuel cycle should go in Australia. I said that it was

a direct lift-out of the Constitutional Review committee's report. Professor Ringwood became quite annoyed about this.

As my office was only 20 metres away I produced the report and proved it. In this report there are about 10 pages devoted to nuclear fuel energy, alone. The report says:

> The Committee has recommended (1958 Report, paragraph 120) that the Commonwealth Parliament should be empowered by constitutional amendment to make laws with respect to—
>
> *(a)* the manufacture of nuclear fuels and the generation and use of nuclear energy; and
>
> *(b)* ionizing radiations.

The committee went further and recommended:

> Accordingly, the Committee has recommended that the Commonwealth Parliament should be empowered by a constitutional amendment to make laws with respect to—(1) the manufacture of nuclear fuels and generation and use of nuclear energy; and (2) ionising radiations.

The report goes on:

> By 1970 nuclear power may account for the greater part of new power station construction. It is possible that, by 1975, nuclear power output will be equivalent to some 600 000 000 tons of coal a year.

The report continues and says that the matters of manufacture and enrichment should be undertaken in Australia. Those are some of the reasons why I have thought deeply about this matter.

Members on this side of the Chamber have consistently taken the wrong attitude and have consistently said that they are opposed to Roxby Downs because of policy matters, and then stupidly go out and say that copper prices have fallen. No-one on this side of the Chamber has said that copper prices have risen by a few hundred dollars in the last fortnight or three weeks. That is a fact.

There is always fluctuation in prices of minerals. There always is a danger in mining minerals. The graves of children in Wallaroo between the ages of two and eight years who died in the early 1920s and at the beginning of the century testify to that. A previous member for that electorate who is within hearing would also testify to it.

There has always been a danger in mining. Chromates and mercury are spilled twice a week on the continental shelf, and this should not happen; we worry about a nuclear generating plant.

Who am I to deny people the right to earn a living? I have two lads who were with Monarto and were sacked because of what happened there. I know the problems associated with unemployment and the problems incurred in finding housing for one member of my family and his children. It is a responsibility I should accept but, unfortnately, it cannot be broadly accepted. I do not speak without emotion on this subject. If people want to go to Roxby Downs and work in that area, that is their choice, not mine; they are adults and it is nothing to do with me.

Honourable members rise and say that since the indenture Bill there has been a down-turn. That particular set of subcontractors was boring a further air shaft and were returning the following day and were glad that the job had finished. Maybe they had had enough; I do not know.

I am in receipt of a confidential document and do not wish to quote Standing Orders for protection and will only name the companies in numerical order. These figures deal with the total amounts of money paid by Roxby in a short financial year and are for the benefit of members on this side of the Chamber. The yearly wages are:

Company No.	Total $
1	4 331
2	81 176
3	250
4	181 543.80
5	25 597
6	902 073
7	28 465
8	1 295
9	18 481
10	913
11	10 060
12	4 344
13	15 999
14	25 351
15	83 161
16	420
17	9 057
18	6 707
19	29 904
20	1 003.50
21	17 101
22	5 482
23	1 053
24	9 827
25	17 219
26	3 909
27	3 992
28	8 026
29	6 019
30	8 666
31	6 254
32	130 435
33	24 794
34	34 018
35	23 836

Where are the Opposition's screams now? I am talking about take-home pay. The table continues:

Company No.	Total $
36	8 995
37	74 389
38	11 563
39	32 773
40	2 912
41	11 772
42	59 000
43	11 309
44	18 153
45	2 789
46	3 663
47	44 354
48	36 817
49	648
50	50 064
51	4 790
52	14 556
53	2 495
54	57 585
55	1 181
56	17 977

I am pleased to be able to read this, because it represents employment. All these companies, except for a few, are Adelaide companies that are talking about sackings. During the election campaign I will name the companies involved at, say, Edwardstown, or in George Whitten's electorate. I will tell the candidates that, if it is their policy to sack, they had better think about the support they will get. Let the Labor Party make its decisions on humanitarian economic grounds. If it fails to do so, the result of the election may well be different from what the Labor Party expects.

Labor Party make its decisions on humanitarian economic grounds. If it fails to do so, the result of the election may well be different from what the Labor Party expects.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Whom would you be campaigning for?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Never you mind. I have had plenty of offers from this Party.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Which Party?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: The offers have come from people who are still in the Party or who have resigned from it. Labor candidates (and there are a number of them, so Dr Cornwall need not start a witch hunt to disclose their identities) have said, 'We dare not door knock because we get the flack from Cornwall and, to some extent, Sumner.'

