

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 25 October 1983

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

NORTHFIELD LOW SECURITY ACCOMMODATION

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:
Northfield Low Security Accommodation.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

Pursuant to Statute—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1982-83.

South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trust.

Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre Trust.

Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trust.

Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1982-83.

South Australian Museum—Report of the Museum Board, 1982-83.

State Theatre Company of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1982-83.

The State Opera of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report, 1982-83.

Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

Pursuant to Statute—

Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Report, 1982-83.

Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936—Regulations—Calcutta Sweepstake.

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—

Proposed Land Division at Part Section 259, Hundred of Monarto.

Proposed Parafield Gardens Primary School Single Transportable Classroom.

Proposal to construct a garage building within the grounds of the Noarlunga Community College, Ramsay Place, Noarlunga Centre.

Proposed Land Division of Section 451, Hundred of Waikerie.

The Parks Community Centre—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—

Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Report, 1983.

Public Examinations Board—Auditor-General's Report, 1982.

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1982-83.

ROXBY DOWNS

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition)**: I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The **Hon. C.J. Sumner**: What is the motion?

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: In due course I intend to move:

That this Council reaffirms its full support for the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act and calls upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment of full support for the Roxby Downs project.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: I gather that Standing Orders have now been suspended and that I can move my motion?

The **PRESIDENT**: Yes.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: I move:

That this Council reaffirms its full support for the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act and calls upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment of full support for the Roxby Downs project.

Mr President, the Opposition moves this motion today because of the uncertainty which now surrounds the future of the Roxby Downs project. The uncertainty arises from a decision of the Prime Minister to consider a full-scale inquiry into the project. If such an inquiry ensues it will be yet another in a series. Its real aim is simply to delay the inevitable day when the Labor Party, under internal siege from its anti-uranium, anti-development left wing, must decide whether or not Australian uranium can actually be mined and exported. I fear that the Commonwealth decision to move for an inquiry is but the commencement of the sealing of the lid on the Roxby Downs coffin. Like the decision to institute an inquiry into the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link, it represents another broken Labor promise—and it will prove exceptionally costly to South Australia. It is a back-down which all South Australians interested in the future of our State must oppose.

This Parliament must be resolute in its support for Roxby Downs. This motion enables all of us to express our strong commitment to the project. The creation of long-term jobs for our record level of unemployed and an improved standard of living, which will arise from the project, are issues which demand a bipartisan approach. We must jointly put our view to the Commonwealth. Exactly 12 months ago, on 25 October 1982, the Premier promised the people of South Australia that, if he was elected, the future of the Roxby Downs project was guaranteed. He said the following in his policy speech:

Roxby Downs can and will go ahead under a Labor Government.

That promise has been accepted in good faith, and welcomed, by most South Australians. It subsequently received the full endorsement of a Labor Prime Minister. It has given the joint venturers the incentive to go on investing in the project at the rate of \$100 000 a day. These funds are employing South Australians now.

The view that Roxby Downs could go ahead has been accepted not just because of the assurances given by the Premier and the Prime Minister but principally as a result of an amendment in 1982 (known as the Hogg amendment) to the Minerals and Energy Platform Committee Report. The resulting Labor policy, which contained some 20 paragraphs, included the following, which was seen as an escape clause for Roxby Downs (this was clause 10C), that an Australian Labor Party Government would—

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

Roxby Downs is clearly such a case! And, in fact, this clause has been openly cited by all A.L.P. members as giving the go ahead for Roxby. Indeed, the Hon. Barbara Wiese spoke in support of the Hogg amendment in those very terms. Now the project is in doubt again. Anyone from overseas witnessing the debate that is occurring in relation to this matter in the A.L.P. community would have good reason to question why on earth there is any doubt at all about whether or not what could be the world's greatest mine should go ahead. They would see Roxby Downs as what it is—a great opportunity to create permanent jobs and wealth in South Australia. Yet, instead of jumping at the opportunity, we find the project still in doubt. At a time when our economy remains depressed the Roxby Downs project

offers a vital stimulus. It is Australia's greatest development project. Already more than \$95 million has been spent on the project and every month an additional \$3 million is pumped into the South Australian economy by the joint venturers.

Whichever way one looks at it, Roxby Downs can be of enormous benefit to South Australia. South Australia was once the nation's big mineral producer. With developments in Western Australia, Queensland and New South Wales, South Australia's importance in this sphere declined. Roxby Downs can help reverse this trend. Certainly, it is not the only answer to our future economic well-being, but it is, nevertheless, a vital project for our State.

This view was recently reinforced by the Marketing Director of the Bannan Government's State Development Department. Mr Johns, the Marketing Director, said on 30 September:

Roxby Downs will be extremely important to South Australia. The production of uranium and other raw materials will make way for further development of high technology and manufacturing industries which will boost the State's economy. It will boost this State's export market by 50 per cent when operating full time, and that will be an economic gain to everyone. It's not a case of 'if' the project proceeds, but 'when'.

That was a full quote. Unfortunately, it appears that, unless this Parliament takes a strong stand, we may be back to 'if' rather than 'when' Roxby Downs goes ahead.

Yet again, the stubborn and blinkered outlook of sections of the A.L.P. has delayed and put at risk the Roxby Downs project. Let there be no mistake: in the resources industry where literally tens of millions of dollars are involved, delays do threaten the project's viability seriously. This puts projects at risk.

It is very hard to believe that we should be forced into moving a motion of support such as this for a project which offers:

\$1 400 in investment;

A new industry worth \$500 million per year (equivalent to just under one-third of the entire State Budget);

Up to 3 000 jobs to construct it;

10 000 new and permanent jobs to run and support—real, meaningful jobs, not simply short-term products of a so-called 'job creation' scheme;

An entirely new town of more than 10 000 in the State's north;

A lift in business and community confidence.

Roxby Downs clearly offers us much as a State.

A recent revision of the reserves of uranium at Roxby Downs has lifted its potential to one million tonnes, putting the value of the uranium at current world contract prices at \$66 000 million. These reserves are so great they could supply the entire Western world with uranium for 40 years at present consumption levels.

A recent press report indicated that the enormity of these reserves was receiving world attention. The *Australian* of 7 July 1983 quoted the Chairman of Nuexco, the leading American brokerage house, who noted our reserves but also pointed to the difficulties:

Mr J.R. Wolcott said recently that Australia was having difficulty in becoming a factor in the world [uranium] market consistent with its potential.

In other words, he was saying that Australia is not realising the potential of Roxby Downs. The article went on:

'In fact, Australia seems determined to "shoot herself in the foot" at every step,' he said.

Nothing could be truer than that. The article continued:

Neither developed resources nor a reliable supplier image has fully materialised.

Mr Wolcott said that vacillations by the Australian Government 'had placed the country in a position where some potential customers regarded it as a supplier of last resort'.

Why should there be any further delay? Why heighten again the uncertainty that had just began to subside? What new information or changed circumstance other than 'political foot shuffling' demands a further study? We have had a number of inquiries into uranium and into Roxby Downs. What will a new inquiry find? We have had the Fox Inquiry; we have had this Legislative Council's Select Committee (which went on for a full two years); we have had the Roxby Downs environmental impact statement. These are more than sufficient bases on which to make a decision. Government by inquiry will achieve nothing and may well lose us a great deal.

The fact which many seem to lose sight of is that the joint venturers—Western Mining and B.P.—are large and experienced corporations. They would not have spent tens of millions already and an additional \$3 million per month unless they had done their sums and established the worth and potential of the Roxby Downs development. To quote Western Mining of the local industry:

The companies involved in the discovery, evaluation and development of these projects have of necessity made a very close study of the world uranium market over more than 10 years.

That all of them wish to proceed with development is a consequence of their judgment that the large investments required to develop these projects are worth while. These are the people of commercial judgment who are close to, and understand, the market in detail.

Recent studies indicate that 25 countries are using electricity produced from uranium—of these, 21 countries are expanding uranium-fuelled stations. Six nations are building their first uranium-fuelled power station and 19 others are planning for uranium-fuelled power stations. This is a total of 50 countries! I point out that 10 per cent of the total world electricity is now produced by uranium, and this puts uranium as the fastest growing fuel for generating electricity. As at May 1983, 294 nuclear power stations were operating, and 215 were under construction.

Completion of the reactors under construction will nearly double world consumption of uranium oxide—providing an upswing in the market in favour of producers. At the same time, by 1990 it is expected that the U.S. will have to import the bulk of its requirements (that is, one-third of the Western world's total). In view of the lead time for such a development as Roxby Downs, this should put Australia as a key uranium exporter in a strong position.

I do not believe it is necessary, in this debate, to canvass safety issues. They have been canvassed previously in this Council during the debate on the Uranium Select Committee. For the purposes of the Roxby Downs project, the Premier has indicated his Government's acceptance that those issues are resolved. He has said—often and unequivocally—that this project can and will go ahead. In saying that, it has to be assumed that the Premier believes it is safe for the project to proceed from all points of view—whether they relate to worker safety in the initial mining stages or the end use of uranium for electricity generation in nuclear power plants.

While this Council and the people of South Australia must be ever vigilant about these questions, they are not central to this debate. What is central is the trust that the people of South Australia have put in us as their elected representatives to ensure that commitments, made by both the major Parties at the last election to the future of this project, are honoured. With the Premier's promise—his clear promise in his policy speech—that this project can and will go ahead under a Labor Government, a degree of bi-partisanship unknown in recent years on the uranium question was achieved. Polls have consistently shown that Roxby Downs has the support of the substantial majority of South Australians. Regrettably, a faction within the A.L.P. seeks to impose its will on the rest of the community in

contravention of the promises made by both the State and Federal Labor Leaders.

On many occasions investors have made it clear to Governments that consistency and certainty of policy are essential to development projects. The A.L.P.'s uranium policy switches have caused confusion over recent years until categorical statements were made by Mr Bannon (prior to the last State election) and by Mr Hawke as recently as last month. These led investors and resource developers to be reassured. These reassurances are vital to these companies.

In the presence of the Attorney-General, the Chairman of B.P. at a recent Adelaide dinner hosted by the Board of B.P. stressed the need for consistent Government policies. The Attorney-General would recall his saying these words. He said of Roxby Downs:

This is not a project which offers quick returns. It involves painstaking and thorough evaluation and long lead times and points to the necessity for a consistent framework of Government policies.

He highlighted, too, how strongly his company relied on the words of assurance which came from the Prime Minister during the Roxby blockade. He stated:

I must say that we have been immensely encouraged not only by the patience, skill and tenacity with which management, miners and police continued work at Roxby Downs throughout this blockade but also by the unequivocal commitment to the project as expressed by the Prime Minister and your own Premier.

This motion is not about embarrassing the State Government or scoring political points. It seeks to obtain joint all-Party agreement for the project and so to apply pressure on the Federal Government to honour the commitments that the Prime Minister made on its behalf that Roxby Downs will go ahead. In an address to the Australian Business Council in September, Mr Hawke said:

As far as our Government is concerned, the Federal Government and the Government of South Australia, the Roxby development is going ahead and nothing is going to stop that.

That commitment is quite clear and it was not the first of such statements. On 1 September in Hobart the Prime Minister said that the Roxby Downs project would go ahead. In the *Advertiser* of 2 September this commitment was reported in the following terms:

The Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, said yesterday the Roxby Downs mine in South Australia would go ahead despite strong protests from conservationists. It was the policy of his Party and his Government that the mine should be and would be developed. We don't agree with the views being expressed by those people (the conservationists), Mr Hawke said.

The Prime Minister's remarks earned him great praise in the editorials. The *News* of 5 September was a typical example, as follows:

Full marks to the Prime Minister for twice renewing his Government's commitment to Roxby Downs. His assurances, as the so-called blockade of the site reached a peak and then a desultory conclusion, could not have been better timed. Mr Hawke was doing no more than re-affirming Labor Party policy.

But, since a central aim of the protestors was to change A.L.P. policy, playing on the emotionalism which surrounds the uranium debate within the Party, it was an effective and necessary use of a Prime Minister's authority. When Mr Hawke made his second statement, the Premier, Mr Bannon, was present. The Prime Minister associated his State colleague with the pledge that Roxby Downs would go ahead.

It is a pity that Mr Bannon was not more outspoken himself during these provocative antics. The editorial continues:

As the Prime Minister plainly appreciates, the yearning for consensus can be taken too far. The anti-uranium extremists are not after compromise or searching for middle ground. They are dedicated to stopping a resource project of immense richness and of crucial importance to this State. Mr Hawke's no nonsense stand was, therefore, in all senses, realistic.

There are indications today that the Labor Party may be moving towards a change for the better in its overall uranium mining policy, regardless of the separate categorical policy of Roxby Downs. It will be entirely for the good of Australia as a whole if it does adopt what the respected South Australian back-bencher, Mr Jacobi,

calls a more realistic and responsible approach. As he says, it is high time that common sense replaced ideology and dogmatism on this issue.

Even as late as this morning we see reports which indicate how threatening a further delay will be to the Roxby Downs project.

On page 1 of the *Australian* the following comments appear under the headline 'Threat by Western Mining Corporation, to shut down Roxby project'. Mr Morgan said that W.M.C. had heard 'absolutely nothing' from the Government about the proposed new inquiry, and that his company's feeling was 'symptomatic of the disappointment prevailing in the mining industry generally.' He added:

We have not seen any terms of reference, we have had no official confirmation . . . but we have already had three inquiries and I don't know what else there is to be discussed.

Mr Morgan stressed that W.M.C. and its minority partner in Roxby Downs, B.P., would not decide on the future of the \$1 400 million project until they had seen the proposed inquiry's terms of reference. But adding that 'anything is an option', he refused to rule out the suspension of the project—which currently costs about \$2.5 million per month—for however long the inquiry might take. The same Federal Labor Party back-bencher, Mr Jacobi, had some very clear words to say about what is occurring, as follows:

There is absolutely no need for an inquiry on Roxby Downs. I will oppose it. There is no doubt about that. Labor's credibility is at stake. We made commitments and we can't backtrack now.

I do not have quite as much confidence as Mr Jacobi, but I do trust that the State Government will continue its support for this project at the same level that we have seen in recent times. Mr Jacobi further stated:

We promised Roxby Downs and we can't go back on our word.

The Roxby Downs uranium, copper, gold and silver mine is a vital project for South Australia. It will provide our State and Australia with jobs; tax and royalty revenues; a huge stimulus to the economy through \$1 400 million in investment and substantial export earnings; and a boost in business confidence. This Council must support this absolutely essential project for South Australia.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: No-one could have expected in June 1982 that, only 15 months later, and after Parliamentary guarantees had been obtained for the huge Roxby Downs project—opposed by the Labor Party at the time and later grudgingly adopted by it—it would be fighting for its life and that South Australia's future development would be under a dark storm cloud, not because of the present Prime Minister's attitude, and presumably that of his Government, but because of in-fighting between members of his Party both in the Federal Parliamentary context and within the organisation.

It is incredible that a mine of world standard, now having the support of the present Premier of the State and also of the Labor Party, should be at risk as a result of ideological bickering. As the Liberal Government said in 1982, and as it has repeatedly said since then, the project is critical to South Australia. The more the Federal Government prevaricates, the more nervous the joint venturers can be expected to become in a difficult international economic climate. Without the project, South Australia is more likely to become a commercial and resource development backwater in Australia. It is true that we have the billion dollar Cooper Basin gas-producing scheme, but we do not have Honeymoon or Beverley. We are less likely now to get a uranium enrichment facility that would have provided about 5 000 jobs. The motor vehicle manufacturing industry is at risk, and the white goods industry is undergoing a period of restructuring and rationalisation. For South Australia to become the vibrant, commercial, industrial and resource

development centre of Australia (as it ought to become), we need major developments such as the Roxby Downs project and other resource developments to provide the basis for expansion in our commercial and industrial activity.

Many people perhaps forget that, when Roxby Downs is up and running, it will produce something like 150 000 tonnes of copper per annum. Last year it was estimated by the joint venturers that, when commitment is made to the project, it could involve expenditure in excess of \$1 billion. Of course, the amount being spent now is something like \$2 million a week, I recollect, which is an indication of the money that can be expected to be spent if the joint venturers give a commitment to proceed with the project after the initial feasibility study. They also indicated last year that between 2 000 and 3 000 people would be employed at the mine site, with the establishment of a town of up to 9 000 people. Of course, there is a multiplier effect of three or four jobs being created for every one job directly created in the mining and resource development.

The township itself, with some 9 000 people, will have to be serviced. As I said in June last year, there are many services which, at first view, may not be seen to be necessary but which, on closer examination, are obviously necessary as a result of the major resource development. Already the project involves daily services such as air charter, heavy haulage and water transport. It also involves bus services, road development, transportable buildings, piping, generating plant, communications, construction, catering, laboratory services, medical care and a variety of other resources that are being used indirectly in the proving up of the deposit. Children also require education: they either travel to Andamooka each day or they are provided with education on site. If the project does proceed after the initial period of the feasibility study, it will have massive repercussions for the South Australian community. It is not only in the provision of services at the site that resource development is important to South Australia but also in the provision of financial and consulting services to the joint venturers as well as the contractors and subcontractors. It also involves the provision of architectural, legal and accounting professional services, all of which are required to be supported by service industries and will, necessarily, involve the creation of jobs for ordinary South Australians.

