HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 8 June 1982

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1982)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for all the purposes set forth in the Supplementary Estimates of Payments for the financial year 1981-82 and the Appropriation Bill (No. 1) (1982).

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending on 30 June 1983.

PETITION: ATHELSTONE BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 430 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain a limited stop bus service to Athelstone during peak-hour travel was presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: URANIUM

A petition signed by 100 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose uranium mining in South Australia, the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill, and declare South Australia a nuclear-free State was presented by the Hon. Peter Duncan.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 302 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a Select Committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hons W. E. Chapman, R. G. Payne, and M. M. Wilson, and Messrs Evans and Whitten.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Questions on the Notice Paper Nos 382, 392, 429, 555, 592, and 613.

HOSPITALS

In reply to **Mr BLACKER** (24 March).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In my interim reply to the honourable member I promised to provide him with a more detailed report concerning the proposed introduction of a 'nursing home type' patient classification in South Australian recognised hospitals. In June 1979, the Commonwealth Government amended the Health Insurance Act to provide for the introduction, for benefit purposes, of a 'nursing home type' patient classification in hospitals.

The Commonwealth Government proceeded directly to introduce this classification in private hospitals in South Australia, but its introduction in public hospitals required the approval of the State Government. Approval has now been given by State Cabinet for this 'nursing home type' patient classification to be introduced in South Australian recognised hospitals from 1 July 1982.

This classification will apply to patients who have been in hospital for more than 60 days and are expected to reside in hospital on virtually a permanent basis. Patients classified as 'nursing home type' will be charged on a similar basis to nursing home residents, thus removing an existing anomaly. Since 1973, nursing home residents have been required to contribute a statutory and uninsurable minimum amount towards the cost of their care and accommodation (87.5 per cent of the maximum single rate pension plus supplementary assistance) while similar types of patients in South Australian recognised hospitals have not had to make any direct personal contributions.

From 1 July 1982, patients classified as 'nursing home type' will be charged $43.85 per day which will attract a basic hospital benefit of $33.60 per day and require a direct patient contribution of $10.25 per day (i.e., 87½ per cent of the maximum single rate pension plus supplementary assistance).

At present, if these patients are Commonwealth eligible (that is, they have been means tested by the Commonwealth Department of Social Security and hold a pensioner health benefit card or health care card) and do not choose to be private patients, the Commonwealth requires that they be treated without charge. From 1 July 1982, Commonwealth eligible patients classified as 'nursing home type' will be charged $10.25 per day (i.e., 87½ per cent of the maximum single rate pension plus supplementary assistance).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CASINO BILL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have to inform the House that at 1.45 p.m. yesterday I had delivered to me a statutory declaration sworn by John Michael Haddad, Managing Director of Federal Hotels Ltd. The statutory declaration was accompanied by a letter written by Mahonys, Barristers and Solicitors, of Melbourne, to the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia. In part, that letter states:

> Our clients deny vigorously any allegations of improper practices and, in support of their denial, Mr Haddad has made a statutory declaration which is enclosed herewith, with the request that it be tabled in Parliament as a denial of Mr Wright's statements.

The statutory declaration reads as follows:

> I, John Michael Haddad of Federal Hotels Ltd, Collins Street, Melbourne, in the State of Victoria, Managing Director, do solemnly and sincerely declare:
>
> 1. That I am the Managing Director of Federal Hotels Ltd, and have occupied that position for the past 10 years.
>
> 2. That I am aware that the Government of the State of South Australia has constituted a select committee to inquire into the desirability of licensing casinos in that State. I first became aware of the proposed inquiry when I read a news item in the press and I was not approached by any member of the committee or any person on behalf of the committee to appear before it. I did, however, advise a representative of the committee that expert personnel employed by my company in the conduct of its casino operations would be available to give evidence and, in fact, Mr

Ronald Hurley and Mr Mario Kuvecke, who are highly qualified employees of Federal Hotels Ltd, attended before the committee for the purpose of giving evidence.

3. That I am the only person within the Federal Hotels Ltd organisation with authority to negotiate or discuss the establishment of new casino operations. My position in this regard is as a result of a board decision made some years ago, and is well known to all executive members of the staff.

4. That the only occasion on which I can recall having met the Premier of South Australia, Mr David Tonkin, was some years ago when I met him at a social function at the Australia Hotel in Adelaide. At this time that hotel was being operated by Federal Hotels Ltd. My only conversation with him on this occasion was to greet him in the normal way and nothing of any consequence occurred.

5. That I have not, in fact, been to Adelaide for some years and I categorically deny that I have ever at any time discussed with Mr Tonkin or any member of the South Australian Parliament the possibility of casinos being legalised within South Australia or the possibility of a casino licence being granted to Federal Hotels Ltd, or any company associated with Federal Hotels Ltd. I further say that I have not had any contact, social or otherwise, with any member of the South Australian Government, other than to be host at the opening of a casino at Alice Springs at which the Minister of Tourism was present. This was a social occasion and no conversation of any consequence took place with her.

6. That I emphatically deny that I or any person representing Federal Hotels Ltd has offered any inducement, financial or otherwise, to the Government or to the Liberal Party in South Australia.

7. That I have no knowledge whatsoever of any evidence available to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Wright, which would substantiate the statements attributed to him in Parliament on 1 June 1982.

8. That I have already denied the allegations against myself and Federal Hotels Ltd, on radio and through the media, and I request that this statutory declaration be tabled in Parliament with a demand that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw the allegations in so far as they affect myself and Federal Hotels Ltd.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and by virtue of the provisions of an Act of the Parliament of Victoria rendering persons making false declarations punishable for wilful and corrupt perjury.

Declared at Melbourne in the State of Victoria by the said John Michael Haddad this 7 June 1982.

(Signed) J. M. Haddad

Before me:

(Signed) M. J. Corridon, a Commissioner of the Supreme Court of Victoria for taking affidavits.

I understand that this information has been in the hands of the Leader of the Opposition since yesterday afternoon. In light of the fact that there has been no public attempt by the Leader of the Opposition to disclose this information publicly during the ample time that has been available for him to do so, I now table the statutory declaration which I have received from Mr Haddad and which I have just read.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I wish to report to members of this House on the condition of the Birkenhead bridge at Port Adelaide. There have been allegations made concerning the safety of the bridge and claims that extensive repair work is necessary. I have received a report from the Highways Department and I am advised that the bridge is structurally sound.

An inspection of the bascule span, or lift section, reveals that the structural steelwork supporting the timber deck planks is in good condition and that the timber deck is sound and will perform satisfactorily for at least another five years. However, many of the asphalt tiles forming the top surface on the deck require replacement. The Highways Department maintains all bridges in South Australia, and inspections and repair work are carried out on a regular basis. However, the company which has supplied the particular asphalt surface tiles used on the Birkenhead bridge has stopped producing them, so the department has been investigating alternatives.

As part of this investigation the department is adapting an industrial tile which will be fixed to the timber deck and then bituminised. When worn or damaged asphalt tiles are removed, any repairs considered necessary to the foundation timber planking will be carried out. As part of the assessment of a new method, the department is also proposing to prepare and double spray-seal with bitumen a section of the foundation planking, but this needs warmer weather and will have to wait until early summer.

Following the assessment of the two treatments, the preferred method will be used to resurface the bascule span within the 1982-83 financial year. In the meantime, I again reassure members of this House, and the public at large, that the bridge is sound, but I would emphasise that the speed limit of 40 km/h should be obeyed. The Commissioner of Police has been asked to give this matter due attention.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. D. O. Tonkin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. State Disaster Act, 1980—General Regulations.

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (Hon. D. C. Brown)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Fees Regulation Act, 1927—Regulations—Hairdressers Fees.

II. Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1981—Regulations—Fees.

III. Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981—Regulations—Aircraft Mechanics.

Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—

IV. Construction Safety—Asbestos.

V. Industrial Safety Code—Asbestos.

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982—Regulations—

I. Operation of.

II. Foreign Company Registration.

III. National Companies and Securities Commission (State Provisions) Act, 1981—Regulations—Application of Acts.

Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—Regulations—

IV. South Australian Code.

V. Companies Code.

VI. Hartley College of Advanced Education—Report, 1981.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act, 1915-1965—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Racing Act, 1976-1981—Greyhound Racing Rules—Field Racing.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Marine Act, 1936-1976—Regulations—Examination for Certificates of Competency and Safety Manning (Amendment).

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Mental Health Services, Director of—Report, 1980-81.

CASINO BILL SELECT COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion forthwith, such suspension to remain in force no later than 4.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That, because the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

(1) Have made certain unsubstantiated public allegations of improper conduct against the Government, both before and after the establishment of the Select Committee on the Casino Bill, 1982, which have caused members of that committee to decide unanimously to adjourn its hearings until those allegations are substantiated or withdrawn;

(2) Have said or inferred that the select committee's activities were not proper and were a farce, directly contrary to the opinions expressed by its members; namely, that the committee had 'at all times carried out its duties objectively, without fear or favour';

(3) Have constantly failed to produce evidence to substantiate their allegations, or to withdraw them;

And because, since that time—

(1) The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been reported (yesterday) as having denied making allegations that a Government Minister was offered or accepted an inducement, and

(2) A statutory declaration has now been received by the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier from the party specifically named by the Deputy Leader in the allegations, namely, Federal Hotels, absolutely denying any negotiations with respect to the Casino Bill, or any improper conduct;

This House

(1) Censures the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader for their actions, believing them to be contrary to the best interests and traditions of the democratic Parliamentary process, and the principles of justice;

(2) Concludes that the best interests of the public would be served by the select committee running its course and reporting fully to this House, having considered all available evidence, and

(3) Requests members of the select committee to resume their deliberations towards that end as soon as possible.

Mr McRae: Will you table the evidence?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A motion of censure is used in this House only in extreme conditions. It is a matter of great regret that those conditions exist today, but I believe that it is necessary to adopt this course of action to protect the very basis of the Parliamentary process in this State. In recent times, particularly in the past few weeks, that process has come under threat because of the irresponsible actions and statements of the Opposition Leader and his deputy.

There appears to be a growing tendency by irresponsible and unscrupulous members in this House to make unsubstantiated and extravagent allegations, and in some cases specifically to name individuals or firms, under the protection of Parliamentary privilege, without having supporting evidence.

Because of the protection afforded by Parliamentary privilege, these accusations have been freely reported by the media as having been made in Parliament, and inevitably they are regarded by very many people in the community as being reliable and factual claims, particularly as they are made in Parliament by community leaders. The public does not in any way make a distinction between an irresponsible statement made under the protection of Parliamentary privilege and an accusation made by a person who is subject to the normal laws of libel or slander. The tendency for some members of this House to make ill-researched claims has become more and more marked in recent weeks and months. Regrettably, I must say that members of the Opposition have been guilty of a number of allegations of this nature. For example, it needed a Royal Commission to expose the allegations made by the member for Elizabeth in respect of prisons as little more than a figment of his own fertile imagination. There have been many, many other examples which I understand the Deputy Premier will deal with at some length later in this debate.

The latest and perhaps the most serious of these claims have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and his deputy in connection with the introduction of casino legislation into this House. The Leader and his deputy have made a series of allegations about negotiations between the State Government and casino interests. Certainly, these stories have changed emphasis as each claim has been rebutted, but at no stage has the Labor Party leadership had the good grace or the courage to admit that it was wrong. On each occasion the Government has totally denied the claims; they are simply not true, and the Opposition must know they are not.

Now, a statutory declaration has been tabled in this House which has completely refuted the claims made about the Federal Hotel group and the Government. The wording of the declaration could not have been couched in more direct or blunt terms. Yet, although the Opposition Leader received this statutory declaration nearly 24 hours ago, he has not attempted to withdraw or produce evidence to substantiate the damaging and irresponsible claims that he and his deputy have made.

Today, the Opposition Leader and his deputy face the censure of this House, because they have not been able to produce the evidence they said they had. They have not been able to bring forward one fact of any substance—not one new fact in support of their claims. On the contrary, their specific claims have now been rebutted. Their reputations will, of course, be judged accordingly by the public. This failure is far more serious than merely a miscalculation about a shabby piece of dirty-trick politicking on their part. If they cannot produce credible supporting evidence to substantiate the very serious and damaging claims that they have made, then they are clearly guilty of misleading this House. That is a grave charge, perhaps the most serious offence that any member can commit. But, that is the burden which the Leader and his deputy must carry into this debate. They can no longer hide behind the questionable excuse that they cannot reveal their sources.

At the very least, the Leader must have the courage to name the specific Minister that the Deputy Leader claims was involved in some clandestine meeting with casino interests. Either the Labor Party leaders know the Minister involved or they do not. If they do not, then what credibility does their claim hold? The answer, of course, is none—none whatever.

Naming the Minister they claim was involved in these so-called negotiations would not require any loss of faith with these mystery sources that they quote. But the Leader would know very well the dire consequences of fabricating a set of circumstances to justify the hopeless tangle of falsehoods, untruths and deceptions that seem to have become the unfortunate trademark of this Opposition.

Apart from misleading the House, the Leader has brought to a halt the work of a valuable committee of this House. I do not intend to canvass the question of whether that was by accident or by design, but, again, the public will draw its own conclusions. What is plainly obvious is that the Casino Select Committee acted properly and courageously in refusing to take further evidence until the Leader and the Deputy Leader had either substantiated their allegations or withdrawn them.

That ultimatum was made a week ago, and all we have heard from the Opposition since then have been excuses for not bringing forward any evidence. The Government believes that it is imperative that the select committee is given the opportunity to complete its work. The purpose of the Bill before the House was to allow members to put their views on the desirability or otherwise of licensing a casino

in South Australia, and to invite members of the public to give evidence to the select committee. The Opposition, by making unsubstantiated allegations and then failing either to substantiate them or to withdraw them, has brought the work of that select committee to a halt. That action is tantamount to subverting the function of Parliament, and the Government cannot stand by and allow the processes of Parliament to be impeded in this way.

If this motion is passed today then it is clearly the view of this House that the Leader and his Deputy have no evidence to substantiate the disgraceful claims. These two men, whom I had until this unfortunate episode regarded as honourable and sincere, will stand condemned for their action in the eyes not only of the Parliament but also of the people of South Australia as a whole.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. My understanding of the Standing Orders is that no member shall impute improper motives to other members. I have just heard the Premier refer to two members on my side as being dishonourable, and I do not believe that that it is in accordance with the requirements of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! If there was an imputation, it has been quite clear in directives given from the Chair in the past that they shall not be made. If the honourable member is able to cite specific challenges, an application can be made to remove them. I ask all members on both sides, this being a particularly serious debate, to be careful about the words that may be used in debate and, indeed, not to interject, which can only inflame circumstances, and that the debate on such a serious issue be maintained in the best Parliamentary tradition.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that these men will stand condemned for their actions in the eyes not only of Parliament but also of the community of South Australia as a whole. These charges are so serious that there is no question at all in my mind that the Leader and his deputy should resign from the high and responsible offices that they hold not as leaders of the Labor Party but as officers of this Parliament. That would be the course adopted by honourable men, but whether the two gentlemen opposite choose to take that honourable course is not relevant. Their failure to substantiate their allegations effectively proves the complete fallacy of their claims and provides the select committee with more than adequate reason to resume its deliberations, free from the smears and innuendo that have emanated from the Leader's office. The select committee should be able to present a full, balanced and comprehensive report to this House. A call has been made for the release of the evidence presented so far, but why has that call been made because, if that call is made, the question must then be asked, 'Why not let the committee complete its inquiries, and report in full, all the detail, not just that evidence which has been heard to date?' It must report if it proceeds in the relatively near future. The report would then provide members with a cross-section of views, opinions and recommendations that could, in turn, form the very basis of the conscience vote that is to be t[illegible]n on the issue of casinos.

Is the Labor Party afraid that further evidence will expose the falseness of their claims? Why do not the Labor leaders want further evidence to be heard? Surely it is in everyone's best interest that all the available evidence is heard, that all sides of the question are canvassed, and as soon as possible. This is clearly what the members of the select committee want, as expressed by their motion. I remind members that it was a unanimous decision, we are told, of that select committee. The significance of the Bill is that it gives members an opportunity to take part in a clear and rational debate that will inevitably encompass the wide cross-section of community attitudes.

If, at the end of the debate, this House decides that it is inappropriate for a casino licence to be issued, that ends the question. If the House gives its support to the measure the Government is in a position to examine how best to proceed. Certainly there are no predetermined plans on where a casino might be, who would run it, or whether it would be part of a larger complex or operate in isolation.

Those questions are yet to be answered; they are yet to be considered. Despite suggestions to the contrary by the Opposition, these issues have not been canvassed by the Government, and it would be improper to do so before the legislation is dealt with in this House.

It should be noted that the Opposition Leader described the select committee studying the casino question as a 'farce'. That is a serious and regrettable accusation to make about a committee which was carrying out its work under conditions of strict security. How the Leader can make a judgment of that kind when he presumably knows nothing of the evidence which has been given to the committee is incomprehensible.

It is even more mystifying when his colleagues, the two Labor members on the select committee, supported and praised the work being done by the committee. This direct contradiction between the Leader and two of his senior Parliamentary colleagues is something which has to be sorted out within the ranks of the Labor Party.

In a motion put to the select committee last week, all seven members were united in their view that the Leader and his deputy should substantiate their allegations made against the Government or withdraw them. That motion was supported by the two Labor members, together with an Independent member whose keen interest in the casino question cannot be disputed.

There is one other matter which has caused considerable distress because of the Opposition Leader's ill-founded allegations. In his desperate attempt to leave an impression that some secret deal may have been done in relation to the casino legislation, the Leader has not only maligned and slandered people in this Parliament but has also caused considerable embarrassment and distress to innocent people in other walks of life. There can be no doubt that officers of the Liberal Party, referred to only by implication, have been placed in the intolerable position of being accused of some under-hand activity. Let me assure this House that the officers at Liberal headquarters have received no offers or inducements from casino interests as the Leader and his deputy have implied.

The tragedy of the Leader's cowardly claims is that these officers are unable to defend themselves with the same vigour which is available to members in this place. The vehemence with which Federal Hotels have denied the allegations leaves no doubt about the considerable embarrassment and possible commercial damage the Opposition Leader and his deputy have done. There is certainly no doubting their position.

There are two further questions which should be addressed in this debate. There have been suggestions that the Government suddenly changed its attitude to the introduction of a casino in South Australia. There is no basis for claiming that the Government did a sudden about-face on the issue. It is a matter of public record that the Government began to reconsider its position following the annual general meeting of the Liberal Party last year and other developments indicating increasing community support.

It is inconceivable and irrational to say that the Government could have taken this action to guarantee the establishment of a casino by one particular interest. First, the casino legislation is not a Bill introduced by the Government with the automatic support of Cabinet. It merely allows members to express an opinion on whether or not the

Government should consider issuing a casino licence. All members have the right to vote on the Bill according to their conscience. Members on this side are as entitled to vote for or against the measure, as members of the opposite side are entitled to support or oppose it. Secondly, the final decision on the issue of a casino licence would rest not with the Government but with an independent tribunal.

The Bill incorporates very strict protections against the infiltration of organised crime, and it bans poker machines. It is not hard to see why Mr Vibert does not wish it to pass. Certainly, Government members voted against the previous Casino Bill brought before this House by the member for Semaphore. But there were aspects of that Bill which the Government was not happy about, and heavy amending would have been necessary if a casino had been approved by Parliament at the second reading stage. I think that the member for Semaphore now recognises that there were clear indications before that Bill was defeated in this House that the Government was rethinking its previous attitude to the introduction of casino legislation. But it was clear, too, that the fact that the Bill was introduced by the Independent Labor member for Semaphore was enough to ensure total opposition by the members of the Australian Labor Party.

That Bill certainly heightened interest in the question. There was little doubt left in anyone's mind that the issue should be cleared up one way or the other. From that point of view, we are grateful to the member for Semaphore for having brought up the subject again and having the courage to do it. I repeat, however, that the Government has not expressed an opinion on whether or not a casino should be established in South Australia. However, it is firmly of the opinion that Parliament should be given the opportunity to make a clear decision, free from the squabbling and bickering of Party politics. This is what the Bill at present before the House (the Bill which the Labor leadership, for reasons which only they can explain, seems determined to defeat) seeks to achieve. This Bill came before the House in March. Yet, in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 November last year, after the Liberal Party A.G.M., I am quoted as saying that the establishment of a casino in South Australia would now be carefully considered by the Government. That hardly suggests a sudden change of attitude by the Government. Last weekend there was an apparent attempt to cloud the issue which the present motion of censure intends to set straight.

A Mr Ted Vibert, Executive Director of the Australian Club Development Association, claimed he had given evidence to the select committee. I do not know, nor do I pretend to know, what evidence Mr Vibert might have presented to the committee. However, it should be noted that his evidence must have been given at least a month after the Opposition Leader made his first unsubstantiated allegation in March, and after the Deputy Leader made a further allegation on 23 April. That is quite significant. It is hard to see how any claim Mr Vibert might have made to the committee could in any way be linked with the allegations made by the Leader and his deputy. Because of Standing Orders, I have no doubt that they would not be aware of them, anyway. I can also reveal that I have had correspondence with Mr Vibert in relation to poker machines, and I now seek leave of the House to table copies of certain letters.

The SPEAKER: The Premier does not require leave. Any Minister may table papers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I now table them. It will be seen from this correspondence that Mr Vibert has a vested interest and a no-holds-barred attitude to the introduction of poker machines, and is opposed to casinos. There was no meeting as suggested by Mr Vibert in his letter of 11 November 1981. Members will be aware that the Bill before the House contains an absolute prohibition on poker machines. But Mr Vibert's late intrusion into this issue is of no consequence. It should not divert the House from the central theme of a serious and most unfortunate episode. I would now like to chronicle the events which have led to this debate. On 30 March the Opposition Leader asked the Deputy Premier in this House:

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

The Leader went on:

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

It was a specific allegation, and the allegation was categorically denied by the Deputy Premier. On 31 March, the following day, the Leader returned to the same theme when he said in debate:

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

The allegation was again denied. On 23 April the Deputy Leader called for an investigation of allegations that the Liberal Party was offered money to introduce casino legislation, and he said:

> We know there was money offered.

The Deputy Premier again denied the claim—a specific allegation. On 20 May the Deputy Leader again took up the issue, accusing the Government of 'actively negotiating with an interstate hotel corporation about establishing a casino in South Australia'.

The Deputy Leader said in a prepared press statement (which, incidentally, has received very close legal attention):

> I understand that at least one Government Minister was involved in the negotiations—

specific allegations, but he did not name the Minister. In the same press release he also claimed:

> A large sum of money had been offered to the Liberal Party to facilitate the introduction of casino legislation—

specific allegations. He continued:

> I believe the amount involved was more than $30 000. I am told the offer was conditional only on a Bill being introduced.

Again, they are specific allegations. It was in this release that the Deputy Leader claimed he would be raising new information when Parliament resumed, because his press release was made outside the privilege of this House. He added:

> I call upon the Premier to name the group the Government has been negotiating with. If he won't, I will when Parliament resumes.

On 1 June, when Parliament resumed, the Deputy Leader asked:

> Will the Premier give a final categorical assurance that neither he nor any of his Ministers has been involved in negotiations with representatives of Federal Hotels Ltd about the establishment of a casino in South Australia during the period that the legislation was before this House and while a select committee was considering the Bill?

He continued:

> I have been reliably informed that the Government and Federal Hotels Ltd were involved in negotiations about the establishment of a casino in South Australia before and after the introduction of the casino legislation currently before this House and, more seriously, during the period the select committee of this House was deliberating and hearing evidence on the Bill.

Again, they are specific allegations, and on each occasion these allegations were made they have been categorically denied by a senior member of this Government, either myself or the Deputy Premier. It is interesting to note how the Opposition's story has developed and changed, because

changed it has over the days. They would like to forget, I suspect, the specific allegations that have been made, because they have not been able to substantiate them. However, their allegations have now settled on three clear and distinct points: first, that a Government Minister has negotiated with casino interests; secondly, that an inducement of $30 000 was offered, either to the Government or to the Liberal Party; and, thirdly, that Federal Hotels Ltd was the group involved.

It is interesting to note that as late as yesterday the Opposition Leader, after previously saying that he would not comment again on the issue before Parliament resumed, repeated the general allegations. He is quoted as saying that the Opposition might give more details of the alleged bribe in Parliament, and here I quote the Leader precisely, as follows:

> . . . depending on the nature of the debate and what opportunities present themselves.

The Deputy Leader, only this morning, issued another disastrous press statement, in which he is reported as follows:

> Both the Leader of the Opposition and myself were separately given reliable information.

He then goes on to excuse the actions that have been taken. Let me establish, once and for all, that the Government absolutely and categorically denies all the allegations made by the Opposition. Let me also say that this is one of the most serious debates to come before this House for a long time. It involves issues which are fundamental to the operation of this Parliament and to the credibility and standing of the Opposition. There could be no more appropriate time for the Leader to reveal all the details which are available to him. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition, when he rises to speak in this debate, to substantiate the clearly defined allegations that he and his Deputy have made since 30 March, or, failing that, to withdraw those allegations without reservation and without any equivocation. As the matter now lies, he stands to be condemned by this House and by the people of South Australia.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier, in commencing his remarks, talked about the gravity of this debate and the need to protect the very basis of Parliament (I think those were his words). Indeed, that will be done this afternoon: the basis of Parliament will be protected by the Government's using the weight of its numbers in the House to ensure the passage of this scurrilous motion. Oozing unction and hypocrisy, the Premier, the man who, in his period as Leader of the Opposition, did not worry about whom he talked in this place, whether it was the Chairman of the Housing Trust or the many others who were in the catalogue of his complaints, allegations and innuendoes, now dares to stand in the House this afternoon and say that he will protect the basis of Parliament.

We suggest that there is one good, sound, firm, honest way in which to do that, and that is to produce the evidence of the select committee, to show us what the committee has heard and the submissions it has received. It should be placed out in the open. Let us have a debate on that; let us hear from the muzzled committee members about what was going on there so that we can see whether or not the questions we raised were legitimate and proper and should or should not be debated in this place. What a shabby trick this is to try to bolster the Government's flagging fortunes. In fact, the whole basis of this debate and the casino question goes right back to that very point. Faced with the economic ruin that has been brought on this State by what the Government has done, it is casting around for any sort of appearance of reform, activity or social change, and it does not care where it goes to do that or what contradictions are involved.

We as an Opposition will protect the basis of this Parliament by raising legitimate questions, by airing issues, by asking that questions be followed up, and by not being satisfied with half answers. The basis of this Parliament will not be protected by motions of this kind and by the Government's using the weight of numbers to ensure that such motions are carried and reported as such. We reject this motion, utterly and completely, and we will insert an amendment in its proper place to ensure that this House does what it should do to protect itself on this occasion.

There is more to come. We have heard the Premier, and the Deputy Premier will soon get to his feet. We have had a hint of the subject matter. It will be typed, as his abuse so often is. According to the Premier, he will give a catalogue of other misdemeanors, other statements and other questions raised by the Opposition. It will be entertaining stuff and will certainly raise the level of this Parliamentary debate. It will certainly be constructive and weighty in its information and material.

Mr McRae: He will drag himself up into the gutter.

Mr BANNON: That interjection by my friend from Playford is very appropriate in the circumstances. Let us stand by for a very edifying reading from our friend the Deputy Premier of this sort of abuse. But before that interlude takes place, and before we hear from my deputy about precisely what he was saying and why he said it, I would like to make a few points. Incidentally, perhaps we will hear from the Deputy Premier about his famous Philippines story, which he has rather tried to bury since then. No doubt we will hear full details of that as well as other allegations that he has made in the past.

But let us get to the basis of this motion and the reason why this issue is before this House in this way. It has nothing to do with our opposition to a select committee's investigating a casino. My colleague from Gilles had such a motion on the Notice Paper, and it would have been debated and supported by us. It is true that we opposed the motion of the member for Semaphore, for some of the reasons adduced by the Premier but also because we had our own motion on the Notice Paper for an open-ended inquiry into the casino question, with no prescription about how the casino may operate and without reference to a particular Bill. The Government voted against the motion of the member for Semaphore, having no alternative of its own. Obviously, it then rejected our proposal and, out of the blue, against all the statements, comments and Ministerial statements made, introduced the Casino Bill.

It was a fully drawn Bill and a Bill which, incidentally (and I think this point ought to be taken up immediately), does in fact provide that the Minister issues the licence. And yet we have heard this nonsense that the Premier and his deputy also on occasions have talked about with regard to the Government's standing aside from this process, that a tribunal is doing it. The tribunal makes recommendations, but it is in the Government's hands as to what it does with them. The Government is the ultimate arbiter in this matter.

However, that is a side issue. Let us now look at the real issue, namely, why the Government changed its mind in the circumstances in which it did, so suddenly. It certainly took members on the Government side totally by surprise. I do not know how the consent of the Minister of Tourism was obtained on this matter or what she told her officers or other supporters about the Government's action or its attitude. Certainly, we know the reaction of the member for Mallee; he issued a press release saying that he was shocked and appalled and that he could not imagine what had happened to change circumstances unless it amounted to some form of political cowardice. Not only did members of the Opposition and people such as the member for Gilles and the member for Semaphore, who had been following

this issue so closely, scratch their head in puzzlement over this change of mind; so did the press and so did everyone in the public arena.

A number of interesting pieces of information then began to be proffered. Actually, this aspect of the casino business was hinted at in an article by none other than Mr Stewart Cockburn, who has been quoted with great approval on previous occasions by members opposite. On this occasion he was writing in the *Advertiser* on 6 November after discussion on this issue by the City Council. He said that he found it disturbing that a particular councillor may have put his neck on the block for being the lone opponent of casinos at that meeting. He goes on to say:

> Are the shadowy vested interests behind the proposal so powerful that they could force an elected councillor out of office? I, for one, would like to know a lot more details before this casino campaign gets much further. Who are its real sponsors? Who are the power brokers at Government and local government level who are secretly committed to getting it under way? What will the licence to run it be worth? Who will determine who gets that licence? What kind of revenue benefit would the S.A. taxpayer really gain from a casino?

He concludes:

> A casino for S.A. would be a confession of economic bankruptcy by the Tonkin Government, a confession that the only new revenue earner left to this benighted State is an eat-drink-and-be-merry-for-tomorrow-we-die joint.

It is that sort of opinion that made a lot of people wonder why there had been that change in the Government's attitude. I say quite firmly that, before asking a question on 30 March about this matter, I took some care to check the sources of information, to see whether it was legitimate to raise the question. Let me stress again my words 'raise the question', as that is what the Opposition has done, and that is what it has demanded answers to. In this rather glib response from the Government, this put-up or shut up argument, to use the vernacular of the Deputy Premier, it has been interesting to see the problems, the constraints, the one-sided nature of that argument, because the questions we have raised have been met with denials, sometimes very convoluted denials. For instance, there have been a number of occasions when all that was needed was a simple response from the Government, from the Premier in particular, such as, 'No', 'That is not so', or, 'I refute it.' Instead, we have had these great long speeches which cloud and confuse the issue. An examination of *Hansard* will make that quite clear.

So, the Government, at nearly every point, has attempted to ginger up the matter, to try to milk it for something or other of its worth. That, of course, has simply compounded the suspicion about this whole question. These questions were raised, and they were raised because of soundly-based information. Of course, the Premier says in the put-up or shut up argument, 'Reveal your sources, let us know everything you know about it and then I can presumably rebut that.' For a start, it is not always possible in these matters to reveal sources. There are all sorts of reasons why it may be in commercial or other interests for people to remain anonymous: that is well recognised in journalistic circles; it is certainly recognised in any case of public inquiry or debate. There are proper ways and procedures of adducing this evidence.

We suggest that the select committee is one of them. If these questions are to be followed through, let them be followed through by that forum which the Parliament itself has appointed, by that group of members which the Parliament itself has charged to do this. But we are told now that the select committee exercise is not to continue. We do not support that. There is a group, established by this Parliament, that can in a proper way, *in camera* if necessary, follow up some of these sources of information, but the Premier, of course, insists that all he has to do is to stand back and deny them and just say, 'Now you name your precise details and sources.'

I would suggest further, Mr Speaker, that we have a major problem in this area, too, and that is the one-sided nature of this debate. The members of the select committee who have been privy to the inquiries and to the evidence gathered by that committee similarly are unable to speak, are unable to let the committee know whether the sort of information received by us has, in fact, been going to the committee, and whether the committee is in possession of such information. There is only one way to clarify that: table the evidence of the select committee. Let us see it all out in front of us, and let us debate that before the select committee resumes its investigation. Let us not waste the time of this House with these pettifogging motions aimed at getting some sort of electoral advantage, or whatever it may be.

Let us turn to the affidavit that the Premier has read with such aplomb today. I thought that that was a very interesting exercise. The declaration was sent to me yesterday under a covering letter. It was dated 7 June, and was from the lawyers in Melbourne. They requested, as the Premier read out, that this be tabled in Parliament as a denial of Mr Wright's statements. This is the first meeting of Parliament since I received it. I had this document with me and was certainly ready to present it to Parliament at whatever appropriate opportunity or in whatever appropriate forum was possible. In fact, the Premier had the first call and the first opportunity. In any case, I knew that he had a copy of it and that it would be tabled either by him or by me, depending on who got the first opportunity. It is pointed out at the bottom of the letter that a copy had been forwarded to the Premier.

Let me read now from the letter received from the lawyers who sent it. The Premier read only the last paragraph, the paragraph stating that the clients of the firm denied vigorously allegations of improper practices and want the document tabled. He did not read the first paragraph, but I think this is relevant, because the letter states:

> Our clients are deeply concerned at the allegations made in the South Australian State Parliament during the last week by the Deputy Opposition Leader, Mr Wright. Mr Wright has accused our clients of attempting to influence the members of the select committee inquiring into the legalisation of casinos in South Australia and has in fact stated that our clients were parties to offering financial inducements in exchange for a favourable finding.

The Deputy Leader did no such thing. The lawyers, or those who have given them their instructions, are clearly misinformed. I do not blame them for that, because what they are repeating here are the sort of statements made by the Deputy Premier as he sought to beat this issue up as he has—the sort of misinformation and colluding together of statements which have made this conclusion perhaps logically drawn by the lawyers drawing up this affidavit.

I would suggest that, if the Premier had been honest and read that and set this affidavit in its proper context, we could understand a little more why this cannot be considered a specific refutation of all the questions raised—some of them perhaps, but certainly not all. Certainly, the basis on which this has been prepared is erroneous information. I would suggest it is interesting and no more, and certainly a fruitful souce of further inquiry of Mr Haddad if the proper venues or opportunities were given through the select committee.

It is interesting on this point, Mr Speaker (and I think it is appropriate that I say this, although I have not mentioned this to my Deputy), to refer to the fact that, as well as having this debate and this motion put before us in the Parliament, the Premier himself outside this place is seeking to take action against my Deputy for a press statement that he issued on 20 May. Whether or not that press statement

is actionable in the terms that the Premier wants to have it made actionable, I am not sure.

We have come to an interesting pass where politicians are suing politicians in this way over matters of public interest. I would suggest that one motive for this letter saying that there is an implication in the statement that the Premier was involved in talks or negotiations relating to the payment of money is to ensure that in any debate that we have in this place or any further raising of this matter the Deputy Leader will have to be very careful about what he says and pay due regard to possible legal proceedings outside this place. It is a form of intimidation, if you like, and I think that it is a pretty poor way to behave. My deputy can have legal action taken against him by the Premier of this State. Well and good, that can be faced up to when it comes up. However, I suggest that the Deputy has not transgressed. Heaven help us, I hope that none of us in this House is in a position of serving writs about some of the things that have been said about us. Where will it stop and what sort of respect or dignity of Parliament does that lead to? Nonetheless, if the purpose of this is some form of intimidation it will not work. I can assure the Premier of that.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A search for truth.

Mr BANNON: A search for truth! The motion states: that we have made unsubstantiated public allegations of improper conduct. We challenge the Government to ensure that that select committee evidence is tabled and we will see just what the nature of the allegations was, where they might lead and where further inquiries might go. My deputy will deal with that point shortly. The motion also states: that the select committee's activities were not proper and were a farce, directly contrary to opinions expressed by its members.

Let me make quite clear that the statements that have been made about the committee were not aimed at reflecting on the way in which the committee has carried out its job. From what I understand of that (and of course we cannot be privy to its hearings and evidence), the exercise of the committee has been carried out perfectly properly. The members have worked extremely hard in their collection of evidence, their inspections, and in all the work that they were required to do. In fact, it would be a tragedy if the work done so far was wasted by the Government's obvious desire to wind up this committee.

