HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 October 1983

The SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: PATAWALONGA CHANNEL

A petition signed by 168 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to make an urgent commitment to dredge the Patawalonga channel, provide a safe all-weather passage for marine craft, and announce planned commencement dates was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

PETITION: FUEL TAX INCREASES

A petition signed by 3 059 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge both the Federal and State Governments to withdraw the recent fuel tax increases and not reintroduce the charge for at least two years was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: FUEL EQUALISATION SCHEME

A petition signed by 695 residents of Eyre Peninsula praying that the House urge the Government to implement a State fuel equalisation scheme was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

PETITION: BIRDS

A petition signed by 94 aviculturists and bird fanciers of Lower Eyre Peninsula praying that the House reject any proposed legislation or regulation that will ban the keeping of exotic and imported species of birds under avicultural conditions was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the following schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 72, 142, 157, 171, 173, 177, 182, 183, 196 and 200; and I direct that the following answer to a question without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*:

NATIONAL PARKS

In reply to **Mr LEWIS** (14 September).

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: With regard to the four areas recommended for purchase in a report by the South-East Wetlands Committee and detailed in an article in the *Advertiser* on Monday 12 September, the following action has been taken to notify the people concerned.

Butchers and Salt Lakes

The owner of this property was notified on Friday 6 May 1983 and agreement has now been reached to purchase the land.

Poocher Swamp

The owner of this property was also notified on Friday 6 May 1983 and negotiations to purchase this area are well advanced.

Naen Naen Swamp (Park)

Preliminary discussions and correspondence with the owner of this property commenced on Tuesday 16 February 1982. A formal approach to negotiate purchase was made on Thursday 10 March 1983 and negotiations are currently continuing with the owner and his agent. Although the entire propery may be known as Naen Naen Park, negotiations are currently for the swamp area only, which runs north-south through the centre of the section and covers at least a third of the property. Consequently this area has been classified as Naen Naen 'swamp' rather than 'park'.

Hundred of Waterhouse—Section 328

The Wetlands Committee wrote to the owner of this property on Thursday 5 May 1983 requesting permission to inspect the property and to hold discussions. The owner declined permission and no further action has been taken to date with regard to the purchase of this land.

NORTHFIELD LOW SECURITY ACCOMMODATION

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Northfield Low Security Accommodation.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for the Arts (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
II. Museum Board—Report, 1982-83.
III. South-East Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
IV. Eyre Peninsula Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
V. Northern Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
VI. Riverland Regional Cultural Centre Trust—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
VII. State Opera of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
VIII. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.
IX. Art Gallery of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

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

I. Land Division hundred of Waikerie.
II. Land Division hundred of Monarto.
III. Parafield Gardens Primary School single transportable classroom.
IV. Construction of a garage at Noarlunga Community College.

By the Hon. G.F. Keneally, for the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Public Examinations Board—Auditor-General's Report on 1982-83.

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. R.G. Payne)—

Pursuant to Statute—

i. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories—Report, 1982-83.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

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

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

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

ii. Parks Community Centre—Report, 1982-83.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a short but very important statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In order that honourable members might be better—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That's next week.

The SPEAKER: Leave has been granted. The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The honourable member wanted to know what seat I am running for. I thought I would tell him that next week, not today. In order that members may be better informed as to the Government's intention with respect to the sittings of the House in 1984, I would like to advise members that it is anticipated that the House, at its rising on 8 December 1983, will adjourn to 20 March 1984. Dependent on progress, it is proposed that the session would continue until 10 May 1984. The Budget session will commence in either the last week of July or the first week of August. I hope that this advance information will be of assistance to the House.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LEVEL CROSSING ACCIDENT

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: On Thursday 20 October 1983, there were some incidents at level crossings on the Gawler line that gave rise to a question in the House from the member for Davenport, regarding what he referred to as the 'malfunction of the boom gates at these crossings'. At the time, I did not have sufficient information to give a considered reply to the question, and I undertook to report to the House on the matter. Apparently, between 7.30 a.m. and 8.20 a.m. on that day, a number of complaints were received by the State Transport Authority from the general public that level crossing lights and gates were operating continuously on the Gawler railway line.

Train Control carried out investigations and discovered that an Australian National ballast train was unloading ballast on the standard gauge between Islington and Mile End. This train departed Islington at 7.10 a.m. and cleared the Torrens Junction at 8.34 a.m. The presence of this slow-moving train on the rail circuit caused the level crossing warning devices at Bedford Avenue, Pimm Street, Torrens Road, and North Adelaide Station Road to operate for long periods. This activity caused major traffic delays at each of these level crossings during the course of the morning peak period. As there was no apparent train movement whilst the boom gates were lowered for long periods, some road vehicles illegally drove around the boom gates and crossed the railway line.

At 8.16 a.m. an A.N. light engine collided with a Bedford van owned by All Trans Transport Company at the Torrens Road level crossing at Ovingham. The vehicle was travelling from east to west on Torrens Road and the driver apparently attempted to negotiate the level crossing with the boom gates in the closed position. The driver was injured, however not seriously, and several suburban passenger services were delayed by the accident. The police had become aware of the delays at these intersections and were on the way to man the intersections when the accident occurred. An investigation showed that all level crossing boom gates and warning devices were operating correctly and there was no malfunctioning of this equipment at the time.

It was the presence of a slow-moving train on that section of track which had caused the gates to operate for longer periods of time. I have contacted Dr Williams (General Manager, Australian National) and received assurances that such ballasting operations will not be carried out in future during peak traffic periods. I am also writing to request that sufficient notification should be given to the State Transport Authority and traffic authorities of any future operations of this nature, so that appropriate manning of affected intersections can occur.

However, I would point out again that this was an isolated and unusual situation which we hope will not occur in the future, but there was no malfunction in the level crossing equipment and it was operating as designed at the time; and that it is illegal for vehicles to cross railway lines when boom gates or warning devices are operating. I would also point out to the public and warn them that they should obey all such level crossing control devices and wait until they signal a clear path, even if this should result in some inconvenience.

URGENCY MOTION: ROXBY DOWNS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

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

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir!