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: Is that right?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yes, it is. Opposition members should wake up before it is too late. They should put their energies towards armament control and should not put all their eggs in this basket. The table continues:

Company No.	Total $
57	135 354
58	24 054
59	208
60	3 499
61	4 503
62	18 663
63	79 953
64	499
65	33 112
66	6 189
67	44 306
68	11 219
69	4 000
70	24 748
71	23
72	37 728
73	7 750
74	70 241
75	277 352
76	179 565
77	17 900
78	65 931
79	526 881
80	20 905
81	48 529
82	69 912
83	239 831
84	209 709
85	2 907 215
86	114 928
87	7 357
88	56 028
89	2 801
90	10 099
91	5 891
92	3 350
93	134 024
94	223 148
95	625 284
96	241 005
97	23 232
98	80 965
99	872 294
100	390 145
101	284 000
102	190 000
103	24 071
104	82 630
105	81 192
106	525 048
107	1 037 473
108	11 720
109	96 832
110	187 512
111	1 781 526

The grand total, if Mr Cornwall is interested—

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I don't know what the figures are all about.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: They represent payments to people and money spent by Adelaide, Port Pirie, Whyalla, and Port Augusta companies. The total, in an extremely short part of the financial year, is $16 424 359. If that is what you want to deny the people of South Australia, that is your business.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You do not like what you hear. That is the type of investigation I undertook. Was I wrong in doing so?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I am not nuts; you are. You sneak out three times a week to a veterinary practice that you sold.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I don't get paid for that.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Never mind what you might want to tell the people or have them believe. You get paid for that.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It's only one session a week.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: But whom do you keep out of work?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I'll give you my four hours any time.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: What about the poor coots who work at Whyalla and Port Augusta? The sums of money to which I have referred represent not a bad figure to be circulating in those areas.

I refer now to a letter signed by Chris Schacht dated 12 July as follows:

> Please find enclosed a copy of the uranium policy as adopted by the 1982 A.L.P. National Conference. The existing Uranium Platform as adopted at the 1977 National Conference was reaffirmed unanimously by the 1982 National Conference and is retained at the beginning of the new platform.
>
> The so-called 'Hogg' amendment is an addendum to the 1977 platform and begins on page one with the words:
>
> > That the Uranium Platform be implemented in the light of the following.
>
> Further copies are available from the A.L.P. Office.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall rejected me. Am I expected to climb the woodwork because of an insignificant veterinary surgeon?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Thank you, Mr President. I will not waste my time on that gentleman. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has had quite a bit to say about the person who signed that letter, and that goes for the Hon. Mr Sumner, too. If they had the courage of their convictions they would both resign from this place and contest seats in another place. Clause 10 *(c)* of the A.L.P. uranium policy states:

> Consider applications for the export of uranium mined incidentally to the mining of other minerals on a case by case basis and on the criteria of whether in the opinion of a Labor Government the mining of such mineral is in the national interest.

I would like someone to show me where a definition of 'employees' appears in that document. Clause 10 *(d)* states:

> allow no new uranium mine developments to commence or come on stream whilst the Government of Australia.

How can a national conference tell a number of very large unions with membership in this State and the Commonwealth that they cannot work? That is just not on.

I take very great umbrage at the wording of a newspaper interview with the Hon. Dr Cornwall of 16 June. I will say no more than that at this stage. However, I will refer to the 'Unley Labor Voice', because it mentions my name.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Is that a Labor Party newspaper?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I will come to that in a moment. It states:

> Following recent events, it has been mooted that the A.L.P. be renamed the Australian Lemming Party. So often has the A.L.P. thrown away chances of governing through electoral blunders, that we must have created an image of masochistic perverseness for ourselves amongst political observers. Norm Foster's antics with regard to Roxby, and Clyde Cameron's very effective technique of selling books, have not exactly enhanced our chances of a land-slide victory in the coming State election. Nor has the increasing factionalism within the Party done any good. Arthur Calwell stated that those who publicly declare themselves a the 'left wing' or 'right wing' within the Party, are not part of the body of the bird itself.