Let me make that point quite clear. Where the question of farce comes in is the way in which that committee was established, the question marks that hung over its establishment by the Government's about-turn, the various pieces of information and allegations that were made, and the fact that that committee was faced with a fully drawn Bill which is aiming it in certain directions. The members of that committee can speak for themselves, and I sincerely hope that they will get an opportunity to do so in the course of this debate. But, it would be far better if they could speak freely and frankly about what they think is happening on that committee by reference to the evidence that it has taken and some of the things that were said before it. That is the challenge that I would throw out to the Premier, to make sure that this matter is properly ventilated. I point out that the Opposition made no move to oppose the suspension of Standing Orders, even though it meant having to give up our Question Time. We are happy to debate this question in any context at any time. I now move the following amendment to this motion:

Delete all words after 'I move that' and insert the following:

This House notes the resolution of the select committee on the Casino Bill and directs the committee to table the evidence given to it and any conclusions it may have come to forthwith.

I would envisage that after debate on that motion, after we have been able to set this exercise in its proper context and give the committee some sort of confidence so that it can get on with the job, being given full access to information and facts, and the full ability to pursue any form of inquiry, we might rescue something from this political exercise by the Government.

If that is not done, the matter will remain at an impasse. However, I can state clearly to this House that after the next election we will institute a full inquiry into the matter, we will pick up the initiatives that have been started if they are not going to be completed by this Government, and we will ensure that the matter is dealt with properly in the interests of South Australia and not in the interests of political gimmickry from the Liberal Party.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): The challenge to the Leader of the Opposition issued last week by all members of the select committee, including two of his own colleagues, and by Federal Hotels Ltd in the statutory declaration of the Managing Director and by the Premier this afternoon has not been answered. The Leader has not withdrawn or substantiated his allegation against Federal Hotels Ltd.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is the affidavit that counts, and it completely refutes the allegations of negotiations between the Government and Federal Hotels. He has not withdrawn or substantiated his allegations against the Government or the Ministry. He has not withdrawn or substantiated his allegation against the Liberal Party. Instead, the Opposition has sought to rest its case on evidence presented to the select committee which it claims will justify in some way the allegations made in relation to this matter.

An examination of some simple facts will expose the complete lack of substance in their case. As the Premier has detailed, the Leader made his original allegations to this House on 30 March. He followed this up with further allegations on the following day. At that stage the select committee had not begun to take evidence; it had not even been appointed. There had also been references to evidence given to the committee by a Mr Vibert. I understand that Mr Vibert first appeared before the select committee on 30 April. That was a full month after the Leader had made his original allegations about the offer of monetary inducement for the introduction of a casino Bill, and a week after the Deputy Leader had alleged that the Opposition knew that money had been offered for the introduction of a casino Bill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the Chair to take the inference from the illegal interjections that members are calling the Chair's attention to the use of notes?

An honourable member: No.

The SPEAKER: I would suggest that the honourable members who are interjecting take full recognition of the course of action that they are starting to direct.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: One always knows when the Opposition is in trouble: they either try to laugh their way out of it or they tend to interject to interrupt the speaker who is making cogent points. I always know when I am making effective points by an indication of the obvious discomfort and the buffoonery of the Opposition.

As Leader of the House, I deeply regret that the time of Parliament has had to be taken up with a debate of this nature. In the last resort, however, if members in this place are not prepared to act with honour and honesty, Parliament as an institution will suffer, unless those members are taken to task by their colleagues in the manner proposed in this

motion. There is no doubt that this motion has become necessary because of the new style of leadership in the Labor Party, a style that I am sure the member for Hartley for one would reject had he any influence in the matter.

The member for Hartley led this House for almost a decade and, while his style of debate was tough and aggressive, it never descended to innuendo, intrigue, misrepresentation or outright slander and defamation of the sort that now characterises the style of the present leadership of the Labor Party. In this context, I also mention a number of other former members of the Labor Party in this place, notably my immediate predecessor as Deputy Premier, Hugh Hudson, and the former Minister of Transport, Geoff Virgo. Their era has now passed, which is unfortunate for Parliament as an institution, because we now have a leadership on the Opposition benches which has demonstrated by its behaviour in relation to this matter that it will stop at nothing to usurp the procedures and traditions of this Parliament.

A select committee, properly appointed by a vote of this House, is adjourned, by a vote of all members of that committee, including those representing the Opposition, because of the allegations made by the Leader and his deputy. This is intolerable and unprecedented. If this situation was allowed to prevail, the Parliamentary system would be the loser. It must not be allowed to prevail.

While this motion deals specifically with certain allegations made in relation to the casino question, it brings to a head a number of episodes which have reflected on the credibility of the Opposition leadership and which have demonstrated the total inability of the Leader in particular to lead his Party and to conduct public debate in a proper and responsible manner. I remind honourable members that last year the member for Elizabeth, once a Cabinet colleague of the Leader, accused him of 'impropriety' and 'treachery'. A member in another place, Mr Foster, accused the Leader of having 'once again demonstrated your weakness and gross misinterpretation of authority and understanding of leadership' and of a 'manner of round about politics'.

I refer, for example, to the attempts of the Deputy Leader in March to destroy the reputation of a company which has been given approval to develop a restaurant at Windy Point. Perhaps it was to the chagrin of the Deputy Leader that this project was at last to happen after a whole series of unfulfilled promises by the former Government. That was no excuse, however, for the behaviour of the Deputy Leader in relation to Mr William Sparr.

Another example, involving the Deputy Leader, followed his suggestion in a question on 10 December last year that the Minister of Education had acted improperly in the disposal of some Education Department land at Mount Gambier. As the Minister pointed out to the House on 25 March, the land transactions to which the Deputy Leader referred were conducted by the appropriate officers of the Government, the valuations were undertaken by the Valuer-General in accordance with usual practice, and there was no instigation of the transaction by the Minister or any other member of the Government. The police and the prison service have been the subject of special attention by Opposition members, particularly the member for Elizabeth.

Honourable members will recall that the headlines on the front page of the *News* on 8 October last year proclaimed the words of the member for Elizabeth, 'Corrupt South Australian police officers had taken bribes, sold drugs and framed people.' Typically, no evidence was offered by the member to substantiate those allegations, and he was later joined by the Leader in a campaign to denigrate the finest Police Force in Australia.

The report of the prisons royal commission had some revealing things to say about the failure of the Opposition to produce evidence to support serious allegations. The Royal Commissioner referred to some of the allegations by the member for Elizabeth about widespread corruption in the Department of Correctional Services and revealed that the member had been approached for further information. The member wrote to counsel assisting the commission on 27 August 1981, as follows:

> I thought I made it quite clear to you at our earlier discussions that I had no first-hand information to put before the commission. However, I now appreciate, following your second letter, that you desire to have formal notification of that fact. Accordingly, I now wish to advise that there are no matters known to me personally which I could usefully have put before the commission.

In other words, the member for Elizabeth admitted to making allegations without any evidence to support them. I suggest that the same situation applies now in relation to the Leader and his deputy.

Another member of the Opposition who has been particularly active in making serious allegations repeatedly against individuals and organisations is Dr Cornwall, in another place. Recently, Dr Cornwall involved himself in the matter of the content of lead in the blood of Port Pirie children. Without any grounds for doing so, he suggested that children at Port Pirie had received brain damage and that areas of Port Pirie would have to be evacuated. As well, he resorted to personal attack, accusing the Mayor of Port Pirie, Mr Jones, of a conflict of interest. It is interesting to note what the member for Stuart has had to say about this matter, and I quote from the Port Pirie *Recorder* of 31 May the words of the member:

> Mr Jones, as Chairman of the local board of health and Mayor of the city, is ultimately responsible to the people of the city. Being an employee of B.H.A.S. as well means he must have loyalty to that company, too, but his major loyalty in this issue is to the people of the city and the health of the children.

The accusations by the Hon. Dr Cornwall are legion. There would be 20 or 30 of them which could be recorded if one had time to research them—scurrilous allegations that are repeated time and again against defenceless members of the public under Parliamentary privilege. I suggest to the honourable member that he should prevail on his colleague in another place publicly to apologise for some of the scurrilous things he has had to say about Mr Jones.

I return to the Leader of the Opposition, and some of the things he has had to say about the Roxby Downs project. Towards the end of last year, the Leader of the Opposition made a whole series of statements about the Indenture Bill which were simply untrue and proved to be so when the Bill was presented to Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Deputy Premier's attention to the fact that under no circumstances should he refer to previous decisions taken by the House, nor to presume the result of a matter that is currently in possession of the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Sir. I am pointing out that members of the Opposition, particularly the Leader and his deputy, are entirely consistent in their approach to the political affairs of this State. They will come before the public, particularly in this place, and make serious allegations without any vestige of proof or any thought to the consequences of their actions and the reputations of the people whom they so grievously damaged. I am seeking by this argument to point out that this is not an isolated incident but this is the Labor Party, under its present leadership, running true to form, and it is pretty dirty form. The only snags in this issue are those confronting the Leader. If he is not careful, they will drown him, just as all his other statements on this matter have been drowned by the tide of fact.

I now come back to the casino issue specifically. In all the period in which they have made their allegations—more

than two months—the Leader and his deputy have not produced one shred of evidence to justify their allegations. That did not matter to them, when the exercise seemed to be achieving its objective. The allegations were receiving prominent media attention. Some of their mud seemed to be sticking.

What happened, however, when they were challenged by the select committee—all members of that committee, including two of their own colleagues—either to withdraw their allegations or substantiate them? Gradually, they changed their story. It was suggested that there was evidence already heard by the select committee that would justify their allegations, but those allegations were first made, as I have emphasised, long before the select committee began to hear evidence, or was ever appointed. They have attacked the conduct of the select committee. The Leader has called it a farce. That is despite the bit of fancy footwork to which we were subjected a moment ago. I think that the original transcript will bear that out. The Leader could get an award for tap dancing any day. The Leader has called it a farce, but the members for Gilles and Playford have a different view.

The Leader and the Deputy Leader have refused to reveal their sources. They have refused to name the Minister. They claim to have been involved, but we know that, when it suits their purpose, nothing hinders some members of the Opposition from coming into this House to name people and organisations under Parliamentary privilege. As late as early this afternoon, we even had a new twist to the Opposition's story, with a call by the Deputy Leader for the reconstitution of the select committee. Clearly this is again at odds with the views of the two members to whom I have referred and who have stated their belief that the committee has carried out its duties objectively, without fear or favour.

The Leader's response to this motion shows just how desperate he has become. With his deputy, he is being taken to task in a manner that they did not envisage when they first made their allegations, and they have gradually and in a cowardly manner attempted to change their story. This House must now allow them to evade their public responsibilities and the full consequences of their actions.

This hoo-hah about the select committee reporting immediately is a complete red herring. The committee has conducted itself in a proper fashion, and when it has concluded its hearing of all this evidence, including that on which the Opposition wants to embark on a fishing expedition, will become available to the House. What a farce to suggest that half-way through the committee's hearings part of that evidence should be made public so that the Opposition can go and dig in the hope, according to its changed grounds, that it has something which is of substance—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: At the eleventh hour.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, at the eleventh hour, after having changed its story. The Opposition has not in any way substantiated its original allegations and it deserves the severest censure of this House.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): That speech was something of a flop for the Deputy Premier—we are used to much more. I have been a strong supporter of the establishment of a casino in South Australia. I have believed, and still believe, that a properly run casino would be a substantial tourist attraction for South Australia in the way that casinos elsewhere have been. However, I stress the words 'properly run' when talking about a casino. No-one can deny that throughout my Parliamentary career I have stressed the importance of 'cleanliness' in Government. Where I have suspected corruption, I have asked questions and pursued inquiries, and I will continue to do so. As long as I believe that the information I am given comes from a credible, if not impeccable, source, and as long as I am a member of this Parliament (and, consequently, I have no intention of resigning, as called on to do by the Premier), I will fight to preserve the lifestyle we have in Adelaide, a community that, thank God, has been relatively free of the influence of organised crime and back-door money.

In Government, I was a member of a Cabinet that continually sought, through the Attorney-General and Minister of Corporate Affairs, with the strong backing of two former Premiers, to root out criminal elements that were trying to get involved in the Adelaide entertainment scene. I do not apologise for my commitment to fight corruption if it is present in our community.

Earlier this year, following a question asking whether or not the Liberal Party had been offered an inducement (and I stress 'offered' because neither I nor the Leader of the Opposition have ever said that the Liberal Party had accepted such an inducement), I received a phone call from a reliable source in Canberra confirming information that had been supplied by a separate source to the Leader of the Opposition. In other words, both the Leader and I were separately given reliable information that a campaign donation was offered to the Liberal Party to facilitate casino legislation. Apparently that offer, whether accepted or not, was made on the basis that a Bill to enable a casino to be established in South Australia would simply be introduced to allow debate on the matter.

I understand that the offer was not conditional upon the Bill being passed. Obviously the developer believed that such a Bill would pass on a conscience vote of both sides of the House. Because of that information, and because of the curious and sudden about-turn by this Government on the casino issue, I decided to pursue my inquiries. In support of that, I turn to what the Premier is reported as saying in an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* after Mr Keen had spoken at the opening of the new S.A.J.C. headquarters. This appeared as part of the remarks made by the member for Ascot Park and reported at page 3813 of *Hansard* as follows:

> The Premier's response in the *Sunday Mail* of 17 May was based on his remarks while opening the new grandstand at Morphettville Racecourse, which, the article pointed out, 'has already been suggested as an ideal venue for a casino'. The Premier said:
>
> 'I am well aware that there is a school of thought within the community that South Australia should have a casino.' He told the huge Marlborough Plate day crowd, 'It has been suggested that Morphettville, with its new facilities, would make an excellent setting for that casino. Well, that's an interesting thought.' Mr Tonkin said that the State Government's policy regarding casinos had not changed.

However, earlier he said that there was not a policy.

I only bring this matter before this House to remind members and the people of South Australia of the attitude of the Premier and his Government some few days before the turn-about came. Because of that curious and sudden about-face by the Government on this casino issue, I decided to pursue my inquiries.

Let us remember that only a short time before the Government introduced this legislation Ministers, including the Premier, indicated that such legislation would not be introduced. That cannot be denied. Something persuaded the Government to change its mind, and it was unfortunate, I believe, that the Premier left for overseas before the Bill was introduced. That prevented the Opposition from asking questions of the person responsible for bringing in the legislation. It was reported in the media that the announcement of the Bill came only a day after a Party meeting of members opposite had been told that it would be introduced. If Cabinet had been informed, back-benchers in the Liberal Party were certainly informed very belatedly about this legislation.

The legislation was hastily put together, and I would like to know who drew it up. Was it the Parliamentary Counsel? If so, can the Premier, Deputy Premier or the Minister responsible for the Bill confirm this? If it was not the Parliamentary Counsel, was it a public servant or public servants? If it was not, can the Premier tell us who did draw up the Bill? I am sure that some Government members, as well as members on this side of the House, would like to know. Indeed, I have released copies of a press statement by the member for Mallee who, like other members, shares the Opposition's concern for the extraordinary way this Bill was introduced. On 24 March this year, in that press release, the member for Mallee said:

> I am shocked and appalled at this most recent proposal to introduce a Bill to legalise a casino in South Australia at this time. It is just not necessary! We debated and voted on this proposal less than six months ago. On that occasion it was overwhelmingly defeated in the House with 43 members opposed to it and only two members (both Independent) supporting it.
>
> I cannot imagine what it is that has happened in the last six months that will now enable any other member to vote in favour of it, unless it is political cowardice. It is frightful to contemplate the lack of moral commitment there must be in some members if they are prepared to change their vote in such a short space of time . . .

If I was condemning the actions of the Government so was one of its members, the member for Mallee. Obviously no supporter of a casino, he later talks about the bankruptcy of principle in the logic and behaviour of some members of Parliament which brings all of us into disrepute. He describes the Government's move as 'this calamitous casino proposition'. Based on the information I received, I acted properly in asking a series of questions to try to clear up the matter. What I did was to ask whether or not the Liberal Party machine had been offered a campaign donation in excess of $30 000 to facilitate casino legislation.

Unfortunately, the Government has apparently sought to mislead the media about what I actually said. Indeed, in its editorial last Friday the *Advertiser* reported that I had claimed that a Minister had been offered a financial inducement. I have never said this. This was pointed out to the *Advertiser's* political reporter on Friday, but that did not prevent the *Advertiser* from twice publishing on Saturday that I had alleged that a Government Minister had been offered more than $30 000 to have the Bill introduced. The *Advertiser* went on to report, on 20 May:

> He [namely myself] alleged the Government had been actively negotiating with an interstate hotel corporation on the establishment of a casino and that $30 000 had been offered to a Minister.

Late on Sunday afternoon, the Opposition raised this inaccuracy with the Chief of Staff of the *Advertiser*, Mr John Doherty, and with the reporter who wrote the copy, Mr Martin Daly. Acknowledging this serious error, the *Advertiser* proffered the defence that it was based on information provided by the Deputy Premier. If that is correct, the Deputy Premier stands condemned for supplying misinformation to the media and for deliberately distorting what I had to say. Let me just recap on what I did say. On 23 April I said that it was well known in political circles that a prospective casino developer had offered a sizeable amount of money for a Casino Bill to be introduced. It had been offered to the Liberal Party. On 20 May I said that I understood that the money being offered was in excess of $30 000.

However, I also said that I was disturbed that the Government actively negotiated with an interstate hotel corporation about the establishment of a casino after the Bill was introduced and during the period when a select committee had been established. I never at any stage said that the inducement was offered by Federal Hotels, and let Mr Haddad of Federal Hotels understand th[illegible] very clearly. I did not make that allegation, and the [illegible]ruction of the affidavit that was presented by Mr Haddad's lawyers is incorrect, as is the terminology of the letter. I said I believed that a Minister was involved, and I asked whether or not the Premier was involved.

I did not say that the Premier or a Minister had received or been offered $30 000. I did not say that the company that had been involved in the negotiations with the Government following the introduction of the Bill was the same company that offered the Liberal Party a financial inducement. That should clear up the matter of Federal Hotels. My press statements are here to go through. The Government is trying to foster this view. Embarrassed by its plummeting fortunes in the polls, the Government is feeding out information to confuse the issue. Now I am being attacked for asking questions based on serious information that was given to me. If I had not asked those questions based on the information I received, I would not be doing my job as a Parliamentarian.

I agree that the allegations were serious, and I said so when I asked the questions, but, based on the separate information that I and the Leader of the Opposition received, those questions had to be raised and answered. I do not believe that the Premier has accepted any financial inducement—and I did not say that. I do not believe that a Minister has accepted a bribe, and neither did I say that. However, the Government has not adequately answered the questions that I raised about whether or not the Liberal Party was offered an inducement or whether or not the Government had been involved in negotiations with representatives of Federal Hotels subsequent to the introduction of the Bill.

Significantly, two members of the select committee into the casino legislation also have expressed concern about what has occurred on the select committee concerning the allegations. Indeed, without revealing what had been said in evidence to the select committee, they indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that they were concerned about matters raised in that committee. For that reason, the information contained in the transcripts of the select committee should be made public now, otherwise the Government will be binding the hands of those associated with that committee, and I believe that that is wrong.

The *Advertiser* on Monday, following an article in the *Sunday Mail*, reported that the Chief Executive of the Australian Club Development Association, Mr E. P. Vibert, had threatened to break an undertaking not to make public an extensive submission made to the South Australian Parliamentary select committee on a casino. Mr Vibert was quoted as saying that he would release the information and correspondence between his association and the Premier in Adelaide today. He said he would take the action 'in the public interest' if the report was not tabled in Parliament or if the committee was disbanded.

I have no idea about that. I do not know Mr Vibert, and I do not know what the pact would be or, in fact, why such a pact would be made with any Government member. It seems rather remarkable that Mr Vibert would be asked to consider not making his submissions public prior to the select committee terminating its work. That is another reason why I call on the Government to release the select committee evidence. Is the Government frightened of what is in the select committee evidence? The Government closed down the select committee the other day, and at that stage it looked to me as though it was avoiding the continuation of that committee.

The onus is not on Mr Vibert to release his evidence: the onus is on the Government to release the evidence received to date by the select committee. Quite frankly, I believe that the select committee should get on with its job of questioning witnesses. It is well equipped to delve into matters raised

by me and by other people. I would like to see the select committee re-formed so that inquiries can be continued, and so that questions can be asked of witnesses here and interstate. However, if the Government will not allow the committee to be re-formed, I believe it has a moral responsibility to release the evidence so far presented.

Regarding this motion, there seems to be a change of face on the part of the Government. One would not have to be Einstein to realise that the Government's proposition will be carried: there can be little doubt about that, because the Government has the numbers. Something has changed the Government's mind again. Last week it wanted to close the committee. What were the effects of that?

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not ask that the committee be closed down, and it is no good the Minister of Education saying that I did. Nor did my Leader ask for the committee to be closed down. It must have appeared to the Government that one of two things occurred: either complications were starting to set in regarding the select committee and the Government became worried; or, alternatively, perhaps the Government was losing the numbers to get the Bill through the House. I do not know where the numbers stand in that situation. The Minister of Recreation and Sport said at the time:

> I might say, without breaching the Standing Orders of this House, that the longer the select committee sits and the more witnesses it hears, the more difficult the subject becomes.

How can that decision be directed at members of the Opposition, as both the Premier and the Deputy Premier have attempted to do? It is no good kidding ourselves. The Government had the numbers on the committee to do whatever it liked. It is no good trying to direct the blame at the member for Playford or the member for Gilles, because whatever they wanted to do would not have survived within the committee in any case. It is important to consider who closed down the select committee. It is quite evident that the Government did so, and it seems that it was getting into some sort of difficulty. In fact, it is quite clear that that is the case. The Minister did not like the situation, so he decided to change course.

Those difficulties might have eroded themselves; I do not know, but we have now been told that the Government wants to censure the Leader of the Opposition and me for bringing up what I consider to be quite responsible questions in this House, matters that had to be sorted out. I have gone on record as saying that I would not now support a casino unless it was run by the Government. I know that that will not suit my private enterprise opponents opposite, but I was so concerned that I made that statement, although at some later stage I might be sufficiently satisfied to change my mind. Currently, that is where I stand.

I have previously been a very strong supporter of a casino, as I said in the second reading debate. I recall the Minister commending me for my reasons for supporting the establishment of a casino. When one looks at today's *News* and finds Sir John Dowd, the Leader of the Liberal Party in New South Wales, making very strong allegations about the possibility of casino legislation in that State and referring to organised crime and the struggling (I think that was the word he used) position or the death knell of some clubs, one wonders whether there has been a great deal of research into that situation. That is why I would like to get my hands on Mr Vibert's submission to the select committee. Clearly, Mr Vibert had something to say about the effect of casinos on clubs, and I would like to read what he said.

I suppose that at some subsequent time I will have to vote on whether or not I support a casino without having the right to see any of the select committee evidence. I have made my points clear. I hope that the time will be extended, if necessary, to give members of the select committee an opportunity to speak. Admittedly, they will be gagged in regard to the evidence that they have received, and their views on the places they have visited, but I still believe that they should be given the opportunity to speak today, and I am cutting short my speech at this stage, knowing that the Premier has moved that this debate continue until 4.30 p.m.

I believe that if the Government has no intention of releasing the transcript of the select committee deliberations today then that is entirely wrong. It ought to be making the transcript public because what it contains is now a public issue. The Government has the opportunity to do that. The committee can continue; there is nothing to prevent that. If this Parliament decides to release the transcript but the Government does not agree, then I believe the Government is hiding behind what is in the evidence. There is nothing to prevent the Government's releasing the evidence of the select committee. The committee can continue to do its work, provided that the Parliament allows it to do so. In the absence of the Government's agreeing to the Opposition's amendment, it should make time available for the members of the select committee to speak on this matter, even if it is necessary to move that the debate continue until 5 o'clock. Members of the select committee should not be denied that opportunity.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): There is probably no motion more serious for this House to move and debate than a motion actually censuring two members of the House. During my nine years in this Parliament I can recall only one other occasion upon which this Parliament has suspended Standing Orders to allow time to move such a motion. But that is exactly what time has been put aside for today, that is, for a motion to censure the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader for their actions. As I have stressed already, that is a very serious matter for any Parliament to spend time on. I think the gravity of the situation has been brought out very well indeed this afternoon by both the Premier and the Deputy Premier. They have highlighted the extent to which, not questions, but allegations, statements, which have been made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have not been substantiated. If anything, the evidence has been produced to show that they are not correct. I shall touch on that matter shortly.

At the outset I take up the final point of the Deputy Leader. He suggested that the best way of clearing up this matter, was to make sure that the evidence could be brought before this Parliament. He was trying to suggest that, by allowing the select committee to proceed, that process was being stopped and that the evidence would not therefore come before this Parliament. I point out that just the opposite would occur: by allowing the select committee to conclude its hearing as quickly as possible, as the motion before the House suggests it should, by allowing the select committee to conclude its hearing, all that evidence can be brought before the Parliament for us to examine in detail.

It is fairly obvious that, if the select committee proceeds with its hearing as quickly as possible, there is a likelihood that that could be before us within a matter of weeks. Because this issue has been debated in the Parliament for so many years, I am sure that the Parliament would agree that it is important that the matter be resolved once and for all and that a vote be taken within the Parliament. I support what the Premier has said: it is important that the select committee finishes its task and tables the evidence before this Parliament so that we can see it. That is exactly what the motion seeks to do.

This afternoon the only defence really put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader is the

claim that they were carrying out their proper Parliamentary role of questioning the Government on a particularly sensitive matter which involved serious offences. They said that theirs were proper and legitimate questions. I think it is appropriate to go back through the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader to find whether or not they were questions, as they have tried to suggest, or whether or not they were bold statements, accusations, claims and allegations made against the Government. After I have read various portions of *Hansard*, I think members will agree without doubt that they are not questions, but that they are allegations against the Government which we now find to be totally unsubstantiated. On 30 March this year, the Leader certainly asked a question, but in the explanation of that question he made the following statement (not a question but a statement):

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

That is not a question but a dogmatic statement being made against the Government, an extremely wild statement. A point was raised again this afternoon by the Leader and the Deputy Leader that, if the Government had denied these allegations at the very beginning, this whole sordid issue would not have proceeded. In answer to that very first question asked by the Leader on 30 March 1982, the Deputy Premier said:

> I give a categorical denial of any such imputation.

One could not ask for a more black and white answer or a more black and white denial. It has been suggested this afternoon that at no stage, at least early in the piece, did the Government stand up and deny those allegations. Yet on the very first occasion on which the matter was raised in this House the Deputy Premier gave a categorical denial of it.

Despite that denial, on the very next day the Leader of the Opposition made a further statement. Again, his comments were made in a speech; they were not even in Question Time on this occasion. He stated:

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

The Leader of the Opposition again made a direct accusation, a direct statement, although it had been denied the previous day. During the same debate he went on to say, not asking a question but making a statement:

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

Then there was an interjection across the House from the member for Hanson, who said: 'Name the company.' The Leader of the Opposition replied:

> I am not saying that this is conditional on the passage of the Bill. However, I am saying that this is a wellknown fact, and I challenge the Government to deny it with clear conscience.

On the previous day the Government had denied the allegation and it had asked the Leader of the Opposition to produce the evidence. As the Deputy Premier put it so well last Thursday, that was the day on which the Opposition had to 'put up or shut up', and ever since this debate started this afternoon the remarks from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader have clearly shown that they have absolutely nothing to put up, and yet they still are not men enough to stand up and withdraw their accusations.

This afternoon they have tried to bury the issue, despite the fact that a statutory declaration tabled in this House on behalf of Federal Hotels clearly indicated that Federal Hotels at no stage had made such an offer. Although the Deputy Leader had made a direct accusation (which I will come to shortly), he has not been man enough to stand up and apologise to Federal Hotels and say that he made a mistake. That is the extent to which the politics of the Opposition of this State have been lowered; that is the extent to which the Opposition is prepared to drop its standards, to drop every single ethic that this Parliament has cherished, in an attempt to gain government in this State. It is the basis of the very point to which I will refer shortly. The member for Elizabeth has already criticised the Leader of the Opposition as a man without principle, and this afternoon we have seen that well and truly.

I go on because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, with some very healthy support from his own Leader, continued to dig a very deep hole for himself. On 20 May, almost two months after those original accusations, almost two months after the absolute denial by the Deputy Premier, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition put out a press statement. Again this afternoon he claimed it was questioning, but I ask members of the House to consider whether or not this is questioning or a dogmatic statement. The press release begins:

> The Government has been actively negotiating with an interstate hotel corporation about establishing a casino in South Australia.

That is not a question: it is an absolute statement that we have been negotiating—not suggesting that someone might have come to us, but a statement that we have been actively involved in negotiating for a casino here in South Australia. I have a copy of the press statement; I am relying not on the press version, but on the original given to me. He goes on to say:

> I understand that at least one Government Minister was involved in the negotiations.

He did not say that the company may have come to the Government and was offering its assistance, but that a Government Minister was directly involved in negotiating with that hotel interest. That was his accusation; it is not a question, but a dogmatic statement. He went on in his press release to say this:

> I believe that the amendment involved was more than $30 000. I am told that the offer was conditional only on the Bill being introduced.

Finally, in that same press release he made the following statement:

> I will be raising new information when Parliament resumes, but for the Government to make deals with the developer—

to make deals, not possibly to look at a deal, but to make deals—

> before the legislation is voted upon shows its extraordinary contempt for Parliament. It is also an insult to the select committee currently assessing the Bill. I call upon the Premier to name the group that the Government has been negotiating with; if he won't, I will when Parliament resumes.

These are the dogmatic statements that he made as Deputy Leader of the Opposition, yet this afternoon he claimed that it was a legitimate question. He even said he would produce the evidence when Parliament resumed. He named one hotel chain, and this afternoon we have had a statutory declaration which clearly indicates that that hotel chain was not involved in such a negotiation with any Minister or the Government. Yet, the Deputy Leader is still not man enough to stand up and say 'I was wrong. I was misinformed; I withdraw those allegations.' Instead he tries to say that it was a legitimate questioning of Parliament.

If that is not bad enough, we now come to the sittings of the Parliament. I quote from *Hansard* what was said by the Deputy Leader in this House only last week, as follows:

> I have been reliably informed that the Government and Federal Hotels Limited were involved in negotiations about the establishment of a casino in South Australia before and after the introduction of the casino legislation currently before this House, and,

more seriously, during the period when a select committee of this House was deliberating and hearing evidence on the Bill.

Again, it is not questioning, as two members opposite have tried to suggest this afternoon. They were bland accusations and allegations against the Government for which the members opposite have produced no evidence whatsoever. When a Parliament is faced with the situation that, over a two-month period or more, the two highest officers of the Opposition, as recognised by this Parliament, make bold accusations in this Parliament and outside, then produce no evidence whatsoever, and still are not prepared to admit they are wrong or withdraw their allegations, I believe this Parliament has no alternative but to take the strongest possible action against those two members, if for no reason other than attempting to drag the reputation of this Parliament down into the sewer with their remarks.

The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, early in his speech, promised to give the details that led to the making of the original allegation. He said that he would set the framework (I think that was the word he used) of the events which led up to the making of the original allegation of 30 March. He highlighted three events. It is extremely pertinent that I remind the Parliament of those three significant events which he said led to his original allegation. The first was Stewart Cockburn's article, and we heard it read to us by the Leader. It claimed absolutely no evidence or no suggestion—all he raised really was the question of why the Government had changed its mind. That is a legitimate question for any journalist to raise, but for the Leader of the Opposition, on the basis of that article, to stand up and make specific allegations that Federal Hotels have been negotiating with the Government Minister and that $30 000 was involved I think shows the very furtive imagination that he must have.

The second piece of evidence brought up was apparently that the Premier and the Deputy Premier gave long answers when replying to the allegations made. I am sure we can recall that allegation made by the Leader of the Opposition earlier today. I shall read the full context of what he claimed was a long and wordy denial, suggesting that, because it was so long and wordy, something had been hidden by the Deputy Premier. When the issue was first raised on 30 March this was the full answer given by the Deputy Premier. I ask the members opposite to listen to this answer, in full:

I most certainly can, and I can say also that one newspaper report attributed to one spokesman the suggestion that the Liberal Party had bowed to vested interests. I give a categorical denial of any such imputation.

That is a two-sentence reply which cannot be questioned in any way whatsoever. The third piece of evidence, which set up the framework for these allegations and the repeated asking of what they call questions, which I think the rest of us, without doubt, would regard as bold statements and allegations, was that possibly some information (we do not know exactly what) may have been given to the select committee. I find it interesting that the Deputy Leader has placed so much importance on the evidence that may have been presented to the select committee.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Apparently the member for Stuart feels the same way. He also feels that the evidence presented to the select committee—

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart should keep his opinions to himself.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: At least the Opposition has highlighted the select committee. Let us put in time frame its allegations with the sittings of the select committee. The first allegation was made in this Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition before the select committee had even been appointed, in fact, before the Parliament had voted to set up such a select committee. They were repeated the next day in some detail. They are in *Hansard*, and I have quoted parts of them. They were repeated in this House before the select committee had been formed. The allegations of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader have nothing to do with the select committee or the evidence before the select committee. They made their allegations before that select committee was ever formed and they must have had some evidence (or one would have hoped they had some evidence) to have made those allegations at that stage. But we find, apparently, that they have absolutely no evidence to put forward to this House. They have yet to name the Minister. They have grabbed one hotel chain out of the air, and we find that it is the wrong one, and yet they continue to make—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Opposition has made the allegation that there was one, it named it, and the hotel chain has tabled in this House this afternoon a statutory declaration denying it. So, obviously it was the wrong one.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Exactly. Name the Minister and the hotel chain. We guarantee that you cannot do either, because there have been no such negotiations whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: An honourable member opposite says, 'Don't be so sure.' He has been making that sort of statement for two months. He promised to put the evidence up in Parliament.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must refer to the honourable member, and not to 'you' or 'he'.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been making that type of statement for two months. He promised to put up the evidence when this Parliament met, and he wanted the protection of Parliament. We have told him that he need not bother about naming his informant if that bothered him, as long as he just named the Minister and the hotel chain. He has been unable to do either. I think that reflects seriously on his character and on the evidence upon which he is prepared to stand and make the most serious allegations in this Parliament.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition also raised the position of Mr Vibert in this matter. Early this afternoon the Premier tabled in Parliament a number of letters involving Mr Vibert. I think it is appropriate that I deal with Mr Vibert in some detail. It should be recognised that in relation to this matter Mr Vibert cannot be regarded as being a disinterested person. As long ago as 8 October last year, more than five months before the introduction of the casino legislation, the Premier, in an unsolicited letter to Mr Vibert, gave a clear indication to him that the South Australian Government would not approve of the introduction of poker machines in this State. In that letter, the Premier stated in part:

You should be aware that my Government has a firm policy of opposition to the introduction of poker machines in this State. There is no demonstrable demand by the overwhelming majority of South Australians for legislation to allow poker machines to operate in this State. I believe most people would oppose the idea.

Mr Vibert has since persisted with claims that there is a demand for poker machines in South Australia, writing further to the Premier on 2 and 15 December. In his letter on 15 December, Mr Vibert stated in part:

I am sure you can see why the club industry intends to pursue its campaign for poker machine legislation—you, as a politician, are there to represent the wishes of the people. I hope in the coming months we will be able to show you that the demand for

poker machines in licensed clubs is far greater than that for a casino.

Honourable members should be aware that in his letter Mr Vibert had also referred to a public statement by the Premier reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 8 November that the establishment of a casino in South Australia would be carefully considered following a decision of the Liberal Party State Council and a motion in support of a casino passed by the Adelaide City Council. However, nowhere in this letter did Mr Vibert allege that the Government had accepted a bribe or that there was anything sinister at all in the Premier's reconsidering his approach to this question.

The first the Government was aware of such an allegation by Mr Vibert was the report in the *Sunday Mail* at the weekend, and it is very difficult to resist the conclusion that Mr Vibert is now making that allegation because his views in relation to poker machines have not prevailed on this Government or on the Liberal Party. It seems, however, that he has had more success in other States. In his letter to the Premier dated 11 November 1981 Mr Vibert referred to the situation in Queensland. In part he wrote:

> In respect of the attitude of Labor Party members in each of the States we are working in, all started out in violent opposition to poker machines. In Queensland, the Labor Party there set up a committee of inquiry and, after a six-month research, approved of their introduction. The legislation of poker machines formed part of their election platform.