So, the job opportunities expected to be created from a resource development such as Roxby Downs are quite significant not only at the site but also in the metropolitan area of Adelaide and other parts of South Australia. Although the giant Cooper Basin project is up and running in South Australia, and although there is the prospect of Roxby Downs being up and running, to achieve a snowballing effect of development in the provision of services, we need more development, whether it be of the Honeymoon and Beverley type, uranium enrichment facilities, or other resource development projects. A core of head offices will be situated in South Australia, drawing on the expertise of South Australians in regard to those developments, and that will have wide ramifications for all South Australians.

The other factor is that, if Roxby Downs and other resource developments go ahead in South Australia, they will naturally attract other interests. If, notwithstanding the fight of all South Australians for this major development at Roxby Downs, the Federal Government resolves to delay final approvals or if, when some interim approvals are granted somewhere down the track, it will not grant export licences, it will put not only Roxby Downs at risk but also all other resource developments in South Australia. I believe that all South Australians ought to recognise quickly that that risk is something that they should not be called upon to bear and that pressure ought to be exerted upon the Federal Government to immediately crank up the resource devel-

opment industry rather than throwing obstacles or delaying tactics in the path of the developers.

I would certainly urge the Government, in a bipartisan approach to the Federal Government, to re-affirm the full support of not only the Labor Party and the Liberal Party but also all South Australians for the Roxby Downs project and to call upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment and full support for that project. I would urge all South Australians to take whatever action is necessary to bring home to the Federal Government and the South Australian members of the Federal Government the importance of that project for South Australia.

They can do that either by writing letters, by telephoning Federal members, or by taking other steps to ensure that their view is brought very much to the fore in the deliberations of the Federal Government in the weeks ahead on this very, very important project. I therefore commend the motion to the Council.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I wish to move an amendment to the motion which I think more precisely indicates what should be the view of this Council.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Get's you off the hook, does it?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: No. I understand that a motion will be passed in the House of Assembly in the same terms as my proposed amendment. It would be useful if, for no other reason, a consistent approach to this matter was taken by the South Australian Parliament. I am sure that all honourable members will agree that the amendment is consistent with the sentiments expressed here today by the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr Griffin. However, I think that it more particularly specifies what the view of this Council could be. Therefore, I move the following amendment:

Leave out all words after 'this Council' and insert in lieu thereof:

'recognises that the Roxby Downs project has the potential to bring major benefits both to the South Australian and national economies. It believes that:

- (1) no further inquiry into the project is necessary, and
- (2) its development should proceed under the conditions previously determined by the Parliament.

It further acknowledges that the South Australian Government has taken all necessary action to facilitate the project.'

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: Could you add the words 'in recent times'?

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: Do you include your support for the indenture Bill in that?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It already contains the words 'the Government'. I believe that this amendment does not cut across the sentiments expressed here today by the Hon. Mr Cameron. The fact is that Roxby Downs has the potential to be of enormous benefit to the South Australian economy.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You didn't think so when Mr Foster cast his vote.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think that there was ever a great deal of doubt about the benefits it might have brought in strictly economic terms. The Hon. Mr Hill well knows, and this still applies to some extent, that the Labor Party was and is concerned about certain safeguard issues involving the uranium fuel cycle.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Are you happy about that now. Why don't you let the Honeymoon Mine go ahead?

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: It hasn't got enough copper in it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Did you hear that—'It hasn't got enough copper in it'!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You really are hypocrites.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Hill to desist from interjecting. Either he does that, or I will warn him and take further action.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I also ask the honourable member to withdraw and apologise for the unparliamentary language that he has just used.

The PRESIDENT: I did not hear any unparliamentary language.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I didn't use any. I called him a hypocrite. Calling a person a hypocrite in the political sense is not unparliamentary, and never has been in the Westminster system.

The PRESIDENT: I do not believe that that word is unparliamentary.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I ask you to reconsider your position, Mr President, and to perhaps take some advice from the Clerk.

The PRESIDENT: I have taken that advice, but, from my own observation, this is a word that has been banded around in this Council many times. As a matter of fact, I can recall having used it myself. I do not believe that it constitutes a Parliamentary offence as it was used today.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I am pleased to note your ruling, Mr President. Although I consider it not to be consistent with previous rulings on the use of that word in the Westminster system, I am sure that as a House of the South Australian Parliament we can be trail blazers in more than one way. I am pleased to note that we are prepared to blaze a trail on the use of that particular word in referring to honourable members. All I wish to say, Mr President, is that that establishes a precedent, but a precedent that is inconsistent with previous rulings of this Council and other Parliaments under the Westminster system.

Clearly, Roxby Downs is a copper, uranium, gold, silver and rare earth deposit of major importance on a world scale. As a consequence of the joint venturers' drilling programme, the resource has been progressively upgraded and is currently estimated at 2 000 million tonnes. At indicative prices the average value per tonne of ore is \$88, or a total of \$176 000 million. It is difficult to conceive of another mine of such proportions. Whether or not the mine's production figures are looked at in terms of weight or value, the uranium will only be mined incidentally to the other minerals.

The average grade of copper is 1.6 per cent, while uranium oxide is only 0.6 kilograms per tonne, gold 0.6 grams per tonne and silver 4 grams per tonne. Planned annual production is 150 000 tonnes of copper, 3 000 tonnes of uranium oxide, 3 400 kilograms of gold and 23 000 kilograms of silver. Initial production would be expected to produce revenue in the proportions 45 per cent copper, 45 per cent uranium and 10 per cent gold. The project will bring a range of benefits which far exceed these raw production values.

The cost of construction for the planned production rate of 6 500 000 tonnes of ore per annum is estimated at \$1 400 million (in December 1981 dollar terms). At the planned production level, the direct employment in the operation is expected to be of the order of 2 400 jobs with an additional 700 jobs in a new permanent town for 9 000 people. During the construction phase the project has been forecast by various studies as generating between 9 000 and 18 600 jobs, and, in operation, between 5 700 and 8 300 jobs. Total royalties on a low revenue case for the first 20 years of the project life have been estimated at \$450 million (in 1982 dollars), and for a high revenue case at \$600 million.

In addition, the State will receive pay-roll tax payments of \$2.4 million per annum. Corporate and personal income tax paid in respect of direct project activity will contribute a significant amount to the Federal Treasury. These latter receipts would be increased by a factor of perhaps three in

respect of indirect and induced economic activity. Planning has contemplated the possibility of a further major expansion at some time in the future. Suitable development land in the vicinity of the town site allows for a possible ultimate population of 30 000 people. A standard gauge rail spur from Woomera or Pimba has also been allowed for. This planning is clear recognition that mine life may well exceed 100 years, given the extent of the identified resource. Development of such dimensions is clearly in the national interest. I do not believe we need an inquiry to tell us that. To date, that is, during the period 1975 to 30 June 1983 (and, of course, the previous Labor Government allowed exploration in the area), the joint venturers have expended \$99 518 000 in both exploration and assessment of the Roxby Downs area.

To put this figure into perspective, it is already double the pre-feasibility expenditure for the North-West Shelf project. By the common assessment of the programme, scheduled for completion in December 1984, that figure will approach \$150 million. As my amendment says, Roxby Downs has the potential to bring major benefits to both the South Australian and the national economies. I say 'has the potential', because the figures that I have given indicate the sort of development with the jobs which could flow from it.

It is, of course, a matter now for the joint venturers to continue their work of proving up the deposit to determine whether or not they intend to proceed with the project. As far as the South Australian Government is concerned, the project should proceed in accordance with the previously determined wish of the South Australian Parliament, and it should proceed provided that the joint venturers determine that it is economic to do so. That is a decision within the terms of the Roxby Downs indenture which they must make in the light of the feasibility work that they are doing and the economic conditions at the time. The figures that I have given to the Council, I am sure, indicate that potentially Roxby Downs is a resource of major world significance and has the potential to bring major benefits to South Australia and to the national economy. So, there should be no doubt about that potential.

The Federal Government should be reminded of that potential by a motion passed by this Council and by the House of Assembly so that there is a united view on the project from the South Australian Parliament.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Will you go to Canberra and press your views?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I intend to say something to the Federal Government about the State Government's attitude in relation to this matter, but, first, as far as the Labor Party's general policy is concerned, there clearly are still major concerns about the nuclear fuel cycle that remain unresolved. I do not think that anyone who has looked at the issue, whether it be on this side of the Parliament or on the other, can say that all the safety issues in relation to uranium mining have been resolved satisfactorily.

There are still questions of waste disposal and of proliferation of nuclear weapons, both issues of major concern. I concede that some steps have been taken towards the development of adequate safeguards for the disposal of high-level wastes in the nuclear fuel cycle, but there are still some doubts about that feasibility.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: What changes have taken place since June of last year?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I do not think that there have been any dramatic breakthroughs since June of last year. There were concerns in June of last year, but it is probably true to say that from the time of the Ranger Report there has been an increased likelihood that safe disposal of waste products will be determined. However, there are still some

unresolved issues in that area. That is all that I can say to the Council. Anyone who honestly looked at it would concede that, but progress has been made in developing a safe method of disposal of high-level waste.

Regarding the second question, namely, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, again more emphasis has to be given to this area by Governments throughout the world and, indeed, by the Federal Government. Strong action needs to be taken, for instance, in relation to the French Government's continual flouting of international opinion by dumping its nuclear problems in the South Pacific. There needs to be more emphasis by an Australian Government on the question of safeguards for the non-proliferation of weapons and the dispersion of uranium for use in nuclear weapons. So, the Labor Party's position clearly is that these issues have not been completely resolved to everyone's satisfaction and that more work needs to be done on them.

As far as the policy is concerned, a commitment was given by the State Government to Roxby Downs that was consistent with a decision of the Federal conference of the Labor Party in July last year. The policy determined at that time expressed two concerns about the unresolved problems of uranium mining, but also permitted mines that contained uranium in conjunction with other metals to proceed. In pursuance of that policy, the Premier, as Leader of the Opposition, made a clear and unequivocal statement that under a State Labor Government Roxby Downs could and would go ahead. That is still the State Government's position.

Since the election, further statements have been made by the State Government and, in particular, by the Premier in support of Roxby Downs. Representations have been made to the Federal Government indicating the importance of this project for South Australia. That has occurred on a number of occasions since the election; so, I believe that the amendment which I have moved more accurately—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You said that you would say whether you or the Premier would go to Canberra.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The Premier has been to Canberra and spoken to the Prime Minister on a number of occasions since the election.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: And he has on a number of occasions pressed on the Prime Minister the importance of the Roxby Downs project for South Australia. That has been made quite clear to the Federal Government and similar statements, as honourable members well know, have been made by the Prime Minister.

The fact is that the South Australian Government would be placed in an utterly untenable position should the Federal Government decide that Roxby Downs should not proceed. At this stage all that we have is a proposal for an inquiry; no decisions have been taken by the Federal Government that Roxby Downs should not proceed. Although the inquiry has been proposed, which gives cause for concern and for this motion to be passed, it is worth remembering that to this time there has been no decision by the Federal Government to oppose the development at Roxby Downs.

In summary, I support the sentiments of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I believe that my amendment is a better statement of the views of the Council and that, if the motion is passed in the Council, it will mean that there will be a united statement of position by the South Australian Parliament as a whole in support of the Roxby Downs project.

There should be no misapprehension about the position in this Council, in this Parliament, in the South Australian community, or throughout Australia about the South Australian Government's position: we made a commitment to Roxby Downs prior to the election, given that the indenture

Bill was passed and was a fact of life, and given that the joint venturers were operating under the terms of an indenture passed by this Parliament. The South Australian Government before the last election made a commitment to support the Roxby Downs project and since that time has done whatever it could to facilitate the joint venturers getting to a point where they could make a decision about mining, and of course that includes the environmental impact statement and support in other ways for the project.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: What about the conflict at Cane-grass Swamp?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: That is an issue that still has to be resolved, and the Government is attempting to resolve the conflict between the joint venturers and the Aboriginal groups concerned. My amendment to the motion expresses the views of the South Australian Government. We are happy for this to be placed clearly on the record for this Parliament, this State and for the Federal Government to see. I ask honourable members, in the spirit of getting a uniform approach to this matter out for the South Australian Parliament, to support my amendment.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: Only 18 months ago the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill was passed in this Council. That was an historic occasion, where the courage of one member resulted in the passage of that Bill. About four months later we saw the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr Bannon) announce in a prerecorded election speech that the Labor Party, if elected to Government, would support Roxby Downs. One could not hear the sound of one hand clapping when he made that statement. In the months that have followed the Roxby Downs development has proceeded to a point where we are told that \$95 million has been spent on the project since it was first discovered about seven years ago. We have now reached a stage where we see the State Labor Government in South Australia in a head-on clash with the Federal Labor Government led by the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke.

It has brought into the open the divisions of the Labor Party in Australia on this important issue. On the one hand, we have the Victorian and Tasmanian Labor Parties openly urging their Federal members to change the policy—to ban uranium—and, of course, it is easy for them to say that because they do not have uranium in Victoria or Tasmania. On the other hand, we have the eleventh-hour converts in South Australia who, to win an election, sold their ideological soul.

The Labor Party in South Australia, faced with the reality of what arguably is the largest mining development in the world, agreed to proceed with the development of Roxby Downs. Yet we now have this incredible position where the Federal Labor Government, the Labor Government led by a so-called pro-uranium person, in the shape of the Prime Minister, has backed off a commitment that it gave through the Hogg amendment to the uranium industry.

Sadly, because Roxby Downs is hundreds of kilometres north of Adelaide, it tends to be out of sight, out of mind. It is easy to be blase about what is described as arguably the largest mining development the world has ever seen.

I suggest that, if the \$1 000 million was being spent on a petro-chemical plant at Port Adelaide instead (which hopefully will be the case one day), there would be absolute uproar in the community and from the project's developers if a Government, whether Federal or State, moved to inquire into the need for a petro-chemical plant after \$100 million had been spent, after hundreds of people had been given jobs and after contracts had been entered into for the development of the project. That is exactly the situation that we have here. It is a fiasco.

This position is making not only the South Australian Government but also the Federal Government the laughing stock of the business community not just in Australia but internationally. How can business hope to plan with this 'on again—off again' approach? The fact is that nothing has changed in the uranium debate. There are no new facts, and no new arguments have emerged which indicate that we should not proceed with uranium mining. To the contrary, in recent weeks we have seen the growing recognition of what acid rain will do to the earth's atmosphere and the expected 2 degree increase in temperatures over the next 60 years as we burn more coal and affect the earth's atmosphere. Uranium mining does not heighten that problem. Whilst there has been no change in the facts in the uranium debate, there has been a change of heart in the Labor Party.

The only thing is that the left wing of the Labor Party has gained the upper hand. Simply because there has been a shift in numbers, the pro-uranium Prime Minister of Australia—the so-called 'Mr 70 per cent'—has bowed to left-wing pressure and left industry in the lurch. This has left the developers of the largest mine that the world has ever seen wondering what is going to happen, wondering how on earth they could possibly have got into this situation, and wondering about the strength of a commitment given by a State Labor Government and a Federal Labor Government 12 months ago that it was all right for Roxby Downs to proceed.

This is an unmitigated farce. Although I have not been able to confirm it, I have heard that Western Mining Corporation has, not surprisingly, expressed concern about the latest development. What is it to do with a development when, half way through its long lead time, the ball bounces in yet another direction? We also have the absurd situation where on the one hand the South Australian Government is saying that it has done all that is necessary to facilitate the project (which was initially launched in 1976 with the discovery of the Roxby Downs mineralisation), and on the other hand in the past 12 months since coming to office the Government has wound down the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium projects, which were discovered well before 1976. What sort of consistency is there in that approach?

We have a rather amazing situation where in the Roxby Downs debate last year the now Leader of the Government in the Council, the Hon. Mr Sumner, said (page 4761 of *Hansard*):

The jobs at Roxby Downs are not threatened by Labor's approach to the indenture.

Of course, we know all about Labor's approach to Roxby Downs at that stage—it was dead against it. Now that the indenture is out of the way (one would have thought securing permanently the contractual arrangement entered into by the State Labor Government and the joint venturers), we have an amazing situation where the Federal Labor Government is threatening to destroy the contractual relationship entered into by the State Government and the joint venturers. I think that that is a highly dangerous precedent.

In his policy speech on 25 October last year, Mr Bannon said:

We need to stand up to Mr Fraser and make South Australia's voice heard again in Canberra.