The pamphlet continues:

> There have been recent rumours of members resigning or intending to resign from the Party *en masse*. This has not happened and we should be aware of the fact that this course of action is the worst possible. Now is the time to unite around, not retreat from, our basic socialist principles. Members need to demand changes in rules governing conferences, and start to seriously question the tactics of those who express one opinion in their home State, and vote for the opposite viewpoint when away from immediate recrimination or censure.

I wanted to briefly explain the enormity of the project as I saw it because, as I said, I spent a long time among the sub-branches of this organisation in respect of this matter, and I was quite outspoken about it. Anyone who says that what I did came as a surprise does not know me very well in respect of my compassion to those who were working on the project and to those who ought to be working on it. I have emphasised my views in this regard during the time between 1946 to 1968 or 1969.

I saw a programme last night on television which concerned this matter, despite all the arguments about a downturn, and the words of gloom about the inherent failure of Roxby Downs and the silence about Honeymoon. Then there are those who had nothing to say about the giant undertaking of Oktedi in New Guinea, where there is a mountain of copper and everything else, and where everything is air-lifted by helicopter. I do not know how many honourable members have been to New Guinea and experienced the conditions in the high mountainous country there, but those who have would have some appreciation of the gigantic operation that is involved. Further, the weather in those areas is the worst possible weather, with freezing temperatures in a tropical mountain zone.

An article in the Melbourne *Age* stated:

> Roxby Downs is one of the biggest mineral deposits in the world according to preliminary data from Western Mining Corporation.

That is how I envisaged Roxby Downs the last time I visited the area and had a look around as much as possible. It is foolish for the Labor Party to now deny a feasibility study to the Government of the day simply because the Labor Party so stupidly threw away office. The feasibility has continued and analysis of just part of the deposit has shown that the orebody contains 32 000 000 tonnes of copper, 1 200 000 tonnes of uranium and 1 200 000 tonnes of gold.

At times I thought that perhaps the figures quoted for those minerals were inflated, but one thing that I learned, when moving around the country to the extent that I did, was that geologists have a system of communication that is indeed unique. I had the opportunity to speak to a geologist who is now in a position much higher than actually working in the mining industry and who was at Mount Isa in July 1981. He had just returned from overseas and had witnessed the attempted blowing up by one of the national movements in South Africa of the Sassol plant in that country. Although he had been out of the country for some months, while speaking to him I gained the impression that he seemed to be conversant with what was happening at Roxby, at Oktedi and other mineral deposits.

Remarkably, geologists' assessments seem to be rather accurate, although it is said in the industry that geologists are always over-confident about what they might find. The article in the *Age* by David Uren, to which I have already referred, further stated:

> W.M.C.'s Executive Director, Mr Hugh Morgan, said last night: 'Its richness lies not so much in its grades, as in its extraordinary size which will require large scale operations.

Is it any business of politicians whether companies run the risk of losing money in a risk capital area? It is not our business, and we are not here for that purpose: we are here to protect the rights of people. The *Age* report continues:

> Mining would be assisted by the existence of higher grade ore in the deposit, he said. While the overall copper grade of 0.8 per cent would not be enough to justify mining in today's depressed markets, Western Mining says close spaced drilling has indicated 'significant tonnages of higher grade material'. Although Mr Morgan could not be more specific, a number of drill holes have turned up copper grades of between 2.5 per cent and 3 per cent.

By world standards that is high. The Hon. Dr Cornwall would agree with that. The report continues:

> Western Mining said yesterday that the deposit covered an area of 7 kilometres by 4 kilometres, and began at about 350 metres below the surface. The depth indicates that mining would be underground. Drilling has mainly been to a maximum depth of 600 metres.
>
> The company's first estimate of the size of the Roxby Downs deposit was drawn from a drilling programme in a 200-metre grid over part of the deposit. Further drilling would be likely to add significantly to its size. Part of the high grade ore reserve is near the Whennan exploration, shaft which is being sunk into the orebody. Detailed drilling is in progress in this area in an effort to establish a proven ore reserve. Establishing a proven reserve that justifies mining will be aided by the gold content of the ore. At an average grade of 0.6 grammes a tonne, the ore has similar gold content to that of Bougainville.
>
> The uranium content of 0.6 grammes a tonne, the ore has similar gold content to that of Bougainville.
>
> The uranium content of 0.6 kilogrammes a tonne is only about a fifth of that at Ranger uranium mine, but is a significant component in the value of the ore. At current prices, one tonne of the ore would contain copper worth $24, uranium worth $26 and gold worth $7.50. This suggests a value of ore of $US57.50 for a tonne of ore. The copper grade of the deposit compares with 0.4 per cent at Bougainville, 3.0 per cent at Mt Isa and 1.4 per cent at Mount Lyall. The Roxby indenture agreement with the South Australian Government calls for the feasibility study to be completed by the end of 1984.