Honourable members should also be aware that Mr Vibert contributed to A.L.P. funds for the 1980 Queensland election. On 7 May this year the *Courier-Mail* stated:

> Leading poker machine lobbyist, Mr Ted Vibert, said in Sydney that he had made 'significant contributions to the Opposition Leader, Mr Casey, for Labor's 1980 campaign. "I gave a considerable amount of money on a personal basis to help the ALP get into office", Mr Vibert said. Mr Casey said from MacKay, "Donations by poker machine people were included in Labor's total election advertising of $100 190 for the 1980 campaign." '

Where Mr Vibert has been unable to get his views supported he has attempted to intimidate political Parties. His letter to the Premier on 11 November last year says the following about the refusal of the then Victorian Liberal Government to hold an inquiry into poker machines:

> It is regrettable that they are taking this 'closed minded' approach for the club industry will have no alternative but to get involved in the forthcoming elections in a 'boots and all' campaign against them.

I make plain to this House that intimidation of this or any type will not work with this Government. It appears, however, from the extent to which the Opposition in this House is relying on Mr Vibert to justify its allegations and the contributions to the Queensland Opposition Leader, that the A.L.P. has much closer relations with Mr Vibert than has the South Australian Government. In all these circumstances, I leave it to honourable members to judge for themselves the motives that Mr Vibert may have for repeating the allegations of the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. At the same time, I repeat the clear fact that the Opposition is bringing Mr Vibert into this matter at this stage as an obvious tactic to divert the real issues before the House.

The facts are these. The Opposition has not just questioned the Premier and the Deputy Premier: it has made bold allegations, and has promised to produce before this House the evidence. However, it has been unable to produce any evidence whatsoever. The Liberal Party has denied the allegations; Federal Hotels Ltd has denied the allegations. We have constantly asked the Opposition to produce the evidence. However, the Oppostiion, the Labor Party of this State, has been unable to do so. The real issue at stake now is the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition and of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The member for Elizabeth had something to say about the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition: he has no trust in it whatsoever. The Hon. Norm Foster had something to say about the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition: he does not have much regard for it, either. After the failure of the Labor Party, and in particular of their Deputy Leader and Leader this afternoon, to produce any evidence whatsoever, and in face of the absolute denials given by all parties involved that their allegations are wrong, there is no doubt that this Parliament has no alternative but now to pass this motion condemning the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is a shame, and it is shabby. It is an unfortunate reflection on members of Parliament in this place, and it is time that they at least are men enough to stand up and say that they were wrong, apologise and withdraw the allegations. Unfortunately, they are not even men enough to do that.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I certainly will not drag on like previous speakers. This matter is of extreme importance to the State, to the members of this Parliament and to the people. The way we are carrying on, I do not know where we are going to end up. I have no reason at all to doubt the statement of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I have known the man reasonably well, and I believe that he is acting on information that he has been given. I do not deny him his right to do that; that is his job as a representative of his constituents in this House. Surely, somewhere in this situation some sanity must prevail and we must get on with the running of this State and making a decision on whether or not we want a casino or not. Because of the way we are going, we are getting nowhere near it. With 47 representatives in this House, surely we can make a decision about whether or not we want a casino.

I have some interest in this matter. I raised this matter in the House last year purely to get it discussed and to enable some people to have a say on it so that we could reach a decision on it. That is all we want to do with this, and the only way we can do it is to use the select committee system. However, the way we are going at the moment the whole select committee system is at risk. Who will come forward to a select committee if people think, 'What is the point'? The Government, whichever it may be, is doing this only out of personal interest because there is money involved. If I go to a select committee no-one will take any notice of what I say. The evidence will be in doubt. What is the point? How will we get the people to come to a select committee? It is hard enough now. One cannot reveal what happens on select committees. Those involved in them know that it is extremely difficult to get people to come and give evidence. We are putting that whole system at risk.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the matter would be raised at a change of government, which I am sure will happen, but we will have a repeat of the same situation. The Government will be sitting on this side and the Opposition on the other, and it will say exactly the same things from the other side. If one looks back through *Hansard* at the speeches made over the years, one sees that one could change the names and that they would be the same speeches on different matters. That is all that will happen, so let us get on with it now.

Mr Vibert's name has been mentioned, and it is fair for me to comment. There is no doubt he is an interested party. In my opinion, his interest is in preventing a casino. If a casino goes ahead, obviously the possibility of poker machines in clubs in this State would diminish. He has a vested interest in making sure that a casino does not go ahead. I do not blame him, because he is involved in the industry, he is a good operator, and poker machines are his business. I do not deny him that right, but one must not lose sight of that fact.

An amendment has been moved by the Opposition, but I would like to move a further amendment, as follows:

To amend the motion by leaving out the words:

censures the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader for their actions, believing them to be contrary to the best interests and traditions of the democratic Parliamentary process and the principles of justice,

If we remove those words, the motion will read:

Concludes that the best interests of the public would be served by the select committee running its course, and reporting fully to this House having considered all available evidence and requests members of the select committee to resume their deliberations towards that end as soon as possible.

That is the way it must be if we are to retain any credibility with the South Australian people and any self respect for ourselves. I commend my amendment to the House. Hopefully, we will then get on with the job and find out what effects the casino will have. Otherwise, we will never get there. We will never have any credibility again if we let this matter slip through our fingers.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): Last week in this House when the Minister moved for an extension of time for the report to be brought back, I expressed my disquiet and concern about certain aspects of the select committee, and a certain uneasiness of mind that has been with me since the beginning of the select committee's deliberations. As time went by, my uneasiness grew. I make clear to the House that I cast no reflection on the Chairman or members of the select committee.

My uneasiness was linked with factors outside although perhaps associated with events not being determined by the select committee. I said in the House last week that I was concerned about certain press statements about the committee's deliberations. I was also concerned about allegations and counter allegations being made publicly and in this House. I think I would have been remiss in my duty if I did not, as a member of the House and of the select committee, express my concern and disquiet in relation to certain happenings associated with the committee. I felt it was my duty to do so, and I did it publicly in this place. I was surprised by the Government reaction to those expressions of concern and subsequent events.

First, the Bill was introduced, rather surprisingly, after comments and assurances given by the Premier that a casino would not be introduced by the Government. I accept that Governments change their minds on certain issues. However, the question was immediately asked: what had occurred to make the Government take this decision when some members of its own Cabinet had expressed their total opposition to a casino's being introduced? Additionally, a vitriolic attack was made by the member for Mallee on his own Government, indicating that the matter was very controversial within the Government. We remember that 30 members spoke in this House on the Bill to establish the select committee. Members will recall that I clearly stated that, the issue being one of conscience for both sides of the House, it was important that there be political impartiality, which should be exercised by having three members of the Government and the Independent member for Semaphore on the committee. Unfortunately, this was not accepted by the Government.

I have no quarrel, as I said, with the Chairman or committee members. I believe that the motion carried last week that we pursued our duties to the best of our ability without fear or favour was correct, but we were set a very difficult task to report back on a very highly emotive issue in a matter of four or five weeks. From the beginning, I believed that the committee could not perform its task in that time. My assumption was proven correct. Ve were unable to take evidence, evaluate it, and report back to this House by 1 June.

I had very grave thoughts, following my statement in the House last Tuesday, about the meeting called at short notice at 12 noon on Wednesday last. We assembled, and it was clear to me that Liberal members of the select committee knew exactly what was going to transpire. I am sorry to say that I believe there was collusion by the four Liberal members of the select committee. I realised that they would use their numbers just as the Liberal Party will use its numbers in regard to this afternoon's motion. That is a very sad state of affairs. I sought the call from the Chairman, but it was refused. Consequently, one of the other members of the committee moved a resolution.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the Standing Order in respect of the select committee, its receipt of evidence and the discussion of any action taken within that select committee before it is formally presented to the House. It is not competent for a member to refer to any part of that.

Mr SLATER: I appreciate that, Sir. Of course, this problem exists for members of this select committee in not being able to reveal publicly exactly how the events occurred.

I will accept, Mr Speaker, that I cannot give to the House any information regarding the conduct of the select committee. I again express my serious reservations about the way in which the meeting of Wednesday last at 12 noon was conducted and about the resolution that came to this place. There are other matters that concern me greatly. One of them was certain information which the select committee sought and which was refused by Cabinet. I think that that information should have been given to the select committee. It was not, and that was one of my concerns.

Mr MATHWIN: On a point of order, I ask that you, Sir, rule that this is a matter that was discussed by the select committee and therefore is not to be discussed in this place.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I indicated previously to the honourable member for Gilles that this matter is specifically catered for in Standing Orders. I recognise that the honourable member, when previously debating the issue, was referring to a motion that was brought to the notice of this House and that, therefore, there was a discretion which could be allowed in respect of that motion. However, the other details of the committee's activities, and the evidence that it has obtained, or failed to obtain, will remain with the committee, and the committee only, until such time as a report is presented to this House—if, in fact, a report is presented to the House. I ask the member for Gilles to recognise that fact.

Mr SLATER: There is only one other point that I wish to make about a matter that concerns me greatly. I understand that a Cabinet Minister instructed the head of the department not to give evidence to the select committee. That departmental head, to his eternal credit, came and gave evidence to the select committee. There has been deceit and dishonesty—

Mr MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I ask for your ruling on this matter. The honourable member is bringing into this debate matters that ought not be brought into it, even by inference. He is not talking about applications to the Labor Party, he is talking about the Liberal Party and Ministers of the Crown.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. I was listening very closely to the presentation by the honourable member for Gilles, and it is my belief that he was moving close to an area where he was going to transgress his responsibility to other members of the committee and, therefore, to the Standing Orders of this House. He has made allegations about certain members who gave evidence but has not indicated what their evidence was. That is the

basis on which he was permitted to proceed. That does not give the honourable member *carte blanche* to indicate the basis upon which a person appeared before the committee.

Mr SLATER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I make only one additional point: we have had a statutory declaration presented to this House this afternoon from the General Manager of Federal Hotels, Mr Haddad. That declaration, which was tabled by the Premier, states that there have been no discussions with the Government on the casino matter. It depends very much on Mr Haddad's interpretation of 'Government'. I believe that this has been a sorry and sordid affair. It is obvious that Government members have not revealed all the facts. The Government has been dishonest and deceptive, even within its own ranks. I feel some degree of sympathy for the Chairman of the select committee who, in fact, has been burdened with this responsibility. One thing that I could not work out was whether the casino was partly his responsibility as Minister of Recreation and Sport or whether it was more appropriately the responsibility of the Minister of Tourism or perhaps that of the Minister of Corporate Affairs. Why did not they handle the legislation? The Minister of Recreation and Sport was saddled with this legislation because no-one else on the Government side was game enough to introduce it.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order and seek a ruling from you, Mr Speaker. With great respect, I think that I must seek that ruling immediately.

The SPEAKER: In seeking a ruling, the honourable member is not rising on a point of order.

Mr McRAE: I am seeking your advice, Mr Speaker. I wish to move for an extension of time for the continuance of this debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is able, if he is called, to undertake that course of action. In the normal traditions of this House, a member from the side that was not represented at the last call, having sought to speak to the motion, has been called, and I call the Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Mr McRAE: I again seek your advice, Sir. It would be apparent to you that if you give the call to the Minister I will lose my opportunity to move the extension. May I ask, therefore—

The SPEAKER: Order! I realise the honourable member's predicament, but I point out that whoever is going to speak further in this debate will do so before 4.30 p.m. and within the restraints of the motion that involved the suspension of Standing Orders at the commencement of this debate.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): The member for Gilles has said that this is a sorry and sordid affair. Let me put things in perspective, because during this debate the main thrust has been lost. It is important that the House realises what has caused this 'sorry and sordid affair'. I agree with the honourable member for Gilles that it is a sorry and sordid affair, but not in the way that he intends the House to interpret that. The select committee, in it deliberations, has been faced with a series of accusations made both inside and outside this House. It has tried to continue its deliberations with that turmoil going on outside the committee. Do the people of this State really believe that a select committee can continue its deliberations properly and in the way that it should carry out those deliberations when this sort of nonsense is going on outside its deliberations? Of course it has an influence! Of course it increases the tensions surrounding the sittings of the committee! Further to that turmoil going on in the public arena (and I include this House in 'public arena'), two members of the select committee threatened resignation. That is a matter of public record.

Mr Slater: Only because of the turmoil you are talking about.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Nevertheless, two members of the select committee threatened resignation. Of course the select committee had an emergency meeting. How could it continue its deliberations properly? A unanimous motion passed by that select committee requested that the matter be resolved by this House inside this House. What has happened? The people making the allegations have not answered the select committee's request. They have not withdrawn the allegations without qualification. They have suggested that the select committee evidence be tabled in this House when, if the select committee does its job properly, the evidence will be tabled in this House, anyway, together with a full report of the select committee, thus enabling the House to have a full debate on the matter. My time is running out, so I just say, in answer to the amendment moved by the member for Semaphore, that members on this side would have been pleased to support his amendment if the Leader and Deputy Leader had withdrawn their allegations.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the debate on this motion to continue until 5 p.m.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion. This matter was put to the House properly in the form of a suspension motion when the House sat at 2 p.m. There was no suggestion at that time that 4.30 p.m. was an improper or inadequate time. Indeed, the suspension of Standing Orders was agreed to without any statement from the Opposition. Now, the Opposition wants to muddy the waters still further.

There are other matters that must go forward, including the most important Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. There is no way that the Government is prepared to allow the Opposition any additional time. The Opposition has had every opportunity to put foward answers to the challenges and the questions that have been raised by this Government. If it has not chosen to do so until now, it is too late to seek time now.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is the motion for suspension. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against say 'No'. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on Mr McRae's motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Trainer, Whitten and Wright.

Noes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr O'Neill. No—Mr Olsen.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The House divided on Mr Bannon's amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (24)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chap-

man, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, and Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs Tonkin, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr O'Neill. No—Mr Olsen.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr Peterson's amendment negatived.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (20)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Olsen. No—Mr O'Neill.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

FISHERIES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION AND YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on the question:

That the report of the select committee be noted.

(Continued from 3 June. Page 4310.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Mr Speaker, the clock is not operating.

The SPEAKER: There was some difficulty with the clock earlier this afternoon. It may be that should the necessity arise a direction will be given by the Chair that there is two minutes to go.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It seems to me that there was some difficulty with it on Thursday, too, because I had 12 minutes when I sat down on Thursday, and now I have 11, but I will not go into that. When I was speaking on Thursday, I had reached the point of indicating that I believed that the economic future of Roxby Downs was very shaky indeed and that I had my gravest doubts as to whether the project would ever get off the ground even if this indenture was to get through this Parliament. One of the other reasons why I believe that is simply that the safety of the nuclear industry is day by day, week by week, month by month, proving to be so unsatisfactory that throughout the world more and more organisations are refraining from going ahead with the building of nuclear power plants and refraining from going nuclear. It is no wonder when one looks at the safety record of the nuclear industry. I have a collected table here of accidents, leaks, failures and incidents involving the nuclear fuel cycle from 1950 to 1980 which I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard*. It is statistical material.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that it is purely statistical material?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, Sir.

Leave granted.

Leave to insert subsequently withdrawn (see *Hansard* page 4474).

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: When members have had the opportunity of looking at that information, I am sure they will readily become aware of just what an enormous problem safety is in relation to the nuclear fuel cycle. Earlier this afternoon I placed before the House a petition of signatures gathered by the people who have been holding a protest on the steps of Parliament House for the past few days. Those signatures were only the last few collected; in fact, following the protesters becoming aware of the fact that the specific form of the House had to be used to collect those signatures, I just want to indicate that a further 2 500 signatures had been collected but unfortunately not in the appropriate form for placing on the record of Parliament. Therefore, I am unable to include those in the petition.

I wish to make a passing reference (ironically) to the editorial in the *News* of last Thursday. Mr Murdoch is entitled to his view, as I suppose is everybody else in society, but it should simply be seen as the view of Mr Murdoch and not of anyone more authoritative in society than he is. It was interesting to note in that editorial the conclusion, as follows:

> Mr Bannon, Mr Milne and their followers are not world policemen and it would be preposterous for them to imagine otherwise.

Nobody has ever suggested that the Leader of the Opposition, Democrat Milne or any of their followers see themselves in the position of world policemen. Quite on the contrary, we see ourselves, if anything, as people who are gravely concerned about the deep and important moral questions involved in this matter. As a State and nation, we are uniquely well placed to renounce every aspect of the nuclear fuel cycle, and in doing so, we would gain immense moral authority and influence over the fate of the world. Australia could begin to nudge the nuclear debate back from the arid and inevitably fatal course on which it seems to have been set. We could force it back into the realm of morality again. Regrettably, it does not seem that some of the most powerful institutions in this country are particularly anxious to do that.

In my concluding few moments I want to deal briefly with a couple of the aspects of this indenture. I said on Thursday that I was not particularly impressed with the fact that the Parliament in a sense was constrained to debating the crossing of the 't's' and dotting of the 'i's' on this document. However, in light of the fact that we have little choice but to approach this question from that point of view I want to deal with a couple of matters that I feel are of some importance to the State, particularly in relation to the indenture clauses governing termination of the indenture: clauses 4, 32 (16) and (17), 41 and 53. Clause 4 provides that if the Bill does not become an Act the provisions of the indenture will not come into operation.

Clause 53 (2) provides that if the joint venturers do not give notice by 31 December 1987 of a decision to proceed with the initial project the indenture terminates. So, what we are dealing with here is an indenture which does not bind the company to do anything at all. It certainly is likely to bind the State to do certain things, but it is not binding the company. Clauses 32 (16) and (17) apply when the joint venturers default in payment of royalties to the State. The State does not have any power to terminate the indenture, or to seek to recover the amount from any other joint venturer. The State is entitled to terminate the indenture if:

> *(a)* The joint venturers or any of them are in default in the performance or observance of any covenants or obligations under the indenture. The default must be material and unremedied. The State may also terminate if the joint venturers abandon their operations or repudiate their obligations.

(b) The indenture will also terminate on the expiration of the special mining leases or any extension or renewal of special mining leases.

The activities contemplated by the indenture are only determinable in the above situations, and it can be seen, therefore, that the Government cannot immediately terminate those activities permanently, indefinitely or for a specified period. Clause 52 allows the joint venturers to terminate the indenture by notice to the State if the State Parliament enacts any legislation which modifies the rights or increases the obligations of the joint venturers, or reduces the obligations of the State under the Bill or the indenture. This clause, if ratified along with others, effectively numbs any further legislative initiative outside the existing terms of the indenture. In other words, if we pass this indenture we are stuck with it for all time. It seems to me that if we pass this indenture in these circumstances, if any control is needed in future it would have to be control by Commonwealth action. In other words, we as a State are vacating the field; we will be passing legislation now which will bind us for a very long period in relation to this quite gigantic proposal.

The indenture refers to the State making representations to the Commonwealth on behalf of the joint venturers to assist in procuring any licences or consents the joint venturers may require in connection with any agreement necessary for the joint venturers to perform their obligations. Any export arrangements being entered into would need Commonwealth approval, as uranium is a prohibited export under the Customs (Prohibited Exports) Regulations.

The Commonwealth Minister, in exercising his discretion whether or not to consent to the export of uranium, may take into account the defence of Australia, environmental issues and anything else he may consider to be relevant. So long as uranium is mined for export, the Commonwealth has the final say on whether a mining operation for uranium, even in a State, is to have ultimately any value at all. I make that point in the context of my comment that I did not believe that this project would finally get off the ground and that, even if it did, I believed it would be mothballed, because I have no doubt that during the life of this indenture, if it is passed by this Parliament, there will be a Federal Labor Government which will take a principled and moral stand in relation to the export of uranium, the export of which I dealt with earlier in pointing out that there is no such thing as a safeguard which stops Australian uranium sent overseas from finding its way into the world nuclear fuel cycle and from there into the making of bombs, and the like.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Do you think Tom Uren will beat Bob Hawke?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am now running out of time so I cannot answer stupid interjections. All I want to say is that I believe that this Parliament has the opportunity in dealing with this Bill and this indenture—

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): Until recently I was not one to be adamant about uranium being mined at all costs without concern for those who work in the mining, production and transport of yellowcake and for the community. However, following several emotional debates in this House since 1977, I have undertaken to read and study as much as possible on the subject. I was surprised to read the following report on page 2 of the *News* this afternoon:

Worth a look—Bannon. Making South Australia a nuclear-free State was an idea 'worthy of examination,' the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said today. Questioned on the plan by Victoria's Labor Government to try to make the State nuclear free, Mr Bannon said the issue had never coome up in the South Australian Party, except for the ban already in place on nuclear powered naval vessels.

'It is unlikely that it will come up in the Victorian form here,' he said. 'But it is an idea worthy of exanination.' Mr Bannon said there were major differences between Victoria and South Australia.

'We have naturally occurring large deposits of uranium,' he said. 'And rejecting the nuclear power option is not something that we have to worry about directly at this stage. Power generation by other means is assured for some time.'

Mr Bannon said any move to make South Australia a nuclear-free State would require changes to the Party platform at an annual State Convention. The next A.L.P. State Convention will be held in Adelaide over the coming long weekend. But Mr Bannon said it was unlikely now that there could be any move this year on making South Austalia a nuclear-free State.

It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition was not aware of his own Party's policy on uranium. A resolution adopted at the State A.L.P. Convention last year stated:

That State Convention approve the establishment of a nuclear hazards committee consisting of eight persons whose task it will be to undertake all activities necessary to promote Labor's policy on uranium and nuclear power; such activities to include the conduct of community education programmes to offset the propaganda of the Liberal Party and mining corporations on this issue. The committee will report to State Convention; that nominations open forthwith and close with the State Secretary at 12 noon one week before the July State Council and a ballot if necessary will be conducted at the July State Council. The committee shall have the power to co-opt and seek the advice and support of people of scientific and technological expertise.

Here is the crunch clause:

That this convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear free zone and requests the South Australian A.L.P. to examine the implications and report back to the next convention on the feasibility of such a declaration, and that the water catchment area of the Adelaide Hills be declared a nuclear free zone as a first step.

It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition does not understand his own Party's policy in relation to this. It is a pity that he did not consult the eight-person committee that was set up last year before he made his statement to the *News*. Let him stand up and tell the truth on this issue. The Leader has done his own credibility no good by waffling around the place as he has done. As to the nonsensical statements and arguments going backwards and forwards across this Chamber, I am convinced that sufficient safeguards exist today to enable us as a Parliament to endorse the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill. The Labor Party in South Australia must accept the responsibility for allowing the mining company in the initial stages (Western Mining) to undertake massive exploration and development of its lease, involving an expenditure of $50 000 000 so far. The Labor Party granted that lease, allowing Western Mining to proceed, and no-one will ever convince me that members of the Labor Party did not know what Western Mining intended to do. If they did not know, they were totally ignorant. A former Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. Hugh Hudson) said in this House on 6 February 1979:

Roxby Downs cannot proceed on copper alone, with uranium being stockpiled, and for Roxby Downs to proceed would require a huge amount of front-end money, probably about $1 000 000 000. Without a large measure of support, not just in this Parliament but in the South Australian community as a whole, no company will be able to take the risks associated with the expenditure of such a huge sum of money.

Clause 15 of the report of the Select Committee on the Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Bill states:

Your committee has given consideration to the question of the need for an indenture at this stage of the project's development. The joint venturers emphasised the need for security as to title and the ground rules for the project in order for them to commit a further $50 000 000 to feasibility studies. Dr K. Keep of BP put it this way: 'The level of expenditure that we require on the feasibility study is more than we anticipated when we joined the venture; we expected by now that by spending $50 000 000 we would have got a firm hold on financing plans for the future, but nature is a bit precocious, and the mine is not a simple ore body

that might occur in some parts of the world: It is a very complex technical geological problem to unravel the details of that body, so we fully recognise that something like another $50 000 000 needs to be spent on it. We need to do that which we feel we cannot do in the first instance solely on $50 000 000 itself, but it does not make economic sense to be spending that sort of money which is laying the foundations for billions of dollars to be spend if we don't know (and I think Mr Morgan called them this) the ground rules.'

The report of the select committee continues:

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

> As to the financial backing, it is extremely rare for a mineral development of this nature to have a commitment of foreign money both for exploration and eventual development at such an early stage. Such a commitment demands an unbroken sequence of activity as there is reason to believe that the further money commitment will be spent after the exploration money. Once spending starts there is no turning back—

the Labor Party and former Minister of Mines and Energy knew that—

> nor will there be repayments of money without a successful outcome.

Your committee understands and accepts the joint venturers' views in this regard.

The indenture Bill allows the now joint partners of Roxby Downs to proceed to the next stage of committing another $50 000 000 of their shareholders' funds. What is more important is that the indenture gives credibility to the future of the project to allow the joint partners to seek not only funding for the project but long-term contracts for the sale of the minerals mined, that is, copper, gold, silver, uranium and rare earths. All members would be aware that in terms of the Mining Act leases must be worked continually or the lease is forfeited.

The Labor Party, I reiterate, committed the State and future Governments when leases were granted for this area. Mining companies may apply for exemptions from working conditions from time to time, but after spending $50 000 000, how could any Government suddenly call a halt on what has occurred? It would be totally dishonourable. Therefore, I believe the previous Labor Government presented any future Government with a *fait accompli.* Honour demands that the project must proceed. If the project is not supported now, it could well stop. That warning has been given to us on many occasions.

If we listen to the so-called moral arguments put up from time to time, we might think that that is a small price to pay. But, there is no substance to those arguments. Scientists are divided on the final issue, and there are some differences in predictions. Some facts cannot be denied. We hear a lot about the dangers of genetic effects. Not only is there no conclusive evidence that there are any dangers, but Hiroshima and Nagasaki have provided evidence that exposure to massive radiation doses does not increase the risk of genetic damage; 71 000 children born of two generations show that there is no frequency of abnormalities.

What about pollution? Coal produces immediate and devastating pollution, mountains of ash, and changes in climate due to coal dust blankets over cities. We will not remind the Victorian Premier about the Latrobe Valley! I want to quote from the Uranium Information Centre Limited pamphlet called *Management of Radioactive Wastes in the Twentieth Century,* as follows:

> Modern society creates waste materials which have to be disposed of in nature without disturbing the ecological equilibrium. For some of them, effective disposal techniques have not been found as yet: most plastic products do not degrade, poisonous mercury does not decay, piles of scrap cars, airplanes and metal containers rust away in junk-yards. We live and breathe admidst discharges of noxious gases, aerosols and the exhaust emissions of motor vehicles.
>
> One 1 000 MWe coal-fired power plant uses 60 000 000 tonnes of fuel in 30 years, producing millions of tonnes of various gaseous wastes and 15 000 000 tonnes of ash, which means a heap of 1 km², 15 m high. This ash contains cadmium, mercury, etc. which are non-degradable and also do not decay.

Solar energy and windmills are put forward as alternatives. There is no way they can meet our current energy needs. We can, perhaps, survive without heaters in our winters, although the last few days may have raised some doubts on that score.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It would be chilly, wouldn't it?

Mr BECKER: That is right. Certain people were complaining about getting going in the morning. How can we make the rest of the world reduce its energy use to the levels which sun and wind can provide? Coal mining and oil drilling are not safe operations either. From 1947 to 1976, 8 001 miners were killed underground and 49 971 seriously injured in the United Kingdom alone. Approximately 130 persons lost their lives following the collapse of an oil rig in the North Sea not long ago, not to mention the number of lives lost or the pollution caused by oil tankers around the world.

I have been having difficulty in getting up-to-date figures on actual deaths or injuries from various energy sources. But, another set of figures I received recently indicated that there were 619 fatalities in the coal industry in the United Kindgom from 1970 to 1979. There were 65 fatalities in the same period in North Sea oil and gas, and four deaths at commercial nuclear power generation plants. However, none of the deaths was connected with radiation incidence. Coal mining, in particular, carries the risk of accidental death, as exampled, plus the awful effects of occupational diseases, such as lung damage. We do not ban coal mining or oil drilling after a devastating fire. We try to prevent it happening again, to make it safer for the future.

These arguments are all emotional and they are based on mixtures of facts, fears, suggestions, hysterics and myths. The facts are that we need industry, and, to compete on world markets, cheap energy. Twenty-three countries have accepted nuclear energy. We must proceed to use the resources we can and stop bowing to short-sighted emotionalism that has been created over years of debate. Somehow, we must take the politics out of uranium. The reason for all this fuss is the impending end of the oil era. Within 10 years or so the demand will exceed the supply, no matter what conservation measures we take—and we must conserve as much as we can now.

It is interesting to note that allegations have been made from time to time of the huge contributions made by the Rockefeller Foundation to the various groups currently opposed to the mining and development of uranium. That, I believe, has been substantiated, but why should the Rockefeller Foundation be involved in this field? Of course, it has a monopoly in a world cartel, as far as oil and finances is concerned. I am worried when someone from the Chase Manhattan Bank visits Australia, because one can bet one's socks that interest rates probably will go up. It is always a good indicator to watch the activities associated with the Chase Manhattan Bank or anything associated with the Rockefeller Foundation.

The world population is likely to at least double in the next decade or so. Its energy needs will increase enormously. With oil on the way out, coal might extend our fossil power capacity by 100 years, with frightful pollution and the danger of a 'greenhouse effect' from the carbon dioxide produced, raising the atmospheric temperature enough to produce a catastrophe.

Many 'no growth' organisations from affluent groups in our society are opposing the mining of uranium on emotional

grounds almost indistinguishable from the outcries of the past against the introduction of steam power, anaesthetics, electricity, motor cars, aluminium saucepans, smallpox vaccinations, and fluoridation. We will always find people to oppose new developments. That is human nature. Many are repeating what they have been told, advocating policies which must perpetuate unemployment and weaken our country. To do this the truth is often ignored. Their tools include fear and cynicism. Do not let us underestimate the power of the many 10-second not-the-whole-truths, each of which requires 20 minutes to refute. But one must be fair: Many of the speakers honestly believe what they are saying and are quite unaware of the facts.

I want to quote from an advertisement that appeared recently in the press from the Australian Democrats, where the Hon. Mr Lance Milne, holder of the Australian Democrats seat in the Legislative Council, had this to say:

> It is my firm belief that exploitation of uranium resources should not proceed as this stage, because the hazards of reactor malfunction, misappropriation of fissile materials and temporary and permanent storage of the waste products of the nuclear fuel cycle are at present beyond the capacity of mankind to control.

The Hon. Mr Milne was at the meeting yesterday afternoon with Professor Beckmann. I am quite sure that, if Mr Milne did not understand what Professor Beckmann had to say, this State is the worse for having Mr Milne, who claims he holds the balance of power in the Legislative Council. We have made the current situation very clear, and there is plenty of information available. Unfortunately, there is one person in the Parliament who simply does not have the time or has not been provided with resources to vet the amount of the material available.

A few years ago 34 eminent American scientists, including 11 Nobel prize winners, summed up the nuclear situation, as follows:

> We can see no reasonable alternative to an increased use of nuclear power to satisfy our energy needs.

This was ignored by the American media in favour of an empty Nader statement. Of course, we know that some of his organisations have been sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation. Too many people are now too proud to acknowledge the true situation. I am sure that Don Dunstan may have been one of them in the early part of 1979, because he had just come back from a world tour to study this very issue. I would be very surprised if he did not find what he believed could have been to the benefit of South Australia, and supported the Roxby Downs situation. From the hard core anti-uranium movement, one would think nuclear energy had just been invented and that the world was not sure what to do with it. We forget that Calder Hall nuclear power station was opened in 1956, more than 25 years ago. Nuclear energy has been with us for about 30 years, and was known in this country as far back as 1906.

I turn now to Calder Hall. In the first 25 years since the Calder Hall nuclear station in North-West England was opened, it has produced some 37 thousand million units of electricity. One unit of electricity is one kilowatt-hour and equal to the electricity needed to power a one-bar electric fire for one hour. It would have taken more than 16 000 000 tonnes of coal equivalent, or more than 9 000 000 tonnes of oil equivalent, to produce the same amount of electricity. Put another way, on an annual basis Calder Hall produces enough electricity to satisfy the needs of more than 300 000 people. In addition to providing power for the national grid, Calder Hall also meets the electricity supply and process steam needs of a nearby nuclear fuel reprocessing complex. You cannot tell those who are running hundreds of nuclear reactors all over the world to get lost. Decisions should never be made purely on emotion, ignoring the facts. As I said previously, if we take the politics out of this issue we will probably get a rational basis for the whole thing.

In a speech in March 1982 at the Japan Atomic Industrial Forum Conference, in Tokyo, the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. State Committee for the Utilization of Atomic energy gave some figures to illustrate why the U.S.S.R. is enthusiastic about the construction of further nuclear power stations. Nuclear power, which provides 6 per cent of the country's total electricity generation, has grown to the equivalent of 50 000 000 tonnes of coal annually. The initial investment costs are lower for nuclear plants than for coal-fired power plants by a ratio of 5 to 7, and labour costs as a ratio of salaries to total generating costs are also lower in nuclear stations than coal-fired power generation. In addition, it is necessary to transport coal from the east to the populous western part of the U.S.S.R.—an expensive operation. That is an admission from the Soviet. Plans are also under way for nuclear reactors designed exclusively for heating homes and industrial plants and for combined nuclear-hydroelectric stations where the nuclear plants will assist in supplying the base load.

'Safe energy safe future', an association founded late last year by 30 shop stewards from Vienna and Lower Austria, is arguing for the commissioning of the Zwentendorf nuclear power plant. They are opposing environmentalists whom they believe by their attitudes are contributing to the increased rate of unemployment. Let us look further around the world. In Switzerland, Beznau-2, a 350-megawatt reactor, has produced electricity commercially for the past 10 years and during the past year it has operated at a capacity of 90 per cent. The two reactors, Beznau-1 and Beznau-2, have been operating together for more than 20 reactor years. During this time no major incident has occurred, and not one worker has received a radiation dose exceeding the legal limit. Radioactivity released to the environment was only a few per cent of the very strict limits fixed by the authorities.

France, in its recently released revised forecast, expects electricity use to increase significantly and, therefore, by 1985 nuclear power is expected to provide 65 per cent of the generated electricity and 71 per cent by 1988. Yugoslavia plans to commence construction of a second nuclear power plant in 1985, which should be ready to commence operation in 1992. The growth of nuclear power in the O.E.C.D. area in the next decade is expected to be as follows:

	1980	1985	1990
Plants operating no.	193	298	408
Total generating capacity	113GW^{E}	220GW^{E}	330GW^{E}
Share of total electricity reproduction	11 per cent	19 per cent	25 per cent

So, in the next decade in O.E.C.D. countries the dependence on nuclear energy for electricity will rise from 11 per cent to 25 per cent.

During a recent trip to Europe I found that there was feeling against Britain in European countries that were unable to compete, particularly in the steel industry because, they felt, Britain had a power advantage over other European countries. When workers start taking an interest in that sort of matter, there are problems.

Turning again to Russia, the Soviet Chairman, Leonid I. Brezhnev, in February 1981 said:

> It is necessary to reduce the share of oil as fuel to replace it with gas and coal, and to expand the nuclear power industry, including fast-neutron reactors, more rapidly.

The following comment appeared in *Socialism—Theory and Practice,* in June 1981.

> Today there are no serious or well-reasoned objections to widely using atomic energy . . . in the current decade, the U.S.S.R. will

assist in putting nuclear power stations with an aggregate capacity of 37 000 000 kw into operation in the European C.M.E.A. countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, The G.D.R., Poland, Romania, the U.S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia) and Cuba. This will enable savings of 70 000 000 tons of conventional fuel a year.

Dr Hans Bethe, Nobel Prize for Physics, when addressing a seminar in New York conducted by the American Nuclear Society in February 1981 stated:

The Western World has a moral responsibility gradually to withdraw from the world oil market and to accelerate its nuclear power program. This should give the developing nations a bigger share of the world's diminishing oil supplies till they have a chance to build their own nuclear reactors.

A report appeared in the *Beijung (Peking) Review* No. 49 of 1980, as follows:

Professor Lu Yingzhong, Nuclear Technology Institute, Quinghua University, maintained that though economising on energy was a way out in the short run, nuclear power was the best long-term alternative energy source for energy-hungry regions. There are more than 200 reactors operating in nuclear power stations in the world. Their safety, reliability and economic value have all been proved in practice. In comparison with coal and oil, nuclear power causes the least amount of air pollution, and is thus the cleanest energy source.