Mr OLSEN: I thank the house for its indulgence.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the honourable gentleman is now speaking to his rights rather than speaking to the motion. In that case, I will put the question. I hear no dissentent voice and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allowed for this motion be three hours.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN: I thank the House for its indulgence in this matter, and move:

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

This motion is about jobs for South Australia—investment in South Australia. It is about opportunities for our children and their children. It is about fighting for a project that will develop our resources to benefit all South Australians. More importantly, in the present circumstances, it is about fighting for the rights of this State to develop a project which is

clearly supported by the vast majority of South Australians. Exactly 12 months ago, on 25 October 1982, the Premier promised the people of South Australia that, if he was elected, the future of the Roxby Downs project would be guaranteed. He said this in his policy speech:

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

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

They have advanced the project to a vital stage in the feasibility study. All the indications so far are that this mine will rank with the largest in the world and will provide jobs for thousands of South Australians and double the export earnings of this State. No-one can now deny the significance of this project to South Australia and the nation. It has already run the gauntlet of exhaustive scrutiny by this Parliament during the ratification of the indenture. A comprehensive environmental impact statement has been produced by the joint venturers and approved by the South Australian and Federal Labor Governments.

All lights for the remainder of the feasibility work were green until last Friday, when media reports speculated (and the Premier subsequently confirmed) that Federal Cabinet would consider a six-month inquiry into the project. South Australia must stand strong and united against any further inquiry in this project. We must fight to ensure that the feasibility study can be completed by the end of 1984, as required by the indenture passed by this Parliament last year.

It has to be realised, because it must be firmly resisted, that, if the Federal Government does establish another inquiry, this will amount to a further move by Canberra to interfere with the rights of the States. An inquiry will delay the feasibility study which this Parliament has already required to be completed by the end of next year. The indenture would have to be amended because Canberra has gone back on its word. It will be another massive blow for the States, and this Parliament must fight it with all the reasons and all the resources it can muster.

In asking every member of this House to support my motion, I pose the question asked in the *News* editorial last Friday:

> How much longer does our viability have to be put at risk by those who refuse to face the economic and energy realities of the late twentieth century?

The Federal Labor member for Hawker (Mr Jacobi) repeats the very same question in the *News* today, in criticising those of his colleagues who seek to stop the Roxby Downs project. I do not believe that it is necessary in this debate to canvass safety issues. For the purposes of the Roxby Downs project, the Premier has indicated his Government's acceptance that those issues are resolved. He has said, often and unequivocally, that this project can and will go ahead.

In saying that, it has to be assumed that the Premier believes it is safe for the project to proceed from all points of view, whether they relate to worker safety in the initial mining stages or the end use of uranium for electricity generation in nuclear power plants. While this House and the people of South Australia must be ever vigilant about these questions, they are not central to this debate. What is central is the trust that the people of South Australia have put in us, as their elected representatives, to ensure that commitments made by both major Parties at the last election to the future of this project are honoured.

With the Premier's promise—his clear promise in his policy speech—that this project can and will go ahead under a Labor Government, a degree of bipartisanship unknown in recent years on the uranium question was achieved. It must be maintained. I ask the House to note that the Premier's election commitment was accepted by the people of South Australia as having been given on behalf of the whole of the Labor movement.

This meant that a future Federal Labor Government would be obliged to honour that commitment in terms of approving export licences for uranium mined at Roxby Downs, a responsibility exclusively the Commonwealth's. Mr Hawke, in statements before and after the last Federal election, has indicated in the clearest of terms that the Premier's promise at the last State election did commit the whole of the Labor Party and not just the South Australian Government. As recently as 2 September, the Prime Minister said this to the Business Council of Australia:

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

The Premier and I heard the Prime Minister give that assurance to the Business Council in Sydney. I welcomed it and until last Friday accepted it, as I am sure most South Australians did. Now, however, it appears that that assurance may have been worthless because an inquiry into the Roxby Downs project is being considered by Federal Cabinet. An inquiry means that the entire project is back in the melting pot.

This House must tell Federal Cabinet today, in no uncertain terms, that enough is enough. As well as the inquiries into this project in particular, the uranium industry generally in Australia has been the subject of numerous inquiries in recent years. None has recommended against uranium mining. All have advocated stringent safeguards to protect workers and to ensure the use of our uranium only for peaceful purposes. Those safeguards are now in place, and, particularly in relation to worker safety questions, this Parliament can hold its head high for having set new standards for Australia through the radiation protection legislation passed last year.

It is now time a stand was taken against those individuals and groups who ignore these facts in their never-ending, nonsensical, emotional rhetoric aimed at stopping uranium mining. Let me emphasise that I do not deny that many people hold genuine concerns about uranium mining. But, in the main, these concerns are founded on ill-informed public debate and baseless allegations by anti-uranium groups. And if an inquiry into the Roxby Downs project is established by the Federal Government, this will represent another victory for these groups, another defeat for common sense—and another sell-out for South Australia. We have already seen the Alice Springs to Darwin railway shunted into the siding of an inquiry. The Roxby Downs project must not meet the same fate. If we lose the fight against this inquiry the consequences for the future of the project could be disastrous.

A board member of Western Mining Corporation (Mr Keith Parry) has made a statement which must concern and alarm all South Australians who support the need for the sort of economic development and job opportunities that this project can generate. In the *Advertiser* last Saturday he said that, in the event of an inquiry, the joint venturers would have to seriously consider their position, and that present levels of investment in the project might not be maintained. Mr Parry is a forthright man, not given to over-reaction or exaggeration and, albeit a West Australian, is as anxious as is any South Australian to see this project proceed. But he is also a business man who must inevitably question the risk inherent in continuing to invest up to $3 million a month in a project which cannot obtain Government guarantees about its future.