The Prime Ministers have changed and Mr Hawke is now Prime Minister. I join with all members on this side of the Council in putting forward this resolution today and urging that we in South Australia need to stand up to Mr Hawke and make South Australia's voice heard again in Canberra. I ask members of the Labor Party whether they will lobby their Federal Labor Party colleagues to ensure that Roxby Downs proceeds. I also ask members opposite whether they will lobby their Federal colleagues in the Labor Party to

strengthen uranium policy to enable Beverley and Honeymoon to proceed.

There has been a strange silence from the Government in relation to this matter. Other States and other State Labor Parties are putting propositions either for or against uranium mining; South Australia's State Labor Government has stood by mute, I suspect fearful of moving in any direction lest it offends someone. I hope that the Premier, as Leader of the Government in this State, will be strong on this issue and will take the fight up to the Prime Minister to ensure that the contractual arrangement, properly entered into by the South Australian Government with the joint developers 18 months ago, will be allowed to proceed without any more unfortunate delay and without any more uncertainty, because that may well jeopardise the future of this great mineral development.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I support the motion. I think that this is an excellent opportunity for us to give our views on this subject generally. I am hopeful that we will hear from all Ministers in the Council, not just the Attorney-General, so that we know their views on this important matter. A few moments ago I was reprimanded somewhat by the Attorney for indicating, by way of interjection, that I thought he was being politically hypocritical.

Let us face the hard facts of life. In June last year the Hon. Mr Sumner fought like a tiger in the Council against Roxby Downs. One of his own supporters, a Labor man to the core, who was not an opportunist and who had at heart the interests of the workers at Whyalla and elsewhere, went against the Attorney and his Party and, as a result, Roxby Downs was launched.

Not long after Roxby Downs was launched, opportunists within the Labor Party, of which the Hon. Mr Sumner is one (and let us be frank, he went through the university and did Politics I, II and III and decided where his best interests would lie, so he threw his lot in with the Labor Party), took the initiative simply to win an election. We saw the same thing happen only last year in relation to Roxby, when the Hon. Mr Sumner and the Government seized an opportunity to gain power in this State by doing a double somersault and supporting Roxby Downs.

It is politically hypocritical for the Government, on an occasion such as this, to continue the stance that it is all for Roxby. The State Labor Government says that it cannot understand why its Federal counterparts oppose Roxby. However, it was only in June last year that that same State Labor Party was fighting like cats and dogs against it. What about the other Ministers? What about the socialists who sit alongside the Hon. Mr Sumner? Let us hear what the Hon. Mr Blevins has to say on this subject at this time. I would like his comrades and his friends at Whyalla to see his views in *Hansard*.

Surely this is a time when Ministers ought to pull the flag to the top of the mast, show their colours and be brave enough to describe their views on the subject of Roxby Downs. We all know what happened at the last election: the opportunists scented victory and convinced Caucus to change its mind on this issue prior to the election, even though it was only by a narrow margin. This is a chance when Government members on the front bench can give us their views on this subject individually as Ministers and tell us whether or not they are for Roxby Downs. One cannot continue to accept a spirit of compromise, quick footing and side-stepping in the political arena simply to gain and control power.

I would like to hear the three Ministers in the Council stand up and say, 'We are all for Roxby. We were wrong last year in pursuing the course that we pursued at that time. Foster was right and we are now on course and, having

changed our minds at the election, we firmly believe that Roxby Downs should proceed.' However, as a rider, I would also like to hear their views on Honeymoon and Beverley. Frankly, I cannot see how one could support one project and not the other and still be Ministers of principle. In other words, they are on very weak ground, and the people of South Australia are beginning to sense that the Government is on weak ground.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: You're whipping a dead horse, Murray.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The Hon. Mr Bruce says that I am whipping a dead horse. He should be ashamed of himself, too.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Why?

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Because he fought tooth and nail against Roxby Downs only 16 months ago.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: I haven't got a closed mind.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The Hon. Mr Bruce says that he does not have a closed mind. Are we not supposed to have a base to work from, some sort of a political principle and some sort of hard, fixed view on issues of big moment when, economically, the whole of South Australia can be at stake?

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: We support it.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The Labor Party supports it now, but that was not the case last year.

The Hon. G.L. Bruce: Times change.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: At least I give the Hon. Mr Bruce credit, because he nailed his flag to the mast. The Hon. Mr Bruce has given an open commitment that he supports change and that he is now all for Roxby.

I come back to the more important members on the other side, namely, the Ministers. Where does the Hon. Dr Cornwall stand on the issue? One thing I will give Dr Cornwall—he is relatively honest in what he says and in his general purpose and approach. I would like to know exactly what the Hon. Mr Blevins wants, as my friends in Whyalla are always asking me where he stands on the Roxby Downs issue. I say that I think he is all over the place but I cannot get him to speak or to make his voice heard. All the workers in Whyalla and north of Whyalla in places such as Roxby Downs want to know where this champion of the Labor Party stands. Surely this is the forum where he ought to make his voice heard. I would like to see him get up and state his own views.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I bet there won't be a squeak.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: He has an opportunity to speak in this debate. The Government agreed to the debate and has even moved an amendment to the motion. All members opposite are part of the debate.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Members opposite should want to send a clear voice to Canberra in order to give the total voice of South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You have lowered the whole tone of the debate.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: There cannot be much tone in the debate when we are dealing with an issue on which members opposite took one stand 16 months ago and then, for the sole purpose of gaining political power, did a complete somersault. They now have the effrontery to say that they totally support Roxby. Nothing is being mentioned from the other side about Honeymoon and Beverley. They see those projects as being different. As one past member in this place used to say, 'When things are different they are not the same'. That still seems to be the Labor Party's philosophy when different subjects arise. I suspect that, as socialists, the two other Ministers (Dr Cornwall and Mr Blevins) do not really support Roxby Downs.

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: Dr Cornwall certainly did not last year.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Why should he not be given the opportunity and why should not he have the political courage to get up and tell the Council? This is where he was elected to give his views—on the floor of the people's House—not behind closed doors with faceless men in Caucus.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I am the least faceless man in South Australia, so knock that off.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I am challenging the Minister to get up and give his views on the subject. I am also challenging the Hon. Mr Blevins, because of the great groundswell of comment coming from Whyalla. Where does he stand on Roxby Downs? If Ministers opposite do not stand up, the charge of political hypocrisy in regard to the whole of the Labor Party is justified; there is no doubt about that. I hope we all join on this issue, but I have a strong suspicion that the Australian Democrats will not support Roxby. I look forward to hearing their contribution. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan was up at Canegrass Swamp, looking over the scene and grabbing a telephone to ring up a radio station talk-back programme to give his view on what the authorities and the company were not doing up there. I am sure that the Democrats supporters out on the hustings want to know where the Democrats stand on the Roxby issue.

I stand for Roxby Downs as I did 16 months ago. Every member on this side was of the same view and is still of the same view. We are consistent and honest about the issue. However, as far as the Labor Party is concerned, politically speaking it is hypocritical.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The controversial word 'hypocritical' is being used again. Tomorrow I will bring down a ruling on the matter when I have studied the debate which ensued earlier on the use of the word. As I need to research the question, I ask members not to use the word 'hypocritical' in the meantime.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I accept your ruling without question, Mr President. However, I was concerned about the Hon. Mr Sumner's trying to find some 'let out' or excuse and trying to get out of the situation in which he found himself, simply by taking a point of order and asking me to withdraw. The plain fact of life is that A.L.P. members of this Council were totally against the issue 16 months ago. So that they could win the election (and I give them credit as opportunists, as their political tactic paid off) they changed their stand on the issue. As far as political honesty and consistency are concerned, their policy does not stand up. Today, with the opportunity of letting us know what is in their hearts, the Hon. Mr Blevins has cleared out of the Chamber and the Hon. Dr Cornwall is hanging on, but I do not believe that he will speak. The Party probably gagged him in the Caucus room, where it makes secret decisions and where members are under the pain and penalty of expulsion if they go against majority decisions taken in that room of secrets. They are bound to Caucus decisions by written pledge. Last week the Hon. Dr Cornwall said that he totally supported the principle of the written pledge. They are the so-called democrats within our society.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: You will be bound by written pledge if the Valder Report is adopted.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: We do not do that. We are a Party of principle. We give the individual an opportunity in this Council to get up and express his views. We have no pledge or iron-clad discipline. We do not stand here under the fear of expulsion if we put a foot wrong. The Labor Party has expelled members when they have put one foot wrong.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: I am not old enough to remember that—it must have been before my time.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: The Hon. Dr Cornwall only just scraped in with his endorsement last time. It was only

because of the unfortunate death of the Hon. Jim Dunford that he was saved.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the issue.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Minister was doomed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member to keep his remarks to matters before the Council.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The matter before the Council is a very important issue and I believe this is the forum where the Ministers in this Chamber should give their views on the subject. The people of South Australia should know exactly where those members stand. The people do not want to know the decision of Caucus where the majority rules and the minority cannot open their mouths. The people of this State want to know where those Ministers stand, as the public is beginning to say that perhaps the wool was pulled over its eyes last November. They certainly said that when Honeymoon and Beverley were knocked out by the present Government. They did not know where they stood!

The Hon. K.T. Griffin: They also said it when State taxes were raised.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Yes. They have been saying it because of the broken promises that have occurred ever since November. However, this is one issue upon which the South Australian public will concentrate, in my view, for some years to come. The economic future of this State is at risk. Let us face it: unless economic progress is made by this State we do not make any progress at all—we will not be able to pay our social benefits, fund the arts, or give money to the ethnic people who, quite undeniably, need help. We cannot do all these things unless we get money in from the people who pay taxes. However, people will not be paying taxes in this State unless the economy is sound and progressive. This linchpin to this State's economy is not so noticeable at the present time because we are just managing to scrape through, but, as the years go by, the linchpin of the South Australian economy will be Roxby Downs. I return to the situation existing in Canberra and wonder how our Federal Labor representatives can stand and be counted when they have delayed this issue for a further six months with a possibility that it might then go down the drain. Where are the Labor Senators from South Australia?

I have always been informed that the Senate is a States' House. If ever there was an issue in the history of this State on which Senators should be standing up and being counted it is this issue of Roxby Downs. I am waiting to see and hear reports of what is said by South Australian Labor Senators on the floor of the Senate in Canberra about this issue. The member for Hawker is a man for whom I have always had a great respect. He is one of the best Labor people that this State has ever produced, although he does not get much of a go in the Labor Party because he is not a 'trendy' in their sense of the word.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Not like Gordon Bilney!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No; he doesn't send \$10 000 worth of telegrams to gain a bit of publicity.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: And spend another \$10 000 to withdraw the message in the first lot of telegrams.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Mr Jacobi is one of the best Labor politicians this State has ever produced. He is moderate, hard-working, conscientious, and worried at the moment about his preselection, incidentally—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: No, he isn't.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: —because of the great left-wing influence in preselections. Honourable members opposite know that this is true.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the honourable member not to debate the prospects of the next election at this time and to concentrate on the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I yield to your advice, Mr President. I was about to commend Mr Jacobi for a statement he is reported in this morning's press as making. If other State Labor members in Canberra, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, would follow his lead and be honest about this matter then I think that we would start to get the message through to the Prime Minister and Cabinet as to the seriousness of this matter from South Australia's point of view. It is Mr Jacobi's leadership that should give members in this Council a lead in standing up and being counted. The fact that the Government Leader in this Council simply made a general statement and apparently said that that was the voice of the whole membership of the Government in this Chamber is not good enough on an issue of this kind. There are three Ministers in this Council and if the other two do not stand and support their Leader in this very important debate then I can only assume that in their hearts their views are different from those expressed by the Leader.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Nonsense!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Hon. Mr Sumner says that that is nonsense, but let us prove the point—call back the other two Ministers, both of whom have left the Chamber. They do not have the courage to stay in the Chamber during this important debate. They should stand up and support their Leader. As I said when I rose to my feet, my friends in Whyalla have been asking me, 'Where is the Hon. Mr Blevins?' I do not know whether the Hon. Dr Cornwall has any friends—no-one has mentioned anything to me about him. When I was talking to the Mayor of Port Pirie he raised the subject of Dr Cornwall, who really could not call him a friend. However, he is willing to let bygones be bygones.

The Hon. R.J. Lucas: The Minister is a bygone.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I totally support the motion and believe that, if people really think this issue through and accept its importance to the future of South Australia, they will treat it so seriously that leading members on both sides of the Chamber will stand—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Bring a little bit of dignity back into the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Minister should bring his views into the debate.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I want to hear the Minister's views.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to come to order and the Minister not to continue interjecting. He will have an opportunity to speak later.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: An amount of \$2 million a week is being spent on development of this mine, but that could go up the spout along with 5 000 jobs.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: \$2 million a week—that's a big joke!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: An amount of \$2 million a week was reported in the press last week as being spent. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has no idea of the immensity of this project—it is the biggest mine in the world and 5 000 potential jobs are at stake—not 10, 20 or 30. Let me get the message home to members opposite—I am talking about 5 000 jobs!

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: How?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Minister sits there unprepared to express his view. That is not good enough!

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: He supports everything I said.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Then let him get up and say so.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: As the Hon. Mr Davis says, let him get up and say so.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We want to get on with the Council's business.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: This matter is more important than anything on the Notice Paper—all those rats and mice Bills.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: Cut it out, there is a Health Commission matter on the Notice Paper.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I totally support the motion and hope that, before the debate is concluded, we hear the views of senior members on both sides of this House so that the public may judge them.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am not sure that this is an appropriate time to rise during this debate as the climate in the Council does not seem appropriate to deal with this matter seriously. Members have been well entertained by the Hon. Murray Hill, whom I congratulate on being a well-chosen shadow Minister for the Arts. His contribution to the debate has been minimal. This matter is not a question of point scoring and of how many points the two power groups score in the 'support Roxby Downs' contest. It is, in fact, a challenge before this Parliament as to the appropriateness and propriety of a State supporting a uranium mine of massive consequences. It is not just a question of supporting a mine from which uranium is incidental and a part product. I do not believe that anyone of serious intent can deny that Roxby Downs is a major uranium mine or that that is its over-riding intention and character.

The Democrats intend to oppose the original motion, and the amendment, on several grounds. I must emphasise that, first and foremost, our opposition is based on the fact that we believe the mining, selling and using of uranium to be immoral throughout the world until such time as the industry producing energy from uranium can show beyond any doubt that it can handle the waste that reactors produce, the energy is adequately proven to be beyond risk of accident of such proportion that thousands of lives could be lost and the production of electricity by nuclear means has been thoroughly costed.

It is a deceptive market in which the costing of decommissioning and other aspects have not been fully taken into account. Overriding it all is the fact that we suspect that both major Parties in South Australia have been conned by the view of a dollar, and the issue has not been considered on its moral grounds as a uranium mine.

We say categorically that Roxby Downs by itself, as a mineral ore body properly used and exploited, has our support. We are not antagonistic to the mining industry *per se*; nor do we have any objection to other minerals which are deposited in vast quantities at Roxby Downs. However, we are not in any way reassured that the world can handle the uranium industry. Therefore, we are steadfastly opposed to uranium mining at Roxby Downs.

However, that does not mean that Roxby Downs should not continue as a mine extracting and selling the considerable quantities of other precious, wealth-producing minerals. Unfortunately, there has not yet been a serious attempt to assess the viability and feasibility of Roxby Downs as a mine in extracting and selling uranium. That is not surprising because, if I were in Western Mining's or the joint venturers' position, as long as I felt that there was a chance that I could sell uranium as a by-product I would not even hint that there was a possibility that Roxby Downs could be feasible without selling uranium. This is very unfortunate because those who have done some serious work on it have identified for those who care that the cost of the uranium component in the mining operations is enormous. It is over

20 per cent of the total cost of the mine and, depending on the actual price of uranium, the feasibility and viability of Roxby Downs are not as inseparably linked to the extraction and sale of uranium that the joint venturers have persuaded both the gullible major Parties in South Australia to believe. Had the joint venturers been pressed and given this option—'You can proceed with Roxby, but not market and sell uranium'—they would have done some assessments and continued with the development of Roxby Downs.

Incidentally, although many of the previous speakers in this place have described Roxby as the linchpin of South Australia, we have no assurance that Roxby will proceed. That indenture has so many wide open doors that, if South Australia depends on the full development and marketing of uranium from Roxby Downs, it is on very fragile ground, even if either major Party continues with it.

We took some courage when the Hon. John Bannon was quoted on 10 July last year as saying that a Labor Government would seek to renegotiate the indenture. This situation could certainly give those who are determined to renegotiate the indenture a chance to do so. It is not for me to put up arguments for those who do not have moral objections to the mining of uranium; it is not for me to suggest what procedure they should follow, but if Roxby Downs is to be of substantial benefit to South Australia it is about time that the Government negotiated royalties which mean that we get our fair share.