Frank Chapple, Secretary General of the 450 000 strong Electrical Electronic Telecommunications Plumbing Union in Britain, said this:

I think we ought to have uranium made available to the nations who need energy. The French and the Germans, in fact the whole of Europe, is energy starved and Japan has no indigenous sources of energy of its own. It is a selfish and unreasonable attitude to say you can't mine or must not mine uranium in Australia.

Joe Gormley, President, National Union of Mineworkers, in 1981 said this:

Britain must go for nuclear powered electricity at the turn of the century and save coal for conversion into synthetic oil and gas. If we have to have nuclear energy, then we must be assured that it has the greatest safety possible and we must convince people that we can deal with the residue safely. There have been disasters at coal pits, but there was no reason to call for the closing down of all pits.

Referring to the European Common Market, he said:

Twenty-two trade unions in the Common Market have declared themselves in favour of nuclear energy.

Bettino Craxi, Italian Socialist Party Secretary, said this:

The nuclear choice is inevitable and the Government must accelerate the nuclear power programme.

Gian Franco Borghini, Communist Party Director of Industrial Problems, in January 1981 said this:

Italy will face an energy hole by 1985 and nuclear power is the best way to fill it.

A poll carried out in August 1980 by the Emnid Institute on behalf of the Chemical Industry's Employers' Organisation in West Germany found the following:

Trade Unionists (69 per cent) were in favour of nuclear energy.

Frank Chapple, Chairman T.U.C. Fuel and Power Industry Committee, in Britain in December 1979 said this:

Hysterical voices of environmentalists, ecologists and sundry political opportunists exploit public ignorance. They rewrite all of our known experience with nuclear energy, embellishing every detail, exaggerating every mishap; and behind this smoke-screen they skilfully conceal the fact that the logical outcome of their policies will, at worst, leave us with a shortage of energy around the year 2000 and, at best, lead us first to stagnation and then to a reduced standard of living.

Turning to the Three Mile Island happening, which has been mentioned, an advertisement placed in the *Washington Post* of 30 March 1981 by 15 unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organisations' Building and Construction Trades Department, stated:

Despite the sensational headlines to work . . . what the T.M.I. accident did accomplish was to make nuclear power even safer . . . the American public has nothing to fear from either T.M.I. or nuclear power generally, what the public should fear is the possibility that we as a nation would actually shut down a proven energy source which provides electricity and jobs.

The fight against nuclear power has turned into a holy war without rhyme or reason. I get annoyed with people who are opposed to things because it is fashionable. And the South Western United States is suffering because of it. Stripping the land for the production of coal and utilizing coal-burning plants are, I think, far more dangerous than utilizing clean, controlled nuclear plants . . .

Three Mile Island has set off what you'd think is the next civil war. And yet nothing really happened. Certainly nothing that compares to the stuff I've seen in the south-west at the Four Corners coal plant. The sky is no longer blue, the country's being raped by strip mining, precious water is being used to sluice out the coal. And some day that coal will give out . . .

That statement was issued in August 1980 by Ansell Adamson, ardent conservationist, and for nearly 40 years a member of the Sierra Club's board of trustees. Finally, from the Vatican there was the following statement:

There was no reason for banning nuclear energy development for civilian use. In the next 10 years only nuclear power and coal would be able to satifsy the increased energy demand.

That was the conclusion of a study week organised in late 1980 by the Papal Academy of Science, the Vatican. I am trying to demonstrate the comments, the concern, and the future possible needs of other countries, and certainly the 23 odd countries that currently have nuclear power plants, but more importantly, the contribution that we in South Australia and the joint partners of Roxby Downs can make in providing a source of nuclear energy in the future. It may not be needed until 1985 or 1990, but it will provide jobs and benefits for the working class that have never been considered before. Any person who is prepared to deny that is not being honest.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. I call the honourable member for Mitcham. In doing so, I draw to the attention of the House that this is the honourable member's maiden speech in this House, and I am sure that all honourable members from both sides will give it the due regard that is made available on such occasions.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am also aware of the tradition that I should not be controversial when making a maiden speech, but, being forced to make my maiden speech on the subject of Roxby Downs, I feel that it will be difficult not to be controversial. Indeed, I must begin by commenting on a remark made by the member for Hanson, when he referred to Professor Beckmann, who was introduced to us yesterday at the meeting as having no particular interest in the mining of uranium despite the fact that he was brought to Australia by the Chamber of Mines.

Last night I heard the same gentleman comment on television that we should proceed to mine uranium at Roxby Downs as quickly as possible. The first reason he gave was that the price for yellowcake was high. I can assure the honourable member opposite that the Australian Democrats do not accept the fact of possible profit to the joint venturers as the basis for decision on this issue.

I would like to preface my remarks by commenting on the statement by the Minister that there were few submissions from local non-government bodies or individuals. I do not find this surprising (as the Minister did) in the light of the clear statement before the indenture Bill was referred to the select committee that the Government and the joint venturers would not accept amendments to the indenture. I would like to begin by making a personal statement on my position on the concept of the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs. It is a far bigger issue than just an economic deal between a State Government and mining companies. I feel strongly

that no issue before this Parliament could be of more significance to the future well-being of mankind.

I now refer to the most widely used arguments in support of mining uranium. The major pro arguments (and their counters) are:

(1) 'If we do not supply uranium, someone else will'. This is the same argument used by heroin pushers to justify their ugly activities, and it is no more valid a reason here than in that case.

(2) 'If we do not supply it, the people who want it will invade us to get it'. If the first is true (that is, there are plenty of other suppliers), then this does not apply. If it is not true, it is still impossible to imagine any nation (especially an underdeveloped nation) spending the vast amounts of money on the war necessary to acquire the limited stocks of uranium in Australia, especially since they are unlikely to have the expertise to get it and use it even if they won such a war. In any case, nuclear power is too expensive for Third World countries, where most people do not even have electricity; it would lead to dependency on foreign technicians, fuel and capital.

(3) 'The State will benefit from the huge royalties and the massive employment'. That is utter rubbish, as reference to clauses in the Bill relating to royalties shows. How many people are employed at Honeymoon or Mary Kathleen, or any other sophisticated mining venture?

(4) 'We will not sell it to countries unless they promise to use it only for peaceful purposes'. And when they do not, what do we do? International safeguards cannot be enforced. Even the pro-nuclear advocate, Sir Ernest Titterton, in 1974, called the non-proliferation treaty 'a worthless and ineffective bit of paper'.

I cannot accept any moral position which dissociates the responsibility for the use and the end product of any commodity sold from the seller, in this case the South Australian Government and the joint venturers. The comforting words of assurance by those eager to sell nuclear energy or uranium for profit cannot be taken at face value, and I remain personally persuaded that the arguments exposing the dangers of nuclear energy and of inevitable nuclear arms production reflect the true state of the nuclear threat to the world. What is seen as a temporary lapse in demand for nuclear energy in the United States may well indicate the uncompetitive situation that the nuclear energy industry now finds itself in within the country that has used it most.

The most divisive issue of our time is nuclear power. All over the world, ordinary citizens are demonstrating, making public protest against the issues of proliferation of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy. Nowhere in the world have these protests been more forceful than in Japan, the only country yet to have direct experience of nuclear war. Yet protests and changes in attitude have not been limited to the citizens of Japan. Since the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island, not one of the previously projected nuclear power plants has been proceeded with. No new nuclear power plants have been commissioned, none have been completed.

In Canada, the escalating cost of operating nuclear power stations within the safety regulations demanded by the Nuclear Energy Authority has given rise to serious concern. New projects are being abandoned; the mirage of cheap nuclear energy is being seen for what it is—a mirage. On latest information, the Canadian Government has moved away from all expansion of nuclear power on economic grounds. The statistics on which the industry was based have proved unreliable, and the demand for energy has fallen. Do we ignore market forces which show that the world demand for steel, aluminium and other metals has slumped? Even leading industrialists will now admit that an upturn is not likely before the end of the century (and I quote Sir Arvi Parbo on aluminium). The demand for coal previously exported by Australia to Japan has fallen, not because of inadequate port facilities, not because of shipping disputes, but because the world steel market is in a state of decline.

Is it seriously suggested that, as the developed world enters the post-industrial era, we should encourage the Third World to enter an industrial age of expansion? If we cannot increase our production because of falling demand, how can we advise our Third World neighbours that there is a future in manufacturing and in heavy industry? Nuclear power may be an option in the year 2082, even in 2032; it is not an option in 1982. The risks are too great, the costs are too high, and the rewards are uncertain.

It will be to the developed world's eternal shame if, because of our greed, we sell and extend uranium and nuclear technology into countries which, because of their limited technological ability and the hazards of the industry, run the risk of a succession of devastating nuclear accidents. Nor do they have the ability to store the waste safely. Inevitably, they will be tempted to acquire a nuclear arms capacity. With the example of the Falklands so starkly before us, the temptation for desperate leaders to use their ultimate weapons will be irresistible. I believe it is no longer possible to keep the so-called peaceful use of uranium separate from the production of nuclear weapons. The first Fox Report stated that 'the nuclear power industry is unintentionally contributing to an increased risk of nuclear war'. Sir Mark Oliphant said in July 1981:

> The recent Israeli destruction of a French-built nuclear power station in Baghdad illustrates the growing problem of the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability. Possession of power reactors provides the ability to make nuclear weapons from the plutonium they produce. Adherence to the non-proliferation treaty with its powers of inspection can be withdrawn after six months notice.

The examples of Israel, South Africa, India, and Pakistan come immediately to mind. In spite of strong opposition from the world community, atomic armaments have been made in these countries, and the fact that the non-proliferation treaty allows in clause 10 for a signatory country to renegue on the obligations of the treaty makes ridiculous any claims that the peaceful and military uses for uranium will be kept separate.

Australia has already weakened its safeguards in order to sell uranium. In December 1980, a decision was made to allow reprocessing by customers in order to win huge contracts with E.E.C. countries. Likely customers of our uranium include South Korea, unstable military dictatorships, and France. France continues to test weapons in the Pacific. It has exploded 88 bombs in its testing programme in the Pacific. Yet we have contracted to supply France with uranium despite the fact that Australia is a signatory to the Pacific Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Japan, another likely customer, plans to dump waste in the Pacific. As the market weakens further, we may be under pressure from buyers to relax safeguards further or to accept back the waste. The Minister in his statement referred to the evidence of Mr Morgan, who said:

> I believe the world would regard it as an extraordinary event if South Australia did not want such a project as this. In fact, it would be unique.

I agree with that statement completely. I believe it is time for someone to take a stand as an example to the rest of the world. We must rethink the lifestyle that has been imposed on us by a system designed to maximise profits without concern for our environment or future health. We need to promote the development of alternative energy

systems, as well as a lifestyle which is lower in energy consumption. Anyone who supports the mining of uranium may at some future time be contributing to the production of a nuclear weapon. For example, according to a report by Robert Hershey of the *New York Times*, published in the *Financial Review* of Tuesday 15 September 1981, the Reagan Administration is considering a plan under which the Government would reprocess spent fuel from nuclear power plants for its own use, including the making of weapons. It seems particularly appropriate for me to be speaking in this debate during the United Nations Second Special Session on Disarmament, at present being held in New York. The nations of the world have come together to talk once again, despite the fact that little progress has been made towards world peace since they met in 1978 and signed an agreement to take steps towards disarmament.

Having made my own position clear on the mining and sale of uranium, I would like to reiterate my Party's position on the Roxby Downs project. The Democrats are in favour of mining the copper, gold and rare earths at Roxby Downs on three conditions: that the associated uranium is returned as mine fill and is not sold; that the terms of the indenture Bill ensure a fair and economic return to the people of South Australia, and the environment is properly cared for; and that the health of the workers is safeguarded.

I now turn my attention to the report of the select committee itself. With regard to paragraph four,it will be at the best 1987 before any mineral production comes from the mine, so there will be very little of this decade left, as quoted in the report, 'to take advantage of improvement in the markets', if indeed they do improve. The Managing Director of the A.M.P. said in October 1981 that the uranium market was saturated and that Australia had missed the boat completely. Indeed, if the joint venturers take advantage of clause 53 of the indenture itself, which is entitled 'Extensions of Time', there may well be no mineral production this decade at all. If Roxby proceeds, our economy could be dependent on decisions made in the boardrooms of the joint venturers and the price fluctuations of copper and uranium.

Paragraph five deals with royalities. If the case is as stated by the select committee, why has the Minister refused to disclose to us the supporting royalty calculations? We know that Treasury and Western Mining Company have jointly calculated the anticipated royalties. I call on the Minister to make the calculations available to this Parliament. In discussing the royalty arrangements, referring to the two-tier arrangement, the Under Treasurer, Mr Barnes, says that it is to ensure that the State gets something out of the project, no matter whether it is profitable or not. The current Mining Act would ensure the same commencement *ad valorem* royalty, so there is no urgency for the indenture on this account. As for the second tier, the surplus related royalty, it is an extremely complicated matter and will be dealt with in more detail by my colleague in another place.

With regard to paragraph seven, I refer to infra-structure. I note with interest the sentence, 'Your committee's understanding of the clauses is as follows'. I appreciate the use of the word 'understanding', because much of it is difficult to understand and is not precisely defined. The full cost of the listed infra-structure items need only be expended once the town reaches a population of 9 000 people. That will occur as soon as the mining company commences its initial projects in earnest and may well be five years (from evidence given to us by officers of the Mines Department and independent mining engineers) before the production of any saleable metals, and receipt by the Government of any royalties.

Paragraph No. 7 states that the limit to the cost of the Government for the infra-structure is to be $50 000 000 in terms of June 1981 dollars. That does not agree with clause 22 (3) of the indenture which states the joint venturers and the Minister may from time to time agree to vary the provisions of the infra-structure by an addition to the services, facilities and infra-structure listed therein.

The committee points out that whether the State does in fact maintain its contribution at $50 000 000 will depend upon the degree to which the cost of specific items are carefully controlled. It is obvious that the committee itself had grave doubts about keeping the lid on the Government's obligations at $50 000 000.

The provisions outlined in paragraph nine compare unfavourably with Western Australia, where the mining company at Yeelirrie is obliged to comply with whatever conditions of radiation exposure control that the State may determine. The South Australian agreement does not require the joint venturers to comply with any controls more stringent that the codes referred to in clause 10.

Paragraph 10 refers to the environment. It is remarkable to see the Director-General of Environment and Planning announce that the Government will prepare an environmental assessment which cannot be completed before the end of the year, and yet we are being asked to pass this indenture by the end of June, some six months before the assessment will be ready. Furthermore, it is remarkable to find in clause 11 (9) of the indenture the comment that:

> The State shall give due consideration to ameliorating the adverse effects of cost.

This relates to any change made by the State to environmental laws from time to time. There has been no allowance for possible cost to the State of this generosity.

With regard to paragraph 11, it is with some concern that both the Aboriginals and those who care for their heritage in South Australia are alarmed to find in clause 9 (7) of the Bill that several of the powers of the Aboriginal Heritage Act are not exercisable without the consent of the joint venturers.

In conclusion, the report glibly says that the joint venturers' requirements of water from the Great Artesian Basin could be easily met. Our advice has been that 6 000 000 tonnes per year of underground water could be used by the project annually, and, over 50 to 100 years, this would put enormous strains on the artesian water supply. We believe that the time is long overdue for control at Federal level of the use of water from the Artesian Basin.

I do not have time to cover all the problems within the indenture Bill itself. A series of experts has been produced and lengthy evidence quoted from the pro-Roxby point of view. However, many other equally eminent experts would refute that evidence. The Minister has referred scathingly to the evidence presented on behalf of environmental groups being given by people from interstate. He overlooks the fact that such bodies have very limited funds to employ research staff, and these are usually based in the Eastern States. I believe that it is important to hear some of the evidence presented to the select committee by Mr John Hallam on behalf of the Friends of the Earth. I shall quote part of his evidence, as follows:

> What the indenture Bill is, and is not.
>
> Briefly, the Roxby Downs Indenture Ratification Bill and the accompanying indenture, form an agreement between the State of South Australia and the Roxby Downs joint venturers for the development of the Roxby Downs copper/gold/uranium deposit at Olympic Dam. The document itself is long and complicated. In spite of this complexity, which reaches its peak in the arrangements for royalties, it lacks detail in a number of critical areas.
>
> It is divided into two parts: a brief document entitled 'A Bill for an Act to ratify and approve a certain indenture between the State of South Australia and others; to make special provision for local government in a part of the State subject to the indenture; and for other purposes', and the Indenture itself. The indenture itself has the air of a *fait accompli*, having been already signed by the Premier, the Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Hugh

Morgan, for Western Mining Corporation and Roxby Mining Corporation, and Mr A. W. Gorrie and K. R. Keep for BP Australia. This would seem, on the face of it, to pre-empt any decision of the South Australian Parliament. All that remains is for the ratification Act itself to be passed by the two Houses of the South Australian Parliament, an event that could be seen as speculative at best.

In his summary and recommendations, Mr Hallam states:

The indenture as a whole is premature. The lack of project detail, and, indeed of certainty as to whether the project will proceed at all even if the indenture is passed in its present form, make the writing of a detailed agreement, or the framing of a detailed indenture Act an exercise in futility.

Prior to any indenture being passed in any form:

Detailed exploration and feasibility studies should be done. These should include comparative economic studies of different extraction processes, with varying assumptions as to copper, gold, and uranium markets. Special attention should be given to processes that do not involve the extraction of uranium from the ore.

Also, before the indenture is passed, the process of the Commonwealth Environment Protection—Impact of Proposals Act should be gone through, in parallel with its State equivalent. It should clearly be borne in mind that the primary purpose of this process is to determine whether the project ought to proceed at all. The detailed feasibility studies should be released as part of this public assessment process.

Mr Hallam continues:

The indenture is inflexible. There is no provision in it for Parliament to amend it, and any variation in it is entirely a matter between the joint venturers and the Minister.

He goes on to question the control that Parliament should have over the indenture and the agreement rather than just between the joint venturers and the Minister. Mr Hallam continues:

The indenture and its Ratifying Bill cuts a swath through a whole series of South Australian Acts, and one Commonwealth Act. The effect of this is to give the joint venturers and the Roxby Downs project a special, privileged, legal status. This should be avoided, and the joint venturers made subject, as far as possible, to normal South Australian law. In particular, the provisions of the Aboriginal Heritage Act must be made to apply. Its bypassing is a slap in the face for the Aboriginal people of South Australia. Clauses exempting the joint venturers from environmental or radiation safety requirements passed by the South Australian Parliament must also be deleted.

I now wish in the last few minutes available to me to comment on the conclusions in the minority report which I believe may be used as the basis for amendments to the indenture Bill. I would like to make my position perfectly clear. I can see little point in supporting amendments when I entend to vote against the indenture Bill in its present form at this point of time, although I concede that some of the amendments may have merit. I would like to examine three of the proposals in detail.

There is no need for an amendment to allow the joint venturers to proceed to the end of the feasibility stage; they can continue if they wish, regardless of whether or not the indenture Bill is passed. There is no need for an amendment to be made to allow the Government of the day to make up its mind on the provision of infra-structure and the other provisions of the indenture. If the Bill is defeated, that is what the position would be.

Finally, what is the security of granting a 50-year lease when the joint venturers may decide in 1984 not to proceed with the project, and the Government of the day may or may not agree to an indenture in terms satisfactory to the joint venturers?

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I support the motion. I would like to say at the outset that for some considerable time I, too, have endeavoured to find my true position in relation to the consideration of nuclear mining, or the mining of uranium and the production of power by nuclear means. I have endeavoured to seek information from various sources. I find that, as everyone would know, there is a need for power throughout the world, and that this need is progressing and becoming much greater. We know that there are various sources of power, or types of power stations, and that there are the means of fossil fuels, oil and gas. I am given to understand that, with known reserves, and at the rate of usage at the moment, those fossil fuels will be depleted at the turn of the century, or soon into the 21st century.

There are large reserves of coal. Of course, in this country we are fortunate, as we have very good quality coal in some areas of Australia, and in South Australia we have large reserves of coal the quality of which is perhaps not as good as it could be. In the Port Wakefield and Balaklava area of my own electorate there is a deposit of millions of tonnes of low-grade coal. Nevertheless, there is the confidence that this can be used in the production of electric power.

In my keen desire to learn as much as I can, particularly because this Bill was before Parliament, it was my privilege last month to go to the United Kingdom. While there I had a look at four power stations; three of them were nuclear, and one, a pump storage power station, was at Dinorwic in Wales. The other two were at Windscale, and Trawsfynydd in Wales, and the third, at Dounreay in Scotland, is a fast reactor power station. I feel that one must take some notice of people who have been involved in the industry for a considerable time. There were people at Windscale who have been in the industry since 1948. Their impression of the need for nuclear power is that, if there is a continuation of the use of oil and gas, without restriction, the resources will be exhausted long before the estimated time.

With coal, there are certain difficulties. I remember living during my youth and before that as a child in the mining district of Wallaroo Mines. It was common there for men who had worked in the mines to contract what was known as 'miners' complaint'. They would cough, and no doubt they had lung complaints. I understand that this is one of the problems of the coal industry. As recently as last week, the Deputy Premier quoted from a booklet entitled *Challenge to Australia* that has just recently been produced.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr RUSSACK: Before the dinner adjournment I was about to quote from the book *Challenge to Australia* and an article written by Sir Barton Pope. Time does not allow me to read the whole article but I know members will understand if I just take a couple of paragraphs. I quote:

The world is suffering enormous damage to the environment from coal-burning pollution. This is assuming very serious significance in the highly industrialised centres of the world reliant on coal-burning as their energy source.

The treatment of black lung disease in America is costing some one billion dollars per annum. To this must be added the high incidence of death by accident. Nuclear can be, and must be, managed according to established rules. Its history now reveals its much greater freedom from accident than other energy sources and that it is the most free of environmental pollution. Science has advanced enormously in nuclear design, management and control over the last 30 years.

Other methods are being investigated. There is wave power and wind power. It was suggested to me that these are being investigated and researched, but there have to be the right geographical circumstances and the correct technology. Regarding wind power, I understand progress has been made in New Zealand concerning this source of generating power. I bring to the notice of the House the Dinorwic dam in Wales, which is a pumped storage power station. It uses water falling from a high level source to produce electricity. The water drives turbines that in turn drive the generators that produce the electricity. A pump storage power station differs from the normal hydro-electric station, because it has two reservoirs and uses the same water again and again.

After driving the turbines, the water is pumped from the lower reservoir back to the upper reservoir, ready to be used

again when needed. In some pump storage schemes the turbines and pumps are separate machines but at Dinorwic the turbine generators will work in reverse as motor pumps to return the water to the top reservoir, powered by electricity from the national grid, but there is one problem about this type of station in the United Kingdom, and I read from a pamphlet as follows:

> Hydro-electric stations, whose water sources are replenished by rain or snowfall, are obviously cheaper to operate but, unfortunately, all the viable hydro-electric sites in the U.K. have been developed and are of limited capacity. Pumped-storage schemes remain the only practical means of generating electricity from water power.

The pump storage scheme is used for a particular purpose and that is very similar to the purpose of the Snowy Mountains scheme, where at peak periods power is produced within 10 seconds or less and can be introduced into the grid for those peak periods. Immediately that need has been satisfied, the water is returned to the original reservoir ready to be used again. There is a limit in the United Kingdom as far as hydro-electric generation is concerned.

I am not saying that there are hazards in every other method of production and that there are not hazards and dangers associated with the production of nuclear power: there are. However, all these problems must be compared in conjunction with the fact that there is a need for power in countries that have no other possible means of generating power. France, at the moment, is reliant upon 50 per cent of its power needs being generated by nuclear means. In England, one in eight, or about 12½ per cent, of the electric light globes is receiving its power from a nuclear source. In Scotland that percentage is higher, up to something like 20 per cent. There is, therefore, a power need in those particular places, as there is in Germany, Japan and other countries.

I will mention some of the hazards associated with other forms of electricity production. Of course, there is oil and gas generated power, but stocks of those materials are rapidly decreasing because of the rate at which they are being used. There is also the hazard mentioned, I think, by the member for Hanson this afternoon, when he referred to accidents like the one in the North Sea when an oil rig turned turtle and many lives were lost. One finds that there are accidents in mining and there are always things such as black lung disease and explosions.

There must, of course, be conservation of water to generate hydro-electric power. We find that it is not infrequent (and I do not think I am exaggerating) for dams to burst and cause havoc. In 1963, in Vaiont, in Italy, a dam disaster occurred, causing the loss of 1 189 lives. Recently, at a water gathering point on the border of China and India at the foot of the Himalayas, because of the removal of the forests, silt and boulders accumulated and caused disasters. In Teton, Georgia, in the United States of America there was quite a disaster in 1977. In all these places there has been loss of life.

While hydro-electric generation is cheaper in some areas, I have read that in the prairie areas of America, because of siltation, a power plant has a life of only about 50 years, and that in those areas generation of power by steam has become much cheaper in recent years than production of electricity by hydro-electric means. Whatever the source or whatever the means of production of power, there are dangers involved.

Mr Hamilton: There is not much danger with hydro-electric power.

Mr RUSSACK: There have been disasters with hydro-power, just as with other forms of power generation.

Mr Langley: Not compared to nuclear power.

Mr RUSSACK: How safe is nuclear power? I refer to an article in the *Atom News*, headed 'How safe is nuclear power', as follows:

> No-one pretends a nuclear reactor is a suitable place for children to play.
>
> But large numbers of people have been working in nuclear power stations for many years.
>
> And the Electrical Power Engineers' Association has published a report which says that the risk of a worker being hurt in a nuclear power station—or of anyone living nearby being harmed—is lower than risks accepted by workers in many other industries and by ordinary people in their everyday lives.
>
> Britain's Health and Safety Commission has suggested that if all the electricity used in Britain was generated in nuclear power stations fewer workers would be likely to die in accidents.
>
> Lloyd's Register of Shipping, recognised for more than 200 years as the leading independent international ship-classification society, has been involved, too, with nuclear safety since 1950 and has made many inspections of nuclear power stations, the equipment used in them, and the ships which carry nuclear fuel around the world.
>
> 'I thoroughly welcome the increasingly realistic attitudes of Governments around the world towards nuclear power', said Lloyd's Register Chairman, Robert Huskisson, in his annual report for 1979. 'In my view, linked with the increased use of coal, it is the one realistic road out of future oil difficulties and the political and economic tensions which arise from them. It is a field in which LR is proud to be involved in several countries.'
>
> No industrial activity is absolutely safe but great care is taken to make the risk to anyone as small as possible if there should be an accident in any nuclear plant. Experts all over the world co-operate to keep the already high safety standards under review and raise them even higher if necessary. The amount of radioactivity which is allowed to reach the environment is kept to the lowest practicable level.
>
> It is easy to make measurements to ensure that this is so. Someone living next door to a nuclear power station runs less risk of dying as a result of what goes on there than he would if he smoked just one cigarette a year.

When I visited Trawsfynydd in Wales and Dounreay in Scotland, I noticed that dairy cows were grazing next to the power plants. Therefore, I made inquiries concerning the risk, because I remember that it was claimed a few years ago in New South Wales that milk was one of the most susceptible liquids to absorb radioactivity. I was told in Trawsfynydd and Dounreay that this practice has been in operation for 25 years and the situation is monitored continuously. There has not been one known case of contamination in that industry. The population of Thurso in the past 10 years has increased from 3 000 to 10 000.

Mr Hemmings: What does that prove?

Mr RUSSACK: It proves that for over a quarter of a century there has been no danger in the generation of electricity through nuclear power stations. As a matter of fact, for 18 consecutive years the plant at Dounreay has won the safety award of the British Safety Council, which I think speaks for itself. Three major areas of concern have been expressed, which I endeavoured to investigate while I was away. The first is health, and I have just referred to one factor in regard to health. The plants that I visited were scrupulously clean, and the workers are continually monitored. Every care is taken, which is justified and correct.

Windscale, the first plant of its kind in the world, has been reprocessing nuclear fuel since 1952 and brought its present reprocessing plant on stream in 1964 to meet the expanding Magnox reactor programme, the first generation of nuclear power stations. The principals at Windscale told me that there are presently about 6 500 employees. The plant has been producing power since 1952 and has been established since 1948. Over those years, only five industrial claims have been made for suspected illness from working in such a plant.

I am sure that members of the House would agree that that is an infinitesimal number of employees for that period. At the moment there are over 6 000 employed at the Dounreay fast breeder station in Scotland.

Mr Hemmings: What about casual workers?

Mr RUSSACK: Those figures include all the workers involved in the plant.

Mr Hemmings: Yes, but what about claims by casual workers?

Mr RUSSACK: I did whatever I could to investigate the health aspect. I believe that if a person is ill that person goes to the doctor; if a person wants to know something about law he goes to a legal practitioner; if we want to know something about nuclear power and its production, we should go to experts who have been involved in it. The first thing that the gentleman said (and there were three or four of us there with him) was, 'I've been here since 1948. Look at me; am I anything but normal?' I am convinced that those involved in the industry are conscious of the health factor, and every care is taken in looking at that aspect. As regards security, a statement has been made that nuclear fuel can fall into the wrong hands. In a news release issued by the Minister of Mines and Energy on 10 May this year, he stated:

> The fact is that any sale of uranium from South Australia will be made only to responsible customers under stringent safeguards. Such sales would be subject to approval by the Federal Government under the terms of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty—a Treaty Australia entered into under the Whitlam Federal Labor Government.

I would like to quote from Parliamentary Paper 154, the Report of the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on Uranium Resources. On page 18, under the heading 'The Commonwealth Government's response to the Ranger Inquiry,' paragraph *(h)* states:

> On Australia's international obligations, the inquiry concluded:
>
> A total refusal to supply would place Australia in clear breach of Article IV of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty and could adversely affect its relation to countries which are parties to the non-proliferation treaty.
>
> Article IV of the Treaty obliges Australia to co-operate in the production and usage of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The export by Australia of uranium under stringent safeguards would give effect to our obligations under Articles III and IV of the Treaty.

So, the treaty suggests that Australia should meet its obligations on a moral basis to those countries in need of this source of power, but under the correct conditions. The Minister has given me an assurance that that would be done. Those people involved in the United Kingdom are insistent that that should be done. Let me say again that those provisions were arranged and stated during the term of a Federal Labor Government. With regard to the security of transportation of fuel, fuel is being transferred to Windscale for storage, and it is transported in cylinders weighing 50 tonnes. It is stored in such containers so that it cannot be easily hijacked. If time permitted, but it does not, I could read the details of the tests through which those cylinders pass in order to ensure security of transportation of fuel in that form.

Mr Hemmings: What about accidents?

Mr RUSSACK: As yet, there have not been any real accidents.

Mr Hemmings: What if there is one?

Mr RUSSACK: I am just telling the House that they have been tested to withstand an 80 mile-an-hour crash, and tested to a 30-feet drop on to solid concrete. They must not leak even if left in 15 metres of water for eight hours. Accidents have been deliberately staged at about 80 miles an hour between a train and a lorry carrying a container, yet there was no serious damage to the container.

My third point concerns waste. As I mentioned, at Windscale waste is stored in very high quality stainless steel containers. Research and development are continually being carried out in relation to safer storage. The liquid is under continual surveillance. It was impressed on me that waste from uranium ultimately amounts to about 2 per cent. I learnt that the fuel is used in various ways at different times. Ultimately, there is a small percentage of what is truly waste. Progress is being made towards turning waste into a solidified form, such as glass. I have a tape which states that the people at Windscale are convinced that the storage of this fuel is safe.

Going back to the scientists who have been involved in this field, I quote again one of our past Governors, Sir Mark Oliphant, who was quoted this afternoon. We know of his concern about nuclear and other weapons that are so devastating that he will not contemplate them. But, he does encourage mining and export, under correct guidelines, of uranium ore. He says:

> The prime necessity for the survival of mankind, including Australians, is the elimination from the arsenals of the world of all nuclear weapons. However, because weapons can be assembled again rapidly from fissile material and ordinary explosive, banning of nuclear weapons is not sufficient. All weapons of mass destruction, and the means of delivering them, must be outlawed, and the agreement enforced. In the end, this can be achieved only by doing away with war itself as a means of settling international disputes.

I want to make that point as forcibly as I can. Here is a man who is concerned about proliferation of nuclear weapons, yet he must believe that there is security in mining uranium and in seeing that it is used for power generation, because he continues:

> As one who has been involved all my life in nuclear physics and nuclear energy, who has participated in many international discussions with Soviet and other workers in these fields, and in scientific and technical aid to developing nations, who is committed to the search for peace, I am convinced that Australia would be foolish not to mine, use, and sell uranium. Nuclear power stations are now far less polluting, and are safer, than coal-burning equivalents. Pending the general acceptability of vitrification, or the Ringwood method of storage of radioactive residues, there is no need, while uranium is plentiful, to separate the dangerous radioactive 'ashes' of the nuclear burning, so that spent nuclear fuel can be stored unprocessed. There is continued development in all aspects of waste handling.

I agree that we must be concerned with this: we must be genuine. I have endeavoured to look at the points of concern; one is health, and another one is security, and another one is the disposal of waste.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I enter this debate as one of the two Ministers who have introduced legislation into this Parliament in relation to the mining of uranium in South Australia. The role that I played, as Minister of Health, was to ensure that the Government's policy of permitting uranium mining, subject to satisfactory controls and protection, was carried out in the form of a piece of legislation which I believe is the most comprehensive enabling legislation for radiation protection yet enacted in Australia. That legislation is the answer to the critics who state that it is not possible to mine uranium safely. Those critics, if they were honest, should as well admit that there is scarcely any occupation whatsoever that can be undertaken in complete and perfect safety.

Having recognised that fact, they must then go on logically to consider the risks involved in any occupation. A logical and scientific examination of the facts related to the proposed mining of Roxby Downs will lead any unbiased observer to the fact that mining at Roxby can be undertaken with as much safety as other mining ventures and, indeed, with more safety than some more hazardous occupations. That fact must be recognised and understood by the Opposition. It is a matter of amazement, to those who have read the evidence of the two select committees of this Parliament that have examined the question of uranium mining and

the Roxby indenture, that members of the Labor Party and the Australian Democrats could hear evidence of witness after witness endorsing the fact that mining can proceed with satisfactory safety controls, yet stand up in this Parliament and on public platforms and maintain that this is not the case. It is interesting to note, Mr Speaker, that the radiation protection legislation was supported in both Houses by the Opposition and by the Australian Democrats, and that—

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Labor Party sought to amend the legislation. Some of its amendments were accepted by the Government and, indeed, an amendment moved by the Australian Democrat in the Legislative Council, The Hon. Mr Milne, was accepted by the Government. But neither the Labor Party nor the Australian Democrats opposed the radiation Bill. In so doing, their support for it implies a satisfaction which I believe is well and truly justified, because the Act is a comprehensive set of regulatory controls based on the principles of the International Commission on Radiological Protection, which is an autonomous scientific organisation whose recommendations have been adopted by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia.

The present scheme of radiological protection, which is endorsed by the I.C.R.P., is based on three central requirements, all of which are inherent in both pieces of legislation, the Roxby Downs indenture and the Radiation Protection and Control Act. The first requirement is that no practice shall be adopted unless its introduction produces a positive net benefit. That requirement has been amply demonstrated by the Government and by the vast majority of witnesses who appeared before both select committees. The second requirement is that all exposure shall be kept as low as reasonably achievable, economic and social factors being taken into account. I shall refer to that requirement later. Also, the dose to individuals shall not exceed the limits recommended for the appropriate circumstances. In considering those three matters and in considering both pieces of legislation, it must be acknowledged that the Radiation Protection and Control Act and the Roxby Downs indenture Bill both meet those requirements.

In that respect, if mining is to proceed with the public support that we believe exists in South Australia, both are worthy of support and both provide or should provide the people of this State with the reassurance that they obviously need as a result of the public anxiety that has been generated for political purposes by the Opposition.

I was interested to hear the member for Mitcham suggest in her speech that the joint venturers are not subject to the provisions of the Radiation Protection and Control Act. I strongly refute that suggestion and refer her to the indenture itself, to the Radiation Protection and Control Act and also to page 3 724 of *Hansard* dated 30 March 1982 where a question was put during the Committee stage of the Radiation Protection and Control Bill as to whether the Roxby Downs project was in some way exempt. In response to that question, I replied as follows:

> I stress that it is not a question of overriding—

that is, the indenture overriding the Radiation Protection and Control Bill—

> but one of complementary legislation. I have already said that Roxby Downs will be subject to all the regulations under this Bill. Because it is an indenture that provides a special mining lease instead of a prescribed mining tenement, certain initiatives must be taken in the Bill to ensure that Roxby Downs is not excluded but is included.