The Executive Director of Western Mining (Mr Hugh Morgan) has echoed Mr Parry's concerns in *The Australian*

today. In raising questions about the future of the project, Mr Morgan has also expressed disappointment that his company has been told nothing officially about an inquiry. I ask honourable members whether they consider this to be fair treatment of companies which have acted responsibly. The joint venturers have invested much faith as well as funds in the future of South Australia. They are employing South Australians now, and they want to employ thousands more in the future. Their total investment at Roxby Downs now amounts to about $100 million. They must be given every encouragement to continue this investment so that the joint venturers are in a position by the end of next year to consider decisions about a start to production at the mine.

This House need be under no illusions about the importance of giving full Government support for this project and the uranium industry generally. With Government support the industry will develop, it will establish long-term markets and it will employ many South Australians. Western Mining Corporation, in an information paper published in August, stated:

> The main disadvantage under which intending Australian producers find themselves at present is the uncertain posture of the Federal Government as to its uranium policies.

Energy Resources of Australia Limited, the company developing the Ranger project, has expressed similar views. In the *Advertiser* last Friday, the Chairman of E.R.A. (Mr Morokoff) said:

> The lack of a clear policy from the new Federal Government towards the mining and export of uranium was creating an atmosphere of uncertainty in which planning was difficult.

In relation to future markets, he also said:

> Inquiries relating to new business are strong, and we are confident therefore that we can make additional sales.

An article in the 11 October issue of the *Bulletin* has also pointed to the improving market prospects for the industry. It stated:

> In this decade, we will have the opportunity to develop an industry generating export earnings of $1 billion a year as the world doubles its nuclear power dependence.

And to take advantage of these market opportunities, the industry needs Government support now—not the prospect of further uncertainty, because uranium which will be needed to fuel nuclear power plants in the 1990s has to be contracted for now.

This was a point the Premier ignored on his return from Japan. Saying that uranium was not a critical issue in Japan may be palatable to the left, but it ignores the reality that Japan looks to Australia as a secure, stable, long-term supplier of nuclear fuel, and wants our policy clarified now, so that long-term contracts can be negotiated, because the latest projections are that Japan will increase its nuclear generating capacity by about 70 per cent between now and 1990. That was the message I received in the Tokyo boardrooms I visited earlier this year. It was a message given in the interests of maintaining harmonious trade relations between Australia and Japan.

While those who oppose uranium can no longer claim that mining in Australia is not necessary and will not be viable because of lack of markets, let them also consider the stark reality of what their aims would achieve. A report commissioned by the Federal Government—the present Labor Government—reflects the views of various Government departments with responsibilities relating to uranium mining and export. These views are not coloured by political prejudice. The report has been prepared by technical people who are experts in various fields and who have weighed up all the pros and cons to give dispassionate advice to the Federal Government. On the question of any rejection of the nuclear fuel cycle by Australia, the report states that such a move would be unlikely to improve Australia's capacity to advance the cause of non-proliferation. Indeed, the report says that such a move, in all likelihood, would be counterproductive of the Government's efforts in regard to disarmament which ascribe a central importance to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The report also warned that, if the anti-uranium lobby has its way, it could have serious consequences for Australia's position as a supplier of other commodities. These are grave warnings to contemplate. The experts have advised the Federal Government that, should we withdraw as a supplier from the international nuclear fuel cycle—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. I wish to point out that, as usual, the Leader of the Opposition is reading a speech into *Hansard* instead of giving a speech off the cuff with the assistance of notes. I would ask you, Mr Speaker, to draw his attention to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to Standing Orders, but otherwise I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr OLSEN: The experts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is a very serious matter. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: The experts have advised the Federal Government—and I can understand the member for Elizabeth not liking a little bit of the home truth being exposed to the Parliament today—that should we withdraw as a supplier from the international nuclear fuel cycle, Australia would be recording a vote of no confidence in the international non-proliferation regime—a regime in which Australia has so far made a significant contribution to ensure strong and effective safeguards against diversion of nuclear fuel for non-peaceful purposes. Their report also raises the possibility of serious damage to Australia's reputation as a responsible and reliable economic partner, particularly with those countries, such as Japan, which require uranium to satisfy their long-term energy needs.

In view of the fact that members of the Federal Government have had this report before them for some weeks, it is alarming, to say the least, to consider the extent to which some Ministers are now backing away from previous commitments to the industry. The Prime Minister signalled the start of the retreat in the House of Representatives when he qualified his earlier commitment to the Business Council. On 21 September, Mr Hawke told Parliament:

> When I spoke to the Business Council of Australia I expressed my belief as to what would happen. It is still my belief. Of course, it is a matter for discussion.

Thus, what had previously been represented by Mr Hawke and the Premier as a cast-iron commitment to the future of the project under Federal and State Labor Governments has become, instead, a belief as to what would happen, a matter for discussion—in other words, a huge question mark.

In the Senate last week, the Minister for Resources and Energy (Senator Walsh) was equally hasty in his retreat. Last Wednesday, he admitted (and I quote from Federal *Hansard*):

> There is significant scope for differing interpretations of what is written in the Labor Policy platform on this matter.

His colleague Senator Button then interjected:

> An understatement.

The confusion arises from the fact that the Federal Labor conference last year in effect defined three classes of uranium. There is, according to the A.L.P., uranium mined before July last year, which is safe to export and use in nuclear reactors. There is uranium mined after that date, which is dangerous. There is also uranium from Roxby Downs, which

is either safe or dangerous depending on which faction of the A.L.P. is speaking at the time.

The decision of the A.L.P. Federal conference last year has been represented by the Premier as a green light for Roxby Downs. He was quoted in the *Weekend Australian* dated 10-11 July last year as saying:

> I feel that what we achieved at the conference has been all part of a defusing process and we now have a policy that can be properly administered by a Labor Government.

That is not what Federal Ministers are saying now, because they do not know themselves how that policy is to be administered. Instead, what the latest machinations within the Party seem to be about is seeking a compromise on last year's compromise. Nothing could be more destabilising to the future of the project, in particular, or for business confidence in general.

In these difficult economic times we need firm and decisive leadership, not further pandering to Party political factions. The former Liberal State Government emphasised before the last State election that the compromise at last year's Federal A.L.P. conference would allow the A.L.P. to take one attitude before an election and the opposite attitude afterwards.