The calculations of royalties by successive Governments have been denied to people who we believe have an inalienable right to those calculations. We have been fed many ideas of what may be the expected benefits to the State of those royalties. The calculation that we have was done under our auspices last year as our contribution to that debate; that showed that there would be only small returns from royalties to South Australia. We were not denying that there would be spin-off benefits. Obviously, if \$50 million were spent by the Government in a town, there would be a spin-off to industry, but how ridiculous that the Electricity Trust itself—a South Australian entity and a statutory body—had to pay for the development of Leigh Creek, whereas Roxby Downs has an infrastructure handed it on a plate! Yet, we (the Government and taxpayers) will offer that as a bonus to the joint venturers of what is claimed to be the biggest mine in the world. What an incredible anomaly that the biggest mine in the world, touted as a money spinner to save South Australia from all its problems, requires such a handout from the State Government to lure it and to keep it going!

The environmental impact statement is a sham, with vast areas which are open to severe criticism and which have already been proved weak: the Aboriginal heritage section of it is faulty; there is not an adequate provision for water; there are serious misgivings about the requirements for tailings storage. People who care about South Australia will be listening and treating these matters seriously. It is not just a matter of the next months or even years as to which Government obstructs or facilitates the procedures to get Roxby Downs going as a mine. In future decades, we may very well be left with an embarrassing tailings problem; we may be looking very red faced in having been contributors to the proliferation of uranium in a world-wide situation. We have now been given an opportunity to pause and reconsider.

I ask the Government whether it will take this issue of Roxby Downs seriously, because it has obviously been forced by forces beyond its control to reconsider it. It is appropriate to look at the indenture again. Although the Democrats have this steadfast opposition to uranium mining *per se*, we would support this opportunity for the Government to renegotiate the indenture. It is a sell-out of the people and

is an embarrassment to the State Government. It stands up in a bad light against the Yeerilerie agreement and other agreements interstate. Neither major Party has made a serious attempt to negotiate with the joint venturers to get a decent deal for South Australia.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Would you support the mining if there were somewhat different royalty conditions?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: No; we do not support the mining of uranium.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Then what you said is quite irrelevant.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I do not believe that it is irrelevant because we have stated our opposition to the mining of uranium. Two of us here are incapable of stopping it, although we would if we could. However, facing that fact, we do not want the State to see its share of the wealth flowing down the drain because the Government has been too soft hearted to renegotiate the indenture agreement. Neither of the major Parties has taken this seriously. No-one has refuted it. The Department of Mines and Energy has not been allowed by either Government to show us its calculations for royalties. Why is there a mystery? If these royalty calculations are solid and support the deal that we get from the Roxby Downs joint venturers, why can we not see them?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: How can you compare them if you have not seen them?

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Let us see them. The calculations that we have done show that South Australia is the loser in the royalty deal. We have invited both major Parties or anyone else interested to refute our calculations. They have not even shown us the figures; if they have them, they have been too embarrassed to say so. Our figures have not been refuted. We have asked for the figures from the Department of Mines and Energy, but the Department is not allowed to disclose them. I would like to know why. In making plain that we intend to oppose both the amendment and the motion, I indicate that we have never supported the mining of uranium from Roxby Downs. We do not intend to change our policy until substantial conditions in the uranium industry are proven to us beyond doubt. If there was any opportunity for a responsible Government to review that indenture, it would be disgraceful if it did not take it. Therefore, it is our intention to oppose both the amendment and the motion.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: In speaking to this motion, I believe it is important to review the political history of the whole uranium debate.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: Only 1½ hours was the deal.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: In the light of that comment, it appears that I am instantly in the position of having to compose a new five-minute speech, which I will attempt to do. It has been said before in this Chamber that for every action there are two reasons: the good reason, which is given, and the real reason, which is not given. It is not possible to pass by this debate without looking at the real reasons for the situation in which we find ourselves today. It is common knowledge to anyone who wants to look at the facts that uranium has been mined in Australia for about 30 years, that the nuclear industry has involved peaceful uses of nuclear power over that period, that a nuclear reactor has been operating in New South Wales for about three decades, and that it is a political fact of life that the peaceful nuclear industry has already demonstrated its safety for a long time but that in recent years a small group of people for their own reasons have whipped-up an anti-uranium campaign of major proportions.

All these facts are a matter of common knowledge. The communists and their sympathisers have been able to recruit many well-meaning people who have been deliberately made anxious by the propaganda created, causing unease throughout society. These people have been able to influence their sympathisers in the A.L.P., which is where the difficulties have begun. Anyone familiar with the corridor atmosphere and talk in this Parliament in June 1982 knows that at least a simple majority of A.L.P. members of Parliament were personally in favour of the passage of the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill and were perfectly convinced of the safety and appropriateness of mining and the peaceful use of uranium.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: How did you work that out?

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: It is something that is plain to people who are able to sniff the political atmosphere. However, tragically, the A.L.P. Party machine, having been influenced by Marxist elements, bound its members by resolution. A.L.P. members of Parliament were put in the position of coming into this Council and opposing the instructions of their Party machine, which they could not do.

The bitterness that that situation caused was highlighted by the resignation of the Hon. Mr Foster from the A.L.P. and his subsequent crossing of the floor on that dramatic occasion. A.L.P. members of this Council at that time were anxious because they were aware that the public had come to see what was wrong with the anti-uranium lobby, and there are records of their shifting and hand-wringing as set out in *Hansard*. I refer to the delightful intellectual exchange between the Hon. Mr Milne and the Hon. Dr Cornwall.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I have to remind the honourable member that we are not going back to rehash the original debate in the Council last year. The question is whether the Council supports or rejects the proposition before it.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Very well, Mr President, I will leave out some of that detail, although I believe that this motion cannot be considered in isolation, because the Labor Party of the day opposed the matter on the grounds of scientific belief, on the instructions of the Party, only two weeks before the Federal Party changed the rules. Indeed, I am sure that South Australian Labor members of Parliament would have been much relieved if the rules had been changed two weeks earlier. The Hon. Mr Foster might not have resigned and some of the bitter Party feuding might not have occurred.

We now have this motion before us for one reason—since the last election, after an initial period of not only peace but actually pro-uranium enthusiasm by the new Premier, who was even moved recently to accuse the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Olsen) of trying to obstruct Roxby Downs, after this initial period of enthusiasm, Mr Bannon returned from Japan and made several luke-warm statements about uranium. That was the straw in the wind, as it were, which told us that the left-wing activists were becoming active again in the Labor Party generally. Clearly, it was about time the A.L.P. stopped claiming credit for the passage of the Roxby Downs Bill which, in fact, it opposed so bitterly. It was clear that it was time once more to start saying that Roxby Downs was not all that it was cracked-up to be and that uranium was not important. The Premier made those remarks to placate the left wing, but the left wing was not placated. The left wing came out in Victoria, all over the place, and it has now come out in South Australia.

I commend the Hon. Mr Sumner on his amendment to the motion to the extent that what he has said is a reasonable proposition. What he has said is reasonable and probably represents his genuinely held belief. My problem with that is that his remarks remain silent about the great uranium debate. They remain silent about Honeymoon and Beverley,

and they do not tell us who will win the next round in his Party machine and what its uranium mining policy will be like next year or the year after. So, even though I agree with everything in the amendment, because it is just one phase of the see-sawing ideological battle with the left wing of the Party and does not represent an enlightened pro-uranium policy, I find that I must oppose the amendment.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): In closing the debate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: It is not necessary for the Hon. Dr Cornwall to speak. The Council has heard him on the other side of the debate, and I would not want to hear him change his mind radically, as he would have to do, if he spoke in favour of the amendment. I thank honourable members, particularly the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, for their support. I give the Hon. Mr Gilfillan and his compatriot, the Hon. Mr Milne, full credit for being absolutely consistent during the entire uranium debate.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson Wrong, but honest.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Nevertheless, they have been consistent. I do not give the Hon. Mr Gilfillan credit for some of the things that he has said today, but they are his views. I believe that he is wrong and I believe that he is wrong to attempt to deny the State the opportunity for one of the greatest developments that South Australia has seen. In my opinion and in the Liberal Party's opinion he is certainly wrong about the negotiations in relation to Roxby Downs. As I have said, I believe that that was the best fought deal that this State has seen in relation to any mining venture and, perhaps, it is the best that Australia has seen. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan has his opinion and we have our opinion, but at least he is consistent. However, that consistency has not been evident on the Government side.

This motion is an attempt to achieve some consistency in relation to the Federal Government's view on this matter and to persuade the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, to be positive about this support and not run away from what he has said. Uranium is a safe fuel for nuclear power stations: regardless of what has been said, it is safe. Uranium has been in use for 26 years and, during that time, no deaths or injuries have occurred through radiation. Nor has any uranium-fueled electricity generating station ever been used as a source of military weapons material. I believe that the red herring of the French atomic tests has been laid to rest in that regard. The uranium that we sell to France is safeguarded; that comes under the mantle of the International Atomic Agreement, and it has not been misused.

Claims that the nuclear industry is violent are just not supported. If it was not for the last two lines of the Hon. Mr Sumner's amendment, I would have supported it, because it is almost exactly the same as my motion. However, the last two lines of the Hon. Mr Sumner's amendment attempt to persuade Parliament to totally support every move that has been made by the Labor Party. The Opposition cannot support the amendment, because we do not support every action taken by the Government in this matter. One only has to look at the anthropological problem facing the Government to know that that is the case. At the moment, the Government has an anthropologist looking at an anthropological report that considered the original anthropologist's environmental impact statement. If the Government does not agree with the current anthropologist, it could be that it will continue to employ further anthropologists until it finds one who agrees with it. I do not support the Government's action in that regard.

I do not support that last part of the Government's amendment. I urge members to vote against the amendment

to ensure that we remove the politics and proceed only with the original statesmanlike motion. Roxby Downs is absolutely vital to South Australia. We must persuade Mr Hawke to stick to his word. The people of this nation must be able to believe their Prime Minister. In order to persuade the Prime Minister I think it is important that both Houses of the South Australian Parliament send forward a clear message, that is, that this State wants Roxby Downs to proceed, and that the project must proceed in order for South Australia to gain the resulting benefits. I urge honourable members to vote against the Government's amendment and to support the original motion.

The Council divided on the amendment:

Ayes (9)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G.L. Bruce, B.A. Chatterton, J.R. Cornwall, C.W. Creedon, M.S. Feleppa, Anne Levy, C.J. Sumner (teller), and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (12)—The Hons J.C. Burdett, M.B. Cameron (teller), L.H. Davis, R.C. DeGaris, H.P.K. Dunn, I. Gilfillan, K.T. Griffin, C.M. Hill, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, K.L. Milne, and R.J. Ritson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the Hon. Mr Cameron's motion be agreed to. Those in favour say 'Aye'; those against say 'No'.

The Hon. I. Gilfillan: Divide!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: On a point of order, Mr President, as there is only one dissentient voice, the Council cannot divide.

The PRESIDENT: I uphold the point of order.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS

MINISTERIAL OFFICERS

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I ask the Minister of Agriculture Questions on Notice Nos 1 to 5.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I do not have the answers to those questions; I ask the honourable member to put those questions on notice for Thursday 27 October. I think that perhaps I can find answers by then.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Why haven't you got them?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mind your own business.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: It is my business.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. Hill: I want to hear the answers.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Hill to come to order. The questions were not asked by him. If he wants to ask a question, he may do so.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: These questions are fairly routine and have been on the Notice Paper for some time. However, as the answers are not available, I will place them on notice for Thursday 27 October.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The questions are sinister. Why do you want names?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I rise on a point of order. The Minister of Agriculture has said that the questions being asked by the Opposition are very sinister. I ask him to withdraw that remark. These questions have been asked before by the present Government when in Opposition. I do not believe that we ever called them sinister. I believe it is inappropriate to use that word in the Parliament.

The PRESIDENT: I call on the Minister to explain his reasons for calling the questions sinister.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I am not quite sure that I have to explain anything. If my comments offend members opposite, quite frankly, that is too bad. I am sure that the words I used in expressing how I see the nature of the

questions are perfectly all right in that context. The fact that the Opposition does not like it does not concern me at all.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is not a satisfactory explanation, nor does it withdraw the implication that the Opposition's questions are sinister. I take exception to those remarks, as similar questions were asked of every Minister of the previous Government.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: We wrote them down.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, answers were provided. There was nothing sinister involved. The Minister is imputing sinister motives—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What is the point of order?

The PRESIDENT: There was a request for the Minister to withdraw the word 'sinister'. As I see the situation, I doubt that the word is unparliamentary, although it may not please the Opposition.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I ask the Minister of Health Questions on Notice Nos 6 to 9.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: My answer is identical to that given by my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. The answers to the questions have not been finally processed. Quite frankly, I also wonder why the name of an acting clerical officer, class 1, in my office, as well as the relevant small salary that she receives, should be a matter of public record. Certainly, seeking details on classification is in order, but seeking the names of employees down to a temporary CO1 is unnecessary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I do not know why there has been a debate about the nature of the questions. Either they will be answered, or they will not be answered.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What do you want to do with all these young people?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask the Hon. Mr Burdett to resume his seat and I call for order. It is quite unparliamentary (a word used in this place many times today) for members on both sides to behave in this way, to continually bellow and to not heed calls to order. I appeal to the Ministers and Leaders on both sides to assist with the Parliamentary procedure. The Hon. Mr Burdett.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: There could be no great expense in providing the information, but I will accede to the request that has been made.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: It is a waste of the taxpayers' money.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: It is not a waste of the taxpayers' money at all. Similar questions were asked by the previous Opposition when we were in Government.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: It is breaking all tradition.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: What is he doing? He can't make a speech.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I rise on a point of order. I fully endorse the desire to reintroduce decorum into this place. The honourable member cannot make a speech—he can only ask a question.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the Attorney-General for his assistance. The Hon. Mr Burdett must state whether he wants to put his questions back on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: Yes, but all of these matters have been raised previously.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I ask that the questions be put on notice for Thursday 27 October.

I ask the Attorney-General Questions on Notice Nos 10 to 13.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Unfortunately, the answers still seem to be in the system somewhere. I am anxious to provide answers, and I suggest that the honourable member place the questions on notice for Thursday next.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I will do so.

JOB CREATION SCHEME

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I ask the Attorney-General Question on Notice No. 14.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I am very anxious to obtain this information for the honourable member but, unfortunately, as yet it is not available.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I ask that the question be put on notice for Tuesday 8 November.

ITALIAN EARTHQUAKE APPEAL FUNDS

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I ask the Attorney-General Question on Notice No. 15. Last Thursday I asked the Attorney-General this question, and he advised me to put it on notice for today. Does he now have a reply to my question?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: I advise the Council that the present whereabouts of this answer is an even greater mystery to me than the answers I should have had to the previous three questions—the ways of bureaucracy never cease to amaze me! I recall approving this matter some time ago. If the honourable member cares to put the question on the Notice Paper for tomorrow, I will use my best endeavours to ensure that this matter is resolved to everyone's satisfaction.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Received from House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill, which is the main Appropriation Bill for 1983-84, provides for an appropriation of \$2 118 637 000. The Treasurer has made a statement and has given a detailed explanation of the Bill in another place. That statement has been tabled in the debate on the motion to note the Budget papers and made available to honourable members.

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

HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Historic Shipwrecks Act, 1981, which mirrors the Commonwealth legislation of the same name, provides for the protection and preservation of historic shipwrecks and relics situated within the territorial waters of the State. Section 5 of the principal Act enables declaration of a shipwreck as historic where it lies within either of the two gulfs, or, alternatively, other inland waters such as the Murray River.

Section 7 empowers the Minister to declare a protected zone of up to 100 hectares around a historic wreck or relic where the wreck or relic is situated in or below the sea and permits the making of regulations to prohibit or restrict certain activities in such zones. The purpose of this Bill is to extend the application of this section to inland waters consisting of fresh water such as the Murray River. Already one shipwreck located in the Murray River has been declared historic, and it is considered that declaration of a protected zone around this wreck is required in order to achieve an adequate degree of protection. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act. Paragraph (a) replaces the definition of 'protected zone' with a simpler definition having the same effect but not referring to 'sea-bed'. Paragraph (b) removes the definition of the word 'sea' as this definition is no longer required for the purposes of the principal Act. Paragraphs (c) and (d) remove references to 'sea-bed' in subsections (2) and (3) of section 3. Clause 3 removes references to 'sea' and 'sea-bed' from section 7 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is that the section will operate in relation to historic wrecks and relics whether they lie in the sea or in inland waters. Clause 4 makes a similar amendment to section 13 (2) of the principal Act.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of the Bill is to replace section 60 of the Housing Improvement Act, 1940, with a provision that requires additional information to be given by the South Australian Housing Trust in relation to substandard houses and makes provision for fees to be prescribed by regulation. When the Housing Improvement Act, 1940, was first proclaimed on 5 December 1940, it contained section 60, which provided:

Upon application in writing stating the particulars of any house in respect of which information is required by any person, and upon receipt of a fee of ten cents, the housing authority shall give or send by post to the person so applying a statement in writing as to whether as at the date of the statement a notice fixing the maximum rental of the house is in force under this Part, and, if so, giving particulars of the maximum rental.