So, far from being exempt, the joint venturers must comply with all the provisions, except where they vary by specific reference in the indenture.

In relation to that question, it is worth noting page 97 of the select committee evidence provided by Mr Michael Bowering of the Crown Law Department. In response to a question from Dr Hopgood, he said:

> Basically the State agreed that the Government will not seek to impose perforce of statutory measures, be it by condition, regulation, or statutory amendment, conditions that go above those codes.

The regulations under the Radiation Protection and Control Act implement the codes. As well as the codes, the indenture embraces the ALARA principle and imposes a requirement on the joint venturers to observe that principle. Mr Bowering then said:

> If it does do that—

that is, if it permits conditions that go above those codes—

> it is in breach of the contract. Nevertheless, we were concerned to see that the joint venturers used all modern techniques to keep dose levels as low as possible. Therefore, they have given a contractual undertaking to do that, and it could well be, for example, that the most stringent dose radiation specified under any code is, say, level 5, but the advance of technology is such that, meeting the all practicable means test in the ALARA principle, they could meet a lower standard of, say, level 3.

He then went on to say that the joint venturers are contractually obliged to observe the ALARA principle and that, if they do not do so, they will be in breach of clause 10.

I therefore suggest that the member for Mitcham should study the indenture and the Radiation Protection and Control Act very carefully. If she does that, she will see that the joint venturers are subject to legislation that is certainly more stringent than that applying to the Yeelirree project. The joint venturers are obliged to conform to codes as they are updated. If and when (as will surely happen) the codes of practice under the Commonwealth Environment Protection Nuclear Codes Act are amended to impose higher standards, which would invariably mean lower acceptable levels, the joint venturers will be obliged to conform to all those standards under the regulations of the Radiation Protection and Control Act and the terms of the indenture.

I now refer to the select committee minority report and the extraordinary statements which appear on page 5 of that report, under the heading 'radiation', in regard to the safety of the work force. In his Ministerial statement tabling the report, the Deputy Premier exposed for what it is the shabby and deceitful way in which the Labor Party has presented a National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health working paper which has no status whatsover as, in effect, an internationally accepted standard.

In view of the evidence which was given to the select committee and which discounted the NIOSH working paper, it is extraordinary that the Labor Party members of the select committee should seek to present evidence that has been discredited. In so doing, I believe that they indicate a degree of intellectual dishonesty which does not do them or their Party any credit and which casts doubt on many of the other statements that they made. The Labor members of the committee state, in somewhat ambiguous terms admittedly, the following:

> The committee is aware of a report from the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health which is the US Government sub-agency. It is part of the Centre for Disease Control of the Department of Health and Human Services.

They go on to state:

> This report recommends a reduction of 50 per cent in the radiation exposure working levels agreed to in the indenture.

That is what the Labor Party says. What did those members hear in the select committee deliberations? That is a different story. Dr Keith Wilson of the Health Commission was asked whether the commission had considered the NIOSH report. His answer was as follows;

> We have copies of the report and it was prepared by a working party of NIOSH and circulated for discussion. It seems that it

was one of those occasions when there was an unfortunate leak, if that is the proper term, because it was circulated for comment. It was never endorsed by NIOSH. It was subsequently reviewed by the I.C.R.P. in the annual review of radiation protection in mining and milling. It was discounted.

I there conclude the quote from Dr Wilson. Mrs Fitch, also of the South Australian Health Commission, subsequently added:

It is true that NIOSH is re-examining it and that a working party—

not NIOSH itself—

prepared the report.

For the Labor Party to cast doubt on the working levels that the Health Commission has accepted in accordance with the codes, and to suggest that they are inadequate when members who make that suggestion know full well that the basis on which they adjudge those levels to be inadequate has been discounted, represents to me much of the Labor Party's attitutude to this legislation.

Even those members of the Labor Party who support the legislation (and we know that there are a number) have been so manipulated by their Party as to ignore completely scientific evidence and replace it with a shabby effort to distort the facts and mislead the people of South Australia. I conclude by saying that, having recently questioned people in North America who are responsible for radiation protection in Canada, I am confident that the legislation enacted by this Parliament for radiation protection will, in the not too distant future, be regarded internationally as a model for other States and countries to follow.

I say that for two reasons: first, because the legislation is a pace-setter in so far as it recognises the scientific fact that radiation, whatever its use and application (be it medical, mining, industrial or scientific), has to have placed upon it the same controls if there is to be proper protection. That fact in itself indicates that the recent announcement by the Premier of Victoria that he will make his State a nuclear free zone is nothing more than humbuggery because it simply indicates that people are prepared to take one attitude to radiation if it is used for medical or scientific purposes and another attitude if it is used for energy purposes. The inconsistency and lack of logic should be exposed for what it is.

The other reason, apart from the all-embracing nature of the legislation, is that it requires administration by a health authority. That is not the case in other States in Australia. It is not the case in the United States or in Canada. There is a proliferation of administration authorities which leads to divided responsibility. I believe that wherever divided responsibility exists, eventually and inevitably there must be a failure of proper administration.

Our legislation can be regarded as a model and on that basis alone, and on the basis that it complements the Roxby Downs indenture, South Australians can be confident that the mining of uranium at Roxby Downs should go ahead in the full knowledge that proper safeguards are being insisted upon by the Government and that the proper procedures exist for those safeguards to be administered on a continuing basis. Indeed, I believe that much of the evidence of expert witnesses to the Select Committee indicated that when mining proceeds at Roxby, as I hope and believe that it will, it will be regarded as one of the safest, if not the safest, uranium mine in the world.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): With a problem as large as the Roxby Downs indenture Bill has become, it is very hard to assess the situation. As I am sure all members have done, I have tried to read through evidence by experts to see what the situation is in regard to the commercial potential, safety and all other aspects connected with the uranium venture. We are talking about uranium—not copper or other elements. It is a debate on whether we should mine uranium in South Australia. Despite the fact that we have started already at Honeymoon, we have centred in on Roxby Downs as the key issue. It was a difficult matter to get the expert opinion and come up with a straight-out answer. One expert witness with a number of letters behind his name would say that there were no problems. One could read another expert witness with the same number of letters behind his name and would get a different answer.

In this situation I went, as I believe all members should go, to my electorate. I asked for their response. I would say that the vast majority of these people believe Roxby Downs will be worked and needs to be worked. However, they have an overwhelming fear in regard to the disposal of waste, whether it be tailings from the mine or the final disposal. I tried to discuss it with all these people, and started searching back through the evidence. I could not find a definitive statement about an effective way of disposing of the waste. I went to a lecture the other night given by Professor Svenke from Sweden. He showed us what they were going to do in Sweden, and explained the programme very well. It was a good presentation.

At the end of the session, two aspects worried me. One was about sending waste to France for reprocessing and vitrification, which is believed, in many parts of the world, to be the best way of dealing with waste. When it gets back to Sweden, the vitrification is cracked off the waste and the waste is put in copper and different metals. That planted doubt in my mind. I cannot see how one can argue that a method is perfect, and then have someone else changing the method. It seems that the vitrification should be kept on.

The other matter which worried me was when a member of the other place, who was at the same lecture, asked Professor Svenke how much waste had been lodged in the permanent disposal system.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Awkward that, wasn't it?

Mr PETERSON: It was not awkward at all; it was a very definite answer—'None'. I then looked at different publications on the matter. One booklet I have is from the Uranium Information Centre Limited, and is entitled, 'The Management of Radioactive Wastes'. I know that other members of the House have this booklet. It goes into the types of systems used in relation to radioactive waste, and talks about vitrified high level waste lodging in granite and salt. I then looked at the countries and the systems they used, and at how positive the systems were, because the genuine fear in my electorate is about what will be done with the waste. This booklet lists countries in alphabetical order. I will read from the document to show the doubt expressed in it.

The current practice in Belgium is for liquid wastes from Eurochemic reprocessing plants to be stored in stainless steel tanks. Future plans are referred to. I suppose that a plan is a scheme of things to happen, and one would think that that would be firm and concrete. It says that vitrification processes are being considered. In Canada, methods for disposal of irradiated fuel or separated wastes in deep underground rock formations are being developed. In CSSR an experimental storage facility for vitrified waste is designed and will be constructed. In Finland crystalline rocks as a repository are being investigated. In France, solidified wastes will be stored in air-cooled vaults. A similar vitrification plant will be installed at The Hague after confirmation of routine operations. Salt and crystalline rocks for waste repository are being investigated.

In the Federal Republic of Germany, vitrification processes are being developed. Salt formations are being studied for disposal. In India igneous rock is being investigated. In Italy batch solidification to form borosilicate or phosphate glasses

is under consideration. Disposal of solid wastes in clay formations is being investigated. In Japan, solidification processes are being developed and granite for waste is being investigated.

In the Netherlands rock salt formations are being investigated. I had the benefit of being present at the lecture the other night, and I know what Sweden is doing. The booklet says that in Sweden any return solidified high-level waste will be stored in underground air-cooled vaults and eventually disposed of in a depository deep in Sweden bedrock. That was the scheme outlined. Professor Svenke said that it was experimental, and that there would be an experimental laboratory in a cavern under the ground.

So, there is nothing even concrete about that. In Switzerland, there is a report of investigating evaporite formations for repository of any returned solidified waste. In the United Kingdom, the possibilities for disposal are being considered . . . Research into the feasibility of ocean disposal . . . to investigate . . . the feasibility of geological disposal. I will come back to the U.S.A. because I have some other information on that. For the U.S.S.R , the document states:

> Industrial scale plant to vitrify wastes is expected to begin operation in the 1980s. Storage of solidified waste in near-surface facilities and deep geological disposal concepts are being studied.

They are all the major countries in the world with a waste disposal problem and not one of them that I can see is really confident about disposal. The document entitled *Uranium Information Centre*, a newsletter of 5 May 1982, in relation to the U.S.A. Nuclear Waste Bill, states:

> On 30 April the Nuclear Waste Bill was passed in the Senate by a vote of 69 to 9. The Bill calls for the President to develop an integrated program, which includes a permanent waste repository away from reactor storage and monitored retrievable storage. The Bill requires the Secretary of Energy to select two permanent nuclear waste burial sites, one by 1986 and the other by 1992.

Only now are they starting to think about what they are going to do with the waste. In an article from a 1980 *Spectrum* about the types of systems used or that could be used for the disposal of waste, again there is nothing concrete in this; they say that the Department of Energy is worried about how it is going to dispose of the waste and even in the United States of America there are some States which have passed legislation saying that they cannot dispose of waste in their States. More than a dozen States have responded to public pressure and have passed laws that prohibit or make difficult the disposal of nuclear waste within their borders. It is reported that 20 more States are considering legislation. If it is so safe, why are there 32 States in the United States of America which have doubts about the disposal of wastes? It seems odd to me that the environmental impact study will not be done until after the State commits itself to some expenditure or to the $50 000 000.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That is not right.

Mr PETERSON: According to my reading of the Bill, I believe that is right. According to my interpretation of what I have read, there is no provision at all for that environmental impact study to be made until after the indenture is made. That seems at odds to me. I will check that with the Minister, but that is my interpretation. That is odd, because as I recall other projects in this State, there was always an environmental impact study done before there was any permission to go ahead. One that comes to mind straight away is Redcliff. They were years doing environmental studies up there and there was never any indenture signed.

This is a different situation, apparently. It just does not seem to work in the same way. I believe that there is a feeling in the community that this project will go ahead. I think that the Government has been at fault for not trying to get information across to the public.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We tried hard enough.

Mr PETERSON: Why then is this fear in the community? Why is it that people do not know about disposal of waste? Why is it that literature sent out by the Uranium Information Centre itself is not definitive about disposal systems? The information is just not there. This fear is in the community, and people will not support this project until they are confident about the waste disposal problem being solved. I know that people to whom I have spoken feel that the project will be of great benefit and will create jobs; there is no doubt about that, and people want that. However, people want to be assured that the problems that will develop out of this project will not come back on us in years to come. The other point made to me by people to whom I spoke is that we are in an unusual situation in South Australia because uranium is being mined and worked all around us. Western Australia, Northern Territory and Queensland are all mining, processing and shipping uranium. That puts us in an odd situation. We are the conscience of Australia at the moment.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Western Australia is not that far ahead, but it is under way.

Mr PETERSON: Well, it is under way. One of the problems we face in this State is that we run the risk, if we muck around with this project too long, that if the project goes ahead there will be people who will work there, and worker is going to be set against worker. I see that as being a problem we must not have, because people will go there.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: They are already there.

Mr PETERSON: There are only a few people there at the moment.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A couple of hundred.

Mr PETERSON: It would be different if there was a full mining operation. I see a danger if Western Mining Corporation decides to go ahead and takes the risk on the money and gets to the stage of working the mine: people will work there. I would like to stress the point that there is support in the community for this project if one can convince people of the safety of disposal methods. I do not believe that that has been done effectively and, until the Government does that, I do not believe that it will have the full support of the people in this State. I think that this has been a let down by the Government, which has had this project on its plate for some time, yet the message has not got across. It may be that there is no answer to this problem. I have my doubts about that and I have read all the literature. If there is an answer to this problem, and the Government can convince the people of my electorate it is right, I will support this legislation. However, if it cannot do that, the Government will lose the legislation.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion. The Bill was introduced into this House on 4 March. The Bill and the schedule to it were the outcome of detailed negotiations between the Government and representatives of the joint venturers, Western Mining Corporation and BP. On 23 March 1982, following the second reading debate, the Bill was referred to a select committee. That select committee has now reported to Parliament and I fully support its report. Clause 16 of that report states that the committee recommends that the Bill be passed without amendment and without delay. It goes on to give some explanation about the actual timing of 30 June this year and the need for the indenture to be passed by then. Unfortunately, the question of Roxby Downs has developed into a pro-uranium, anti-uranium debate. I say 'unfortunately' because the uranium component of this ore body is so minute that the uranium question is only a side issue to the overall development of the Olympic Dam resources.

I understand that the uranium component of the ore body is .05 per cent. I have been told that a good uranium mine

constitutes about .5 per cent, so, in other words, we are looking at an ore body with a uranium content of about one-twelfth that of a viable uranium mine. Even though a minute quantity of uranium is present in the ore body, nevertheless it is a significant amount. We could consider all of the minerals involved in the ore body and give exactly the same story in regard to each. There is a significant amount of copper, which is the largest ore body in the project.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It is 3 per cent.

Mr BLACKER: That would not be a viable or economic commodity to mine in its own right. There are at least 10 identifiable resources in the ore body, copper, silver, gold and uranium being the major ones, and there is a series of rare earths. The body also contains 52 per cent iron ore, but the State has so much iron ore that, obviously, we would not want to mine it up there at a depth of 300 metres. Realistically, the operation involves the extraction of the total ore body and the refining of at least four of the elements contained therein.

This body has been recognised as the largest single ore body in the world. It has the potential to put South Australia on the map in terms of world development, yet we hear this philosophical argument in regard to a component of .05 per cent of uranium. I believe that is the disappointing part. If one asks the man in the street what is at Roxby Downs, one finds that the general story is that it is uranium, uranium, uranium. That is the whole story. What is not put over to the general public is that uranium constitutes only a small part of the ore body. There is a significant wealth of copper, gold, silver and uranium that could be available for the people of South Australia and to the benefit of the State.

That ore body has been identified as being able to substantiate a town of about 9 000 people on the site or in the immediate area. I compare a town of that size to Port Lincoln, the main city in my district. A town the size of Port Lincoln popped on the development scene must have tremendous impact on South Australia's economy and development, and that is only the initial part. We must look at the spin-off effect. What will this town do for Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla? All of the major cities in the Iron Triangle are clamouring for the development of the Roxby Downs venture, because they can see a spin-off effect.

Even in my own district I can envisage a spin-off effect, particularly in regard to tourism, but it would be to a lesser degree than would occur in the Iron Triangle. Generally, South Australia would develop to a very significant degree. Some 18 months ago I visited Roxby Downs at the invitation of Western Mining. The company was prepared to take any member of Parliament to the area for an on-site inspection. Four Liberal members, four Labor members, the Independent Labor member for Semaphore, and I visited the site, and I came away quite convinced that the development was very worth while and that South Australians would be utter fools if they flew in the face of a potential development of this nature. This development was started by the Australian Labor Party when it was in Government. The A.L.P. turned the first sod, to use a colloquialism: it got the project under way, saw the first test hole drilled. Now it is turning around, casting doubts on the project, and throwing the whole complex to the wind.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Careful! The present Government claims full credit for the whole show, almost.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, that is absolute nonsense. We negotiated the indenture.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member for Flinders has the floor.

Mr BLACKER: I do not think there is any doubt about the fact that the site for the first drill or the first mineral lease was determined by the previous Government. Perhaps the future development and expansion of it took place under the present Government and it is to the Government's credit that it encouraged that development; $50 000 000 has already been spent just to the stage where those concerned still do not know the full extent of the ore body lode. All that is known is that it is of massive proportions and that it is more than an economic prospect at this stage. The spending of another $50 000 000 to prove out the extent of the ore body and will put the companies in a position to then proceed to proper development of the body.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The further they have gone, the better it has looked.

Mr BLACKER: In response to the Deputy Premier's interjection, I also point out that, when we were there some eighteen months ago, the south-western corner of the ore body had been found but it was not known where the north-eastern corner was. At that stage it was of such a significant size that they were able to put down a main shaft in a concentrated part of the ore body, in the full knowledge that that in itself would be viable apart from what was yet to be found farther to the north or north-east. That is an indication of the magnitude of the whole opertion. For the life of me, I cannot see how any person in this State could reject a proposal such as this. An interesting part of the matter is that when the Leader of the Opposition delivered his second reading speech on 23 March 1982 he went on for some considerable time about the project, but he finished up with a quotation which I quoted again when I made my second reading speech. He stated:

> We must let the Select Committee do its work and then heed the advice that comes from its deliberations.

That is a quotation from the Leader of the Opposition. This House has now been asked to heed the advice of the deliberations of the select committee. I support what it is recommending, that is, the passage of this Bill. After listening to some of the debate that has taken place, it is apparent that the arguments have evolved from two basic viewpoints, one pro-uranium and the other anti-uranium. Accepting that it is a uranium mine, not a complex ore body, which it really is, it then becomes a matter of the questions of waste disposal and the peaceful use of uranium or the use of uranium in wartime. In regard to the waste disposal question, probably every one of us is not totally satisfied with the measures for the ultimate disposal of waste or with measures for the control of that waste.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: But you are prepared to go ahead—you just said so.

Mr BLACKER: I am prepared to go ahead for the following reasons: when uranium is being used for a power source (and we all know that about one-third of Europe and the Western world is being powered by nuclear power stations), there is nothing that we can do that will stop such use. We cannot cut off the uranium source; we cannot do anything that will stop uranium being used. There are some 600 nuclear power plants throughout the world either in operation or under construction.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: At present there are 576.

Mr BLACKER: I accept that interjection by the member for Mitchell that there are 576. I think we should be precise in this type of debate. The point is that with 576 nuclear power plants in operation or under construction, there is nothing that we can do to stop that power energy source.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: If everyone is mad, we should go mad too? Is that what you are saying?

Mr BLACKER: No, but what I am saying is that we cannot shut down those nuclear power plants. The world is short of power.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I could take up the point that we have had nuclear-powered submarines sailing around in our waters for 25 years and there are no hassles about that. We cannot shut the power plants down. If the uranium source is not continually fed into that power chain, development of fast breeder reactors will occur. Already some fast breeder reactors are under construction, although I am not sure whether they are yet in operation, but they take the waste from nuclear power plants and reprocess it. However, waste from fast breeder reactors is a highly dangerous commodity which, if it should happen to fall into the hands of an unstable Government or country, would really cause problems. I do not think any member of the Opposition has taken that into account.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That was Hugh Hudson's very argument, sitting in this seat.

Mr BLACKER: Yes. I asked a question from where the member for Mitcham is now sitting, and that was exactly the Hon. Hugh Hudson's answer on that occasion. We must not do anything in a nuclear or any other power cycle that will hasten development of the fast breeder reactor, because that would really cause problems. Anyone who talks about staving off or trying to stop the nuclear power cycle is not taking that into consideration, because once those fast breeders get under way and once countries needing energy or power go to fast breeder reactors, what do they do with their waste? Throughout the world we have a limited uranium source which can be effectively converted into domestic power. If that uranium is fed out into the power chain at a controlled rate, it will stave off for many years fast breeder reactor development.

But, if we do not mine our uranium resources and do not farm them out into the power chain, it will hasten the development of fast breeder reactors. If there is a fear about nuclear power, it involves fast breeders, not necessarily the normal nuclear reactor power generator. Having made that point, I go one step further. If our argument is peace versus wartime, I wonder how many of those persons who have argued that we should not mine uranium because it might lead to the development of war weapons have said the same thing to some of the countries that oppose the Western world. I have never heard those people argue against nuclear power generation by some of our enemy countries. We do not seem to hear that. We could say that uranium could be used in warfare, but we could say exactly the same thing about iron ore and bauxite. We still mine and sell iron ore, and we still mine bauxite and sell aluminium.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Bob Hawke's argument was that we make guns out of iron yet we still mine it, until he was muzzled.

Mr BLACKER: We must be realistic. I have made my position quite clear. The people of my electorate to whom I have spoken and those who have contacted me all believe that this project must go ahead. They believe that South Australia would suffer tremendously if it does not. I have yet to find a person who can put up any logical opposition to it. I have said that the actual uranium component of the ore body is only .05 of 1 per cent, and the general reaction to that has been: why has somebody not said that?—it is not published in the press; it has not got across to the general public. But there have been many attempts to get it across to the general public. The real story is that the uranium component is a very small component. The real value in the ore body is copper, with gold, silver and uranium making it a composite ore body. However, the whole opposition to Roxby Downs has revolved around the emotive issue of that very minute portion of uranium that happens to be in the ore body. It would be a totally different picture if that .05 of 1 per cent were not present, because I think that the whole State, the Opposition, the Government and every other member of the House would be in full support of it. I support the noting of the reports.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): Mr Acting Speaker, I will be very brief. Never have I known in the years that I have been in this place a subject on which I have received so much correspondence and seen so much literature assembled in our library, which on this matter, I must say, has been very good in taking no sides at all. Like other members of this House, as a layman I do not really understand the real issues behind uranium mining. The Government of the day has made this matter its big project, but it has backfired on it. I assure members that I have door-knocked many homes in my district and have not had this matter mentioned once to me. I suppose members of other Parties in the District of Unley may have had the matter raised with them when they were door-knocking, but it has not once been mentioned to me so far. I assure members also that I have not received any advertising or material from people with vested interests in the project, and I have not even had a phone call on this matter. The Government has created a situation for itself, yet I have noticed that not one speaker, including the last speaker, has mentioned anything about the fatalities that have occurred or how people have been affected. Members know that there have been fatalities and that people have been affected.

Mr Mathwin: Tell us about the fatalities in the coal industry.

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg can have his say. I am perturbed, as are people in my district, about the number of jobs that will be created. No-one can tell us about that, not even the Chamber of Commerce. I do not know how much money this matter is costing the vested interests in press coverage and advertising, but I believe that we should always play this sort of thing down the centre and if possible consider both sides.

I agree with the member for Semaphore, although I do not always do so. People are worried about the safety aspect, as are all members of the Opposition and people generally. I have never had so much correspondence or material concerning this subject from bodies such as the Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian Energy Council, trying to tell us how we should vote and what we should do, but there is always someone who puts the opposite point of view. How do we know what to do?

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: We have to make a decision. I will make a decision in relation to my electorate. I point out to the member for Glenelg that not one person from my electorate has said anything to me about this matter.

Mr Mathwin: Have you asked them?

Mr LANGLEY: Does the member for Glenelg have the time to visit every house in his electorate and ask what they think about uranium? There are more important things in my district, such as the question of schools. That is what the Government should be doing. I assure honourable members opposite that it is just not going down, and it will not go down in the electorate of Unley. I am voting according to the wishes of the people in my electorate. I look into the matters that they raise in their letters and their discussions with me.

Furthermore, not one member opposite has mentioned at any stage that America is very worried about nuclear power. If the Minister of Mines and Energy can provide evidence refuting that I will listen to what he has to say. Other countries are also worried, but that has not been mentioned during this debate. As member for Unley for quite some time, I have always considered my constituents first and I am doing that in this case. If I had received

letters from my constituents in relation to this matter I would say so. Perhaps I will receive a flood of them tomorrow (I have an up to date electoral roll which shows where they all live).

With those few words, I assure all members that until safety measures are provided I will oppose this Bill. I have a document which indicates that some of this material passed through different channels and finished up in Russia. I point out that I have nothing against the Russian people. However, I believe that the Government should have more control over this material. I oppose the motion.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): There have been a number of contributions to this debate. In the 30 minutes at my disposal it will be quite impossible for me to answer all of them, but I do wish to comment on a number. I agree entirely with the member for Flinders that it is virtually impossible in a debate such as this to educate the public. In fact, it is very difficult to educate members of this House in relation to a document as unashamedly complex as this Bill.

The number of misconceptions in relation to this indenture is legion. I will deal first with some of the latter contributions to the debate. I will not mention the member for Flinders, because I believe his comments were entirely cogent and comprehensible; I found no errors in his contribution. In fact, what he said was completely true in relation to the size of the ore body, its exploitation, and so on. However, the member for Semaphore, unfortunately, is labouring under a number of misapprehensions.

In relation to his point about infra-structure, the State will not spend $50 000 000 before the e.i.s. proposals. There is no commitment by the State to spend any money on infra-structure at all before the date of committal to a firm project which, of course, will come after the completion of all the feasibility studies. There is a list of items in the indenture which the State has agreed to provide to the extent of $50 000 000 pro rata-ed to a town of 9 000 people. In other words, the State will spend $25 000 000 for a town of 4 500 people in providing facilities such as schools, hospitals, a fire station, limited play grounds, a swimming pool, and so on. They are detailed. If the State chooses to spend that money at the request of the joint venturers before a firm commitment, and they do not commit to go ahead, they are obliged in terms of the indenture to pay back that money to the State.

There is no commitment to spend $50 000 000 until there is a firm commitment to proceed with a well defined and approved project. Let that be clear. Also, I point out that there is and has a been widespread misconception in relation to the size of the commitment. The fact is that when we talk about infra-structure, we are talking about town facilities, and not about the millions of dollars to develop the mine. That is outside the scope of what is normally termed 'infra-structure'.

Infra-structure talks about supporting infra-structures, which in this case are town facilities. It is estimated that the joint venturers would be required to establish this town of 9 000 people at a cost of about seven times the amount which the State has agreed to expend in 1981 dollars. The joint venturers have to provide many facilities that normally would be considered Government responsibilities, for example, a water reticulation supply system, a sewerage system, electric power, the whole of the power supply. These are expensive items. Moreover, we have negotiated that the joint venturers will pay full tote odds in relation to the supply of water and power, so that no other consumer in South Australia subsidises those supplies in any way. They will be very expensive.

There is a general misconception in relation to the infra-structure commitment. Let me compare the terms of the indenture with the commitment made by the Labor Party in relation to the Redcliff project where, in 1981 dollars, the State was committed to contribute $400 000 000 to provide houses and other infra-structure in relation to that project, which had an estimated life of 25 years. This project has an estimated life of between 50 and 100 years. That project was far less expensive overall, would have created much less employment, and would have generated much less revenue to the State.

For the Labor Party to criticise the fact that we agreed to provide part of what is normal State infra-structure, and to suggest that the only housing would be provided in terms of housing for Government employees, teachers, and the like is completely false and hypocritical. The member for Semaphore is wrong in suggesting that the Government would spend $50 000 000 or have any obligation at all before there is a final commitment to go ahead with a defined project. The $50 000 000 is pro rata. If the project is only half the size of that outlined in the indenture, the Government is required to spend only half the money, and so on.

In regard to waste disposal, which is one of the vexed questions along with the weapons proliferation argument, I acknowledge that there is nothing I can say here in this debate which will contribute to the millions of words that have been said and repeated constantly *ad nauseam*. I was disappointed that more people did not go and hear Beckman yesterday, because he did write a book which I found interesting and logical called *The Health Hazards of Not Going Nuclear*, which I picked up three or four years ago. It is a great pity—

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member can laugh, but I recommend that, if he has an open mind, he should read the book.

Mr Hemmings: It was given to you, it was force fed to you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe it was. Let us not quibble. It came into my possession and I read it. It is a great pity that the honourable member who has interjected did not return to his homeland and look at the real situation there. I went overseas some years ago at my own expense—it was not a Parliamentary junket—to look first-hand at the nuclear industry. I went to Britain and visited nuclear power stations. I crawled all over an old one and over a new one. One power station had been in operation for 30 years and the other had just been completed. I undertook a more extensive trip about 18 months ago, as Minister, and visited a number of countries involved not only in mining uranium but using it as customer countries.

The fact is that it is an integral and increasing part of the power generating capacity of the Western world. If we carry to their logical conclusion the arguments of the opponents of nuclear power and close down the nuclear power houses we would inflict on the Western world a depression the likes of which we have never seen, and we would condemn to starvation and death literally millions of people. It is an established fact that it is an increasing part of the scene.

People quote Japan. The member for Unley quoted demonstrations. There are demonstrations in Sweden and in every country. Even Mitterand, as part of his election campaign in France, appealed to conservationists and said that he would do something about the increasing nuclear content

of the French grid. He is quite powerless to alter the increasing commitment to nuclear power in France. He is making a few inquiries in locations where nuclear power stations are to be established, but there will be no appreciable change to the commitment to nuclear power because the French have no alternative, other than wide spread hardship and poverty, than to increase the nuclear commitment. The point I am making is that we live in the real world.

The member for Mitcham made a thoughtful speech. It is a fact that the radiation control clauses in this indenture are more stringent than those which appear in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill which passed this House and the Upper House. Built in on top of the provisions of the Radiation Protection and Control Bill is the ALARA principle, which provides an obligation that levels must be kept as low as reasonably possible. It is interesting to note that Victoria was so vocal during discussions in regard to the establishment of Australia-wide codes in regard to radiological protection. Now we have Premier Cain embarking upon this business of declaring Victoria a nuclear-free State when it was Victoria that was well to the fore in the co-operative effort between the States and the Commonwealth in establishing what were universally agreed by the States as safe codes. These codes, along with two others, are established in the Bill.

Let me deal with the contributions of some members in the debate. The member for Mitchell, who is leading for the Opposition, relied heavily on Nuexco for his market information. That information is deficient as it deals with the spot market only and not with long-term sales contracts. I cannot understand why everyone is so hung up about the price of uranium. The Government does not take the risk. If the joint venturers are prepared to spend one billion dollars and take the risk, they must assess the viability of the market for these commodities. What is it to us if they are prepared to spend a billion and a half dollars—

Mr Lynn Arnold: Are you saying that Nuexco did not summarise what really is going to happen in the 1980s?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will say more about Nuexco in a moment. Why the gloom and doom? In any industrial proposal the companies must make the assessment as to its economic viability. Why are we saying that it will not go ahead? The company has to put up the money, take the risk and spend vast sums of money to get it going. This was one of the points raised by the member for Mitchell. Nuexco has an axe to grind, as it would prefer to discourage people entering into long-term sales contracts and encourage them to rely on the spot market by keeping the prices low. In discussing the U.K. Nuclear Installations Act, the member for Mitchell overlooked the fact that the South Australian Radiation Protection and Control Bill has regulation-making powers.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Before you wanted to use common law; now you have switched.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I spoke in private conversation with the honourable member.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I gave the honourable member a copy privately of the British Bill which he was quoting in rational discussion. Under common law, if any detriment occurs to a worker and it can be detected within six years of the occurrence, he can go to common law. In other words, if that person worked for a mining company for 30 years and any part of his ailment occurred and could be detected during the last six years of that period, he could go to common law and claim damages for the whole period.

Mr McRae: Nonsense. That is absolute rubbish and garbage.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If it is nonsense, we will get other legal opinions. However, that is what I am told by a lawyer. The British law puts a limit on it. In other words, there could be a nuclear accident that could blow up the whole of London, and the limit would be £5 000 000.

Mr Hemmings: £50 000 000.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought it was £5 000 000. The fact is that limits are established in the British Legislation that do not occur. The Radiological Control Bill, which has passed both Houses, allows for the making of regulations in relation to these matters. I have comments on contributions made by Government members, but I shall not deal with those, as the time will preclude that.

The member for Eyre was quite correct when he pointed out that rejection of the Bill would affect exploration on the Stuart Shelf, as well as at Olympic Dam. My figure of £5 000 000 has been verified by an honourable member who has just looked at the Bill. So much for the interjection! It is all very well to ridicule people, but, as I said, they could blow up London, and the limit would be £5 000 000. That does not apply.

Mr Hemmings: We are not talking about London; we are talking about Adelaide.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know we are. I am saying that there is no limit here under that law, but there is under that legislation. The point obviously deludes the member opposite. The member for Eyre is also correct in emphasising the benefit to Andamooka. The majority report is sensitive to the possibility that rapid growth may cause problems here and has recommended that the Government and joint venturers maintain close contact with that community.

The other member of the select committee for the Opposition, the member for Baudin, relies only on Nuexco. In proposing that codes by other unnamed bodies be incorporated into clause 10, he ignores the standing of I.C.R.P. (the International Commission for Radiation Protection), the I.A.E.A. (the International Atomic Energy Agency) and the National Health and Medical Research Council. The I.C.R.P. has been in existence for about 50 years.

The member for Baudin ignores all of these completely. He is not correct in saying that the ultimate disposal of tailings is not dealt with. It will be, and must be, an integral part of the normal e.i.s. procedures of both State and Commonwealth. The Radiation Protection and Control Act also applies in relation to this matter. The honourable member is also incorrect in saying that we only want to be as good as other mines. The thrust of the radiological protection clause, existing and new codes, plus the ALARA principle, is that we will be better. That is the thrust of clause 10. Sir Edward Pochin, whose evidence seems to appeal to the Opposition, is on record as saying that the mine will be a pacesetter in this regard. The honourable member makes misleading comparisons when he refers to Honeymoon. The total expenditure on Honeymoon, assuming that the pilot plant is successful and a full-scale production plant is constructed, will be approximately $20 000 000, or far less than half the first $50 000 000 already expended on the Olympic Dam joint venture. It is interesting to note that the successful passage through both Houses of the Radiological Control Bill has enabled the Honeymoon uranium project to go ahead.

The member for Todd, in stating that the State is not committed to infra-structure until a project notice is given is quite correct, and I have dealt with that point. The honourable member is also correct in stating that the joint venturers need the indenture. It would not be commercially prudent for them, and they have said categorically that they would not be prepared to spend another $50 000 000 without the ground rules being known.

As I have said on numerous occasions, the pre-feasibility expenditures on this project will exceed anything that has ever occurred in Australia previously, including the North-West Shelf. No other project has required an expenditure in excess of $100 000 000 in the pre-feasibility stage. It is not surprising that they are asking what the ground rules are.

The Leader of the Opposition spoke some time ago, or last week. He is not correct in saying that the select committee tested hypothesis. Their questions were not related to the recommendations in the appendix which were requested by the two Labor members of the committee. The Government members did not sweep aside objections, as the Leader asserted. If he had taken the trouble to read the evidence—and the evidence was not all that fulsome as select committees go—this would have been shown to be completely incorrect. Had he read the report, he would know that there are five recommendations regarding management and control of infra-structure costs and the provision of information to Parliament from time to time regarding environment, water and radiological protection.

It is not true that the Government has politicised the development. Contrary to the interests of the people of South Australia, the A.L.P. has sought to politicise the development by rejecting this major project to be properly controlled under the indenture arrangements. It is not true to say that the joint venturers got any sort of agreement they wanted. The Leader wants it all ways. At various times during the latter months of last year, he castigated the Government for delaying bringing in the indenture.

The indenture is complex because it deals with the largest project ever contemplated of this nature in South Australia. It deals with the largest ore body of this nature ever developed in Australia. I make no apology for the fact that it is complex, or for the fact that it took about a year of hard bargaining to come up with what people who have come to grips with the indenture recognise as a very good deal for the State. One has only to compare it with the Redcliff project and other deals negotiated by the Labor Party to recognise how much superior it is to what was proposed in those cases in terms of what the public of South Australia is expected to put up.