The State Secretary of the A.L.P., Mr Schacht, has suggested publicly that the compromise did indeed have more to do with political expediency than the economic future of South Australia. In the *Advertiser* on 14 June Mr Schacht was reported as saying at the A.L.P. State convention that the Labor Party had decided not to oppose the Roxby Downs mine at the last State election for pragmatic reasons. He said:

> We want to win the election. The A.L.P. would have faced political oblivion in South Australia if it had opposed the mine. The compromise the Party had made over Roxby Downs had been well worth the cost.

The likelihood is now increasing that last year's so-called compromise was a marriage of temporary convenience rather than a long-term commitment to Roxby Downs. The main suitor for dissolution of the agreement is the member for Elizabeth.

In the *Advertiser* on 2 November last year (just four days before the last State election), the honourable member was quoted as saying that Roxby Downs would proceed under a Labor Government. He said that the project was a *fait accompli* in political terms and, referring to the Premier's promise that the project can and will go ahead, continued:

> Before he made that it was cleared with the State Executive and the Caucus. That's the policy and that's the policy that will stand.

But less than 12 months after supporting his Party Leader in such a clear and unequivocal manner, the member for Elizabeth has returned to his own ideological enclave as the leader of the left. He has put his name to an advertisement in the latest issue of the Australian Labor Party's official newspaper (the *Herald*) calling on the Federal Government to stop the project.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Along with a few others.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, I understand that the wife of the member for Unley and several members of the South Australian Executive of the A.L.P. have signed the advertisement. The member for Elizabeth has done so with complete impunity—without any thought for the people who have jobs now as a result of this project and the many more who will get jobs at Roxby Downs in the future. In stories in the *News* on 14 and 21 October, the honourable member gave obvious indications where his loyalties now lie, and they are not with the Premier, the Prime Minister or the people of South Australia. They line up more with the Victorian A.L.P.

In a resolution passed at the Victorian State conference of the A.L.P. at the weekend, the Victorian branch opposed the Roxby Downs project in specific terms, saying that any new uranium mine would seriously violate the spirit and letter of A.L.P. policy and provoke widespread dismay and hostility within the Party and the community at large. I hope that, in view of the great quantity of literature he has brought into the Chamber, the member for Elizabeth will clear up this matter when he speaks and give the House reasons for repudiating the commitment he gave before the last election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Leader of the Opposition will be heard in silence, and that includes the silence of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as well as that of every other member. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr OLSEN: Victoria may have no known uranium resources of economic value, but that is no reason for denying South Australia the opportunity to develop our resources. I regret that the member for Elizabeth has taken a line which is more sympathetic to the Victorian branch of his Party than that of his own State. On the face of it, he is a top qualifier for the 'Irrational blancmange'—the characterisation of the left by the Labor member for Kalgoorlie in the Federal Parliament (Mr Campbell). In his letter to his Caucus colleagues, dated 5 October, Mr Campbell had this to say about the left wing of the Party:

> It is my belief that the left has allowed itself to become an irrational blancmange, quivering in whatever mould the middle-class trendies have chosen to pour it.

Obviously, Mr Campbell believes the left has a soft underbelly. It is time the Prime Minister and the Premier attacked it before the member for Elizabeth and his supporters complete their act of adultery with the Roxby Downs project. The Premier must take a long handle to them and hit them out of this debate once and for all. They have had their oportunity to influence the Party and the people. They have failed to do so on previous occasions. Their final-over assault must be resisted by all those who want South Australia to win.

Support for this motion will demonstrate to Mr Hawke that the vast majority of South Australians want him to honour the commitments that he and the Premier have already given to the future of this project. These commitments have been particularly welcome in South Australia because, as a result of the determination of the former Liberal Government to give this project a chance (to give it a future), it is now generally recognised that the whole community can benefit. As well as jobs, the project will also generate income for the State which can build roads, schools and hospitals many hundreds of kilometres away from the mining action and will mean that the Government will have the capacity to meet community expectations. This Parliament has already put up one fight for this project.

Apparently, we now have to fight all over again. This is not a fight we can afford to shirk. It is a fight we can win because most members apparently agree with the expression of support for the project contained in the motion. I want the House to take particular note of the fact that in this motion or in my remarks I have not attacked the Premier's position. He has expressed his support in clear terms, and it has been in support of the project and against any inquiry. With his support and that of his Government and the majority of his Party colleagues for this motion, Canberra will be left under no illusions that, if it pursues the option for a further inquiry into this project, it will meet a bipartisan force of resistance, because this Parliament wants South Australia to win.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): In his opening remarks, the Leader of the Opposition told us that

this motion is about jobs, investment and opportunities for our children, but I would suggest that there is a good degree of humbug and hypocrisy in that. This motion is very much about politicking and attempting to sow disaffection and problems within the community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! From the very beginning I insisted that the Leader of the Opposition be heard in silence, and I make the same insistence concerning the Premier. There was provocation during the course of the honourable Leader's speech, and he must expect something in return.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Therefore, I would seriously question any attempt by the Opposition to dress up this motion as some kind of initiative in the interests of South Australians. In fact, I would suggest that the way in which the Liberal Party has chosen to treat this whole issue since the traumatic and tumultuous debate that occurred in relation to the indenture legislation last year has been—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —calculated to create just such a situation of public controversy as has shown itself in the past few days. The very doubts and uncertainties that the Opposition claims it is attempting to allay and says we must fight against are in fact generated, and have been consistently, by the way in which it has approached this project. The Leader of the Opposition said that the promise I made before the last election that Roxby Downs can and will go ahead under a State Labor Government had been accepted in good faith. I am glad to hear that, and I am glad to hear him put it on the record. It is the first time that I have heard him do so, and I suggest that it is at odds with what he and a number of his colleagues have said consistently over the past 10 or 11 months.