There has been no amendment to that section since 1940 and the fee of 10c does not, of course, cover the cost of postage, let alone the preparation of the statement.

Section 90 of the Land and Business Agents Act, 1973 requires that certain information must be supplied by the vendor of a property to the prospective purchaser. The information to be supplied includes any declaration made under section 52 of the Housing Improvement Act, 1940, in relation to the property, the date of the declaration and the maximum rental (if any) fixed in respect of the house or the part of the house for which a maximum rental has been fixed. The Government believes that it is proper that persons supplied with information by the Housing Trust pursuant to section 60 of the Act should pay a reasonable

fee for that service. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 replaces the last part of section 52 of the principal Act with three new subsections. Section 52 enables the South Australian Housing Trust to initiate rent control in relation to substandard houses by serving notice of its intention to declare a house to be substandard. New subsection (2) requires the Trust to state its reasons for the view that the house is substandard. New subsection (3) replaces the substance of existing subsection (2). New subsection (4) provides that the Trust may withdraw a notice served under subsection (1).

Clause 4 replaces section 60 of the principal Act. The new section will require information as to any notice or declaration under section 52 and as to any notice fixing a maximum rental under section 54. Clause 5 inserts a paragraph in section 87 of the principal Act that will cater for the prescription of fees under the Act. This provision is expressed in general terms but will enable the prescription of fees for statements provided under section 60.

The Hon. C.M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:
That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal object of this Bill is to broaden the Enfield General Cemetery Trust's powers of investment. As the Act now stands, the Trust is limited to investing its moneys in Government securities, Government guaranteed securities or on deposit with the Treasurer or a bank. It is desirable that the Trust be given the same powers of investment normally given to other statutory authorities, so that the Trust may generate extra income from its reserve fund.

The Bill also seeks to remove the Trust's obligation to publish its annual accounts in the *Government Gazette*, which is a costly process. The accounts are audited by the Auditor-General in the normal way, and therefore appear in his annual report tabled in Parliament. Publication of accounts in the *Gazette* is not normally required of statutory authorities. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers the Trust to invest, with the approval of the Treasurer, its reserve fund and any other surplus moneys in such form of investment as the Treasurer approves. Clause 3 repeals section 28, which obliged the Trust to publish its annual accounts in the *Gazette* and also forward copies to the Minister. The whole of this provision is unnecessary, as sections 27 and 29 of the Act provide the normal requirements made of statutory authorities.

The Hon. C.M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARIES OF TOWNS OF MOONTA,
WALLAROO AND DISTRICT COUNCIL OF KADINA**

The Hon. G.L. BRUCE: I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until Tuesday 29 November 1983.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT
BOUNDARIES OF TOWN OF GAWLER**

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until Tuesday 6 December 1983.

Motion carried.

WRONGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Thursday 27 October 1983.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON ST JOHN AMBULANCE
SERVICE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee be extended until Tuesday 6 December 1983.

Motion carried.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION
ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)**

In Committee.

(Continued from 20 October. Page 1220.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Constitution of the Commission.'

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I move:

Page 1, line 24—Leave out "three" and insert "five".

Clause 3 is the heart of the Bill because it seeks to change the constitution of the Health Commission. It is necessary to understand what the constitution of the Health Commission is now, what it will be as contemplated by the Bill, and what it will be as contemplated by the amendment. The South Australian Health Commission as it is now has one full-time and seven part-time members. That, as I will explain in detail in a moment, can give and can be used to provide a proper spread over the health community.

The Bill contemplates a smaller Commission of two full-time and three part-time members—a Commission of five members. The amendment is to change the 'three' to 'five' so that there would be two full-time and five part-time members and a Commission of seven. In my second reading speech I adverted to the purpose of the Health Commission, and I refer to this again. I suggest that a Health Commission could simply fulfil the role of a Director-General in a Department and simply have a management role. I suggest, too, that if it does this there is no real point in having a

Health Commission; it could be effectively managed by a department.

I note that New South Wales has gone back to a department, having had a commission previously, but the whole point of a Health Commission is that it does not operate in the same way as a department. It has something more than a management role: it has a decentralisation function in the operation of the Health Commission and has representation from the health community. That is the only point in having a Health Commission. If one simply has a tight management function as recommended by the Alexander Report, which was commissioned to look at management, a small Commission of five members is fine. However, if one is to pay any regard to the very objective of the Health Commission, which is to decentralise the structures and to have input from the total health community, it is necessary that the Commission is so structured that that is possible.

The way that the Commission was structured by the previous Minister, with one full-time and seven part-time commissioners, it could be and was used to do just that because the Commission comprised the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, who was a full-time member; a woman dentist with an academic and private practice and school dental background; a woman Aboriginal community nurse; an eminent physician and nutritionist with a specialty in geriatric and Aboriginal health; a woman Director of Nursing and also Chief Executive Officer in a community hospital; a g.p. with a background in community health; an academic in a university department of community health; and a woman social worker experienced in the voluntary health field. There were four men and four women.

Honourable members will see that this structure of one full-time member and seven part-time members which exists at present was used to provide great representation and a great overview from the total health community. The members were carefully selected to provide a balance between the sexes, which is particularly important in the health field. Also, not only did each one have a different expertise and a different input to bring to the Health Commission, but almost all of them had several fields themselves. So, the previous Minister so structured the Commission under the existing Act as to enable the Commission not just to be bureaucrats and not just to have a management role but also to have an input from the total health community.

This Bill seeks not only to change the structure of the Commission in the way that I have mentioned but also to abolish the Health Services Advisory Committee so that there will be no input into the Commission from the general health community.

The Bill has passed its second reading. Therefore, the existing structure has to be changed. The objective of my amendment is to extend the number of part-time Commissioners from three to five and, therefore, the total Commission from five to seven, so as to enable the Government and the Minister, if the Minister sees fit, to do something like what was done before. The structure of the Commission as the Minister intends, as he has said from time to time, is the two full-time Commissioners (as set out in the Bill), and they are to be the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Health Commission respectively. They are public servants.

It is mentioned who the others will be. One will be another public servant; that is, one of the part-time Commissioners. Another will be an accountant, a financier, and I am certainly pleased to see such a person included. The fifth one will be a medical administrator, and certainly the person suggested is an excellent choice. However, it means that only one health professional is involved in the field in the Commission. There is no other input from that area. The Chairman of the Commission is certainly an excellently

qualified person and was an excellent selection (I congratulate the Minister on that) but is not now involved in that field.

We do have a management-centred Commission based on public servants, based on bureaucrats (I use that word in the best sense), so we do not have that broad input that exists with the Commission as presently structured. True, the Alexander Report suggested the setting up of a Community Health Advisory Committee, and doubtless the Minister will look at that and implement it. Community health is a concept which I support thoroughly, but it is only a fairly small part of the total activity of the Health Commission. I do not see that as any substitute for having a Health Commission which has the excellent broad base that the Health Commission structured by the previous Minister has.

The Health Services Advisory Committee is to be abolished by the Bill because, as the Minister said, it did not work. I am not sure therefore that the Community Health Advisory Committee will necessarily work either but, in any event, it is not a substitute for having a proper input from the health community into the Health Commission, which applies at the present time because community health, as important as it is, is only one aspect of the total work of the Health Commission. For these reasons I have moved my amendment, which is a compromise. At present we have one full-time Commissioner and seven part-timers. The Bill proposes two full-timers and three part-timers. The amendment is in the middle and proposes two full-timers plus five part-timers and gives room for the Minister to move, if he wishes, somewhere towards the present direction of giving some input into the Health Commission from the total health community.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Government opposes the amendment strenuously. True, the previous Minister and Government did, to use the Hon. Mr Burdett's words, '... so structure the Commission', but the fact is that they got it wrong. Despite the fact that they appointed several very good people, none of the seven part-time Commissioners could really find a role for themselves. It is no reflection on the part-time Commissioners at all, because they were people of excellent knowledge and substance and were tremendously well regarded in their various areas of expertise and in the community.

However, in practice they became nothing more than seven part-time dabblers. They used to come in once a fortnight for a matter of perhaps 2½ to 3 hours, and they really could not make up their minds whether they were involved in policy development *vis-a-vis* the Government of the day, or whether they were involved in policy decisions. At the other end of the scale, they were not sure whether they should be involved in the day-to-day running of the Commission. None of the functions that they tried to take upon themselves was entirely satisfactory, to put it mildly.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Who told you that?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It did not take me long to work it out when I became Minister of Health. There is no question about that at all. There were some quite substantial conferences. As is well known, the Commission is subject to the Minister's general direction and control. In those circumstances, it is very important that the roles and functions of the Commission and the Commissioners themselves are well defined. With seven part-timers, that was quite impossible.

Also, we had a ludicrous situation where, in the absence of the full-time Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Health Commission, the deputy, the number two professional employed in the South Australian health structure, could not take over the job as Chairman. In fact, he was excluded from sitting on the Commission. That was a ludicrous situation. Ultimately, the decision was

not based on something that I decided sitting in isolation in my office, and it was not arrived at after some sort of superficial examination by Cabinet. As part of an outreach or part of the whole review of Government operations which had been headed by Mr Bruce Guerin of the Premier's Department, I set up a review of the Health Commission under the Chairmanship of Mr Don Alexander, Deputy Director-General, E. and W.S. Department, a very senior and extremely competent public servant.

The other members of the review committee are all well known and senior competent public servants in South Australia: Mr Don Faulkner, Public Service Board, Mr B.A. Brooks, and Mr Mel Whinnen. After suitable deliberations, they produced an excellent report. One of their outstanding recommendations is as follows:

4.1 The Commission itself should be restructured to comprise the Chairman, Deputy Chairman (both full-time) and three part-time members appointed by the Minister, and its role should be revised. The Commission's role would be to advise the Minister and to assist the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer in the management of the Commission's affairs. It would not itself attempt to fulfil all of the functions listed in the Health Commission Act, but act more like a 'board of management'.

The three part-time members should be carefully selected by the Minister with their potential contribution to management the prime consideration. In this context, the individual is more important than background but, for example, an effective composition could be:

A senior or recently retired public sector manager.

A private sector appointee.

A respected health administrator.

No members should represent sectional interests. It is recommended that full delegation to the Chairman/Chief Executive Officer should continue, but with a more formal process of accountability to the Commission for decisions taken. It may also be useful to assign particular functional areas of operation, for example, planning, computing, finance to Commission members as areas of special attention compatible with their personal expertise. This is becoming a widespread practice on company boards in the private sector.

We want to tighten up administration and draw on the considerable expertise available within the private sector in South Australia. To suggest that that is going back to a department situation is nonsense and shows yet again that, unfortunately, the Hon. Mr Burdett has not begun to grasp even the periphery of his shadow portfolio. At the outset I said that, when my Party first came to Government, we had to make a decision as to whether we would follow the New South Wales situation, dismantle the Commission and go back to a Health Department, or whether we would further upgrade the Commission and make it work as effectively as possible. In the event, the Government took a firm decision that it would put the stress and emphasis on management expertise; that was most appropriate in the difficult times in which we live. That is precisely what we have done.

I will explain later how we can draw on the collective wisdom of a whole range of people in the health industry. It is not appropriate to do that by using them as commissioners. I resent the fact that a half-baked, unhappy compromise amendment has been moved. It interferes with the legitimate business of the Government and it interferes with the legitimate business of management. I refer to the report produced by Mr Don Alexander and other senior public servants.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Do you accept everything in it?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I do not automatically accept everything in reports that I receive. However, I most certainly accept recommendation 4.1 in this report. More importantly, Cabinet accepts it and Caucus accepts it. I stress the point that it is not a question of ideology. If it comprised 'way out' thinking that was supposed to represent radical change or a move down the path to dreaded socialism (which the Hon. Mr Hill talks about so frequently), then it

could well be a legitimate matter for public concern and for contention within Parliament. However, it is a legitimate move by the duly elected Government of the day to take a significant step to tighten the administration of the Health Commission.

We are telling the people of South Australia that we want to tighten the management structure. I am rather dumbfounded that our Conservative friends opposite are not jumping up and down with delight. In other circumstances, the Hon. Mr Davis, with the dollar signs gleaming in his eyes, would be on his feet telling us that we must be careful about how we spend the taxpayers' money and how we must carefully shepherd the hard-earned tax revenue that comes into the Government coffers. Of course, the Bill is all about better management.

The Hon. Mr Burdett's amendment completely departs from the Alexander Report, which emphasises substantially strengthening the management skills and expertise of the Commission. As I have said, this is not the mid-seventies; we live in times of limited resources and, therefore, effective management of resources by responsible Governments is all the more important. I repeat that, for those who have not yet read it, the Sax Report makes it very clear that there is no fat within the health area. Therefore, we have to be very careful, and we must be extraordinarily accountable in the way in which we handle the substantial public funds in the health area.

Certainly, the better accountability of public funds will be achieved through significantly tightening the Commission structure as proposed in the Bill. I will expand a little on those people to be appointed as the three part-time Commissioners. They have already been appointed to the Commission to fill recent vacancies. When the three part-time Commissioners are working together with the Chairman and Deputy Chairman, we will have an effective and efficient Commission. First, Mr Rick Allen has been appointed from the private sector—he is a man of substance and great standing in the financial management area of the private sector; secondly, Commissioner Mary Beasley has great experience and skills in public sector management; and, thirdly, Dr Brendon Kearney, who is currently the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and formerly Acting Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission—he is a person who has great skills and expertise in relation to health administration.

The Chairman of the Commission is a very senior and experienced medical administrator, and even the Hon. Mr Burdett agreed with that. The Deputy Chairman is Mr John Cooper. He is a non-medical person, but he is one of the best qualified, most experienced and effective health service administrators in the country. I am asking Parliament to please give the Government the opportunity to tighten up the management structure of the Commission and to put the emphasis on tight and effective management—not to have part-time dabblers who do not really know whether they want to produce policy on the one hand or go into the day-to-day management of hospitals on the other, and do not know quite where they stand in the scheme of things.

It is most appropriate that a Minister of Health should have available to him or her the sort of advice that the Hon. Mr Burdett talks about. However, that should not be done through the Commission itself. That leads to inefficiency and, in some cases, gross inefficiency. I give an undertaking so that it is in *Hansard* and on the record that we are proposing to establish a Community Health Advisory Council. It will have representation from a broad spectrum within the community, and it will be a consultative and advisory council in the best sense. It is being developed very carefully with patience and prudence so that when it is set up it will not be like the old Health Services Advisory

Committee. It will not represent 14 separate vested interests. We are going to get it right.

At this point I serve notice that, if the amendment is carried, it is quite unacceptable to the Government. At this stage of the proceedings there is no room for manoeuvre. In fact, I am prepared to lose the Bill if it is interfered with, because that would destroy everything that I am trying to put in place in the Commission. I repeat that, if the combined numbers are used to interfere with or defeat the Bill, at this time I see no room for compromise, because it would defeat the entire spirit and intent of the legislation. If the combined numbers are used to interfere with the Bill, be it on the heads of members opposite, and they can wear the public odium.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I am sorry that the Minister sees fit to take such an emphatic stand in the Committee process in this place. The Democrats do not intend to be bulldozed by what seems to be a high-pressure push to support a measure that we may, on deliberation, find that we cannot conscientiously support. The issue is, for those of us not close to the Commission or the health industry, a complicated one. We have taken great pains to listen diligently to advisers from several areas, all of whom had complete trust and confidence in the information they gave to us. I have spoken to people who work closely with the Commission. Without pretending that that is an extensive background on which to make decisions, I make it plain that we have tried as best we can to obtain a helpful and balanced response to the dispute on whether there should be three or five part-time Commissioners.

The argument as to the role of the Commission is a fascinating one and is important for the proper role of the health administration in this State. I do not see that the argument will be won or lost by the increase or decrease of two people—depending on which number one favours. If it is the role of the Commission to do certain things, I do not believe that that role would be affected by a difference of two people one way or the other. These people have not been over-worked in regard to the amount of time that they have had to put into the Commission. I have been told by the previous Minister that that is his assessment. However, there are several aspects of the Commission's work which get different emphasis from different sides of the Chamber. The administration responsibility, the policy-forming or policy-discussing responsibility, and the sector representation responsibility are three aspects. Obviously there is no dispute that administrative matters are an important role of the Commission.

It seems that the Minister is making an effort to get the most effective administrative structure together. For that he should be congratulated as it is an important aspect of the Health Commission's services in South Australia. If that same body is also to act as a sounding board and a policy-contributing entity, it has a very important role to play. My advice is that there is no other sector or group which has that role. Unless the Minister contradicts me, I take it that my assumption is correct, namely, that the Commission is a policy-contributing entity and is relied upon for discussion and contribution. The third aspect concerns professional representation. I can see that, by having extra people, it would add marginally to the scope for representation of professionals if the members were chosen wisely and well.