We were castigated on the one hand for not rushing the thing in. We were told we were having problems in relation to power, water and so on. On the other hand, the Leader is trying to say that the Government gave the game away. The fact is that it took so long because we insisted that the general public did not subsidise this project in terms of power and water particularly, and in terms of a lot of infrastructure which normally would be a Government responsibility. The Leader wants it all ways. In December he said, 'Let us see it; we want it; let us have it.' He also said that he would reserve judgment until he saw it. From the speech he made in this House, it is evident he has not even read the indenture, because the statements he made are completely false.

He asked when production would precisely commence. What date, he wants to know. Will production start on 1 July 1986? Let us have a look at the Labor Party's record in relation to this much-vaunted Redcliff scheme. Even in Opposition, he announced the starting date for that, which was completely phoney. If ever there was a starting date for a project announced and reannounced *ad nauseam*, it was for this mighty Redcliff project, which was trundled out election after election until the public finally woke up in 1979. The people had had enough of this tired old hoofer, as I think the former Minister was described in one of the editorials. We know what the Opposition means by 'precise dates'. It is absurd to suggest that the joint venturers will spend $100 000 000 as a result of the passage of this indenture, and say that that will lead to a start-up date on 1 July 1986. What the Leader suggests runs counter to the propaganda that the Labor Party used to turn out in relation to its announcements of the starting dates of its projects. Not once in the 10 years when I was in Opposition did any of its announced starting dates come to fruition. We were going to have the project at the railway station. We were going to have a sports centre at the showground. Even when we were in Government, the Opposition announced Redcliff for February 1980.

There are a number of other matters that I could canvass, but I want to deal with this wonderful package. I did not have time when I opened the debate to refer to the seven-point package the Labor Party is offering. The first is that the decision to allow the joint venturers to proceed to production be reserved for the Government of the day. That completely misses the point which the Government first undertook and the Parliament is now undertaking; that is, that the money will just not be spent unless the ground rules are known.

There is no incentive for the joint venturers to spend a further $50 000 000 on feasibility studies, on top of the $50 000 000 plus they have already spent and, if I understand their views correctly, if the Opposition view prevailed they would not do so. The second proposal in the appendix is that the joint venturers be granted a 50-year lease. That is about the most absurd derogation of responsibility of which I can conceive. Here is a world-class ore body which any responsible Government would want to develop, and the Opposition is suggesting that we hand it over for a mining company to sit on and do nothing with for 50 years.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It's a 50-year lease in your indenture.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: But there are commitments, if the honourable member comes to grips with it. If they do not meet their commitments they get out. As I have pointed out on numerous occasions, some of the hardest fought clauses in this indenture were the tenure clauses. Of course a mining company wants to get hold of a resource of this world class, sit on it and exclude the rest. We would be the laughing stock of the mining industry if we were to grant this sort of concession. The project could be put on ice for that period. Mr Webb, Director-General of Mines and Energy, said to the Select Committee:

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

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

The third proposal in the appendix is that the lease should be subject to periodic assessment by the Government and the companies. Again, on its face, this proposal appears to lead to all the uncertainty that the indenture seeks to overcome. It is not true, of course, to say that the Government is without rights in this regard. Clauses 6 and 7 of the indenture give the right to the Government of the day to accept, reject or vary, subject to arbitration, any application by the joint venturers for any necessary approvals for the project. The normal e.i.s. procedures are not impaired and clause 7 provides for proposals regarding the protection and management of the environment far in excess of those that normally apply.

The fourth recommendation in the appendix is that the radiological safeguards contained in the Bill be amended to allow for properly endorsed requirements for radiation pro-

tection. I have dealt with that. Clause 10 is tougher than the conditions in the Radiological Control Bill, which received the support of both Houses of Parliament.

Mr Hemmings: The Radiation Protection Bill, not 'Radiological'.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Radiation and radiological protection, about which, as I said earlier, the Victorian Government was so enthusiastic until it went on this jag in the last week. The fifth recommendation in the appendix is that special workers compensation legislation be enacted and a State register of employees involved in uranium be drawn up and maintained. I mentioned that earlier in relation to the limits which apply in the U.K. Act and the fact that the Radiological Control Bill allows for the making of regulations that could well cover this point.

The second last proposal refers to the need for adequate storage and disposal of tailings. I have mentioned that that will be, and must be, an integral part of State and Federal e.i.s. procedures. As I said earlier, there is a clause in the indenture which specifically requires the joint venturers to report to the Minister of Environment and Planning every three years so that he can monitor what is going on and so that he can be satisfied on all counts across the whole range of matters, including tailings, in relation to protection of the environment. So there is a continuing monitoring role that we specifically negotiated at the request of the Department of Environment and Planning.

The final recommendation in the appendix is that the project be subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth's Environment (Impact of Proposals) Act and, of course it is. We know, as the member for Flinders rightly pointed out, that the Government has never sought to claim it initiated this project. The fact is that the Labor Party started the whole exercise in relation to uranium exploration and enrichment, and set up the Uranium Enrichment Committee back in 1973.

The A.L.P. encouraged uranium exploration during the life of its Government, and there was an exchange of letters (one of which was signed by former Premier Corcoran), which stated, in effect, that the A.L.P. envisaged an indenture agreement with the company. The company had every encouragement to proceed.

In the meantime, as a result of the company's activities, the ore body has proved to be bigger and better than was originally thought as the enormous drilling programme has proceeded. Expenditures far in excess of what was envisaged had to be made in relation to the feasibility stages of this project, because the ore body was far bigger than was originally thought. I suggest that no other company in the world could commit itself to the expenditures which are contemplated in terms of this feasibility study unless it had every expectation that the project would proceed and certainly unless it knew the ground rules in relation to the development of the project.

I commend the report of the select committee to the House. As I said earlier, the appendix does not address itself to the matters that came before the select committee. It was interesting to note that, when the Stony Point indenture was before the House, a lot of witnesses came before the select committee, including the Conservation Council and other groups, who were critical of the proposal and wanted the project to be halted and shifted. Those people did not see fit to front up to this select committee. It is all very well to say that it was a foregone conclusion: the Stony Point issue was also a foregone conclusion in the sense that the Government had the numbers in this House. An enormous queue of people, including those opposed to the project, appeared before the Stony Point select committee. However, in this case, two Friends of the Earth from Melbourne turned up.

Mr Mathwin: Did Mr Dunstan come in?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he did not. It is amazing to me that people who are such vocal opponents of this Bill in the public arena did not see fit to come before the select committee. In fact, at the request of the Labor members of the committee, we invited the Trades and Labor Council to give evidence; we made an appointment, but at the appointed time we received a phone call to say that the council would not come.

We know that there is a division of opinion in the Labor Party and in the public about this matter, and it is difficult to understand how people who are opposed to this proposal were not prepared to front up and analyse this indenture, which has been hailed around Australia as the most detailed and best document of its type devised by a State Government.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Under Standing Order 403, I request that you, Mr Speaker, do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the clauses of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to make a request, but I question in my own mind the words he used. Standing Order 403 states:

> If any measure or proceeding be necessary upon a report of a committee, such measure or proceeding shall be brought under the consideration of the House by a specific motion, of which notice must be given in the usual manner.

I ask the member for Mitchell to move a motion, and not make a request.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr Speaker, I must say that during the 12 years in which I have been in the House I have not been wrongly advised. I certainly accept your ruling, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member referred to Standing Order 403, which I quoted, but, in fact, we should be addressing Standing Order 303. To clarify the position, I indicate that the normal position upon a report being noted would be a motion for recall to the Minister in charge to move the third reading. However, Standing Order 303 provides that:

> When a report of the Select Committee on a Bill has been brought up—
>
> (5) If the select committee has recommended any amendment to the Bill or if any member so requests. . . .

The member for Mitchell was correct in making the request; the only difficulty concerned the number of the Standing Order that was mentioned. The member for Mitchell's request will be met.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Mr Speaker, I am sorry: I looked down the wrong barrel.

The SPEAKER: The end result is what counts.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—'Ratification of Indenture.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In the first line of clause 6 reference is made to the indenture's being ratified and approved. Members will have seen from a perusal of amendments on file that they refer to clause 8 yet, in fact, they have an impact upon the ratification of the Bill. My understanding of our position is that appendix C, the Opposition's original statement to the House which was attached to the report of the select committee, suggested to members of the House that there was a need for amendment to clause 6 in the Opposition's terms as distinct from the majority report. Subsequent advice I have taken indicated that the best method of putting before the House the amendments that we suggested would be in the form in which they now appear, that is, by amending clause 8. I simply want to make it clear that under clause 8 the Opposition will be

raising matters that are associated with matters related to the ratification of the indenture.

Mr HEMMINGS: I am at a loss to say whether under this clause I can speak on the areas that concern me regarding the protection of those people working in the area of Roxby Downs. I seek your advice, Sir, as to whether I can speak to that point at this stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Under this clause the honourable member can relate any remarks that he has which concern the indenture itself.

Mr HEMMINGS: Thank you, Mr Chairman. When the Radiation Protection and Control Bill was debated in this House, the Minister of Health assured members of the House that the points that I was raising concerning the protection of workers would be met. I listened carefully to the remarks of the Deputy Premier when he introduced this Bill and I listened carefully to his closing remarks. I point out that in no way has he reassured me that the protection of the workers at Roxby Downs will be met by this indenture Bill. Can the Minister please clarify whether in this particular instance the workers at Roxby Downs will be protected in line with the comments I made in the debate on the Radiation Protection and Control Bill?

We have talked about all the measures that the joint venturers will undertake. The Minister has assured us that everything will be fine, but I would like him to clearly state, point by point, whether the workers at those mines will be protected.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer the member to the evidence given before the select committee, particularly by Dr Wilson and Mrs Fitch, of the Health Commission, in relation to this question, asked, I think, by the member for Eyre point blank:

> Are these members of the Health Commission satisfied that the health of the workers at this mine will be adequately protected?

The unequivocal answer to that was 'Yes'. The committee requested some further information in relation to the matter, and some questions were asked about health checks on people already working in the Whennen shaft there. It transpired that all the workers, even those employed by the contractor currently building that shaft, have had an initial medical examination. Regular medical examinations will be conducted.

I again refer the member to the radiation control measures in this indenture which, as I have pointed out, are stricter than those in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill to which he refers. If he seeks that reassurance and chooses to believe Health Commission evidence before the Select Committee, he should read the evidence they gave.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Things were going along steadily before you came in, David. Do you want to go out?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Napier has the call.

Mr HEMMINGS: I am partially satisfied with the Minister's answer. The Minister quoted Dr Wilson, from the Health Commission, who appeared before the committee. I have read the committee's report and evidence, and I was surprised that Dr Wilson appeared twice. Were the words in the answer that the Minister gave me previously the words of Dr Wilson at his first appearance or his second appearance? Why did he appear twice?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He was not asked precisely the same question the second time, because we chose to believe him the first time. A written submission was made by the Health Commission to the committee. The sequence of events was this: the Health Commission witnesses appeared before the Select Committee and gave verbal evidence. They were asked for some further readings of radiation levels in the Whennen shaft. They went away and provided some written evidence, which came before the Select Committee.

As I understand it, Dr Wilson was on leave at the time. Subsequently, a submission was sent to the Select Committee. Dr Wilson chose to revise that, which he did. When the written evidence came from the Health Commission the Labor members of the Select Committee requested that those persons again appear as witnesses. Dr Wilson appeared. They asked him the questions they wanted to ask and he retired. I guess the member for Eyre did not ask precisely the same question because he was satisfied with the answer he got the first time. The reason why they came back again was that the Labor members wanted to ask him questions about the written submission.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister has said that the health protection for workers under this indenture is better than that described under the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. I would like to ask the Minister exactly what kind of protection those workers received as far as medical examinations go. I would like to quote the amendment I moved to the Radiation Protection Bill, which was defeated, as the Chamber would be well aware. The amendment said that:

> An operator shall ensure that each prescribed employee undergoes a medical examination as required by the Commission—
>
> *(a)* within a period of four weeks of the date of commencement of his employment as a prescribed employee;
>
> *(b)* while the person continues to be a prescribed employee, before the expiration of the period of twelve months from the date of commencement of his employment as a prescribed employee and before the expiration of each succeeding period of twelve months;
>
> and
>
> *(c)* upon the termination of his employment as a prescribed employee.
>
> (3) A prescribed employee is not required to be examined in accordance with subsection 2 *(a)*, or *(c)*, which was dealing with that particular Bill where he has undergone an examination under that subsection during the period of eight weeks preceding the commencement or, as the case may be, the termination of his employment as a prescribed employee.
>
> (4) An operator shall ensure that employees other than prescribed employees undergo medical examination as required by the Commission.
>
> (5) An operator shall ensure that any employee who is exposed to ionising radiation in excess of limts fixed by the Commission shall undergo a medical examination as required by the Commission.
>
> (6) Every medical examination conducted pursuant to this section shall include a detailed examination of pulmonary function.
>
> (7) A medical practitioner conducting a medical examination pursuant to this section shall ensure that the person examined is advised, in writing, of the results of the examination and his fitness for work.
>
> (8) The cost of any medical examination conducted pursuant to this section in relation to an employee shall be met by the operator.

The Minister has said that the medical examination by the joint venturers will be better than that prescribed in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. Those amendments, which I moved, were lost solely by the Ministers saying that the Radiation Protection and Control Bill achieved better than what we were trying to achieve at that time. If the Minister is saying that the indenture is providing for the workers at the Olympic Dam, better protection than the Radiation Protection and Control Bill provided, will he please spell out exactly what that protection is, because it is of no use for the Minister to say that the protection given to the workers is better than the protection in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill?

That Bill says nothing; it simply provides a framework. The reason given by the Minister of Health for the defeat of the Opposition's amendments was that regulations would be provided to give workers some protection. Is the Minister of Mines and Energy now saying that the protection is better than that provided by the Radiation Protection and Control Bill? I have not seen any regulations in this House providing

that protection. Will the Minister be honest and spell out the protection that will be provided for those workers? The Minister said that there will be a medical examination. I ask the Minister to give details of the medical examination and the protection that will be provided for workers.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Napier has misquoted what I said. I said that the radiation protection in the indenture is superior to that offered in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. Both the indenture and the Radiation Protection and Control Bill refer to a developed code which, as I pointed out, has been developed co-operatively between the States and the Commonwealth of Australia to cover the whole range of radiation protection.

I specifically draw the honourable member's attention to clause 10 of the indenture agreement. It is specifically different and has another requirement which does not appear in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. Clause 10 of the indenture—compliance with codes—refers in subclause (1) to the minimum codes which must be observed. Subclause (2), a provision which does not occur in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill, states:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of subclause (1) of this clause—

as I have said, which outlines the codes—

> the relevant joint venturers shall, at all times, use their best endeavours to ensure that the radiation exposure of employees and the public shall be kept to levels that are in accordance with the principles of the system of dose limitation as recommended by the International Commission on Radiological Protection (publication No. 26 of 1977) as varied . . .
>
> (3) Where, by or under an Act of the Parliament of the State or Commonwealth provision is made in respect of a matter contained in a code, standard or recommendation described in subclause (1) of this clause, the relevant joint venturers shall comply with that provision.

I will repeat the provisions. The so-called ALARA principle in relation to the indenture provides that radiation shall be kept as low as possible. There was some debate by the select committee in relation to the binding legality of that requirement. It was established that it is a legal requirement on the joint venturers. The ALARA principle does not appear in the Yeelirrie indenture, which I believe was mentioned by the member for Mitcham for one. The radiation control procedures are more stringent than those which occur in the Yeelirrie agreement and are more stringent than those provided in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill which recently passed both Houses of Parliament.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It may be of use to my colleague if I explain that the Minister has given a rather sketchy indication of what actually transpired in relation to the select committee and the Health Commission. I will deal with that in a moment for the benefit of my colleague. The Minister has just said that the provisions in the indenture are to achieve radiation levels as low as possible, and referred to the ALARA (as low as reasonably achievable) principle. There would be quite a difference between as low as reasonably achievable and as low as possible. I do not want to make any more of it than that, because I do not believe that the Minister realised what he said in that case. What actually happened with the Health Commission and its multi appearances before the committee was this: Health Commission representatives stated that they had only short notice to appear before the committee, and that may have been true, because that is left to the organising side of the committee. They also pointed out that they did not have a written submission at that time, but certain detail was given to the committee and some questioning ensued. Subsequently, there were requests for information from the select committee which the witnesses undertook to provide. That is a perfectly normal procedure.

Members of the committee were later informed, or I think we found out ourselves—which is the best way to put it, because I do not think that we were ever directly told until later—that a submission had arrived from the Health Commission but had been withdrawn before the witnesses or my colleague and I actually saw it, and that probably applies to other committee members as well who did not see it. We will never know what was in that submission.

It apparently reached the committee but never got to be distributed to members before it was withdrawn. In the event, the witnesses from the commission returned in response to a written submission which they supplied. I have that submission here. Amongst other things, that submission contained a reference list, on which appears the very committee that the Minister earlier in summing up was at some pains to dismiss as not being of any consequence as regards protection in respect to low-level radiation. The submission is headed 'Submission to the House of Assembly select committee by the South Australian Health Commission' and dated May 1982. On its reference page, it lists the following:

> The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health study group—NIOSH.

The title of the paper concerned was, 'The Risk of Lung Cancer among Underground Miners of Uranium Bearing Ores, June 1980'. Presumably, the Health Commission in putting this evidence forward had a look at the paper and gave some credence to it, because it does not say it was considered and abandoned or that no credence was given to it—it was listed among the references. Presumably it has some standing, yet earlier tonight the Minister of Health spoke in the debate and suggested that it was of no account. I had thought it reasonable to mention that aspect.

I now refer to the next visit of Health Commission representatives before the select committee. Evidence was submitted and was, as all committee members would agree, reasonably detailed: it gave a relatively simple explanation of what is concerned in respect of alpha and gamma radiation, the radon daughter disintegration process and particularly some information about the effects at low levels. The committee at that stage, having done its own reading, was reasonably satisfied with that evidence.

I make no criticism of the Chairman in this, because he apparently understood that there was still some discussion at the commission as to the accuracy or otherwise of this second submission received by the committee. However, the first one we had never seen, because it arrived and was taken away, and apparently there were still some qualms about what was contained in the second submission from the commission. That explains why the sitting of House was suspended for some time last week and why an extra meeting of the committee occurred.

I think that, perhaps quite properly, the Chairman decided that at least he knew of some degree of concern about evidence that we had been given to rely on, and he felt that the committee ought to have the opportunity of having that cleared up in any way it wished. Committee members would be able to ask questions, and so on. The Minister arranged for evidence to be given by Professor Clark from the Flinders University whose speciality, I understand, is biology in the genetics direction, and Sir Edward Pochin, who was in Adelaide as a guest of the Chamber of Mines (which I think was never clearly explained, although I believe it was so), and who is an expert of some standing in this matter in the United Kingdom. Those two persons came before the Select Committee that day at about 5.30. The point they were asked to clarify for the benefit of the committee was in respect to low level doses of radiation, both gamma and alpha radiation.

The point at issue was whether the curve on a graph which had a Y axis of risk against an X axis of exposure, particularly in terms of low level doses at the origin end,

was straight or tapered off at some point before the origin. Sir Edward Pochin corrected the Health Commission evidence before us, particulary in respect of gamma radiation. He added the words 'with gamma radiation' to one or two paragraphs before us which appeared to be of a more general nature and purported presumably to take care of radon daughter induced alpha radiation. It was an edifying process and the committee gained a great deal from it.

I regret to inform the committee that I do not believe it would be fair to say that Professor Clark and Sir Edward agreed 100 per cent on the very topic that they were there to clarify for us. My summation of what occurred would be that whereas we apparently had a possible 180-degree difference of opinion (presumably back at the Health Commission), we might have finished up with a 90-degree difference of opinion in respect of a very narrow area at the end of the curve, based on two approaches to that topic by different disciplines. I believe that that is what actually occurred. I believe it was a useful process for the committee in regard to the gamma radiation, or wall radiation, as Sir Edward Pochin prefers to call it. It is probably an apt term, and easier to understand. On balance the information was of help to us. I believe that the Minister of Health was quite wrong in trying to derogate a body such as NIOSH, because—

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, I realise that. I am quibbling not with the Health Commission but rather with the Minister. The Minister spoke tonight and tried to suggest (and I invite members to read *Hansard* tomorrow) that NIOSH was some fly-by-night crowd which really did not have any standing in the matter. NIOSH is the National Institute of Occupational Health and Safety, a United States Government sub-agency. It is an agency of the Centre for Disease Control which itself is an agency for the Department of Health and Human Services of the United States Federal Government. It administers a national programme for the eradication and control of occupational diseases and the establishment of adequate safety standards. So, one would think that, if NIOSH came out in June 1980, with a paper with the title I have suggested, on the risk of lung cancer among underground miners of uranium-bearing ores, they might have some clout in the matter and we ought not to find our own Minister of Health in conflict with the Health Commission, which apparently thinks enough of the paper to quote it as a reference and yet the Minister is downgrading the same body. It looks as though there is some homework to be done in the Health Commission between the Minister and the commission on that topic. The question in other ways has been summed up by the Minister, who has suggested that the codes concerned will be adequate protection. I believe that it would be better for me to handle those matters when we get to the relevant clause to which certain amendments are proposed.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have no desire to prolong unduly the deliberations of the Committee. Following on the remarks that the Committee has heard from my colleague, there is one question that I have to put to the Minister. It is something that I have thought about quite a lot since my earlier contribution to the debate in the House, that the report of the committee be noted. It relates to what we might call the extraordinary meeting of the committee which was held and which delayed the introduction of the measure to the House without which by now this measure would be in another place.

I found it an extraordinary meeting, because we were told that following a request from the committee for certain information in relation to radiological protection, a report had been prepared, had been sent to the Secretary of the committee and had been inserted in our folders (and you, Sir, will recall that in the earlier part of the proceedings of the committee we were leaving our folders, with evidence, with the Secretary until he brought them up to date, and collecting them in time to prepare ourselves for the following meeting), but then, at the request of the Health Commission, had been removed for correction, and a subsequent report sent down. That report reached us about an hour and a half before the meeting at which it was to be considered.

Subsequent to that again, controversy occurred within the Health Commission as to the accuracy of the two reports. So, the Minister quite properly felt that it would be wrong to bring down a report to the Parliament while there was this controversy in respect of an important piece of evidence. What is interesting is that my impression, on hearing the evidence, was, first that we were arguing about what seemed to be largely an academic point, because all it was necessary to do was to adopt safeguards appropriate to the alpha radiation, and apparently that would take care of the gamma radiation, which produces less of a hazard. Yet it was about the gamma radiation that the quarrel erupted. That was the first point, and it seemed to me that it was covered.

It is significant that, following the evidence, the Minister said to you, Sir, and your colleague, 'Do you gentlemen wish to vary the evidence in any way?' You said, 'No'. The Minister then looked to me and my colleague and said, 'Do you gentlemen wish to vary the evidence in any way?' We said, 'No'. Secondly, it would appear that, on balance, certainly Sir Edward Pochin felt that the first report, if we can somehow reconstruct what was in that first report (we never saw it) was, if anything, more accurate than was the second report which we had before us.

Mr Lewis: That is a complete *non sequitur.*

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I never cease to be amazed by the member for Mallee. Perhaps I will yield my place to the member so that he can explain exactly what he means. I do not want to lose the call, but I am only too happy to allow the member—

Mr Lewis: How on earth can you possibly say that if you do not know what was in it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am certainly prepared to expand a little for the benefit of the honourable member. We were concerned to try to reconstruct what was in the first report; otherwise, it was difficult to make sense of what was happening before us. Yet we are supposed to be people in a position to report to this Parliament. So, by a series of questions we attempted to adduce from the witnesses what was in the first report or in what respect it had differed from the second, and it would appear from the answers we got (we had to be Sherlock Holmeses) that it was in relation to this business of what happens, if I can use this term, in relation to the hazard effect of gamma radiation at the lower levels of exposure.

On the basis of that reconstruction, we put to the witnesses what appeared to be the true picture, and, if anything, certainly Sir Edward Pochin agreed with my reconstruction of the contents of the first report rather than what we had before us in the second report. I hope that satisfies the member for Mallee. It is not clear to me whether or not it does. He has returned to his correspondence.

Mr Lewis: I still say that it does not follow. If you do not know what was there, how on earth can you come to that conclusion?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Perhaps all the member for Mallee is doing is underlining the point of the question that I am about to put to the Minister. It was an extraordinary meeting, in that we were partly in the dark, but, in any event, to the extent that we were able to uncover a controversy, it appears to have been in relation to a rather technical point which, on examination, had no bearing whatsoever on the contents of the indenture, whether one accepted the viewpoint of the Liberal Party in relation to the matter or the viewpoint of the Labor Party, for that matter.

I ask the Minister whether he has had an opportunity to check this whole thing out, to ensure that the situation as was put to us was in fact the situation. The point I want to make really is that, as some sort of amateur physicist, I had a lovely time that afternoon. The Minister will recall the sorts of questions I asked. I enjoyed every minute, but really if I had been in the Minister's position, I think I would have said at the end, 'For heavens sake, why did we waste our time having this meeting? What was this controversy about? Have I not, with the best of motives, wasted the time of the committee?' That has worried me. Was there anything more behind that controversy than purely the point in relation to exposure of gamma radiation that was put before us? If we can have some assurance from the Minister, I will certainly not take the matter any further.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The sequence of events is as I have outlined to the House. As I understand it, a report was prepared by some officers of the Health Commission and was sent directly to the select committee before it had been read by any of the superior officers, including Dr Wilson and Dr Brenton Kearney, who was the Acting Chairman of the Health Commission in the absence overseas of Dr McKay. On becoming aware of the submission and its contents, Dr Wilson withdrew it. There was some discussion, as I understand it, within the Health Commission. I understand that a report written by Dr Wilson was submitted to the committee.

On Tuesday morning, I became aware of the fact, via the Minister of Health, who had returned from overseas, that there was a serious matter of dispute within the Health Commission, that to a group of officers who prepared the report (I think there were about four or five of them, who, by the way, fronted up as observers, one may have noticed, to the hearing of the select committee) there was a serious dispute. That is the way it was described to me.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There were so many there observing that I thought we were going to have a movie when we walked in.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: These professionals take their jobs seriously, and so they should. There was a serious dispute as to the effects of low-level radiation, and in fact Dr Wilson was being challenged. That is the way it was put to me: that he was being challenged in terms of the conclusions that he had drawn. I was aware of the fact that Professor Clark of Flinders University had been quoted as one of the sources of information in relation to this matter. I was aware also that Sir Edward Pochin was in town, and it was not in anyone's interest for this dispute to continue in the Health Commission.

It was not in anyone's interest for there to be any air of controversy, as far as I was concerned, in relation to the report that the select committee put to Parliament. To those on the select committee it may have appeared to be a minor point, but, as relayed to me by the Minister of Health on Tuesday morning, it was a matter of some controversy and not just a fly-by-night, minor matter. To us it was a minor matter, but to the health professionals it was considered to be a major point. In other words, there was a disagreement with Dr Wilson's view. The purpose of calling those expert witnesses, who, everyone acknowledged, would have something to contribute in excess of that of the officers of the Health Commission (and this is no reflection on the officers, as these witnesses are experts in their field) was to get further evidence about the effects of low level radiation. That was the purpose of the exercise.

On Tuesday morning I became aware of what was described to me as 'a serious dispute'. I make no apology for calling a meeting of the select committee, because it was in everyone's interest to have as accurate information as we could have to put to the Parliament, particularly in relation to a matter as sensitive as radiation protection. It was for that purpose that I called the meeting. It may have seemed a fiddly point to us, but to the health professionals it was a pretty serious question.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I make the point that no apology was required from the Minister. I believe he acted quite properly in calling that additional meeting.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: But you seem to think that it was a waste of time. That's what you said.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: In the event, it was. What worries me is that the Minister is saying that to us it seemed to be a minor point. However, to the experts who appeared before us it was quite major. Major and minor are really not relevant in this context. What is relevant is whether the evidence that comes forward has a bearing on the contents of the indenture. We, in our wisdom, came to the conclusion that it really was quite irrelevant to the contents of the indenture. Were we wrong in that respect? It seems to me that public servants may dispute matters. In particular, in this case, we are dealing in a scientific field, a field that is continuing to break new ground all the time. However, when they are arguing the toss over this, surely the matter must arise, 'Look, it is all very well to be raising these matters, but are they really pertinent to the matter that will be before the politicians, who will have to make the final decision on this matter?' That is the nagging doubt that I have in the back of my mind.

Did we, in too cavalier a fashion (and here, I am implicating my colleague and myself as much as I am implicating Liberal members), dismiss this matter or, really, was it, in a sense (although we can appreciate the motivation of the people who appeared before us), really an exercise that was irrelevant to the matter that was before us? Perhaps the Minister does not have to reply to that and his silence is sufficient to reassure me that, in fact, there is nothing further to worry about. However, I think it is important that I make my position clear in this matter.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The only comment I make is that, ultimately, it is senior officers in departments who are responsibile for what comes forward as authoritative material from departments. The honourable member has been a Minister for the Environment in his time.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: No, Development, Education, and Housing.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, he was Minister of Development. I understand that reports are prepared (and this happens in the Mines and Energy Department, or any Government department) by officers in the departments but, ultimately, the responsibility for what comes from that department lies with the Director-General or a senior officer deputed to make that material available. That is the way in which the system works.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: But that wasn't the only argument—the propriety of its not going through the departmental head at the time. There was a technical dispute.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, there was a technical dispute, and I have explained that. The purpose of calling those further expert witnesses was, I guess, to help the Health Commission officers who came along and listened as much as the select committee, quite frankly.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Sir Edward Pochin has been put forward by the Minister as an authority in this matter, and I make no comment on that. However, I had the opportunity to meet Sir Edward before he appeared before the committee, and I found him extremely interesting to talk to. On a private basis (and I told him why I was asking him, so I am sure that he would not mind my relating his comments to the Committee), I asked him what he thought of NIOSH, and he said that he believed it was one of the responsible bodies in the United States, and that it was a

pity that a number of bodies in the United States appeared to be involved in the regulation of health and other aspects of the nuclear industry. I believe that Sir Edward had a high opinion of NIOSH, and I put forward his view to help the Minister of Health, too.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In fact, the NIOSH material that was quoted was a working paper, not a final report. The working paper was reviewed by the International Commission for Radiation Protection, which is a world authority and which did not accept the contentions put forward in the NIOSH report. That report cannot be accepted as the Gospel on radiation protection.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. According to my reckoning, the member for Mitchell has already spoken on three occasions in regard to this clause, and it is my understanding that it is not permissible for him to speak again.

The CHAIRMAN: That is correct in accordance with Standing Order 422.

Mr McRAE: A very childish point of order has been taken by the honourable member on a matter as important as this.

Mr LEWIS: A further point of order, Mr Chairman. The honourable member reflected on my conduct and integrity as a member of this place by referring to my behaving childishly, and I ask him to withdraw those words.

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Napier is not assisting the work of the Committee. To which words does the member for Mallee object?

Mr LEWIS: I object to the word 'childish'.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member ask that the member for Playford withdraw that word?

Mr LEWIS: That was my request, Mr Chairman.

Mr McRAE: Yes, I withdraw that word: I want to get on to important matters, from a legal point of view. So far, we have heard from my colleagues in relation to the technical and scientific matters embraced in clause 6. It should be understood that clause 6 is the pivotal clause of this very large measure. I foreshadow that a number of questions will be asked about this clause, and I propose to begin. I indicate my absolute horror that the workers have not been provided for in this Bill. It is a scandal that, in this State, in the year 1982, we have not yet managed to reach the British standards of 1959. God alone knows that the United Kingdom has the most abysmal record of civilised western countries for looking after its employees. Everyone knows that in the United Kingdom what counts is your contacts, your accent and your old school tie. Everyone knows that when you get before the Privy Council you will be dealt with privily and very nicely if you come from the right class; you will be dealt with very nastily if you come from the wrong class.

I am disgusted when I look at this legislation and find that the workers of this State are treated like dirt. I am stunned by the fact that back in the early 1900s our forebears actually managed to work out that if one worked in an abattoir one might happen to get Q fever because one was working with animals, or that if one was working in a lead mine one might happen to get lead poisoning, or if one was working in a zinc mine one might get zinc poisoning, and so it goes on—there is a whole list of those things in the Workers Compensation Act. Yet, in this legislation what do we find—absolutely no protection for workers. I demand to know of the Minister why, in what we have been told is a one thousand million dollar bonanza of the century for the State, the workers are not being looked after. We are told by all the experts that exposure to radiation in its mildest form is deadly. Any person in the community who has anything to do with this industry or its minor component parts knows that.

Therefore, why then is there not a provision in this legislation to ensure that if a worker, who has been allied with these processes, is at any time in the future injured, acquires a disease, is damaged, or dies, in circumstances that are consistent with his working in that environment, he will be automatically provided for? But that is applying the standards of the early 1900s! I know that you, Mr Chairman, hold in high esteem (and so you should) the Governments of liberal England, in the truly liberal England in the early 1900s. Many a time have I had occasion to refer to Sir Campbell-Bannerman and the work that he did in the early 1900s—he actually managed to get some justice for workers from the pompous idiots who inhabit the benches of the Judiciary in the United Kingdom. He managed to force them into line and he forced the King into line as well as he went. He managed to get basic justice.

But we are talking not about 1906, or 1959, but about 1982. What I am demanding on behalf of the workers of this State is that, if a person works in the circumstances applying to one of these bonanza consortia which, we are told, will make these millions, indeed billions of dollars (the figure depends on whether we have the Premier or Deputy Premier in front of us), the very least that we can demand is a 30-year period with absolute protection for those workers. On this night that is what I demand. So, I want the Deputy Premier to tell me why it is that this Bill does not contain that minimum protection. If this thing is going to proceed at all—and do not take that to mean that I believe it should—I believe that that is the very minimum standard we should demand.

I want to know from the Deputy Premier why in this year of 1982 we have not got a complete reversal of the onus of proof, and why we have not got a proviso that any worker who suffers from injuries which can be linked to radiation poisoning or to any process in production, milling and mining is fully protected. I do not claim to understand very well some of the technical terms. Why is it that there is not full protection for the worker? That is disgusting—absolutely disgraceful.

In my first contribution to this clause, I indicate that I look at clause 6 (3) with horror. I indicate that my colleague the member for Norwood will be developing this theme. Let me read clause 6 (3) slowly so that it can be understood by everybody present in this Parliament before they vote on it, because I can assure you, Sir, I shall not be supporting it. It says:

> No person shall do or omit to do anything that frustrates, hinders, interferes with or derogates from the operation or implementation of the indenture, or any aspect of the indenture, or the ability of the parties to the indenture or any other person to exercise rights or discharge duties or obligations under the indenture.

The year 1984 has arrived. But for the Bill of Rights I would not be able, on the passage of this measure, to even question that clause; I hope that is understood. I know that the Government will roll this through on the numbers, but I hope people in the community understand that, but for the Bill of Rights (the only decent bit of English legislation still on the Statute Books, as vestigial legislation) any criticism, any frustration, anything that interferes with—like a fly brushing by—the implementation of this damn thing (any public debates, any newspaper criticism, anything that gets in the way of the mighty destiny of the Deputy Premier and this vast consortium of companies) is going to be illegal. We are not told what punishments are going to be inflicted upon us, but I presume that one of them would be contempt of Parliament. I know you would not do it, Sir, but persons other than you occupying your Chair might threaten me with contempt of Parliament, were it not for the Bill of Rights. I am not sure that this does not even override the

Bill of Rights, because it is so specific. Anyway, my colleague from Norwood will be dealing with that in a little more detail.

I now want to go back to my first basic question. I want to know from the Deputy Premier, why it is that—with this bonanza that we have got—nothing is being provided, not even at the 1959 pommie level, for the workers of this State. Why is that? I demand that he comes up with a respectable answer. I have looked at the English legislation and I have been appalled by it, as usual. It is an old boys club. I am not sure whether they join together at the Carlton or wherever they join, but it was a Labour Party Minister who moved the thing, and I am ashamed of him and totally dissociate myself from him. He is no worse than all the others. I have all the documentation, but I will not bore the Committee with it. They are all chums together and they probably all have a stake in what is going on, too, directly or indirectly.