Statements were made, for instance, during the course of the demonstration blockade at Roxby Downs recently in which I understood the Opposition to be saying quite the opposite. In fact, the Opposition questioned and attacked the faith and attitude of my Government, so I am glad that that is on the record. In attempting to cut through what I believe is a lot of cant and humbug involved in this motion, or the means of moving it, let me say (and I make quite clear) that the general thrust of this motion—which, in some ways, is unnecessary because there is an acceptance of it—is one that my Government not only adopts but I believe has consistently expressed for some time. For instance, I do not need to have letters from the Leader of the Opposition (which, incidentally, I did not even get the courtesy of receiving before the major press release had been issued and the press conference called) to remind me of the importance of the project or our commitment to it.

In regard to the Leader of the Opposition's reference to the fact that we must support the project with will and reason, I point out that that is very much how the debate should be conducted. However, unfortunately, far too often members of the Opposition, and in particular the Deputy Leader (and we will probably get another vintage performance from him shortly) have ignored the aspect of reason by their language and by the way that they have talked about this project, having attempted to raise the political temperature and create dissension because they see themselves as deriving some political advantage from that.

This debate, or indeed the motion, is not about the uranium question or the uranium industry, and nor should it be, even though in speaking to the motion the Leader devoted much of his time to that matter. It is about the project at Olympic Dam, the Roxby Downs project, and South Australia's commitment to it and about what the Federal Government may or may not do in respect to that project. The broader questions of the uranium industry and the future of mines is something that will be determined in time. My Government has made quite clear its adherence to our Federal policy and our State policy in terms of executing that. We do not believe that in respect of new uranium mine developments there should be some open book, some head-long rush into this industry. We have made that clear. Australia has a very important moral, political, and social role to play on the international stage in this very crucial and sensitive area.

The divisions of opinion within our community are clearly reflected in any political Party that is broadly based and concerned about such issues. I suggest that while all attention is focused on the debate as it occurs within the Australian Labor Party (because we do approach these questions seriously, and attempt to resolve and debate them) within any of the other Parties, and particularly the Liberal Party, there are also underlying doubts and concerns about the nuclear industry, nuclear armaments, international safeguards and waste disposal. If there is not, then, in my view, they are morally bankrupt, and they certainly do not reflect the concerns of those in the community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that by the debate that goes on, as a Party and as a Government seeking to represent the broad views of the community, we are at least indicating our concern about these issues. I reiterate that we are not debating the uranium question: we are debating the Roxby Downs mining project in terms of that project and uranium mining.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition largely was heard in silence, and I hope that the Premier will be accorded the same courtesy. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Uranium mining is part of the extraction involved in the mixed metal mine that is Roxby Downs. Whatever those opposite seek to say, the fact is that we have recognised, first, that this Parliament has passed an indenture Act, which imposes certain obligations on the Government of South Australia, whatever its political complexion, and secondly, that our community has endorsed that project (and a Government, whatever its political complexion, must pay heed to that endorsement), and that the overall and long-term benefits are such that a Government of whatever political complexion must adhere to it.

That is what we have said consistently and that is what we have carried out in practice. All the attempts to beat up this issue in the ways that we have seen, supposedly in the interests of South Australia and in the interest of resource development and of the national and State economies can really be seen as attempts by Opposition members to divide the community, as a way of creating political capital over their opponents. I am afraid that this was again demonstrated in the lead-up to this debate and by the way in which this motion was introduced. The motion before the House should not be necessary in the terms in which it was moved, because since the election of my Government it has been made quite clear that we are committed to this project, and that we have carried out our obligations in relation to it.

Let us get the project into some form of perspective. I believe that this State has suffered from the fact that Roxby Downs has been erected into some kind of symbol of such a crucial nature that it has tended to obscure many other things that are necessary and need to be done in terms of this State's economic development. While conceding the potential importance of that project, I believe that some of the extravagant claims made on its behalf, some of the fantastic statements made by the previous Government and by the present Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the former Minister of Industrial Affairs as they competed

against each other over predictions of jobs, benefits, and so on, have created a false aura around the project that has made the task of Government and the joint venturers getting on with the job much harder to accomplish. That fact ought to be recognised, and I think that it is recognised by those involved, but whether it is fully recognised in the media or the public arena is not so clear.

The project is of enormous significance to South Australia and, as the feasibility study continues and the various assessments are made, we get some sort of perspective of those benefits, but I believe that we should have an end to the politicking in South Australia around this issue. Incidents such as the press release and the big statement made before even the letter arrives, before even the Government's attitude can be ascertained, should be stopped, if indeed it is the intention of the Opposition to seriously assist and pursue this project.

My Government has always been ready to accommodate the Opposition when it wishes to use the forms of the House to move particular motions. We are prepared to let this debate go ahead. I am happy to put on record today my Government's views, although they are well known to the company, the Prime Minister, and to members of his Government.

An honourable member: What are they?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader is well aware that I have already told the Prime Minister that an inquiry is not necessary and that the project is of major importance to South Australia. He would have known that from reading the *Advertiser* on Saturday morning. That statement was, in fact, highlighted on page 1. He would have also known from my answers to his questions in this place, especially when he was trying to create dissension and alarm during the blockade, that my Government was firmly committed to the project going ahead.

Also, both I and my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, have kept in close touch with Federal Government Ministers and with the joint venturers, who are well aware of my Government's support for the project and our position in relation to any further inquiries. As recently as this morning I had a meeting with one of the partners, and assured them that we would be publicly and clearly stating our views. I also told them the project was ill-served by the political stunts the Leader of the Opposition was indulging in.

Also, this morning I spoke to the Prime Minister so that there could be no misunderstanding at the last moment about the views of the Government of South Australia. I told him that the Opposition was planning to move this motion and that, aside from the obvious political aspects of it, we would ensure that a motion was passed in this House that expressed support for the project and opposition to a further inquiry. So, there is no question that the Federal Government and the joint venturers are absolutely clear on the views of my Government.

In relation to the benefits and importance of this project, it is interesting to note that when we came to Government we found there was no consolidated statement of the economic benefits of the Roxby Downs project or detailed analysis of that available. Some weeks ago I asked for just such a document. We had heard these claims about job predictions and economic spin-off benefits. The reason for the total confusion in those figures has not become apparent. Such was the great desire to boost the project politically that no-one had sat down boldly and dispassionately with some kind of check list to make a proper assessment as to what the real benefits were. We have, in fact, done that and made that clear to the Federal Government. The size and complexity of the project and the assessment that is under way have been documented. Figures and details are available in a way that can be understood and that can convince people of our case.