The opinion I have received from people close to the Commission is that, on balance, the optimum number would be two full-time and five part-time Commissioners. Balancing that has been the reflection that it is not an issue of such enormous proportions. If we are reducing the number of people on the Commission, my one concern is this: is it the genuine intention of the Government and the Minister to establish representative advisory bodies? The suggestion I

consider worthy of further discussion is sector advisory bodies. Is a genuine attempt being made to obtain advice from the profession? I have also been advised that previous complaints have been that the industry does not have easy access to the Commission. People in the health field believe that it is difficult to approach the Commission.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The Children's Hospital.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I was not referring specifically to that. I would be reassured if the Minister could answer in this debate and give a little more detail than he was prepared to give earlier when he glossed over the health advisory unit. Could he spell out in more detail what definite plans he has? I will give the Minister an opportunity to give such detail.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is absolute nonsense (I am not suggesting that what the Hon. I. Gilfillan said was nonsense) to suggest that we do not have a process of consultation. We are already putting in place consultative councils around the State. The Central Northern Health Advisory Committee is already operating, is an active group and is right where it is all happening in the Elizabeth, Salisbury and Munno Para areas. Its input is first class. There is already an eastern Health Advisory Committee based on the North-Eastern Community Hospital. I suggest that members not only read the Sax Report but also memorise it, as it will be the bible for the medical field for the next five years. Members will note that the Sax Report recommended Sector Advisory Bodies and it is my intention that such bodies be put in place.

It is my clear intention (and this has been canvassed all over the State) that we should move towards Area Health Councils. We are quite close to putting one in place on the South Coast. We are also moving to have such a body in place in the Riverland to advise on the delivery of total health services in the region. They are going in all over the State at various levels. Consultation is increasing, as it ought to be. I would like to set members' minds at rest if they have any thought of wanting to go back to the system of centralism without consultation. Quite the reverse is happening. There is a consultative process right down to regions in various areas. Structures are being put into place so that the feedback comes up to the upper echelons of the Commission.

I also add that, in a State as small as South Australia from a population viewpoint (1.3 million, which is not exactly California), a great number of people are involved or concerned with the general spectrum of health—such people knowing each other all round the State on a first-name basis. By and large, where the systems are in place and working co-operatively, many of them know the Minister on a first-name basis. No great problem exists. In most of these health units, consultation is widespread and I intend to see that it is expanded through these various mechanisms which I have outlined. The Government sees the Commission itself, in the thrust towards tighter management, as being specifically a management body. For that reason, I would be loath to support what I believe is an unhappy compromise.

With the structure and personnel I have outlined, having seen some of those people, in particular Mr Albert, in action already and having heard the contribution that he is able to make (there was a very sensible and tradesmen-like manner to it), I am very optimistic that we can get this tight management structure. The purpose is to administer a very complex system dealing with health care delivery—the Commission (the 300 professional employees, or thereabouts, in the Commission) in Pirie Street is not into health-care delivery itself. For that reason I believe that that has to be kept as a very tight operating structure.

The other point that ought to be made is that, when all of this information is fed into the Commission from the proposed area health councils, the health advisory councils and the sector advisory bodies that we intend to set up, it will be processed by some top-line professionals in a specific Policy and Projects Division. I believe that I can make a strong case that this is the best Policy and Projects Division in Australia. We have some top professionals working there and I must say that, by and large, it is a joy to work with them. So we have, I submit, a lot of consultative processes at all levels of the system. We have mechanisms whereby accessibility is being expanded all the time through more and more area health councils or advisory councils being established around the metropolitan area and around the State. What we need, in addition to that, is to tighten the management of the Commission, which is precisely why we have brought this Bill before the Parliament.

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Hon. Mr Gilfillan made a thoughtful and interesting contribution to this debate. He stated that he did not know whether or not it made very much difference if there were two full-timers and three part-timers or two full-timers and five part-timers, but that he did think that, on balance, ideologically the two plus five, as in the amendment, was the better alternative. The Minister made it perfectly clear that he would sooner not have the Bill than have it so amended. Of course, members of the Liberal Party in this place did vote against the second reading of the Bill and did speak against it. If the amendment is carried I will support the third reading of the Bill because I believe that that would be a compromise. However, if the amendment is not carried I shall be speaking to, and voting against, the third reading of the Bill.

I was interested in the proposition put by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan. It is difficult to weigh up the numbers, how they will work and what they will contribute. As he has suggested, on balance, as a matter of principle, two plus five, as in the amendment, is the better figure. That being so, I suggest to him that he give consideration to voting for the amendment. It is a stupid proposition put by the Minister that an amendment interferes with the business of the Government. That proposition would simply abrogate the whole role of the Parliament.

The Hon. J.R. Cornwall: You know that this is the linchpin to improving the administration of the Commission, and you are interfering, in this instance, with the legitimate business of the Government?

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: The Minister will have an opportunity to speak again, if he wishes. However, he did say that the amendment was interfering with the business of the Government. That was a stupid statement, and I am quite sure that the Hon. Mr Gilfillan does not think that. He clearly has taken seriously the time that he has been in this place and his role as a member of this Council. He wishes to make his work effective and to not just accept the position that to seek to amend a Bill is interfering with the business of the Government, because that is ridiculous. I resent the suggestion that the seven part-timers were part-time dabblers. On the contrary, they contributed a great deal to the work of the Commission. The Minister has suggested that the Commission, as he would structure it, would not have a policy role to play. It will presumably have an executive role only. He says that he has an excellent policy division, and, from what I have heard of that division, I would certainly agree with him. However, that is no substitute for having on the Commission people who have experience in the health field. I worked, as Minister of Consumer Affairs, with an excellent policy research division, but it was no substitute for someone who had input directly at Ministerial or Director-General level, which is one of the things which the Health Commission is doing.

The Minister again relied largely on the Alexander Report in this debate, as he did during his second reading explanation. In my second reading speech I referred to the role of the Alexander Committee and said that, fairly, it was established to deal solely with the question of management. As far as I am aware, there were not many members of that Committee who had much expertise in the health field. The Committee was part of the review set up by Cabinet to inquire into management generally.

As I have said before, management is important. However, management is not the only thing to be considered, and the expertise of the Alexander Committee came from other administrative areas in the Government sector—it was not from the health sector. Surely the Minister has made it very clear on many occasions that his main concern is with patient care, which is also my main concern. People who are simply in management do not have knowledge about patient care. If one goes away from a Department level and appoints a Commission, one has the opportunity (and this was the concept espoused by the late Sir Charles Bright) within that Commission of employing people who can make a direct input, not only into management but into patient care and all those other spheres that our very wide-ranging Health Commission encompasses. It is for those reasons that I suggest that the Commission, as structured under the previous Government, was the better alternative.

If this amendment does not pass the Committee I will be opposing the third reading of the Bill. My compromise was to extend the number of part-time employees from three to five. As the Hon. Mr Gilfillan has acknowledged, that appears to be a better structure. My reason for so doing is to enable the Minister, if he so chooses (and he does not have to), to use those extra numbers to appoint to the Commission people with expertise, people in touch and people in communication with the general health community. I cannot stress too strongly that the Commission should not have merely a management role. If it does, there is no point in having a Commission; there might just as well be a Director-General of the Department, and that is it. The only point in having a Health Commission is to decentralise the structure for the delivery of health care and to have input at the very place where it counts, in the decision making of that Commission. For these reasons I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. I. GILFILLAN: I appreciate the Minister's answer to my query. I think that he specifically mentioned the sector advisory units. Perhaps it was not spelt out with all the nuts and bolts details that might have assured us 100 per cent but he expressed his intention, and no doubt he will be receptive to the complaint that the communication and representation are not as good as they could be in the future. I want to make quite plain that we are not persuaded that the reduction in the number is of advantage to the Government.

However, another very important factor is involved in how we vote; that is, for the time being at least, the Minister has the responsibility and the very onerous task of running a Health Commission and the maintenance of the health services of this State. On that basis, we will vote to support the Minister's position and oppose the amendment because, although, as I have said before, we are not persuaded that that is a more efficient or better form in which the Commission can work, it does not appear to be such a crippling deficiency that the Commission will not perform to a certain extent in relation to the responsibilities that have been outlined very articulately by the Hon. John Burdett. So, acknowledging that we have an obligation to respect the Minister's view and bearing in mind that in balance (although not agreeing with him completely on this matter) the point of dispute does not appear to us to be of such significance

that we should support the amendment, that is the way in which we intend to vote.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I know that the Hon. Mr Milne is busy at the moment on other matters concerning the Bill in regard to smoking which is before the Council. I thank honourable members for their contributions on this clause. In view of the fact that for some very extraordinary reasons I denied myself the opportunity of replying to the second reading debate, I think that within the parameters that we established in this debate on this clause I can briefly sum up.

I give the Council an unequivocal assurance—I certainly give the Hon. Mr Gilfillan an unequivocal assurance—that consultation, as far as I am concerned in the health area, is the name of the game. I have been at quite some pains since I became Minister to establish where appropriate what I call a 'regional presence'. For example, Dr Brian Dare has already been appointed as area health co-ordinator at Port Augusta; we have appointed a similar area health co-ordinator in the Riverland; and it is our intention in the near future to appoint a similar person in the South-East; so, we have a regional presence.

We are facilitating the access of people in the health industry to the Commission by maintaining the sector arrangement. It is our intention, as I said, to set up sector advisory bodies, as recommended by Dr Sax and his colleagues. We also intend to proceed, wherever possible, to establish area health councils. The closest that we can get at the moment is probably what we are moving towards on the south coast, based at Victor Harbor, and what is evolving naturally (albeit fairly rapidly) in the Riverland. We already have in the suburban areas a Central Northern Health Advisory Council, a model which, with some modification, we can progressively introduce around the metropolitan area. So, there will be very adequate bodies and structures for consultation and advice through the sectors and ultimately through the Chairman is the executive panel to the Commission itself. I am very optimistic that those structures can be put into place in the next two to 2½ years, and I am also very optimistic that they will work well.

I come back to the point that, in terms of the administration of the health industry, with its 20 000 employees and its \$575 million budget for 1983-84, I make no apology at all for wanting to have the tightest possible administrative structure at the top, because although I may be careless with my own money—that is a bad habit that I fell into over 30 odd years—I am scrupulously careful with other people's money. For that reason, I am most anxious to have the tightest administrative structure possible.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (9)—The Hons J.C. Burdett (teller), M.B. Cameron, R.C. DeGaris, H.P.K. Dunn, K.T. Griffin, C.M. Hill, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, and R.J. Ritson.

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

Pair—Aye—The Hon. L.H. Davis. No—The Hon. K.L. Milne.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—'Meetings of the Commission.'

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: My amendment on file is consequential on the previous amendment. A quorum of three was appropriate for a Commission of five, and a quorum of four would be appropriate for a Commission of seven. However, as the previous amendment was defeated, I do not intend to move the amendment on file in my name.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 and 9) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move: *That this Bill be now read a third time.*

The Hon. J.C. BURDETT: I oppose the third reading, just as I opposed the second reading because, as I have said several times (I will not speak at great length now), I believe it was the concept of the late Sir Charles Bright that the point of a Health Commission is that it does not just replicate the role of the Director-General and the Minister. Not only is the management of the Commission itself involved, because the Commission has a role to play—an executive role, a managerial role, a policy-making role and a role related to the very substance of the total health provision in this State.

The Commission, with one full-time member and seven part-time members as structured, covered a wide range of people in the public and private sectors of health, not simply the more traditional roles of medical care, hospitals, and so on, but a much wider range, extending to community health, and so on. To me, that was an excellent way in which to structure the Health Commission, and it is the only way to structure it if one believes in the Commission. It seems to me that the Minister is going part-way towards the New South Wales concept of coming back to a department, as the New South Wales Labor Government has done.

Certainly, it does not satisfy me to hear the Minister talk about the various consultations, excellent as they may be. What one needs is someone in the Commission itself who is part of the Commission and who has direct communication with, and is in touch with, what is going on in the health community. It is because the Commission is so large (although it is in a small State) that it can easily get out of touch with health professionals and other people in the health field. I believe that this is what is happening. Certainly, there are not many health professionals who would support what the Minister is doing, for the reason that there ought to be this kind of communication. The present set-up is appropriate and, as this Bill seeks to change that, I oppose the third reading.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: I, too, oppose the third reading, and I can assure honourable members that I will be brief. The Bill seeks to reduce the number of part-time health commissioners and, in doing so, reduces the importance of community input into the health area. It seems to be a shift towards centralised bureaucracy, and I have much difficulty in understanding why the Hon. Dr Cornwall, having recently demonstrated such limited knowledge of things that are going on in his hospitals, would want to reduce that sort of advice. Further, I was appalled last Wednesday night during the debate, and during the taking of the vote, by the behaviour of Labor Party members who engaged Mr Milne in loud conversation thus preventing him from hearing the Opposition's arguments—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I notice that someone has come into the gallery carrying a banner. I ask that the banner be taken out and left elsewhere.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: When the bells rang for the division, a number of A.L.P. members surrounded the Hon. Mr Milne and in a forceful and almost threatening group. The Hon. Mr Milne has often positively espoused community input into Government decisions but, when he escaped from the Labor scrum with a bewildered look on his face, he proceeded to vote for the emasculating of the present Commission. Perhaps the fatigue of the late night sitting might have contributed to the Hon. Mr Milne's bewilderment, but nothing can excuse the bullying tactics

of Labor members. This was far beyond anything that I have seen in this Chamber in my limited experience of four years in Parliament.

I know that it is common for members of the Parliament to lobby for votes, and members of my Party do approach, say, the Democrats to seek their support for measures, from time to time, but, really, when the Hon. Mr Milne was descended on by a physical wall of Labor Parliamentarians during the ringing of the bells and during the process of dividing on the clause, it must have been intimidating. Certainly, it was most unseemly and most extraordinary in the view of members on this side. The Hon. Mr Gilfillan has just said that he sees much merit in our arguments but that he has some loyalty to the Government and so voted in the way that he has, and I suppose nothing can shift his views—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out to people in the gallery that they cannot display banners, and I ask those people with banners to take them outside. There is still sitting room in the upstairs gallery, and visitors are not permitted to stand in the lower gallery.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: Perhaps I can interrupt my comments and take a point of order, Mr President. The question of access to the floor of the Council and security in the Council relates to some extent to the use of the President's gallery. It has been the practice for people to sign the book that is held by the policeman at the door. I wonder whether you, Mr President, have in fact invited people into your gallery on this occasion.

The PRESIDENT: I have not invited anyone into the gallery, but I am watching the situation. Providing people behave according to the requirements and standards expected, I will leave them there.

The Hon. R.J. RITSON: In fact, I have made all the points that I wish to make at the third reading stage. I oppose the third reading.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I must say to the extent that I am able under Standing Orders that the Hon. Dr Ritson was critical of people in the gallery—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is to be no debate about that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: He talked about the potential threat to national security, I think.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I bring the Minister back to the debate.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: There are many familiar faces in the gallery, and I can assure the Council that there is no threat to security, national or otherwise, although there may be a threat to tobacco companies. I am most upset that the Opposition is fighting tooth and claw to the bitter end to oppose the third reading of the Bill. I will be perfectly happy to review the operation of the Commission in a couple of years.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You won't be in Government to do it.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: God willing, I will be sitting on the Government front bench for as long as I choose, and as long as my health and strength stand up because of the great pressure under which I put myself in making sure that South Australians have access to the best possible health care in the world.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: You are a living legend.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: As long as I am a living legend, I have no wish to have any memorials named after me. If experience proves after, say, two years of operation that the very widespread consultative mechanisms that we are putting into all the health areas are not adequate, or if

the very good and tight administrative structures that we are putting in at the top are seen to be too restrictive and are not working, I will be very pleased to reconsider them. I believe that the steps that we are taking at this time are appropriate. All the advice that I obtain from the people concerned with value for money and with quality care is that this is the way that we should go. I enthusiastically commend the Bill to the Council.

The Council divided on the third reading:

Ayes (11)—The Hons Frank Blevins, G.L. Bruce, B.A. Chatterton, J.R. Cornwall (teller), C.W. Creedon, M.S. Feleppa, I. Gilfillan, Anne Levy, K.L. Milne, C.J. Sumner, and Barbara Wiese.

Noes (10)—The Hons J.C. Burdett (teller), M.B. Cameron, L.H. Davis, R.C. DeGaris, H.P.K. Dunn, K.T. Griffin, C.M. Hill, Diana Laidlaw, R.I. Lucas, and R.J. Ritson.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

[Sitting suspended from 6.56 to 7.45 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 1270.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): The Council is considering today the first full Budget of the Bannon Government since its election in November last year. I say 'first full Budget' because, in many ways of course, this document is the final stage of a process of releasing the Budget which has taken place over some months. It is the culmination of a strategy that can be traced back to December last year when the Bannon Government presented to the Council its interpretation of a Treasury review. Since that time, in a process that was accentuated in the weeks just prior to the Budget being brought down, the public and the Parliament have been drip-fed various sections of the Budget strategy. The Government's strategy in this process has been to make the final presentation of this document to the Parliament something of an anti-climax.