I hasten to say that that is in no way a reflection on you, Mr Chairman, or your colleagues, and I say that most sincerely. I believe that you would have examined this matter very vigorously indeed, far more than our English colleagues. I am not in the least impressed. Some people have referred me to some English legislation and a speech by a Mr Morris. I do not know who he is, but in 1959 he said that they had managed to work out:

> The existing common law was obviously inadequate in that in some cases it would be difficult, if not impossible, for a person who had been injured to prove the negligence of the operator. Because of the long-delayed effects, the normal limitation period for making claims of this kind was obviously inadequate. The normal three-year period would not suffice where the result of an injury might not manifest itself for many years beyond this limitation period. Therefore, in the 1959 Act the limitation period was raised to 30 years.

If a first-year law student could not work that out I would fail him immediately. I give Mr Morris an A grading for giving a rough summary. However, I do not rely on what he has said. I thank those people sincerely who drew my attention to the English legislation. However, I do not rely on it at all.

I do not want second-rate junk imported from the so-called mother country. I want decent South Australian legislation which will cover the workers of this State properly. In fact, I will clearly spell out what I want along with the undertakings that I require from the Minister. I want absolute liability on the employer. I want a time span of 30 years. I want to know why that is not possible. I know that all kinds of specious arguments are used against that. However, if this bonanza is going to work (and, first, it must be a bonanza and, secondly, it must have men to work it), those people working in the mine, many of whom reside in your own electorate, Mr Chairman, should demand, as I will demand, proper and adequate precautions. If we cannot do in the year 1982 what Sir Campbell Bannerman did 80 years ago that is an affront to me and a disgrace for this Parliament. In my first consideration of this pivotal clause 6 I want to know what the Minister will do about the adequate protection of the workers of this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition member in charge of the carriage of this Bill suggested that we might get through it within a reasonable period of time. I hope that his prediction is not too far wrong. We have heard a fairly repetitious monologue from the Hon. Mr McRae.

Mr McRAE: Mr Chairman, I rise on a point of order. First, I object to the way that the Deputy Premier has reflected upon me in his ponderous, school-masterly fashion. Secondly, I demand that I be referred to in the name of the people that I have the honour to represent.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Playford is correct in insisting that he be referred to by his district. However, in relation to the other matter, I do not believe that there is any reflection upon him. Therefore, I cannot uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Playford has made a long speech to the Committee, and I will not make any personal comment on the schoolmaster type of attitude which I have just been accused of having. He said that he wanted an iron-clad guarantee as to the safety of workers at Roxby Downs. The whole purpose of developing the codes in relation to radiological protection is to ensure the safety, as far as is humanly possible, of people who work in industries involving contact with ionising radiation. The whole thrust and purpose of clause 10 is to ensure, as far as we possibly can, their safety. The evidence that has come to me is that far more danger is likely to occur to people from the nature of mining in general. Underground mining compared to other occupations is relatively more hazardous, because of the nature of the occupation. The clear evidence is that the danger and likelihood of risk to miners, when one calculates low-level radiation over 30 years, will be as a result of mechanical accidents.

Recently at Moomba, I think one man was killed and a couple of others seriously injured when a boom fell off a crane. There could be a rock fall in a mine. Such accidents occur in any sort of industry involving machinery. That occurs in this technological age, and that is what workers compensation is all about.

Mr McRae: Tough on the blokes involved!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know it is tough on the blokes involved, but these are the acceptable risks that occur. Is the member for Playford suggesting that it is humanly possible to cut out industrial deaths or accidents in relation to mining or any of the operations which involve modern technology? The level of deaths on the road as a result of our means of locomotion may be accepted, when I have no doubt that succeeding generations will believe that it is intolerable. About 300 people a year are killed on the road. Indeed, more people are killed on the road in this nation and the Western world than have ever been killed in war. We accept this as part of the price that we pay for this form of modern transportation and technology.

The biggest single cause of death among young people aged between 18 and 25 years—disease or anything else—is road accidents. It is like the member from Playford demanding from the Government that it ensures that there are no road deaths. It is an impossible demand. Certainly, we would like to prevent deaths. Why do we enact legislation for compulsory breath analysis? It is not because we want to infringe on the rights of citizens of this nation—it is because some of us happen to be parents and cheerfully accept being subjected to that test, our offspring being subjected to it as well, as a means of reducing the appalling road toll in regard to people between the age of 18 and 25 years. To ask that there be an iron-clad law to ensure that for the next 30 years no-one will be killed on the road is absurd.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That's not what he's asking.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is seeking workers compensation that will ensure—

Mr McRae: Common law—not workers compensation.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Common law applies. Forget about uranium mining: the risks inherent in mining operations are greater and are accepted by miners who are aware of them. Miners go underground knowing that the roof could fall in, as it does occasionally.

Mr McRae: They have no choice.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is all very well to say that they have no choice. However, they cannot all be lawyers like the member for Playford.

Mr McRae: Or Deputy Premiers like the member for Kavel.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is true. Should we all follow the same occupation? Some people have to be food producers, others have to be food distributors, and we are all food consumers. It involves a certain way of life. The select committee went to Roxby Downs and spoke to people currently employed in the mine. We took evidence in relation to the safety procedures. Questions were asked whether medical tests were being conducted. The answer was not given unequivocally at the time, but subsequent, in relation to the contractor who was working in the shaft, it transpires that all these people were given a medical before they went down into the shaft. They are required to wear monitoring badges, and so on.

The radiation procedures are in place and are quite stringent. The readings taken by the Health Commission are only a fraction of the allowable limits of the codes outlined in the Bill. Those who choose to take this form of work do it quite cheerfully, and would be shattered if they were forced to leave that job. It is all very well for the member for Playford to sound off in this fashion and ask for iron-clad guarantees, but the codes are established to ensure that working conditions for these people are safe according to the best human knowledge available on the world scene. The law is in place to ensure that if an accident occurs they will be adequately compensated. Let us look at the workers compensation legislation in this State. We have just raised the limits for death and injury payments. However, that is not where the big payments occur: it is at common law.

Mr McRae: That's what I'm talking about.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That applies to this operation as much as it applies to any other.

Mr McRae: Why don't you make it apply?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The common law does apply. If people are injured in the mining operation they have recourse to the courts. It is impossible to give the iron-clad guarantees that the member for Playford wants in terms of absolute safety of workers in any industry, whether it is the manufacturing industry or any other. Interesting evidence was given to members of Parliament who sought to hear Dr Beckmann. Not everyone agreed with him, as the member for Mitcham has pointed out. She did not accept everything he said. However, everybody who listened to him realised that risks are involved in the conversion of coal to energy. He gave statistics in regard to the number of people killed annually in the transport scene. He gave statistics on lung diseases as a result of that activity. Statistics indicate that bus drivers working for a bus utility suffer an increased incidence of heart disease than do bus conductors. I see no statistics for the nature of the operation. People cannot all choose to be bus conductors, deputy premiers or lawyers. However, they choose a form of employment which they find acceptable.

Society accepts risks. Are we to go back to the trees and live like monkeys or go back to the caves? Are we going to turn our backs on technology because it involves risks? The whole philosophy of this Bill and clause 10 is to see that, as far as is humanly possible, those risks ensure the safety and health of the workers in the mine. The greatest danger to miners in this and other mines will not be the danger from radiation levels, which will be far below those which occur elsewhere. I am the first to admit that precious little was known about radiation, even in my early lifetime. They used to X-ray people's feet to see if their shoes fitted; I remember that as a child. Precious little was known about the effects of ionising radiation, but far more is known about the effects of ionising radiation and there is far more concern about it than there ever was previously.

There were mining procedures which were dangerous to people, but those facts are known now. More time and research has been spent on this aspect than on many other dangers to which the human race is subjected. All I ask is that people have a sense of perspective in what we are on about here, when we are talking about relative risks and dangers.

I repeat, the people who are working at Roxby Downs are entirely satisfied with the safety provisions under which they have to work. The member for Mitchell will agree that we met these people socially, and that one of them got up on a chair and made a speech about what was happening there. That person was in good spirits and described himself as an official of the Labor Party who had come up from Tasmania, as I recall. He made what could only be described as an impassioned plea that they would not be denied the work that they enjoy. They knew the safety provisions perfectly well.

I find the contribution of the member for Playford interesting, but it is impossible to give the sort of iron-clad guarantees which he is seeking. The whole purpose of the codes enunciated in clause 10 is to ensure the safety of those workers. Testimony was given to the select committee, as I had said earlier this evening, from responsible officers in the Health Commission, who said, in answer to the member from Eyre, that they were satisfied that the health of these workers was satisfactorily protected. If there is an accident workers have recourse to the normal workers compensation provisions or the common law.

Mr McRAE: I will not delay the Committee more than two or three minutes on this occasion. First, I indicate that my own family has a long history in the mining industry, the majority of my extended family working in the mining industry in the north of South Australia and in Broken Hill. I am well aware of the dangers of the mining industry. There is one reason and one reason only why one goes into the mining industry: one gets good money in return for high risk, and there are very grave dangers.

Even the class-riddled and rotten British structure managed, in 1959, to work out an automatic principle of absolute liability with a 30-year time limit. It disgusts me that this Government cannot even get to that point. I am not talking about the safety standards. I have no doubt that my colleagues on the committee worked hard with their colleagues from the other Party to work out those standards. It is one thing to set safety standards: it is another to implement them. I am talking about the people who get hurt. When I lived in Broken Hill I well recall that there was a casualty list each morning in the Barrier mine. Those days have improved.

I realise the realities. I am not talking about airy-fairy nonsense. I know what goes on. I am talking about proper compensation to the workers. It is tempting, in one way, to leave it at that and say to the Minister that in five, 10 or 15 years time, I or my successor will direct the widows or cripples straight to his electoral office (if he is still there), or to his successor, to have it sorted out. I can assure you, Mr Chairman—and you can be damn sure about this—that unless the Crown is bound absolutely, your constituents will not be protected. I know from experience in the law that there is no defendant more devious or more vicious than the Crown. Let me warn the Committee about that: no defendant is more devious or more vicious than the Crown, except in relation to its own failures. I have given the appropriate warnings and dealt with all the relevant matters. If the Committee is not interested, so be it, but I walk out with my conscience clear on this matter until we reach clause 8, when I shall re-examine the position at leisure.

There being a disturbance in the public gallery:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr CRAFTER: I seek information from the Minister about why clause 6 (3) has been inserted in the measure above the law that applies in this State at present and I ask what other circumstances the Minister envisages that require this sort of law to be implemented in this case. This, as the member for Playford has said, is the most broad sweeping and Draconian piece of legislation that one could expect to find. I have never seen a precedent for a law of this nature. It does not apply sanctions for breaches of any known law.

It applies sanctions for frustrating, hindering, or interfering with this operation, and words of that nature are not defined by the courts. Indeed, it is a most imprecise definition of what behaviour is expected of the community. As I have said, it is behaviour that is not illegal at law: it is behaviour that has been defined in these very general terms. The Minister has referred to, and used as an example, the implementation of random breath testing as a measure appropriate to help overcome the problem associated with the road toll. That legislation, with its civil liberty hindrances, pales into insignificence compared to the slashing of civil liberties envisaged in this measure.

I will refer to some examples that come to mind of what would be caught, in my view, by this measure. First, there is the outlawing of strikes. Any industrial disputation would be caught, in my view, by this measure. Then there is the failure of suppliers to be able to provide goods or services, and this is clearly caught by something that will hinder, frustrate, or interfere with the operation or implementation of the effects of this indenture. Then there is the ability of people to demonstrate, whether on the site, here in Adelaide, or in some other appropriate place, against the development of this project or some aspect of it. Clearly, that would fall within the definitions.

What of the case of the clergyman who wants to preach a sermon against some aspect of the indenture? Is he caught by it as well, and what are the penalties that the Minister envisages to enforce this law? I cannot see clearly what those penalties are and how they would be enforced. Is it limited to civil action, or does it include criminal sanctions as well? If it is limited to civil actions, how are they to be enforced and what penalties will flow from that for individuals, groups of people, and companies that are caught up in this broad sweeping attempt to facilitate the implementation of this indenture?

What are the duties and responsibilities of newspapers in the State? I do not imagine that the newspaper proprietors would be too concerned about this, but some may be. In this respect, I refer to those who see themselves as having some responsibility to tell both sides of the story about the development of uranium in this State. If a newspaper dares to print some story that will frustrate, hinder or interfere with any aspect of this indenture, what is the sanction against the publication of those articles? One could go on and give examples of what one would consider to be legitimate, basic and fundamental rights of any democratic society to voice its views and, indeed, to demonstrate against proposals that it believes are contrary to the interests of the whole community and then to find that because certain behaviour and acts, have not breached any law but have frustrated, hindered or interfered with in some way this development in the State, one is caught up in an offence against this law that the Government is attempting to pass through this House this evening.

That, to me, if it is not explained properly by the Minister, is in itself sufficient cause for me to want to see this legislation defeated. That, to my mind, is a totally unsatisfactory expression of this Parliament and is contrary to the best interests of any democratic society. I would be interested to hear the Minister give reasons for the breadth of expression in that clause, and to say how he sees it being policed and what evil he envisages in relation to this legislation. I also seek from the Minister some information about the policy of the Liberal Party at both state and Federal levels in respect of the export marketing of uranium. I quote briefly from a speech that Mr Anthony, the Deputy Prime Minister, made in the House of Representatives in 1978 on this topic, as follows:

> I made it clear that in the arrangements we made we would ensure that the Government had at all times proper knowledge, oversight and control of the arrangements under which Australian uranium is exported. That control will also ensure that the Government will be in a position to move immediately to terminate uranium development permanently, indefinitely, or for a specified period as recommended by the Ranger inquiry.

I have searched the first Fox Report, the Ranger inquiry, and I quote what Mr Justice Fox recommended on this point, as follows:

> A decision to mine and sell uranium should not be made unless the Commonwealth Government ensures that the Commonwealth can at any time immediately terminate those activities permanently, indefinitely, or for a specified period.

I believe it is imperative that no commitment of Australia's uranium deposits should be made until the Australian Government endorses this recommendation, and although superficially Mr Anthony has given such endorsement, his statement to which I just referred, when considered carefully, relates only to the export power of the Commonwealth and gives no guarantee, in my view, in the words of Mr Justice Fox, on the activities of mining and selling uranium. Mining of uranium in all of Australia except the Territories remains in the State jurisdiction. This includes the mining of uranium, title of which is vested in the Crown in the right of the State. I think it is important, in view of this conflict or ambiguity, that the Minister tell the House clearly what is the Liberal Party's policy at the Commonwealth level in relation not only to the exporting but also the mining and selling of uranium. Does the Commonwealth, in his view (and has he been advised that the Commonwealth has), have those powers over the export of uranium that Mr Justice Fox recommended it should have?

I would also like the Minister to explain the advice that he has no doubt received on the impact of the Commonwealth Atomic Energy Act, 1953, in regard to the development of uranium mining in this State, and in particular the effect of section 41 of that Act. I understand that, under that Act, the Commonwealth Minister cannot exercise his power of conferring an authority to mine in relation to land in the State without the State Government's consent, unless the authority is conferred for the defence of the Commonwealth.

It would seem that there is almost an inseparable nexus between the matters relating to defence and the mining of uranium. I would be interested to know what advice the Minister has been given by his officers and by the Commonwealth on the implementation of this Act with respect to this State, what consents are required, and what information has transpired from the State to the Commonwealth on this fundamental matter.

I refer to today's press on the decision of the Victorian Government to declare that State a nuclear-free State. The Prime Minister's immediate response was to challenge the validity of that legislation when it is passed on the grounds of the Commonwealth's defence powers. I believe that this is a matter of great importance to the citizens of this State, and I would like to hear the Minister's views on it.

Further, I seek clarification from the Minister on the effect of clause 52 of the indenture, which allows the joint venturers to terminate the indenture by notice to the State if the State Parliament enacts any legislation that modifies the rights or increases the obligations of the State under the Bill or the

indenture. I would be interested to hear whether the Minister agrees with my interpretation.

This clause, if ratified, with other clauses, effectively numbs any further legislative initiatives outside the existing terms of the indenture; that is, it binds future State Parliaments. Therefore, it would require some Commonwealth Government intervention for there to be any changes of control once this legislation is passed.

Further, the indenture refers to the State's making representations to the Commonwealth on behalf of the joint venturers to assist in procuring any licences or consents that the joint venturers may require in connection with any agreement that is necessary for the joint venturers to perform their obligations. Clause 40 embraces that subject. Any export arrangements being entered into would require Commonwealth agreement, as uranium is a prohibited export under the customs prohibited exports regulations. The Minister, in exercising his discretion whether or not to consent to the export of uranium, may take into account the defence of Australia, environmental issues and anything else that the Minister may consider to be relevant.

As long as uranium is mined for export, the Commonwealth Government has the final say on whether a mining operation for uranium, even in the State, will ultimately have any real value. Does the Minister agree with that interpretation and its implications? Obviously, if he does, some concrete discussions and proposals would have been put to the Commonwealth on this point. I would be interested to hear what assurances the Minister has received from the Commonwealth about the effect of these customs regulations on uranium mining in this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member has canvassed a number of matters, the first of which was relevant to the clause, but I am not quite sure whether the latter portion of his lengthy dissertation was. In the first instance the honourable member queried the compass of clause 6 (3), and as a lawyer I guess he has as good an idea as anyone has what that sort of all embracing clause entails. I make no apologies for the fact that I sought legal advice in relation to what the clause means.

Mr Hemmings: You mean you didn't know?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I had a layman's view. We are now getting the lawyers' questioning that I guess one should expect during the committee stage of a Bill such as this. The fact is that what that clause seeks to do is to ensure that there is no impediment deliberately put in the way of fulfilling the reasonable expectations of this indenture. I cannot envisage for a moment the way-out sort of suggestions that were made, such as strike breaking and so on, being pertinent to this clause at all. The provisions in the clause would, I guess, apply to a situation in which, say, because there was a blockade of a road, and the joint venturers were unable to remove their product, they would have a right to seek a court injunction to ensure that, in fact, they could remove their product.

I am advised that in the absence of a specific penalty a statement such as this amounts to what is termed legally a misdemeanour—I guess the honourable member knew that. One could envisage, perhaps the local government doing something deliberately (I cannot imagine why, but it could be the case) to inhibit the operation and the working of the mine in terms of the indenture. I guess that the provision would enable the joint venturers to seek an injunction to ensure that the operations are not unreasonably inhibited. To suggest the sorts of fanciful examples that the honourable member has suggested is really stretching it much too far.

Mr Crafter: It is possible, though.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let us face it, common sense prevails when one goes before a court in terms of seeking an injunction. Surely the honourable member has got some faith in the good sense of judges, magistrates and others who are charged with presiding over the circumstance which would lead to the company's seeking an injunction. Surely the honourable member has enough faith in the legal system's being able to sort out that type of problem. It is quite fanciful to suggest that strike breaking could be effective in terms of this clause. I think that in this country we know enough about the industrial disputation that has occurred recently to realise that the provisions involved were hardly enough to ensure that people obeyed the laws of the land in terms of much stronger penal sanctions than would possibly be envisaged by the compass of this clause.

Then the honourable member went on to a fairly long quiz session in relation to any contact we may have had with the Federal Government. Of course the Government contacts the Federal Government from time to time in relation to various matters. However, it is common knowledge, not requiring any phone call, correspondence or particular contact with the Federal Government, that the Federal Government has export control in relation to uranium. In fact, that is used as a control in terms of seeing that environmental prcedures, according to its requirements, are met.

The honourable member might be interested to know that that provision was first instituted, I think in 1973, by the Whitlam Government. I do not know whether the honourable member rang the Whitlam Government to apprise himself of that detail, but it was known to me. It is known to me that the Federal Government has put safeguard agreements in place without my ringing up or writing it a letter. I am aware of the fact that customer countries have to be signatories to the non-proliferation treaty or else have to enter into a bi-lateral agreement with the Federal Government, which is satisfactory to the Federal Government, and that has resulted in fairly protracted negotiations in relation to a couple of customer countries before satisfaction was reached. It is also a fact that the Australian safeguard agreements are the toughest in the world. That is a fairly sensible reason for becoming a supplying country, because if people who are locked into the use of nuclear power cannot get the uranium from Australia they will get it from a country where the safeguard agreements are far less stringent, but that is a side issue in relation to an answer to the honourable member's question.

The honourable member sought to quiz me in relation to my constant dialogue with the Federal Government in relation to these matters. He knows perfectly well that most of these matters are matters of common knowledge—they should be to his common knowledge. He should be well aware of the fact that they were put in place in the first instance by the Whitlam Government.

Mr CRAFTER: I did not really expect to get very much information from the Minister, and I have been proven right. I raised these questions because I was most distressed to hear, in the summing up that the Minister gave to the motion to adopt the report, that he chose not to comment at all on this problem of the use of uranium once it has left the shores of Australia. In particular, the problems associated with nuclear weapons and their proliferation. That subject is of great concern in the community and, indeed, right throughout the world.

I have had that brought home to me just recently by the application of the Premier's Department to build a nuclear fall-out shelter in my electorate on the Parade at Norwood. When I raised this matter earlier this year with the Minister of Health, I was told that it was as a safeguard against nuclear war. So, right in my own electorate there is a facility that has been attempted to be built by this Government as a protection against the event of nuclear war.

Mr Mathwin: They've been building them in Switzerland for 20 years.

Mr CRAFTER: I would have hoped that we could create some sort of society in which that sort of effort was not required—let alone be contributing to it. That is why I ask the questions about the role of the Commonwealth Government, as I would have thought that was fundamental, yet it is still to be clarified at law what are the rights of the State and the Commonwealth with respect to the sale and the conditions attached to that sale of uranium in Australia. That is why I have raised those matters.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not address the much vexed question of non-proliferation. I referred to the question of disposal of radioactive wastes. Those are the two questions which seemed to have remained after the exhaustive select committee hearing of the Upper House. They were the two on which the dissentients in those reports sought to hang their hats.

Let me just say this in relation to non-proliferation. I think the people who did take the trouble to listen to Professor Peter Beckmann yesterday may not have agreed with him, but they would have found what he said interesting. He gave a perspective to a number of issues, of which I do not think the member for Norwood would be aware. The theme of his overall talk to us was the moral questions in relation to nuclear energy and the moral judgments we are called to make.

I do not recall whether it was in answer to a question or whether it was a comment on non-proliferation. As I have said before, the argument put forward by Bob Hawke a couple of years ago when speaking about the wisdom or otherwise of mining uranium was that if we do not mine uranium we may be able to sit back in a warm glow of moral rectitude. He said that we will feel very pleased with ourselves but asked what effect it will have; we will make energy more expensive for the developing world and we will put up the price of energy and create considerable hardship. In other words, he was saying that it will not make one jot of difference to what happens in the wide world beyond the Australian shores. In fact, it could make things worse.

In effect, I believe that Dr Beckmann said much the same thing yesterday when he addressed the meeting. I think that the honourable member should acknowledge that the Australian safeguards ensure as far as is humanly possible that we keep track of our uranium until it is used to make fuel rods for nuclear reactors. It has been argued that material from nuclear reactors can be used to make bombs. Dr Beckmann said that that is one of the clumsiest methods to follow in the making of a nuclear weapon. The analogy he used was that all the ingredients for the making of chocolate can be used to make TNT. Therefore, the owner of a chocolate factory could make TNT. However, the owner of a chocolate factory would not choose to make TNT that way, because that would be a clumsy way of doing it. The same thing applies to making a nuclear bomb: using material from a nuclear reactor is one of the clumsiest methods.

The other point raised in relation to non-proliferation by Dr Beckmann, and I thought it was cogent, was that uranium is, I think he said, a ubiquitous metal. That means that it is one of the commoner metals in the earth's crust. When it comes to the question of warfare, economics does not loom very large. We are all intent to see that persons such as Idi Amin and Colonel Gadaffi do not get hold of nuclear weapons. The point was made that if in time of war people of their ilk are determined to obtain nuclear weapons they will dig up uranium from places such as the African deserts. I understand that the Japanese are interested in obtaining uranium from the ocean. If these people are determined to obtain uranium there is nothing that we can humanly do to inhibit them. In fact, we will be doing our best to see that Australian uranium goes into nuclear power reactors. That is the purpose of our safeguards. That is one interesting perspective of nuclear non-proliferation.

I make no apology for not exhaustively canvassing the non-proliferation and waste disposal arguments, because they have been the subject of very lengthy discussion by the uranium select committee which took evidence over a 12-month period. As I have said, 18 months ago I visited Sweden and spoke to Svenke. When I was in Sweden I looked at their programme for the intermediate and final disposal of waste. The stipulation law was explained to me. That states, in effect, that the Swedish Government will not ratify the bringing on stream of any new nuclear reactors until the Government is scientifically convinced that technology and engineering can be provided for the final disposal of waste. They went ahead and commissioned new nuclear power stations. I looked at that.

I went to France as Dunstan did earlier. I remember the optimistic reports that came back. Then there would be a phone call from Adelaide saying that the numbers were not there, and then the reports would become pessimistic.

Mr Hemmings: Stick to the facts.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I sat here and listened to a quarter of an hour of what, to some of us, may not have been the most enthralling information that we ever heard. I might be permitted to make a point or two. The fact is that there was clear evidence from Sir Ben Dickinson, who was the Government's uranium adviser on that trip, that the report was changed after it was written in Europe. The only solution is for the individual to make up his own mind. I went and looked. I went to France and duplicated the trip. I stood on the intermediate depository in the concrete vault where they have uranium waste in glass, solidified—not in a glass container but melted into the glass after it has been calcined and brought down to powder form.

I have stood on top of that and looked at it. In the end it comes to one's own judgment of the safety of those procedures. I will not canvass these points again. They were not before the select committee, which considered whether this indenture was a suitable document in relation to the development of this mine. These questions are part of the debate in relation to nuclear energy. They were not specifically dealt with, nor would they have been addressed in any indenture that came before Parliament to spell out conditions covered by the indenture. They are the broad questions of non-proliferation and waste disposal.

The indenture addresses itself to what will happen in South Australia. I do not suggest that those questions are not relevant to the overall debate. I do not suggest that for one moment. This indenture is to ensure that the conditions between the Government and the company which wishes to undertake a mining operation in this State are satisfactory. That is what the indenture does. We have attempted to see that the conditions and the arrangements are satisfactory from all perspectives, and that is what we are debating now.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—'Modification of State law in order to give effect to Indenture, etc.'

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: On page 3, line 41, 'clause 10' should be deleted and 'clause 11' inserted. That error occurred in either the printing or typing stage.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Mathwin): I advise the Committee that the clause has already been altered by the Chairman. It is a matter of explanation by the Minister.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—'Licences, etc., required in respect of the mining and milling of radioactive ores.'

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I move:

Leave out this clause and insert new clauses as follows:

8. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of clause 10 of the indenture, the joint venturers shall be obliged to observe standards relating to the mining, milling, treatment, processing, handling, transportation or storage of radioactive ores, concentrates, wastes or tailings imposed by or under any other law of the State.

(2) Notwithstanding any provisions of the indenture, no special mining lease shall be granted to the joint venturers unless they have submitted to the Minister of Health detailed proposals for the disposal of wastes and tailings resulting from operations to be carried out in pursuance of the lease and that the Minister has approved those proposals.

(3) If the joint venturers fail at any time to comply with proposals approved under subsection (2), the Minister of Health may by order prohibit further mining operations under the special mining lease until the joint venturers make good the default.

(4) Contravention or failure to comply with an order under subsection (3) is an offence punishable by a fine not exceeding $500 000.

8a. (1) The Minister of Industrial Affairs shall maintain a register of all persons who are or have been employed by the joint venturers in work relating to the mining, milling, treatment, processing, handling, transportation or storage of radioactive ores, concentrates, wastes or tailings.

(2) The register shall be available for inspection by any member of the public.

8b. If at the expiration of two years from the commencement of this Act comprehensive legislation providing special rights to workers compensation for workers engaged in work relating to the mining, milling, treatment, processing, handling, transportation or storage of radioactive ores, concentrates, wastes or tailings and involving short-term or long-term exposure to radiation has not been enacted by the Parliament and brought into force, the rights conferred by or under this Act shall be suspended until such legislation has been enacted and brought into force.

8c. Notwithstanding any provision of the indenture, no special mining lease shall be granted unless there has been a comprehensive public inquiry into the probable effects upon the environment of the operations to be carried out in pursuance of the lease.

8d. (1) Notwithstanding any provision of the indenture, no special mining lease shall be granted unless the Governor concurs in the granting of the special mining lease.

(2) The Governor has an absolute discretion to grant or withhold his concurrence under subsection (1).

I propose to deal with it as a single amendment, even though it contains a number of provisions. In so doing I will commence with new clause 8 (1). It is an amendment which results from the recommendations of appendix C, which was put to the House by my colleague the member for Baudin and myself, in respect of the standards which we believe ought to be applied in relation to the indenture in the Bill for the protection from radiation of those people connected with the mining, milling, treatment, processing, handling, transportation or storage of radioactive materials, waste, or tailings. It is our view that the three codes about which there has been some discussion already throughout the early debate and earlier tonight are, in themselves, sets of rules which have some standing in this matter. I am not suggesting, by attempting to add and strengthen those codes, that they in themselves are necessarily under question at present as being what might be referred to as the relevant standards at the present state of the art.

What I am putting and have put in our report is that there ought not to be the restriction that will apply, unless the amendment that I am discussing is to be carried, with respect to the protection and safety standards that will apply to workers who will be involved throughout the whole range of activities associated with this project. I suppose the best example I could give of our thinking on this matter would be in relation to thalidomide.

Thalidomide came into use in the world through the then correct channels in various countries. There were regulations and standards which applied in relation to the safety of drugs of that nature in various countries. The drug apparently met those regulations and standards. It came into considerable use throughout the world. Yet, we all know that subsequently the codes and requirements of those times were found to be at fault because they failed to detect the harmful effects relating to the use of that drug (as discovered at this time) by expectant mothers. If it had not been for the work of an Australian research doctor, people might still be wondering what was causing these shocking birth defects that were occurring.

To come back to this Bill, if we are seeking to set standards for the protection of people based solely on certain codes, it seems that it is too restrictive in its nature. I point out that not just any standard might be applied against the joint venturers in relation to this project. The amendment provides that the joint venturers shall be advised to observe standards relating to that area imposed by or under any other law of the State; in other words, as well as the codes already named.

I cannot see why the Government or the joint venturers should oppose this. At the moment I cannot say what other standards might be used or ought to be applied, but the Opposition maintains that there has to be a law of the State before they will be applied. That does not seem unreasonable in the circumstances, because one rightly assumes that they would not become law unless they had sufficient standing.

I have conducted research, as have many others, in connection with NIOSH. It may well be that that body is subsequently proven correct in respect of what the paper, which has been talked about, states; that is, that the working levels to which workers ought to be subjected on both a monthly and yearly basis ought to be reduced by a significant factor. At the moment, we have been told, not in any authoritative way but by people who have an involvement in the matter—by Sir Edward Pochin and people from the Health Commission—that that recommendation from NIOSH does not have endorsement. That is really the state of the art. No-one has trotted out a report from I.C.R.P., the International Automatic Energy Agency or the Australian national council that was involved in this area, stating that they have examined the NIOSH report and that its findings are incorrect, inadequate, etc. Therefore, we are in a dicey area: nobody is absolutely certain whether or not it is correct.

One interesting thing said to the select committee by Sir Edward Pochin was that there is still a developing art going on in respect to low-level radiation and its effects. I am sure that my colleague would agree with me there. This emerged in discussion. We are not at zero yet. There is still some work being done, and more information is coming to hand all the time. The supposition is that if members will not accept this amendment, and the joint venturers do not want to, then the only knowledge which is going to come forward of any substance will come through those three bodies that have been listed. How can anyone say that, looking ahead five years?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: World authorities.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister is anxious to have a co-operative effort from the Opposition in this matter in relation to time. I suggest that he does not try to bait me. I am absolutely serious about this point. Talking about world authorities, I am not convinced by I.C.R.P. I have conducted research which shows that it is a body, as I have said before, that has an annual budget of $70 000 with three paid employees (if I remember correctly) setting world standards in a matter with results, if they are in error, that can effect people all over the world in respect of radiation damage. I am not saying that the report is wrong. What I am saying is that those bodies are not the only bodies which ought to be given possible credence in the future.

I say no more about it. It does not need any further argument by me or anyone else in the House. It is a perfectly reasonable amendment to seek and I am sure that Hugh Morgan, of Western Mining, or Ken Keith, of British Petro-

leum, are not losing any sleep over that at all. If the amendment is not accepted, it will be because of the intransigence of the Government, which does not want to have anything altered, so that it can trot around and say that it was right all the time and that it did not give way to the Opposition.

The Opposition says that there can be a problem with the disposal of wastes. There has been a careful skirting of this issue by the Government, and the Government speakers so far, as to what we are really talking about. I was absolutely amazed to hear the Minister say, 'Well we have an environmental arrangement in the indenture, there is a three-year programme prepared and things can be altered after three years.' Apparently that was his answer, if the Minister wants to take that three-year programme, to the management of 30 000 000 tonnes of radioactive waste, the tailings after the crushing, and so on.

We have had evidence in the select committee that it is not likely that it can all be stuffed back down the mine. To produce 150 000 tonnes of copper concentrate and the other associated metals, we have been told by eminent people such as Sir Ben Dickinson, represents extraction from 1 000 feet below the surface of 10 000 000 tonnes of ore per year, all of which is crushed and fed through the system and from which all the uranium, copper, or other metals cannot be removed. It is that sort of material that is creating extreme problems in the United States, because it was stuck up in mountains there without treatment and is now blowing all over Wyoming, Texas, and so on, and those concerned do not know what to do about the matter because it involves a lot of money when the matter is not dealt with on a planned basis and people finish up with it all there.

All our amendment says is that there ought to be a plan approved not by the Minister of Mines and Energy, but by the Minister of Health, because we are talking about a health problem, the matter of the effects of contamination, and so on. We seem to be stuck with limited time and I will try to adhere to the nominal arrangement, but I point out that there are problems other than contamination. It does rain at Roxby Downs, because there was a dam there, the Olympic Dam, to catch the rain. Because of the probems that can come to the fore, such as the size of retaining dams, and so on, they ought to be clearly outlined in a plan that has been approved before we start making those mountains of material. That ought to be clear to anyone. No-one can say that we are trying to obstruct the passage of the legislation with that kind of amendment. It is a perfectly rational approach to the problem.

We also say that, because of the possible long-term effects on people who work in this enterprise (if it ever gets going) in relation to their health, special arrangements are necessary and a register ought to be prepared and maintained, listing all the persons who have been employed on the project over a long time. That is to assist in taking care of their long-term health, and that is not revolutionary. We have had evidence and it is well known that the Australian Government is considering doing this on a national scale.

We are always being told by members opposite that South Australia has the opportunity to get in on the greatest bonanza of all time. South Australia also has the opportunity to start the first register of this kind in the country, and what is wrong with being first in that field as well as getting on with the project? However, we do not hear that from the Government. I do not believe for one moment that the joint venturers would have an objection to what we propose, because we want to provide that the Minister of Industrial Affairs ought to do it. It would not cost the joint venturers anything, but we believe that it is a justifiable expense that the State ought to enter into to protect the health of the workers concerned.

We have heard discussion about special compensation. The member for Playford has pointed out the inadequacies of the present arrangement in relation to the indenture and the Bill, and we have no real assurances from the Minister that anything truly humane and protective of those in the work force by way of compensation for illness, death or severe injury is contained in the indenture or the Bill. We are told that the common law will suffice, and my colleague has pointed out and I also point out, although I have no legal background, that various limitations and onuses of proof apply, under the provisions that are most—

Mr LEWIS: On a point of order, Sir, so far as I am aware, under Standing Orders any member is allowed to speak to any clause for 15 minutes. On my reckoning the member for Mitchell began speaking at 11.18½, and I call your attention, Sir, to the time.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Mathwin): Order! I point out to the Committee that the member in charge of the motion has unlimited time to speak to it. There is no point of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you for your protection, Sir. I was, before I had to suffer that asinine interruption—

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member does not need the assistance of the member for Peake.