Let me repeat that that case has not been assisted by the extravagant and conflicting claims made constantly in a political context by members of the Opposition during the period it was attempting to boost this project unreasonably. I do not deny the fact, and I have never attempted to, that when the indenture was before Parliament my Party had some reservations, moved amendments, and opposed aspects of it. I make no apology for that, but the indenture is now law. As I have said many times, we will honour our obligations under that indenture, unlike one or two members of the Opposition such as the member for Coles who picks and chooses what law she wants to obey in this Parliament.

Also, I do not deny that the issue of uranium mining is one of some controversy, one about which many people in our community have strong views. There is no unanimity of opinion, and I have dealt adequately with the fact that that occurs within political Parties as well as within the community at large, and it is healthy that it does so. However, we have had enough inquiries about Roxby Downs. The project was examined by a Select Committee of this Parliament, and it has also been examined through the e.i.s. project, and this Government has ensured that specific questions such as sacred sites of traditional landowners are fully examined, where in some respect that indenture and the procedures have been found to be deficient.

As it is clear that the South Australian community believes that the project should proceed, I suggest that the motion is unnecessary, in that it is well known to the public and the Federal Government that all Parties in South Australia do not believe that an inquiry is necessary. It is well known, both by the public and by the Federal Government, that we believe that the development should now proceed. The motion that the Leader of the Opposition has moved does not successfully achieve his aim, and I intend to move an amendment to the motion, to which I would ask members of the Opposition to listen, because I believe that it improves and clarifies what we are trying to do in this debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Ashenden: Wishy washy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

To delete all words after 'House' and substitute the following: recognises that the Roxby Downs project has the potential to bring major benefits both to the South Australian and national economies. It believes that no further inquiry into the project is necessary, and its development should proceed under the conditions previously determined by the Parliament. It further acknowledges that the South Australian Government has taken all necessary action to facilitate the project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that if members opposite oppose the amendment, they should think carefully before they do so, because I am replacing the fairly simplistic motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition with one that refers specifically to the significance of this project to the national economy. I think that the point is important, when we are addressing ourselves to the Federal Government, to state that no further inquiry is necessary: that is not included in the Leader's motion.

We spell out that the development should proceed under the conditions determined by this Parliament. It also refers to an aspect of the Leader of the Opposition's motion, and also recognises the bipartisan spirit in which I am assured that this motion was moved. When the Leader of the Opposition told us that it was all about jobs, investment and opportunities for our children, I took that at face value. My amendment acknowledges that this Government has taken

all necessary action to facilitate the project, and I believe that that is the sort of motion we should pass and communicate to our Federal colleagues as a unanimous motion of this House.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): The Premier has been sliding around in all directions, as has been his custom, since this uranium debate was introduced into South Australia. What nonsense for the Premier to get up here and suggest that this debate is about Roxby Downs, that it is not a debate about uranium, and that uranium has nothing to do with Roxby Downs. What an absurdity to foist on the Parliament of South Australia. It would do the Premier the world of good to read what the joint venturers publish from time to time. It would give the lie to most of what he has been saying this afternoon. He has accused the Opposition of trying to expand the view of this project. The Opposition (the former Government) have been quoting facts and figures given to the public and to it when in Government by the joint venturers. I commend to the Premier some of their more recent publications. The Premier has said that really, this debate has nothing to do with uranium, but it is about Roxby Downs. The joint venturers had this to say about Roxby Downs:

Olympic Dam, a world-ranking project—

This is the project the Premier accuses the Opposition of over-blowing. Under the heading "Uranium", the joint venturers said:

The Olympic Dam uranium resource is more than twice as large as any other known resource around the world.

That is not the Opposition blowing it up, that is the view of the joint venturers, who dearly want to develop this project for their benefit as well as the benefit of this State and its people. Today the Premier is accusing the Leader of the Opposition of politicking when he talks about jobs, employment, and the future of our children. Of course that is what it is about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier is trying to foist on to the public this slithery garbage, when he knows his Party is split right down the middle on this question. We know that this inquiry is all about Hawke and company trying to gather the numbers. Obviously they think it is shaky, but I will develop that theme in a moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have insisted that each speaker be heard in silence, otherwise it is a mockery to suggest that either side believes in either the motion or the amendment. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I was quoting what the joint venturers have said about the uranium aspects of the project. They said:

The Olympic Dam uranium resource is more than twice as large as any other known resource around the world. The planned production rate of 3 000 tonnes/year is comparable to that from the Ranger mine in the Northern Territory . . .

What humbug for the Premier to say that this is not about uranium. Why is there open revolt in his own Party? We were confronted, I think last week or the week before, with an advertisement saying:

Say 'No' to uranium mining. Demand the phasing out of the uranium industry. Write today to: Mr Hawke, Prime Minister of Australia; Mr Bannon, Premier of South Australia (and a few others). No Roxby Downs, potentially the largest uranium mine in the world.

That was signed by none other than the member for Elizabeth, one of the Premier's own. He said, 'What about the uranium question?' What cant, what humbug! Sections of the Labor Party are in open revolt. Those sections have their spearhead in the socialist left in Victoria and in South Australia, headed by the influential member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: What about politicking?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to continue with his speech, and I ask the Deputy Premier to refrain from interjecting.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am dealing in facts, as plain as the nose on the Deputy Premier's face.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am simply asking the Deputy Leader to continue with his speech.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am, Sir. I am dealing with the facts, and they are as plain as the nose on the Deputy Premier's face. There is open revolt amongst sections within the Labor Party in this nation. The problem is that people are not prepared to deal in facts; the Premier is not prepared to deal in facts, nor has he ever been. To suggest that this is not about jobs, not about employment, not about the development of the State, and not about the future of the rising generation, and then to say, towards the end of his speech, that it has the potential of enormous economic benefit and of becoming a great project to South Australia gives lie to his earlier argument.