Tax and State charge increases, euphemistically called 'revenue measures', had already been announced, and the capital works programme was released early in an effort to gain mileage from what one could at best describe as an uninspiring Budget package.

The conflict between what an A.L.P. Opposition said it would do in Government and what it is actually doing, now that it is there, is marked. Major commitments have been cynically broken. The breaking of the 'no new taxes or increased taxes for the term of the Government' promises have already been referred to and highlighted by the Opposition on a number of occasions. I will take up in detail later in this debate this inconsistency between policy and performance.

First, I wish to set the scene for talking about our alternative Budget strategy. There is, of course, common ground between all Parties in certain long-term Budget objectives. Principal amongst these is the aim of promoting employment or its converse of reducing unemployment. It is the means of achieving this objective which points to the conflict between the Liberal and Labor Parties. Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Beyond this overwhelming concern about employment and unemployment the Liberal Party has at least three other long-term objectives, they are: first, limited or reduced taxation; secondly, a balanced

budget; and, thirdly, proper use of capital and recurrent funds. Within the short term, of course, there will be occasions when such long-term objectives may have to be temporarily put aside, but this should be the exception rather than the rule, and we should not be afraid to take the hard decisions necessary to achieve our long-term goals.

In seeking to stimulate employment in South Australia, the Labor Government and the Liberal Party are at odds. On the one hand, the Labor Party emphasises expanding the public sector to reduce unemployment and promotes short-term high-cost job creation schemes. On the other hand, the Liberal Party believes that long-term jobs are best created through the private sector and that an expansion of the Government sector will only raise the cost of Government and hence create the need to lift taxes and State charges placing, in turn, pressure on the private sector (the source of most taxes and revenue) thus providing a disincentive to employment. The creation of public sector jobs, therefore, may only serve to replace jobs that are lost in the private sector and provide no long-term benefit to employment in South Australia.

The Liberal Party is philosophically opposed to higher taxation. The Labor Party is not. The Labor Party, over many years, has adopted policies and taken action which raises taxes substantially, always with the view that if tax rises are needed to support greater involvement and activity by the State then it is justifiable. Pragmatism within the A.L.P. leads it to say that it regrets higher taxes and charges. However, this is not a philosophically based opposition. We believe that steps could have been taken to contain State tax and charge increases. A Liberal Government would not be afraid to take them and would have, in turn, been able to limit the accumulated budget deficit.

In the 1982-83 financial year, the Bannon Government failed to control department spending, resulting in overspending by \$23 million. This year, the Government proposes an increase in spending in real terms of 4 per cent in an effort to fund its election promises. This increase will consume the new tax and charge increases and mean that South Australians, whilst being forced to pay more than ever before, still face a record accumulated deficit which will undermine the long-term economic stability and well-being of our State. In other words, this budget has done nothing to face or solve the major economic problems which the State faces and merely postpones the day when Government spending has to be tackled. The only other way in which the accumulated deficit can be tackled is by a further (and more substantial) lift in State taxes and charges, something that is opposite to the desire of most South Australians.

There is an alternative strategy which the Government could have adopted. As a start, last years departmental overspending should have been contained. The cost of a Liberal Government's election promises would have been much less. Coupled with job creating capital works proceeding at Finger Point and Cobdogla and no cuts in the O-Bahn project, action to limit promises and spending would have enabled the accumulated deficit to be reduced by approximately \$20 million in 1982-83. In this year, a containment of Government spending to even a 1 per cent growth in real terms would have produced a saving of \$36 million. Reduction of public sector employment by attrition alone would have reduced the wages bill by approximately \$24 million.

Such savings would have meant that tax increases could be avoided and the accumulated deficit could have been reduced by more than \$3 million. Coupled with the action for 1982-83, which I mentioned previously, this would have put the accumulated deficit in 1983-84 at \$41.5 million—\$26.5 million less than under a Labor Government.

It is appropriate in commenting on this Budget nearly 12 months after the Bannon government was elected to review its performance in meeting the nearly 800 promises which it made prior to the last election.

We all recall the major promise not to raise existing taxes or introduce new ones. We all recall, too, the commitment not to use State charge increases as a means of 'back-door taxation'. Both of these promises were discarded by the Government almost at the beginning of its term. One wonders how many more of these will be broken. The most appropriate way to evaluate performance against promise is to return to the Government's policy speech made on 25 October 1982. It was, one would have to acknowledge, a well orchestrated speech, the model for which has been so evident in recent Labor campaigns in other States.

The speech was full of rhetoric: phrases like 'new direction', 'new vigour', 'winning again', 'squandered opportunity', and 'great community purpose' rolled from the youthful Leader's tongue. Almost 12 months down the track we now have the opportunity to compare rhetoric with action. Let me remind the Council of Mr Bannon's policy speech. He opened his speech with a fanfare:

South Australia needs a new direction. It needs a new start. It needs new opportunities, new developments and new vigour.

Well, South Australia has achieved new status. Our State now has record unemployment and has witnessed the highest inflation in Australia. Under this Government we are breaking new ground.

And what is this new direction? It is inwards—towards greater Government control, putting power into the hands of the politicians and the bureaucrats (whether they be in the trade union movement or the public sector) and taking it out of the hands of the people.

If one wishes to work for the Government then one must be prepared to join a union. That applies to everyone—would-be teachers, too. There is no freedom of choice. If one is not a member of a union, the Government will provide one's name to the union so that pressure can be brought to bear to make one join up. If one is self-employed and not a Government employee one still cannot escape the net. Subcontractors who wish to work on Housing Trust sites have to join the union.

But this compulsion is not confined to unionism. If one owns a farm and wishes to clear land there is no guarantee that one will be allowed to. One first needs permission of the Government. If approval to clear is refused, one is not entitled to compensation. And our health system will be increasingly centralised. The Minister wants to have greater control—because only he knows what is best; we have seen an example of that centralisation tonight. And so the list goes on. Mr Bannon went on to say:

We don't say Governments have all the answers, but we have the responsibility to try, and to lead. Instead of sitting back we need to go out and get our share of growth and development, and our share of jobs and investment.

And how has the Government done this? By closing the door to the Honeymoon and Beverley mines, throwing South Australians out of work, undermining business confidence and ensuring that in the future businesses think twice about investment and creating jobs in our State. How can we hope to attract business, growth and investment when our Government:

Legislates so that the Industrial Commission does not have to take into account the public interest and the state of the economy in making wage judgments.

Legislates to increase benefits under the compensation laws, guaranteeing a hike in workers compensation premiums and hence in business costs, making it even more costly to employ people!

We have seen today a most enlightened view given by a Federal Minister on the cost of employing people. I should quote a little of what Senator Button said today; I thought it was an extremely thought provoking statement. He said:

Australia is the only country in the world to have long service leave and I suspect, four weeks annual leave, with a 17½ per cent loading thrown in.

Senator Button said that all issues relating to add-on costs of employment, which represent about 45 per cent of total labour costs, would be 'up for grabs' in discussions that would now take place, and that employers as well as unions would need to abandon their entrenched attitudes towards changes. They are very wise words, indeed, and I trust that Senator Button will not be silenced in this matter and that the State Government will assist him in his attempts to ensure that the cost of employment falls and that some people through that are employed.

He indicated that employers and unions need to establish what workers could justifiably get in the future if we are to have a healthy industry sector. That really does relate to South Australia, because we have a problem in our add-on costs, and this Government has done nothing except exacerbate them. Perhaps it ought to get some advice from Senator Button, who is obviously one of the clearer thinking members of the A.L.P. I will be interested to see whether his views will survive the pressures that will come down upon him.

The Hon. Anne Levy: Didn't you hear *A.M.* this morning?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: No, I did not hear *A.M.* I did not hear Senator Button trying to make excuses, recovering from the barrage of criticism that would have come upon him from the people who would not want such things touched. One of the problems in Australia is that the people in work are not interested in the people out of work. Workers are quite willing to accept higher and higher rates and benefits but they do not give a continental for people out of work. That is one of the sad things about Australia.

I have heard time and time again people say that one can be at the end of the street and be unemployed with the rest of the street not being interested, and this certainly shows up in their attitude towards add-on costs in regard to employment. The Government has increased a host of charges and levies on business. First, there is the financial institutions duty, which is about to be applied. Then there is the general insurance levy, which is one of the cruellest that I have seen, even in the short time that the Government has been in office. There have also been increases in fuel tax, liquor licence fees, water charges (up by 22 per cent), electricity charges, pastoral rents and, finally, bus fares. I could go on and on. This Government has done nothing but add to the costs to the community, well above the cost to the community, at four times the rate of inflation.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: What did the Government promise?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Government made absolute promises that it would not increase taxes and would not use charges as backdoor taxation, yet the opposite has been true. This Government is comprised of one of the most deceptive groups to gain government in South Australia and I am sure the Government will get its answer some time in the future. In the very next paragraph in his speech the now Premier said:

We need to stand up to Mr Fraser and make South Australia's voice heard again in Canberra.

Heard again, indeed! Mr Bannon's Federal Labor colleagues have:

Moved to defer the essential Roxby Downs project—potentially the world's largest mine!—as a result of A.L.P. factional fighting.

Abandoned the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link—a project of great importance to South Australia.

Scrapped the Bicentennial Water Resources Programme—cutting back on millions of dollars to South Australia.

Introduced a wine excise on fortified spirit.

That is one of the most incredible things of all. The Government does not even know how much it will get out of that excise. It thought it would get \$13 million and then the Minister, who has a very good Department, found that he would get \$26 million. Then he said he would halve the rate. That was most generous, except the Minister was giving back only what he was getting originally—\$13 million, unless he expected the amount of fortified wine to drop by half. The Government has threatened intervention on the question of Aboriginal sacred sites. Our voice is not being listened to in Canberra—the South Australian Government seems to have a strategy of attack through silence!

Mr Bannon stated in his policy speech that the A.L.P.'s 'major goal in government will be to get South Australians back to work in a productive way.' So what do we see? The Public Service has jumped by 2 000, placing an additional burden on already beleaguered taxpayers of \$30 million to \$45 million per annum. We see short-term projects created at great expense, again at taxpayers' expense, to provide short-term, generally superficial jobs. Many of these jobs which the Government alleges it is creating will give some form of employment to people, if they are lucky, from six to 12 months. But what about the long term? Long-term jobs will only come, as Mr Bannon acknowledged in his policy speech, by taking steps 'to unlock investment funds and create real jobs.' He went on to say:

As a first step we will establish the South Australian Enterprise Fund to assist the expansion of industry.

The Hon. Mr Davis has raised this matter from time to time and we are still waiting patiently to see what will eventuate. Twelve months into Government, and we are yet to see this 'first step'! The only step that has been taken is to increase taxes and charges in this State. Questions in this place of the Government have failed to elicit any details. Could it be that the Government recognises the futility of the scheme? We have been assured time and again that the scheme is coming—it is yet to materialise.

Turning from the economy generally to the tourism industry, the A.L.P. Leader said in his policy speech:

We view the vigorous development of South Australia's tourism industry as a key part of our strategy to reviving our economy.

What practical and vigorous steps has the Government taken? It has increased liquor fees by one-third to reduce the profitability of many tourist establishments; increased fuel prices through increased taxation making tourists pay more either directly or indirectly through higher costs for bus operators, and so on; increased a host of taxes and charges referred to earlier; ensured the cancellation of a \$3.5 million motel project by deciding to build the remand centre in a commercial/residential area in the city itself; and supported the election of a Federal Labor Government, and its very own Minister of Tourism, Mr Brown, as the honourable Minister will remember, questioned why anyone would wish to come to Adelaide, and criticised the establishment of an international airport here.

The Hon. Anne Levy: He said that koalas piddle.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That was not very nice either. Still on tourism, Mr Bannon went on to say:

Under a Labor Government tourism will not be an appendage to another major portfolio.

Within days of making that statement, we noted, the A.L.P. appointed Mr Keneally as Chief Secretary, with tourism as

his second and junior portfolio. This was a clearly broken promise, and of course, since then, the poor Chief Secretary has been so consumed by the prisons question that tourism has dropped well away as a Government priority; in fact, it has almost disappeared.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Touring the State, looking for a gaol that is still in one piece. The policy speech went on, as does the list of broken Government promises. Mr Bannon stated:

We would take all possible steps, including action at a national level, to ensure that oil from the Jackson field is piped through South Australia and not to Brisbane. This makes economic sense. It is more economical and it is vital for our State. But [and note the Labor Leader's words] we have got to have a Government that will fight to ensure this happens and not like our present Premier who simply caves in to Bjelke-Petersen.

Mr Bannon's fighting for South Australia was k.o.'d in the first round and already Queensland has a signed, sealed and delivered deal to obtain oil from the Jackson field until next century! On transport Mr Bannon said:

... our priority will be to keep fares down to attract and retain passengers.

Yet we have seen increases of up to 60 per cent (and averaging over 40 per cent) in public transport fares. If that is keeping fares down, then I am afraid that we had better send the members of this Government back to school, because they obviously need some re-education.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: Back into Opposition!

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I think that that will happen anyway, but they need to go back to school as well. Mr Bannon continued in his policy speech:

We will give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the north-eastern suburbs and to the neglected southern areas of Adelaide.

And what has now happened? Sections of the O-Bahn programme to serve the north-eastern suburbs have been deferred, and the land held as a bank to allow construction of a north-south freeway is to be sold, ensuring that the transport option will never be able to be built. In 1986 there will be a ludicrous situation where the O-Bahn will be of no use to the people in the north-eastern suburbs, because they will have to find transportation to the terminus, and that will be some way down the track.

The policy speech included three paragraphs in particular, which I am sure that the Government wishes everyone would forget. Remember its unequivocal promises on taxes and charges and how they have been shattered. Remember what the Premier said so assertively looking directly at the camera as his policy speech was broadcast around the State, as follows:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation. The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing taxes during our term of office.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: What about the financial institutions duty?

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: That is exactly right. A financial institutions duty is about to be introduced. We have heard that it will begin on 1 December, although we have yet to see the Bill. The Premier also said:

We will set up an independent inquiry into the State revenue collections and changes to the taxation structure would come after that inquiry reported and take place in our second term.

As every South Australian would know, all too well, taxes and charges have risen—in most cases well above inflation—and a new tax in the form of the financial institutions duty is to be introduced on 1 December. In concluding, Mr Bannon said:

We certainly propose a new direction from what we have now—and it's a direction we must take. We ask you to join us in that

great community purpose. Because we want South Australia to win!

The unique definition of winning includes record deficits, increased taxes and charges, record broken promises, record unemployment and inflation, subservience to Canberra, compulsory unionism, cancelled resource developments, and many other items. Nowhere more than in the area of health would the Government's stated objectives promoting consensus and consultation be so at odds with reality. The Minister of Health has adopted tactics of confrontation and personal abuse at every opportunity.

I make no apology, to either the *Sunday Mail* or to anyone else, for saying that. The Minister has bullied and bludgeoned anyone who dares to disagree with his point of view. He almost brings that attitude into this Council. Time after time he indicates that the Opposition should not really be asking questions—how dare we!

The Minister of Health would have one believe that only he is right and that all that he does is carried out in the name of the public interest. All that the Minister of Health does, he does for himself, for satisfaction of his ego and for self-praise. I have never known anyone to praise himself so much on a continual basis. He would be well advised to remember that, if a person is good enough, he does not have to tell people, because it is obvious. However, the Minister continues to promote himself on a continuing basis. If he can increase the power in his hands, he will, but, if he can pass the buck when the going gets tough, he will. Administration by inquiry is his approach.

This man who acts as the bully-boy of health has used and abused more people in his 12 months as Minister than I have ever seen in my 12 years in politics. What concerns me most about the Minister's behaviour is that confidence in our health system is being undermined. Many South Australians willingly devote a great deal of time and energy without remuneration to the community, serving on hospital boards, working for St John, the aged and the infirm, and serving on health committees and bodies. They quite rightly will not allow themselves to be attacked and threatened by the Minister as so many people in our community have been, including the Mayor of Port Pirie, the Board of the Port Augusta Hospital, the volunteers of St John, the Board of the Julia Farr Centre, the Chairman of the Hillcrest Hospital, and many others whom we know about but who have not yet been mentioned publicly.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: Morale is lower than it has ever been before.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: The Hon. Dr Ritson is dead right. Even journalists carrying out their jobs in the public interest have been attacked—as a journalist from the *News* will attest. People will not serve and, as a result, vital community participation and involvement will be lost all because of an arrogant Minister's dogged disregard for others.

I am pleased that the Minister of Agriculture is present in the Chamber, because I now turn to a matter that I have been raising continually ever since the project was cancelled, and I refer to Finger Point. I have asked the Minister several questions, all of which he attempted to answer. However, he did not really get around to the nitty-gritty of the problem.