Mr PLUNKETT: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I did not open my mouth.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. I apologise to the member for Peake, and I can understand his feelings. The member for Mitchell does not need the assistance of the member for Napier.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What we propose in the amendment is that there should be comprehensive legislation providing special rights to workers compensation. I believe that that is perfectly reasonable. The Minister was at some pains to try to deride this sensible and humane provision that the Opposition is putting forward by referring to the United Kingdom Nuclear Installations Act, and suggesting that that was not satisfactory in these circumstances. I invite the Minister to look at the amendment. So far as I can see, it does not state that we have to produce legislation exactly like the Nuclear Installations Act.

Certainly, in the report that came to the House, we made reference to that area because it at least demonstrated that there was an Act in existence, faulty though it might be, as described by my colleague the member for Playford, that took into account one of the more important factors in this area, that there has to be a long time interval over which claims can be made. The time nominated in that legislation is 30 years, which is, I think, acceptable by present day opinions, medical and otherwise, as a reasonable time during which claims may be lodged in respect of lung and certain other cancers that one might suffer from working in that industry.

The next part of our amendment deals with the question of an environmental impact inquiry being held. What we said in our report to the House was that there needs to be a full, public and open-type inquiry. The Minister already has canvassed this area in his summing up and has suggested that the provisions of the State environmental impact legislation will apply. I am not saying that that is not so. The Opposition took that into account before putting forward the proposition that it ought to be a bit wider than that, because it is going to be (using the Minister's own words, and the joint venturers own words)—'this tremendous bonanza,' 'this giant Broken Hill of the south,' 'the Mount Isa of the east'; it all depends where one is standing as to how it is described.

It is going to be such a large project, the biggest of the century in South Australia, that I think it warrants special attention on behalf of the people of South Australia. So far I have not thrown in that it does involve that awkward material, uranium. Just on the other parameters that the proponents of it are using, it would not seem unreasonable to me, because it does involve a lot of possible fears about the environment, for example, of a fairly delicate area of arid zone country.

I believe that at this enlightened time there is a better understanding of how important it is not to disturb unduly the ecology of such areas and so on. I need say nothing more in that regard. This amendment will not tie up the proposal. It does not ask the joint venturers to spend a lot of money: it simply provides that there shall be a comprehensive public inquiry into the probable effects on the environment of the operations to be carried out in pursuance of the lease. That is a perfectly reasonable approach.

The final part of the amendment relates to the fact that my colleagues and I take the view that it is too early to take decisions about production, and so on, in respect of this project. We are supported in that view by the joint venturers and by all the information that is presently available. We hear from members opposite that the venturers will not spend another $50 000 000 on further feasibility work (those were the words used), which clearly indicates that we are nowhere near having to consider the production stages in relation to this possible, very large mine.

Normally, when a special mining lease is issued, this type of issue is considered. The indenture proposes that the parties will sign and tie up the project now. We say that now is not the time to do it. We are not holding up the project or suggesting that it cannot proceed in the same way that it has gone already. However, we must do further work when all the facts come to hand. That is the time to take the next decision. We believe that that decision should not be reserved for the Labor Party or the Liberal Party, and it should not be given away beforehand. That decision should be taken at the right time, when the preliminary work has been done. That is what it boils down to. Fancy names such as 'feasibility study' and 'pre-feasibility study', and so on are used. The matter should be in the hands of the Government of the day. That is expressed in new clause 8d, as follows:

> No special mining lease shall be granted unless the Government concurs in the granting of the special mining lease.

How are those proposals unreasonable? Where do the proposals set out to impose on the joint venturers undue costs or undue delay? I do not believe that any reasonable member who examines these amendments could suggest that they fit into any of the categories that I have just mentioned. They are sensible in their approach, and penalties are provided in relation to default, although I have not dealt with that matter, which needs to be included to take care of a possible major problem, namely, the handling of wastes. We believe that that will be one of the very serious problems, to the extent that we have suggested that the contravention or failure to comply with an order under subsection (3) in relation to the correct handling of those vast quantities of waste should be subject to a fine not exceeding $500 000. That penalty indicates to the operators of the project and to the people of this State how serious we consider that possible problem. We have set out the penalty that should apply to a failure to comply.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think that the honourable member who has been leading for the Opposition knows perfectly well that these amendments simply put a torpedo straight through the indenture. If he has taken any notice of what the joint venturers have said—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: They haven't said a word for a fortnight.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: These amendments bring into the scene all the uncertainties in relation to a whole range of matters which are covered in the indenture and which have been put to the Government as the reasons why the joint venturers will not spend another $50 000 000 on this project unless those uncertainties are removed.

All the provisions in the proposed amendment introduces that element of uncertainty and gives no safeguards against a capricious action by any Government that may take it into its mind at any stage that it wants to close the venture down. It goes without saying that the provisions of the amendment negate the indenture. No other interpretation can be put on it. The provisions of the amendment run counter to the basic philosophy of the provisions in the indenture. For that reason, the amendment is entirely unacceptable to the Government. I should think that the honourable member opposite would not be at all surprised to hear that.

Let us look at the provisions. I have already pointed out during earlier debate that clause 10 of the indenture provides a protection which is superior to that which is in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. The codes that are invoked in the indenture are those established by the International Commission for Radiation Protection, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia. Further, they incorporate the ALARA principle, which means that the levels of radiation in the mining operation must be kept as low as is possibly achievable. Those codes incorporate the results of extensive discussions with the Commonwealth Government and all the State Governments of Australia, including the Victorian Government, which, as I said, was most vocal in insisting on this sort of provision.

To insert on top of that a requirement that the joint venturers must conform to any standard that may be prescribed by any Government at any time in the future would be to insert that degree of uncertainty and capriciousness that the whole philosophy of the indenture sought to remove.

The idea of the radiation and control clauses was to safeguard the health of workers. In relation to special requirements and further knowledge, the example used by the honourable member concerned the thalidomide tragedy. Anyone would admit that from time to time mistakes are made in the development of drugs. However, the effects of radiation have now been studied for a very long time, and a great deal more is known now than was known years ago when mining of this nature was first undertaken. Some very serious mistakes were made in the past.

Also, the indenture prescribes that any further changes to the prescribed codes must be implemented. By the way, that does not occur in the Yeelirrie indenture, which has been mentioned. The existing codes without the ALARA principle are the ones that apply to the Yeelirrie Western Australian indenture. I am not saying that that necessarily makes it right, but I am pointing out that one of the qualifications here is that any variation to those codes in the light of further knowledge (it may be a relaxation—there is a suggestion from some quarters that maybe the codes are too conservative) must be accommodated in the future.

To insert this element of complete uncertainty as to what any State Government may do in the future would be to insert the element that the joint venturers, I believe rightly, sought to lay out in the ground rules. No company will commit itself to vast expenditure if the ground rules can be changed without its having any knowledge at all of what future Governments might seek to do to it. In other words, this clause could be used to close a company down if a Government so chose.

The standards that have been chosen are recognised in Australia and internationally and comprise the basic material in radiation protection legislation adopted around Australia. Such provisions have been adopted in this indenture with further more stringent provisions.

As to the second part of the amendment, all of these matters canvassed must by law be addressed in the e.i.s. procedures, procedures which the Labor Government had the major hand in establishing in the first instance, I might point out. They must be to the satisfaction of the Governments, both State and Federal, of whatever complexion those Governments may be.

In relation to proposed clause 8 (3), no ground rules are spelt out. This gives any Minister of Health who happens to be anti uranium mining the means of closing down the mine. I do not argue about the penalty, because that is subsidiary to subclause (3). There is no point in arguing about it because subclause (3) would effectively sabotage what is sought to be done in the indenture in laying down predictable ground rules.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Not long ago, we had a Minister of Health called the Hon. Peter Duncan, the member for Elizabeth, and there were quite a number of members of the public, including the present Leader of the Opposition, who have cause for concern in relation to some of his views.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You've got the most Machiavellian mind I've ever come across.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I cannot help it if the honourable member does not agree with what I am saying; I am stating what I believe to be fact. In relation to proposed clause 8a, the Health Commission will be establishing a register and will be monitoring epidemiological study in relation to the workers of this site. As Sir Edward Pochin pointed out, this mine could well attract world attention not only in terms of the mining operation but in terms of safety procedures which will be put in place.

We have dealt at some length with the question of workers compensation. In relation to proposed clause 8c, again there is talk about an inquiry—nothing about how the inquiry will be conducted and what it will lead to. If we set up an inquiry, to whom does it report? What action follows? There is no definition at all in relation to the inquiry, but the e.i.s. is a precise definition of an inquiry and the procedure which must be followed. The public participation in that e.i.s. procedure is precisely set out in terms of both State law and Federal requirements.

The final proposed clause 8d is the king hit; it really makes sure that the torpedo hits the mark. It provides:

> Notwithstanding any provision of the indenture, no special mining lease shall be granted unless the Governor—

which of course means the Government—

> concurs in the granting of the special mining lease.

That brings uncertainty into this deal, despite the whole basis of negotiations and the large expenditure on feasibility and design. I would be surprised if the honourable member has not heard Sir Arvi Parbo publicly testify to the fact that, unless there is some security and the joint venturers know that the tenement is secure, no way will they spend further money on this project.

Before the select committee, evidence was adduced to this effect from both joint venturers. In fact, I can recall illustrations provided by the spokesman for BP, Mr Ken Keep. Both joint venturers were quite unanimous in stating that, if this degree of security is not there, if this tenement can be denied them after they have spent another $50 000 000 (making $100 000 000 in all), and after incurring further expense, it is just not on. That has been repeated by the joint venturers. This amendment is the king hit. All of the Opposition's amendments will make the operation an uncertain proposition. They will give a capricious Government or a Minister the ability to close down this operation, despite the other ground rules contained in the indenture. This is the amendment that puts a seal on it. I do not know how much debate this proposed clause will generate, but it will sink the indenture. I am quite sure that in his heart of hearts the honourable member opposite knows that from statements made before the select committee. This amendment will sink the whole project. It means that the Government has wasted a year of hard negotiation in hammering out a successful deal for the public of South Australia. All I can say is that the Government must totally reject this amendment because it amounts to a rejection of the indenture.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will not take very much time, but a couple of points need to be made, and I will try to make them quickly. First, I did not think that I would ever hear a Minister of Mines and Energy say that he did not believe in the present provisions of the Mining Act, which he administers. That is all that is contained in the last proposed clause the Minister was attacking. That provision normally applies, especially in relation to an application for a special mining lease when the Minister either grants or disallows an application. That is all that should apply in this case. I do not know why the hell the Minister described that as a torpedo. Obviously, if that is the case, the Mining Act must contain a torpedo.

What has really amazed me throughout this debate and during the discussion of this Bill by the Minister tonight and at other times is that the Minister is supposed to be looking after the interests of the people of South Australia. However, time and time again when defending his actions or his statements he has put forward what the joint venturers want, not what the people of South Australia want or what the Government should want in looking after the interests of the people. We are constantly told that this is what the joint venturers want. I have no quarrel with the joint venturers for wanting that. The Minister should look at it from the State's point of view. That is what he is there for, but he does not seem to be able to do that.

During a select committee hearing, I instituted one or two questions and the Minister as Chairman stated that initially the Government wanted a much simpler document than the indenture now before the Parliament. They are not my words but the Minister's words to the select committee. However, the indenture is in its present detailed form because of the requirements of the joint venturers. Who won the battle? Obviously the Minister lost and he is going down the tube along with it to the end. The Minister will not accept simple, straightforward amendments. He has not adduced one argument to show why the amendments should not be accepted by the Committee and by the Government, except to say that they contain a torpedo. The torpedo cited by the Minister is simply the requirement of his own Act.

[Midnight]

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me point out to the honourable member a few fundamental facts. Why do we embark on the business of writing indentures? Indentures are entered into when one is contemplating a major project. Sometimes it is agreed that projects proceed without indentures. The Dow Chemical Company required an indenture in relation to the Redcliff petro-chemical plant, and the Labor Party was well down the track in negotiating an indenture despite the fact that e.i.s. procedures had not been completed at the beginning of negotiations.

One cannot talk about the ordinary application of the Mining Act. I refer to the Honeymoon uranium operation.

That is a small operation by world standards and an indenture is not required in regard to the Honeymoon project because the sums involved are not such that there is enormous capital at risk.

Indentures are special pieces of legislation which are not peculiar to this State but they cover the ground rules when large developments are contemplated. It is not a matter of me, as Minister, giving in to the joint venturers—it is a matter of me, as Minister, coming to terms with reality. It is a question of whether or not we want this project.

The plain facts are that we negotiated over a year to develop this indenture, and they were hard-fought negotiations. The fact is that without the indenture there would be no project. Honourable members must come to terms with that. Either members opposite choose to believe Sir Arvi Parbo and the British Petroleum board or they do not. They are saying that without an indenture and ground rules there is no project.

The honourable member opposite must come to terms with either choosing at this stage to provide an indenture which gives some degree of security or accepting that there will be no project. It is not a matter of the Government's giving in. If the honourable member and the Opposition do not believe those people, that is their prerogative. I was convinced about those facts. I believe that if the majority of South Australians saw Sir Arvi Parbo, who happens to be one of the straightest men that I have dealt with—

Mr Keneally: You mix in poor company!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I deal with many honourable people. If the Opposition chooses not to believe me, that is its prerogative. A plain statement has been made.

Mr Keneally: He has commercial responsibility to get the best deal he can for the companies he represents.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: My responsibility as Minister is to get the best deal I can for the people of South Australia. I was chided by members of the Opposition for not rushing this indenture in because we hung out for clauses in relation to power and water which would not cost the rest of the taxpayers one red cent. Compare that with the efforts of the Labor Party to attract the much vaunted petro-chemical plant—it really did give the game away. The reason why negotiations were so protracted was that the Government and I, as Minister, hung out for conditions which we believed were highly favourable to the public of South Australia, yet I was chided by the Leader of the Opposition for not rushing in the indenture because he said we were having trouble with the power and water clauses.

What does the Opposition want? It can choose to believe or disbelieve the joint venturers. The fact is that if there is no indenture there is no project. That is what the joint venturers are saying—it is not a question of giving in but a question of saying that after a year of hard bargaining we came up with an indenture which we believe is highly advantageous when compared to other indentures written around this nation, particularly those written by the Labor Party. It is highly advantageous to the South Australian public.

We could talk about the gas contracts again if we wanted to get into the negotiating ability of the Labor Party. We could get into the Redcliff indenture, the Riverland Cannery or the Clothing Factory. We could get into 101 problems that this Government inherited. Either members opposite choose to believe the joint venturers or they choose not to believe them. The plain fact has been stated categorically: no indenture, no ground rules—no project. That is not me going to bat for the joint venturers—it is me stating the facts as I see them.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Minister tell me whether or not he has discussed any of the amendments that I am moving tonight with the joint venturers?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, the amendments have been sent to the joint venturers and I have discussed them with representatives here and with the principals in Melbourne.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Minister tell the Committee whether there was any agreement with part of the amendments, all of them, or was it a total blank refusal? Can we have more information on this topic?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think the summation which I gave to the Committee (and I choose to believe the joint venturers again) gives their view as to the uncertainties which would be introduced into the indenture.

Mr Keneally: You think?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know. What I told the Committee I was told by the joint venturers. They agreed with my summation.

Mr HEMMINGS: I refer to the amendment dealing with the register and the special workers compensation legislation. The Minister has gone to great lengths to tell the Committee that this indenture is going to be for the benefit of the Government and the people of this State. I am tempted to think that the Minister is not the least bit interested in the workers of this State. The Minister has rejected the idea that a register should be maintained of all workers in the mining, milling and other associated work in regard to uranium. He said that the Minister of Health will be looking at the matter. I remind members of another Minister in this Government who was dealing with this matter in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. At that time the Minister of Health said that it would be inappropriate for a register to be maintained. Yet, we have this Minister saying that the Minister of Health will be keeping a register or enacting regulations to maintain a register. Whom can we believe—the Deputy Premier or the Minister of Health?

Mr Keneally: That's a tough one.

Mr HEMMINGS: It is a tough one because they are both able to stand on their feet and say one thing and not mean it. If the Minister wants to check *Hansard* I suggest he look at page 3732, without checking up with his assistants. Nowhere in this indenture has anyone been bothered about worker protection. It has been skirted around, and when talked about in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill it was to be enacted by regulation. So far there has been no regulation. Now the Minister is saying that the Minister of Health will look into it. What the Opposition asks, as part of his amendment, is that a register be maintained.

Let us cast our minds back to the problems at Radium Hill, when my colleague the member for Elizabeth, who was Minister of Health at that time, tried to obtain a check. It was then found that no records were kept whatsoever. In fact, there was an indication that records were destroyed.

The Opposition asks that a record be kept dealing with special workers compensation. The United Kingdom has passed legislation which gives that protection to workers in the uranium industry. Why can this not happen here? Why is this Minister always saying that it is all for the good of the State, but then is not prepared to do anything for those people who are going to work in mining in the uranium industry?

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That's nonsense.

Mr HEMMINGS: Where is there anything in this indenture which says that workers will be protected in the case of any accident? All that the Minister has said is that normal workers compensation will apply. It is all very well for members opposite, who in their safe seats are promoting the mining of uranium, to say that it is good. Members opposite do not want to go out there: the poor worker who will go out there and mine it needs protection, but members opposite are not prepared to give it to the worker. The

normal provisions of workers compensation will not be sufficient for those people working at Roxby Downs.

What happens if a person working at Roxby Downs after 10 years contracts cancer? There is no provision in the Workers Compensation Act to protect him. The Minister knows that, and those people on the back benches know it. There will be no way that that person will be protected, and the Minister only 10 minutes ago said that this indenture was for the good of the State. Let the Minister say that the worker will be protected. We went through this exercise on the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. The worker was not protected then, and he is not being protected now. All I want is for the Minister to stand up and say that any person who works at Roxby Downs will be protected. He is yet to say it, but I do not think that he is game enough to say it. In fact, I do not think that he cares. All he is worried about is getting the Bill through this House tonight.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have put up with some insults in this place, but for the member to suggest that I do not care is one of the worst insults that have been levelled at me. It is plainly insulting and scurrilous of him to suggest that I do not care about what happens to people who work in this State. It is one of the most scurrilous comments that have ever been made in this place in relation to my character. Many people have worked for me from time to time in a very small way. I have never expected anyone to do what I myself have not been prepared to do. That is one rule I have applied in my small role as an employer: I have never asked any man to do what I myself am not prepared to do.

Mr Keneally: There's very little you are not prepared to do.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member might think I have not done much, but I have done a few things in my life. For the honourable member to sit there with that smug grin and insult me in that fashion is like my saying precisely the same thing about him. That was plainly insulting to me, and I took it as such. The whole thrust of clause 10 was to make it as tough as we possibly could so as to ensure the health of these workers. The honourable member may not choose to believe me. Let him call Dr Wilson, of the Health Commission, a liar. The Chairman of this committee asked Dr Wilson point blank, 'Is the health of these workers protected?' and the unequivocal answer was 'Yes'. Dr Wilson is better qualified to make judgments than this smart alec is or than I am.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I get stirred when people cast aspersions about my character. People in the gallery can do what they like but I take insults from members about my character and take them personally occasionally. This is one such occasion. For a fellow to say that I do not care about my fellow man is about as insulting as he could get. A register of workers will be kept.

Mr Hemmings: When?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It has started now.

Mr Hemmings: You said 'No'.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister of Health said it would be like this amendment asking for a national register of all workers in South Australia. There will be a register kept of workers at Roxby Downs. It is impossible for the South Australian Health Commission to keep a register across Australia, and that is what the Minister has said.

Mr Mathwin: And they know it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course they damned well know it, bloody hypocrites.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I am sure that you clearly heard the Deputy Premier describe members of the Opposition as bloody hypocrites. I submit to you that that particular use of the English language is unparliamentary, and I ask you to judge that way and take the necessary action.

The CHAIRMAN: I would suggest to the Deputy Premier that he should withdraw the words that he uttered.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will take back 'bloody'. I do not usually use that language.

Mr KENEALLY: I take a further point of order. I ask you to request the Deputy Premier to take back the words 'bloody hypocrites'. 'Bloody' is surely unparliamentary, and 'hypocrites' is a direct reflection on members of the Opposition. The Deputy Premier should not impute such motives to the Opposition, and I ask you to rule accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Deputy Premier has withdrawn the word that was unparliamentary. I take it that the honourable member for Stuart is objecting to the Deputy Premier's using the word 'hypocrites'. It is not unparliamentary but, if the Deputy Premier cares, I will ask him to withdraw it.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am happy to withdraw it. I hope that the member will not make imputations about my character such as he made earlier. I took extreme exception to that, as he knows. I refer now to the relevant quotation from *Hansard* that he obviously did not pick up when he was quoting the Minister of Health. As reported at page 3733 of *Hansard* of 30 March, the Minister said:

> I stress that the commission is strongly in favour of the establishment of a national registry for uranium workers as soon as possible, as was recommended by the uranium select committee. While the commission will maintain health and radiation records for uranium workers in South Australia, it will be important to pool the information from all States for future epidemiological studies.

That is as plain as the nose on the honourable member's face. We have been through the question of workers compensation and common law claims. If, after 10 years, a worker finds that he has contracted some disease and at any time during the immediately preceding six years there has been some contributory factor to that disease, he has a common law claim. I invite the honourable member to go to Roxby Downs and talk to these poor, downtrodden, exploited workers for whom he has this feigned concern. If he does that, I am sure he will find that they are entirely satisfied with their working conditions and the safety measures that have been implemented to the strictest of codes according to this legislation, even before it has come before the Parliament.

Mr HEMMINGS: I am quite used to the abuse of the Minister. In fact, I would perhaps classify him as the Uriah Heep of the House.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Mr Nice Guy, he would say.

Mr HEMMINGS: He always claims to be Mr Nice Guy, but I put him in the class of the Dickens character Uriah Heep.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not think it is necessary to trade personal insults across the Chamber. It certainly will not assist the Committee and I ask the member for Napier to relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr Mathwin: You asked for it—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr Mathwin: You will get it back again—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr HEMMINGS: I always think that we on this side cop it and, when we try to return it, we get the Chair telling us we should not trade insults.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope that the honourable member for Napier is not reflecting upon the Chair.

Mr HEMMINGS: Never, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: I suggest he not continue in that vein or I will take appropriate action under Standing Orders.

Mr HEMMINGS: I would not dream of it, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest to the honourable member that he not endeavour to make sarcastic remarks that in any way reflect upon the Chair or the judgment of the Chair. The Chair endeavours at all times to make sure that every member is treated fairly in this Committee. The honourable member for Napier.

Mr HEMMINGS: When I rose to speak on this clause I was talking about the protection of workers. Nothing in this indenture deals with the safety of workers. The Minister can say that I should see those 200 people working at Roxby Downs now, and say that those poor workers are not being protected. That is not the issue. The issue is whether they are being protected against the dangers that exist. We all know, and this argument has been expounded from this side of the House many times before, that there are people who are prepared to mine uranium because of the large sums of money they can earn.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: There are people who drive nitro trucks.

Mr HEMMINGS: That is right. We are not talking about money but about hidden dangers. Again, I turn to the Radiation Protection Bill. In all the amendments that the Opposition moved to that Bill there was not one answer from the Minister of Health to say that the workers were being protected. The Minister said that that protection would come from regulation or was within the mining code.

The Minister of Mines and Energy is saying the self same thing. We have a simple amendment dealing with a register to be maintained and another dealing with workers compensation. I asked those people be protected and the Minister suddenly went spare. I thought someone might have given him something, because I did not really say anything. The Minister gave me a complete diatribe, but he did not give me that assurance. All I am seeking is an assurance from the Minister who is in charge of this Bill, and who in effect is in charge of the safety of those people who are going to work in mining (if it ever proceeds, and God hope it never does). Let him give an assurance to this Parliament and to the people of South Australia that the health of the people working there will be protected. That is all I am asking. But the Minister will not give that assurance. He hides behind the fact that he has been maligned, insulted, and everything else. I remember that, when he was on the Opposition benches, he insulted every Minister and every member on our side.

Mr Keneally: Viciously.

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, very viciously. He and the Minister of Industrial Affairs were the two members who entered into character assassinations—and he is protected because he is the Deputy Premier.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member should not continue in that vein. From his comments, I understand that I am protecting the Minister.

Mr HEMMINGS: Not you, Sir. I seek a simple assurance from the Minister that, although he is opposed to these simple amendments dealing with worker protection, those people who work in that area will be protected. That is all I want.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would suggest that the honourable member read the codes referred to in clause 10 and in regard to radiation protection, because those codes require that a register be kept. The codes were established, as I have said *ad nauseam* in this debate, as a joint consultative effort between all Australian Governments, including Labor Governments and the Federal Government, to protect the health of workers in industry that involves radiation and in particular the mining of radioactive ores. The honourable member has the assurance of the South Australian Health Commission and of the people who drew up those codes. I suggest that he read the codes, because the assurance that he seeks is there. It is required that a register be kept.

Mr McRAE: I have stated previously most of my substantive remarks in relation to new clause 8b, but I want to add one or two points. First, I do not think that the Minister was being fair dinkum with the Committee, the community or the workers in the answer that he gave. Distinguished advisers are present tonight, and there can be no doubt whatever that the honourable gentleman understands the difference between workers compensation and common law damages. There can be no doubt whatever that the honourable gentleman understands the thrust of the Opposition's attack on the deficiencies of this Bill. I did not receive an answer on the last occasion that was in any way satisfactory.

The Minister said that there will be rockfalls in any mine, and that is agreed. He also said that in any mine, there will be propping or staging that may be incorrect, and that is also agreed. However, the Minister did not allude in any way to the fact that this is a special mine, unlike any of the mines hitherto operated in South Australia, with the exception, I guess, of the Radium Hill mine. I referred on the last occasion to the primitive United Kingdom situation. That is not a reflection on the ordinary British person, but on the United Kingdom Parliament, which is made up of a club of people who come from public schools, who all speak in the same strange dialect, which appeals to them, who all gather together to protect each other, with no particular interest in the benefits that should and could come to the workers.

I am talking about South Australia in the year 1982, and I want an assurance from the Minister that we will have fair dinkum protection. Surely that is not too difficult a request to make. It is a vital request. If this thing is to proceed, it is the duty of the Labor Party to ensure that workers will be protected. I am not in the least convinced by arguments by the Minister about his seeing a jolly group of 200 people up there happy to encounter all sorts of dangers. No doubt those people up there took advantage of the situation of the mining companies offering very high wages, being prepared to take the risk commensurate with it.

That philosophy in Australia went out 50 years ago. It should be remembereed that it was only 50 years ago that mining and construction companies were saying to arbitration commissions and were being granted, to the everlasting disgrace of those commissions, that dangers should be accepted by the workers and that it was too bad if they were, as only some paltry figure was paid out in workers compensation. Do members realise that a widow of a worker in one of these mines would receive the magnificent sum of $25 000 at this point of time? That is the sum that would be received, and that is a disgrace. It would be a disgrace if I, on behalf of the Opposition, in regard to industrial matters, were to let this go unchallenged on this occasion.

It is of great interest to me to note that the various interests supporting the Minister and his Government appear to have spent $20 000 or $30 000 on newspaper advertisements. Honourable members would have seen them; they cover whole pages of the *Advertiser* and whole pages of the *News* and have little clip-out sections. I made a check today to ascertain how many of those clip-out sections have actually arrived at Parliament House, and I was told that there were 200. I point out that that is 200 from the whole South Australian community. Indeed, of that 200 a number was received in one large package. In other words, it was a set-up.

I reflect on no-one except those people who were part of the last campaign in 1979 and who now appear to be part of this campaign. Those people cannot hold their heads

high. I want to say now that the Labor Party made a drastic mistake in 1979: it did not do anything at the time, but it waited until later before urging its members to boycott the publication known as the *News*. For my part, I now indicate to the Parliament that my family and I for 40, 50 or 60 years—I am not sure—have lived (and I did so for most of my life) in the electorate that is now very reputably and honestly represented by the honourable member for Mitchell and, before him, the Hon. Mr Virgo.

For my part, I shall cancel my trading arrangements with the Myer Emporium. I will also send out letters to people in my sub-branch to make them face up to reality. Never again will I see the situation where retaliation comes afterwards. I am sick and tired of these sycophants from the Liberals who are putting in these advertisements in the midst of dirty deals with the *Advertiser* and the *News*. You, Sir, know very well that I have got strong evidence of that. I have raised it in the Parliament before. Because the Myer Emporium has a running deal with the *News*, it gets a 50 per cent discount with that paper, and it then trades it off to other people. That was the way in which Adrian Brien, or was it—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant with the honourable member for Playford. I suggest that he concentrate his remarks on the amendment. Also, I wish that the member for Stuart would conduct his conversation in lower tones. I suggest to the member for Playford that he not continue in this way, as he is out of order.

Mr McRAE: I want to link my remarks in this fashion, by saying that I am demanding that the workers of South Australia get a fair go. I am saying that certain sycophants of the Liberal Party, in an obvious deal with the Minister and the Liberal Party, are now running a campaign, although they are not doing it very well. I would like to demonstrate to some of these people that the workers of South Australia, in the broad, do not like it.

I am indicating this through you, Sir, to the Parliament and to the community of South Australia, and then I will embark on a much larger campaign. If I were to attack the retail traders, that would mean nothing. I will cancel all my dealings with Myer, and I will make sure that the whole of my family does the same. I will then ask my sub-branch members to do the same. I will suggest then to the Labor Party that they do the same, and in that way the message might get through to the retail traders that we, the members of the Opposition and the workers whom we support, will not be black-mailed in this fashion, because we have been black-mailed before. You, Sir, well know that it became apparent in this very Chamber that a certain Adelaide businessman, Adrian Brien, was selling Ford motor vehicles—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is nothing in the amendment dealing with Ford motor vehicles. I therefore request the honourable member to link his remarks to the amendment moved by the member for Mitchell.

Mr McRAE: Let me put it this way: if a worker employed on a mine died, his widow would at the moment receive $25 000. I ask what is the cost of one of those advertisements. I accept that the cost will be discounted 50 per cent because of the actions of the retail traders, such as Myer and others. I notice that my colleague is looking at some very large press advertisements. It appears to me that they come from Serv-Wel, so I guess there is a discount of 10 per cent. The people behind these advertisements are spending $10 000 a day on this campaign, whereas a human being is worth $25 000. Is that worth a joke or a cheap laugh by Government members? It is not worth a damn cheap laugh to me, because I recently acted for a widow with two children whose husband died in tragic circumstances and who stood to receive 25 000 lousy dollars. The people behind this advertising campaign are all millionaires. They are prepared to go along with the Minister in saying that they will not even go as far as the U.K. legislation. They will not be fair dinkum about this and will not acknowledge that there is an added risk in this industry.

I have never accepted that mining as a venture should be treated as are other ventures. On the contrary, in my earlier contribution I indicated that certain occupations are traditionally hazardous and should be treated as such. Can members opposite seriously say that the mining of these substances does not present an added danger? I would have to go further than that—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that the member for Playford has been speaking for 15 minutes.

Mr McRAE: Mr Chairman, are you asking me to resume my seat?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, the honourable member has been speaking for 15 minutes.

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. I understood that we were treating the whole amendment *in globo*. I believe that one of my colleagues spoke at much greater length.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As mover of the amendment, the member for Mitchell had unlimited time. Under Standing Orders, any other member is entitled to speak on three occasions for 15 minutes. The honourable member has already spoken for 15 minutes. He is entitled to speak again after the Chair has called another member to speak.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Playford has gone into a discussion of workers compensation legislation in general. If someone is killed at work under any conditions, whether it be at this mine or elsewhere, the amounts prescribed under the provisions of the Workers Compensation Act will apply. I point out that the present Government recently moved amendments to increase payments significantly over and above those that applied during the previous Labor Administration, as a member of which the honourable member was one of the chief spokesmen on workers compensation. Even though he was not a member of that Administration's Ministry, he was quite often consulted by the Minister of Labour and Industry (in fact he sat behind him) to prime him in relation to workers compensation legislation which came before this Chamber. No-one denies the member for Playford's interest or ability in relation to this matter.

The honourable member's statements apply to any unfortunate death in relation to workers compensation. Recently, we had several tragic deaths when some ETSA workers fell to their death during the construction of a pylon. No-one is suggesting that their lives are worth $25 000. In circumstances such as that, the courts award what they believe is an appropriate sum to the dependants of a deceased's family.

The honourable member made the point that it is a special mine. It is special in the sense that there is no other mine in South Australia of that magnitude. In fact, there is none other in Australia like this mine. I think the honourable member is alluding to the fact that this is a special mine because uranium is dispersed in the ore body.

What makes the provisions of this indenture special is clause 10. If uranium were not a component of the ore body, clause 10 would not appear in this legislation. Clause 10 includes the special provision to cover the special feature which occurs in this mine in the circumstances to which the honourable member has alluded. I have also pointed out at length to other members of the Committee that clause 10 is tougher than the clause which applies in the Radiation Protection and Control Bill. It contains provisions which are there to ensure the health of workers to the best of our knowledge in relation to any hazard that may be encountered as a result of the uranium content in the mine.

All the other matters to which the honourable member has referred are in the general discussion of the provisions, adequate or otherwise, of the workers compensation legislation. By implication, I guess that he is talking about the adequacy of the common law to see that suitable redress is available. Again, I point to the clear evidence of the Health Commission in relation to clause 10, the special clause in the legislation because this is a special mining operation in that sense, and in that sense only. I think that the member for Flinders pointed out that by world standards, the uranium concentration is low. The readings encountered during the monitoring of the sinking of the Whennan shaft have been low compared with what are the standards accepted by those codes. I can only repeat that the evidence before the select committee was to the effect that the provision for workers in relation to this special feature in this special mine was adequate to ensure their wellbeing and safety.

Mr McRAE: I will wind up at this point because it is obvious that I am getting nowhere. I am appalled that in what we regard as an enlightened country—in fact, what I regard as the most enlightened State in the most enlightened country in the Western world—that we are still trying to grope our way up to the United Kingdom standard of 20 years ago when that country provided automatic liability at common law for 30 years. We have reached the stage where we have to crawl up into the gutter or something below what the United Kingdom, that benighted country, when it comes to dealing with workers, it managed to achieve 20 years ago. I am appalled.

This is really a dangerous game of dice. What the Minister is really saying is that the dice will be loaded so that, if there is a risk, the worker and his widow and dependants, will take that risk, not the consortium, this famous thousand million dollar consortium, or the Government but the worker and his family and dependants. If the Minister can go to bed with a clear conscience with all that load on his shoulders, so be it, but I will do everything through the forums of the Party, the Caucus room and Parliament to remedy that situation. I hope very much that within the next six months my colleague the member for Mitchell, in acquiring his proper new title, will deal with the matter far more adequately and far more justly. I have little doubt that he will.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne (teller), Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hamilton, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Billard, Chapman, and Rodda.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 12), indenture and title passed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): It is a great pity that at the third reading stage the Bill has reached the House in the state that it is in. I believe that the Bill would have benefited considerably from having had a new clause 8 inserted in it and not the present clause that is now contained in the Bill.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. As I understand it, the third reading debate must be strictly addressed to the Bill as it comes out of Committee, and reminiscences in relation to what may have happened to the Bill are not in order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. However, I must indicate that although it is unusual for the Chair to stop a sentence in mid-flight, the Chair will not tolerate a tirade about matters which are not contained in the final Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I hasten to assure you, Mr Speaker, that I was not going to launch into a tirade. I believe that at the time I was speaking in quite a reasonable manner, in contrast to some of the behaviour I saw from the Minister earlier this evening while the Bill was getting to the third reading stage. The point I wish to make is that the Bill, in its present form, will not provide for certain protections which the Opposition believes should be included in the Bill. The areas that are not in the Bill and should be there are clear. They are the areas of worker safety, decent humane provisions for the future health—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member gave an indication to the Chair that he recognised the spirit of the third reading debate, and I now ask him to come to a consideration of the Bill as it arrives from the Committee.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Certainly. I am endeavouring to do that. It seems to be my night—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —to figure somewhat in efforts by members on the other side to curtail my speaking to the Bill before us, but the Bill we are now asked to pass at the third reading has a clause 8, which sets out certain requirements that, to my way of thinking, are inadequate, even though they are in the Bill at the third reading stage. The provisions in that clause do not go nearly as far as they should have gone.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be fully conversant with the practice. We are dealing with the Bill as it exists, not philosophising on what it may have been. I ask the honourable member to come back to the third reading of the Bill as it is.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne (teller), Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Billard, Chapman, and Rodda. Noes—Messrs Corcoran, Hamilton, and O'Neill.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.8 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 9 June at 2 p.m.