He has been on this slippery dip ever since this debate came to the fore, when the A.L.P. changed its uranium policy after encouraging exploration in this State. When the left wing had a win the Party toughened up its policy, and the Premier and those on his side of the argument were floundering. The Premier now has taken this project to his bosom, but he and his Party did their damndest in this Chamber to sink it a bit over 12 months ago. When we had a Select Committee inquiring into the project, two of the present Ministers put in a dissenting report, but now they have taken this 'non-uranium' project to their bosoms.

What did those Ministers say when they put in a dissenting report just over a year ago, when the Liberal Government was trying desperately to get this project up and running for the benefit of this State? The member for Mitchell (now Minister of Mines and Energy, charged with the oversight of this project and other developments in South Australia) and the member for Baudin (now Minister for Environment and Planning) went into print when that indenture was before Parliament and said, among a lot of other garbage:

If Roxby Downs is to proceed it will produce up to 400 million pounds of yellowcake—

this is the non-uranium mine we have heard so much about—

during its life. In the present world scene—

this was June last year—

some of this must find its way into bombs, because existing international safeguard arrangements are ineffective and unenforceable. Moreover, Australia's safeguard requirements are being progressively watered down as sales become more difficult.

What changed between then and the November election? The Labor Party realised that it was on a loser, and with the threat of an election looming all sorts of things happened and it resorted to expediency. Members opposite marched across to Canberra and adopted the Federal policy in a completely dishonest way. No-one could understand, simply because it was dishonest and completely contradictory.

They said that uranium could be mined as long as something else was dug up with it. Presumably that means that the uranium would not go into bombs. The arguments against the project advanced by the present Ministers a bit over a year ago have evaporated within the space of a few months. We know what the pressures were, of course. They knew that they would be rolled at the State election if they did not do something about their policies. However, the chickens have come home to roost. I abhor the policies of the left wingers and what they stand for, but at least they are straight. I admire the member for Elizabeth in some

regards. I think his policies are way off, but I admire the fact that at least he is straight.

Mr Becker: When?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: When the Labor Party went over and adopted the policies he voted against it. When the policy was adopted in Canberra six of South Australia's 11 delegates voted against the change. That relates to the adoption of the policy that it would be in order to mine uranium as long as something else was mined with it and then all the radiological hazards disappear and the chance of its getting into bombs disappears if there is a bit of gold with it.

The South Australian delegates who voted against the change included Mr Duncan (at least he is honest: misguided, but honest) and Mr Frank Blevins, now Minister of Agriculture, and put in as a sop to the left. The home of this dissent is Victoria and South Australia. The electorate does not seem to have grasped that the home of the socialist left is in Victoria; and that is where the pressure on Canberra is coming from, aided and abetted by Mr Scott and company in South Australia, but it is headed in South Australia by the redoubtable member for Elizabeth. The Minister of Agriculture wanted to stop Roxby Downs, and at least he is being consistent. Other South Australian delegates who voted against the change were Ms Anne Levy, a member of the Upper House and Mr Bob Gregory (now a prominent back-bencher of the Labor Party, who voted against adopting the policy). At least they were honest, even though they were badly misguided.

Who else was over there? Miss Anne Pengelly (State Executive member of the Australian Labor Party) and Ms Deirdre Tedmanson, from the Christies Beach sub-branch. There were five members in favour, including South Australian Secretary Chris Schacht, who has had a mixed career to say the least, and Miss Barbara Wiese, who has had a career.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader's remark is totally out of order. He is reflecting on a member of the Upper House. The honourable Deputy Leader must withdraw.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If there was any implication, Mr Speaker, it was that Miss Wiese had been State President of the A.L.P. No hurt was meant by that statement. The other members in favour of the motion also included Mr Frank Evans, from the Breadcarters Union, and Mick Young, Federal M.H.R., who has fallen on hard times. So, the heavies in the Party voted six to five against the motion. The six voting for it at least were honest, even though they were misguided. Does anyone in this House believe that that has changed and that the member for Elizabeth was guilty of only a slight aberration last week when he signed the advertisement asking people to write to the Premier, his boss, asking the Premier to get out of Roxby? The A.L.P. is split right down the middle, yet the Premier says that the Opposition is politicking. What humbug! The A.L.P. did its damnedest in this House to scuttle this project with a series of phoney amendments. Referring to the amendment moved by the Premier, does he seriously suggest that the Opposition can vote for an amendment that states that this House acknowledges that the South Australian Government has taken all necessary action to facilitate the Roxby Downs project? That is absolute humbug!

Members questioned the Minister closely in the Estimates Committee on what was happening to Roxby. What is the Government's record on the Canegrass Swamp fiasco a few weeks ago? The Government has received environmental reports from so many anthropologists that they are running out of the Government's ears, and it does not know what to do with them. This Government, from the Premier down, has shown no leadership in this matter. The Minister of Mines and Energy has been charged with getting the Roxby Downs project running as quickly as possible because, if opportunities are not grasped (and we have lost some because of the election of the Labor Government), some of those opportunities will be lost. This disastrous committee of inquiry in Canberra can do nothing to enhance the development of the project: it can only give the member for Elizabeth and his policy committee in South Australia and the lefties in Victoria a chance to mobilise, and we know how they can mobilise. The members of the left are the dedicated people in the Labor Party who seldom lose in a long-term tussle such as this. Indeed, they invariably win.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Glenelg to come to order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I may not go all the way with what Joh said about Hawke's being on the slide but I predict that, as soon as Hawke's popularity slips, he will be past history in the A.L.P., because the left is gunning for him. As soon as his 70 per cent becomes 50 per cent or less, Hawke will be history. It is the left wing of the Labor Party that has a long memory.