The problem is that, when the previous Government decided to proceed with the Finger Point project, it was because of an inquiry that was carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department, a study of the impact of Mount Gambier sewage discharge on the marine environment and marine life in the area of Finger Point, which revealed that rock lobster and abalone were at real risk. This poses a real threat to our vital export market. The previous Government decided that it would be irresponsible, following that study, not to proceed and do something about

the problem. The details of this report, which was commissioned by the former Government, have never been released.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: That is not true. The member for Mount Gambier quoted from it in the House the other day and said that it was freely available.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: On at least two earlier occasions I asked the Minister of Fisheries to release the report and to give me a copy. I am not worried about what the member for Mount Gambier does, but when I ask a question in this Council, I should get an answer. As it was said that the report would be available, I am concerned that that occurs. I think that is fair enough: if the report is not available and if it will not be made available, then the Minister should say so.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It is not my report. It is an Engineering and Water Supply Department report. I will try to find it.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: You said that you would find the report and give me a copy. I have waited and waited: I have been extremely patient about the whole business.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: You should have gone to the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: He is not the Minister of Fisheries and he is not responsible for the protection of the fishing industry in this State: the Minister is responsible, and it is the Minister whom I have been asking. In the *Advertiser* recently it was revealed that yet another report prepared by the Coast Protection Board also addresses the problem of Finger Point. That article states:

The report also recommends the construction of a \$6.58 million secondary treatment works to treat Mount Gambier sewage and effluent which flows into the sea at Finger Point. The report says there are dangers to the fishing industry from the effluent. 'A large proportion of the South Australian catch of rock lobster and abalone comes from the south-eastern area, and much of the catch is for the export market, especially to the United States and Asia,' it says. It is imperative that the quality of rock lobster and abalone products remains above suspicion.

We would stress the importance of immediate, regular monitoring of the heavy-metal content of the effluent from Finger Point and of the biota (total animal and plant life) of surrounding areas. As a first reaction to any discovery of high levels of heavy metals, fishing within a specified radius (perhaps 10 kilometres) of the outfall should be prohibited.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: I have asked some questions, and I will even ask the Minister again tomorrow. I will give him time overnight to find the answers. Is the Minister of Fisheries aware of the Coast Protection Board report and, if so, can I be provided with a copy, either on a confidential basis or otherwise? It does not seem to be very confidential, because it has been provided to the *Advertiser*, and I trust that people who are showing some interest in this issue as well as Kym Tillbrook from the *Advertiser* will be provided with this report.

I think that it is important that we know what is going on, and we are interested: we are concerned. Has the Minister been provided with a copy of the report and does he agree with the views contained in the report? Will he immediately release the Engineering and Water Supply Department report for the Council's benefit, because he has indicated that he would do so and I would be very grateful for that? Will he approach his colleague the Minister for Environment and Planning with a view to using both reports as the bases for a joint approach to Cabinet to obtain special funding for this much needed project? If this problem arises and the decision (and the only decision that can be made) is to extend the area of banning of fishing to 10 kilometres, that would take the prohibition zone into Victoria, which would cover the entire coast from Finger Point down and into Victoria. That zoning is not working, because I have been

down there recently and I have seen abalone divers fishing within the area that is supposed to be prohibited and, clearly, it is impossible to police it on a continuous basis.

At least the Government could do something about the sewage to redress the most irresponsible action taken in regard to a very vital export industry in cancelling the Finger Point project. The Government's action showed an absolute total disregard for the fishing industry and for the prospects of the South-East of South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Burdett: And for the health of the people.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes. I do not quite know how we will eventually persuade the Government to do something about the matter, but it will happen. I do not care whether the Government does it now or next year and gets credit for it then, as long as something is done to rectify this problem. The suggestion was made to me at Mount Gambier that our great marathon-running Premier should be invited to Mount Gambier for a run from Mount Gambier to Finger Point so that he can have a dip at the end of it to see what it is like.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: He could walk on the water there.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: Yes, on bad days he could. It is an incredible show. I believe that the Minister has not yet been down there to look at it. He has been to Mount Gambier and met everyone, but he has never been quite game to go and have a look. If he did so he would have the same reaction as my colleague and I had when we arrived there: it was an absolute disgrace to the community and it is a disgrace that we have allowed it to go on for so long.

The Hon. Frank Blewins: I have not said that I disbelieve everyone in regard to Finger Point. I believe you.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON: This relates not only to the present Government but to previous Governments as well which have left this problem unresolved. However, having made a move to rectify it, once we realised that it was a potential problem then we should continue to do something about it.

The Hon. M.S. FELEPPA: My contribution to this debate concerns matters of education, welfare and equal employment opportunity. Before making some personal comments on specific areas of the Government's programmes covered in the 1983-84 Budget, I want to compliment the Government on the manner in which the Budget was generally formulated. I recognise that the Government has inherited major budgetary problems from the previous Liberal Administration, coupled with the adverse effects on the State's finances caused by the drought and the disastrous bush fires. However, despite those problems, the Budget provides for the maintenance of existing Government programmes and for proposed new endeavours, which will create significant job opportunities for the citizens of South Australia as well as improve other important Government programmes.

I want to comment briefly on the Government's programmes concerning education, equal employment opportunity and welfare. In regard to the education area, I welcome the many positive initiatives offered by the present Government which will redress some of the deficiencies existing in this sphere of Government programmes. I understand that the 1983-84 Budget will enable some important improvements to be made in early childhood education. For example, the Kindergarten Union will be able to increase its staff levels in such important areas as clinical and remedial services for pre-school children. It is envisaged that seven new positions will be created in this new area from 1984.

In the case of primary and secondary education, in spite of the falling numbers of children the Budget provides for an increase of approximately 100 full-time equivalent officers for this area of education. It will also facilitate the improve-

ment of the teacher-pupil ratios at the primary level and permit some reallocation of resources to the secondary level, where an increase in enrolments is anticipated.

With reference to further education, I was pleased to note that permanency of occupation will now be extended to the majority of teachers engaged in adult English as a 'second language' programmes. I understand that the same approach has been adopted for teaching staff in children's English as a 'second language' migrant education.

However, within the education programmes I have some reservation as to the sufficiency of resources which have been allocated for migrant education programmes, both adults' and children's, and for programmes covering multicultural education. The English as a 'second language' programme, directed towards newly arrived children, attempts to cover special needs by a six-months extensive course. Afterwards, as I understand it, they are immersed in the mainstream of education. In the primary education area only some primary schools cater for migrants with special English as a 'second language' programmes. Therefore, many would fail to receive such assistance.

But, at the secondary level, a major difficulty for high schools is that a large number of refugees, particularly from Indo-China, seriously lack literacy in their own language, thus putting extra strain on the ability of the English as a 'second language' teaching force to prepare the students for mainstream education. Most of these students require continual assistance as so-called second-phase learners in English as a 'second language' programme to enable them to develop their full education potential.

Also, to these newcomers must be added a large number of Australian-born children of immigrant families for whom English is not the home language. As well, many of these children are disadvantaged by the deficiencies in the existing mono-lingual education system. Ideally, these children should also be provided with the assistance of English as a 'second language' teachers for several years, or until the need has been met.

The student-teacher ratio allocation of 15:1 in the new arrivals programmes does not cater for the special needs of 'illiterate' first-phase learners, but definitely they would require less than a 10:1 ratio. In the general support programme a 20:1 student-teacher ratio is allocated. However, the actual classroom practice of English as a 'second language' means that a teacher's load also includes the second-phase learners, producing an actual student-teacher ratio of 30:1 to 40:1 in most schools.

Therefore, in view of my comments in this area, I consider the proposed funding allocated for migrant education, as shown in the Programme Estimates 1983-84 (volume 2, book 7, page 24), is not sufficient to meet the essential needs of these programmes. An increase of \$125 000 on the actual expenditure for 1982-83 will not even meet the increased cost resulting from inflation. I would like to read a short paragraph from the Budget paper, at page 23:

Increased expenditure of \$125 000 is primarily due to the full year effect of salary and wage rises awarded in 1982-83 and an increase in number of staff applied to the programme.

I recognise that the Commonwealth Government has prime responsibility for funding the programme. However, I believe that the State's contribution should be increased in order to provide sufficient resources to meet the essential needs of this important State Government programme. In regard to the multicultural education programme (as shown on page 26 of the Programme Estimates, 1983-84, volume 2, book 7), I note that the Budget envisages the employment of six average full-time equivalent officers. This is out of a total work force of 18 124 people engaged by the Education Department. Funds which have been provided for this programme are the same as for 1982-83 and, therefore, the real

level of activity of this programme will have to be reduced to accommodate the increased cost arising out of inflation.

I consider that multicultural education should be reflected in the total curriculum of our schools from year 1 to year 12, both in the State and private school sector. Community languages should be made available to students throughout their school life. This would require training programmes to be provided for teachers whose professional training may not have included multicultural education. Further, of the six people provided for in the Budget, two are involved in curriculum development, with the enormous task of revising the entire school curriculum to reflect the multicultural reality of our society. I understand that some of the material produced by this small unit is deserving of admiration for the dedication, hard work and professionalism put into it. However, with the current manpower and financial allocation for the six people engaged in the area, the unit would not even be able to scratch the surface of the problem.

Another difficulty of achieving multicultural education objectives lies in the weakness of the current departmental policy which leaves the introduction of such material largely up to the goodwill of the principals and teaching staff. I realise, on the other hand, that the present policy gives autonomy to schools to decide on their curriculum to meet the needs of their school's community. However, I believe that schools should receive more encouragement for adopting multicultural education programmes.

In this regard, I believe that the additional resources which may be required for the implementation of meaningful multicultural education programmes in schools would be more than offset by the benefits of understanding and the tolerance which would flow to all sections of the community in South Australia. As to the equal employment opportunity programme, which is the responsibility of the Public Service Board, I have noted that the programme provides for an average employment of 7.4 full-time equivalent officers. Of this number .4 of a full-time equivalent officer has been provided for ethnic groups. This creates some grave concern on my part, on the part of the Ethnic Communities Council of South Australia, and on the part of many other groups, as one wonders how the action programme envisaged in the Rimmington report is to be implemented with such a small manpower resource.

As I have stated time after time in this Chamber, equal employment opportunity in the Government services for Australians with ethnic backgrounds not only lacks representation but also does not have spokesmen with authority and staff resources to rectify the present situation. Certainly, I do not believe that the budgetary allocation for this purpose in the Department of the Public Service Board estimates is sufficient to do justice to the recommendations proposed in the Rimmington Report.

Turning to the estimates of 1983-84 for the Department of Community Welfare, my comments will be centred around three areas: general comments on the format of the process and presentation; comments on some deficiencies of this system; and comments on current welfare issues. During my brief presence in this Parliament, I have come to appreciate the format and process of the preparation of departmental estimates. The development of this process was surely dictated by the need to plan in response to needs and to plan for efficiency. The logic of this process was based on the need to produce a programme which was logical, balanced and perhaps realistic.

Given, however, even the natural limitations of any such process, the document before us presents some deficiencies, which, in my humble opinion, need to be addressed. Therefore, I take this opportunity to point out some of these deficiencies. There seem to be discrepancies between the broad aims and objectives of the Department and its pro-

grammes, which represent the implementation of those aims and objectives. It is as if the aims and objectives were written in a vacuum for some idealistic conceptualisation of a society which, in practice, does not exist. The criticism, however, is not so much that the aims of the Department are idealistic and theoretical—but that they are not adequately reflected in its programmes.

Perhaps this is a reflection of the economic constraints of the present time and of the need to set priorities in spending. However, it can also be a sign of the need to rethink the aims of the Department. I will return to this question later, before I conclude my remarks. At present, I wish to point out two examples of where this discrepancy between aims and practice seem evident. The provision of residential care for all types of children seems to still absorb a large amount of the personnel as well as financial resources of the Department.

Services to children are, of course, an important aspect of the responsibility of any community. In past years, and even currently, the Department has, however, implemented a number of projects which, we have been told, were aimed at reducing the need and incidence of residential care for children. The facts, however, are that numbers of children in residential care have not been significantly reduced and that resources of staff and money used have also not been significantly reduced.

It seems to me that in the not so distant future there should be a tangible relationship between the two programmes. Where programmes have been introduced to reduce the incidence of need of residential care and where a reduction in the resources used is expected, this should become visible at some point or stage. As it is, there seems to be little significant difference in either of these two items from year to year and, yet, new programmes aimed at non-secured care of children seem to start every year.

The other example where planning seems to show some incompleteness is in the area of provision of services to migrants. The Budget estimates show (on page 46 of book No. 10, volume 2) that a total allocation of 2.5 staff is proposed to this section. I assume, of course, that this represents only those members of the staff who are directly and exclusively involved with the provision of services to migrants. However, precisely because the rest cannot be clearly quantified, it seems to me sufficient reason to scrutinise the figure in more detail.

The issue is very relevant and was raised even by the Mann Report a considerable time ago: the Mann Committee found not only that its research was inconclusive in terms of the use of departmental services by immigrants, but also that the Department was inadequately prepared for the needs of migrants. The specific recommendations of the Mann report, which was delivered in July 1980, were geared towards some practical actions by the Department. I believe that these, even three years after the report, have not been implemented.

To be a bit more specific, one could ask what proportion of the staff or of the time of the staff is working with migrants. Does the Department take into account the ethnic composition of the population in determining the employment of its staff? Does the distribution of the departmental staff from district office to district office reflect the distribution of the ethnic communities?

Glaring among the deficiencies of the Budget papers, there is no sign of any allocation for the employment of interpreters. We have, then, the situation where the papers not only indicate whether specific staff are allocated for migrant groups, but also contain indication of how 'mainstream' staff could cope with migrant clients in the absence of interpreters. I am not speaking here simply in terms of lack of statistics. I am indicating that in its planning the Depart-

ment should specify in greater detail the allocation of its staff to the specific needs of the community.

The Department has done this in great detail in the case, for instance, of other groups, such as children, as well as for the aged, where the programmes have been presented separately. Why should this not happen for the migrants who represent a clearly identifiable proportion of our community? Is, perhaps, the absence of such identification a sign that no special provisions are made for migrants, and that both staff and migrant clients of the Department are expected to muddle through the exercise of seeking and providing help? I do, therefore, urge my Government to undertake this exercise in its further planning, and I am passing these comments in the knowledge that the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. Greg Crafter) has recently established a task force on migrant welfare.

I express sincerely the hope that these issues will be taken up by the task force and presented in recommendation form so the Department will have no reason or excuse for further deferring this exercise. At this point, I should also point out that I have not seen in the Budget papers any reference to the task force. Does that mean that the task force has no budget from departmental funds, or that its expenses are absorbed in some other line, or was it too late for it to be listed in these papers? Or, maybe, is it the usual oversight which occurs so often in the case of migrant services? Finally, I wish to address some comments toward some current issues of welfare. If we walked down the Rundle Mall and asked people what they considered to be current issues related to welfare, we would all agree that the single issue they would all raise would be the relationship of the Department to the treatment of children in regard to the responsibilities of their parents. It is not only topical, as made by the media, but it is also real. Statistics seem to show that runaway children are more common an occurrence and that there is a sense of uneasiness in the community about the way the Department is dealing with this problem.

I do not intend to dwell on this complex matter in terms of whether or not the Department is doing a good job. Rather, what I wish to point out is the fact that the Budget Estimates do not seem to acknowledge it overtly. There must be a reason behind this. If the community as a whole identifies this as a real and strident issue and the Department glosses over it, then one is bound to be mildly suspicious and to ask why this is so. Honourable members will surely remember my intervention on this topic in the past. I do not wish to go over ground previously covered; instead, I wish instead to go a step further. It seems to me that the public discussion, awareness and reaction to this issue has reached a point where it requires a systematic and formal inquiry.

Ultimately, what is at stake are some of the most basic concepts of welfare. What we should seriously ask ourselves is whether the traditional assumptions about the role of the Government towards families and individuals are still valid. We have now not only a different society, in terms of its cultural background, but also a society whose attitudes within the same cultural groups have altered. What concerns me is that maybe Governments and departments have neither

recognised nor acknowledged these changes in attitudes and expectations. The criticism publicly stated of the Department will not go away. Therefore, it needs confronting with an open mind. I believe it is worth a full-scale inquiry.

The inquiry should investigate the legislative basis of the authority of parents, the consequences of the intervention of the Department, alternative forms of intervention, and whether the current movement towards individualism is ultimately conducive to a better society or not. I suspect that the old-fashioned assumption of the role of government in lives of individuals is no longer suitable today. However, I will not take a position on this. As I said, I believe that the matter should be investigated thoroughly. Perhaps this is the real contribution that my Government, the present Labor Government, could make in the area of welfare. When examining the allocations of the past three years and the allocation for this year, one is hard put to notice a significant difference. The changes are not in quality but in quantity. I believe that the difference between the Liberal and Labor philosophy towards welfare is qualitative rather than quantitative. However, I am not convinced that this difference as yet has shown up.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 8.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 26 October at 2.15 p.m.