That is what I was about—the right of the company to continue its feasibility study. Why should it be denied that? The report continues:

> Company officials suggest the study could be completed sooner. Yesterday's announcement of the possible size of the orebody follows eight years of exploration work.

Why should this Council deny the company on 18 June the right to do further work after eight years? Why would the company want a political storm? Politicians should not take upon themselves the luxury of having a stop-go policy in regard to mineral exploration or development. South Australia is in a depressed state as the rest of the world finds itself today. The report continues:

> British Petroleum, which has a 49 per cent stake in the project, officially known as the Olympic Dam Project Joint Venture, is financing the first $50 000 000 of the feasibility work, and will advance loans for any further development work required up to the beginning of construction.

If honourable members want to ostracise me, they can do so. I will not hang my head. If another speaker wants to follow me in debate, so be it, but there is a motion on the

Notice Paper with which I will be dealing in October. My comments may be affected by further remarks in this debate. In conclusion, I commend to honourable members and the public—and it would certainly be the ideal subject of a leading article in any newspaper—the publication *Still Waters: The Chilling Reality of Acid Rain.*

The report of the Sub-committee on Acid Rain of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of the Canadian Government makes startling reading. There were nine members on that committee and its report has shown that the amount of pollution arising from the coal-fired plants that have mushroomed in the United States and Canada has been so disastrous that fish no longer live, trees are dying, children are affected, and in the areas near to some of these coal-fired and other refining plants a staggering 13.2 per cent of the adult population is affected. That is far more than the figure for any other industry in the industrial world.

We can no longer afford further coal-burning plants in the Northern Spencer Gulf region or in the metropolitan area. I suggest to Dr Cornwall that, in his address to this Council, he should have done more homework in relation to coal deposits in this State. I predict that the next development we will see will be by W.M.C. in the Kingston area. Most of the coal deposits in the State are in the hands of multi-national companies or part-Australian companies, such as W.M.C. or B.H.P. Had he done his homework on coal deposits in the Sedan area he would know that they are not large. Ample water is available in the Kingston area. I suggest to the Labor Party that its members would be wise in the event of what might happen in the future not to oppose this undertaking, because it is in the seat of Mount Gambier.

Let me remind the honourable member that the criticisms I have heard have hurt me. I have taken them as personal. I say in all seriousness that, if my memory serves me correctly, you were involved twice in Barker and were defeated. Dr Forbes, at the last meeting of Cabinet in 1969, told Cabinet that his chance of being re-elected was very slim, but he was re-elected. You have been associated with Kingston on two occasions and the Labor Party has lost it. I understand that Dr Gun is now resident in the United States. You imposed yourself on Mount Gambier, and we lost it when it was ours. I advised you three years ago that you should get out because you would be identified with defeat. We lost the seat. We lost Henley Beach, and you involved yourself in Semaphore and we lost there.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: I did not involve myself in Semaphore.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I dragged you in by the heels in the 1975 election for the Labor Party.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF AUSTRALIA LIMITED (MERGER) BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

No. 1. New clause 17, page 11, line 22—Insert new clause as follows:

17. Duties.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other Act or law, no duty of any kind is chargeable or payable on any instrument, certificate or document or in respect of any act or transaction executed, done, suffered or entered into for the purpose of this Act or of any corresponding law of the Commonwealth or of another State or Territory.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

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

Motion carried.

COMMERCIAL BANKING COMPANY OF SYDNEY LIMITED (MERGER) BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

No. 1. New clause 16, page 11—insert new clause as follows:

16. Duties

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in any other Act or law, no duty of any kind is chargeable or payable on any instrument, certificate or document or in respect of any act or transaction executed, done, suffered or entered into for the purpose of this Act or of any corresponding law of the Commonwealth or of another State or Territory.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

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

Motion carried.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 10 August at 2.15 p.m.