This debate is all about who will win. When the Premier returned from Japan, I knew that something was wrong. One did not have to be a genius to know that something was amiss when the Premier came back talking about projectitis and saying, 'We don't want to get hung up on Roxby or put all our eggs in one basket. The Japanese do not want uranium.' When he returned from overseas, the Premier fed a load of untruthful garbage to South Australians for a reason. He suddenly became cautious on the uranium issue, and Premier watchers did not have to be geniuses to know that something had gone wrong. The Premier said that the Japanese did not want uranium, but the figures he gave us were completely untrue. In Japan, he trotted off to the shrine of remembrance at Hiroshima, but he did not look at any nuclear reactor that generates electricity. There was all this emphasis on the peace movement, all this playing down of the needs of the Japanese for uranium.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Ascot Park to order, and other members, too.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It was no surprise at all to members on this side to find what the hitch was. The Prime Minister did not have the numbers to push through the uranium policy that he wanted to rationalise, so the Premier had to soften up the public of South Australia because something had gone wrong. He said, 'The Japanese do not need our uranium.' However, that is completely untrue, and the figures he gave us were untrue. By 1992, the Japanese will have increased their nuclear commitment to one-third of the total Japanese electricty capacity, and to suggest that now was not the time to seek uranium contracts with the Japanese was dangerous folly.

The Premier and the Federal A.L.P. have considered the question of markets. For how long have we been so concerned about these multi-nationals which the member for Elizabeth has consistently criticised—companies such as B.P.? How long since have we been concerned to find markets for such companies? The consortium wants to spend $1.5 billion to develop this, the largest uranium mine in the world, even though the Premier calls it a non-uranium mine. Would those people develop the mine if they did not believe that they could sell the product? Not for a moment. However, the Premier is saying that we cannot let it go because the Government thinks that the company cannot sell the product. I urge the Premier to read what the joint venturers are saying from time to time. Among other things, they say:

The main disadvantage under which intending Australian producers find themselves at present is the uncertain posture of the Federal Government as to its uranium policy.

In relation to markets, the statement continues:

Access to world markets: The Australian minerals industry has accumulated a great deal of experience in selling a variety of mineral products on world markets. Those responsible for the commercial operations of the uranium industry have this background available to them. These professionals are convinced that markets are available to Australia for the sale of uranium.

This is not the Opposition talking: this is the people who are running the Roxby Downs project (Western Mining Corporation and B.P.), who have spent $100 million already. Yet the Government is telling them to go slow because of the uncertainty of markets. The statement by the joint venturers continues:

Such sales are, of course, subject to Australian Government conditions, including contractual conditions and safeguard requirements, and are restricted to countries which have signed the N.P.T. and with whom bilateral safeguard agreements have been completed or may be negotiated in the future prior to any uranium delivery.

The Federal Government has recently withdrawn the determination (the approval to negotiate sales contracts) from those Australian companies which are seeking sales contracts arrangements abroad, with the exception of the existing producers at Ranger and Nabarlek. It is therefore not possible at present to conclude sales of Australia uranium from mines which are as yet undeveloped.

This is Roxby Downs—the joint venturers—talking. The Labor Party's policies on uranium are not only damaging but also, I believe, disastrous. They have cost South Australians jobs already. The Premier said that this non-uranium mine, which would become the biggest uranium oxide producer in the world, could go ahead. They closed down the Honeymoon and Beverley mines. There is a $500 million investment involved in Beverley. They have thrown hundreds of people out of work just like that. This is the Government that goes to the people and says, 'We are interested in employment. We will generate jobs.' However, one of the first things it did when coming into Government was throw people out of work. I do not think that that has ever happened in the history of South Australia. I do not know of any other Government which said to a mine (other than because of this ideological bind), when it wanted to carry on and have its pilot plant built, 'No—stop. That's it!' We have made history in South Australia and, as I have said, we have lost opportunities.

The Federal Government and some of its members (the lefties, and I will give one small example of that) refuse to deal in the facts, and the Premier has refused to deal in the facts today. One Federal member spoke in the House of Representatives last week, and I will give an example of the sort of untruths that are still being noised abroad by opponents of the Roxby Downs venture. I refer to Ms McHugh, the member for Phillip, Victoria, one of the new members, I think.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: A Labor member?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: She sure is. She is one of the new breed—no doubt one of the members they have to gather and one of the reasons for Prime Minister Hawke agreeing to a six-month mess-around while they try to gather the numbers. They obviously had to gather Ms McHugh, because what she said in the House of Representatives on 20 October 1983 brings into focus this nonsense about a committee of inquiry into a project which the Premier says he now supports. Ms McHugh said:

I want now to bring to the attention of the House the serious lack of safety conditions for workers at Roxby Downs.

Mr Ashenden: Has she been there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I very much doubt it. If she has, she either did not talk to anyone up there or walked around with her eyes shut.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The quote continues:

At the moment a feasibility study is being carried out and a pilot programme is under construction. The company, Roxby Management Services Pty Ltd, has accepted absolutely no responsibility for the protection of the workers on the site.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It's breathtaking.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the member for Coles said, it is breathtaking, and that is a good word. It defies imagination that a Federal member of Parliament can get up in the House and be so ignorant of the stringent safety conditions which were written into the indenture: the most stringent conditions in the world, I suggest. The radiological conditions in the Roxby Downs indenture are certainly second to none in Australia. When one takes that along with our radiation protection legislation plus what is written into that indenture, I would be very surprised if there is any more stringent safety requirement for uranium mining anywhere else in the world. In fact, one of the overseas experts from Great Britain whose name, if any member is interested, I will find—

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Sir Edward Pochin.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am glad that the Minister has said that. He was on the Select Committee before which Mr Pochin appeared. Full marks to the honourable member: no doubt he will recall with some embarrassment—

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: He happens to be the Minister of Mines and Energy.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Deputy Leader will get on with his speech.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I know that he happens to be the Minister, and he will recall to his dying day with some embarrassment, no doubt, his contribution to the Roxby debate and the Select Committee. However, Mr Pochin, a world expert, came here and said that the provisions in the Roxby indenture in relation to radiological safety were pace-setting in the world scene. Yet, Ms McHugh, the member for Phillip, gets up in the Federal House and says that the company has accepted absolutely no responsibility for the protection of workers on the site. Mr Acting Speaker, am I right to call a Federal member a liar in the House of Assembly?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Not while I am here.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On occasions, I would very much have liked to stand up and call some Government members liars, but I know that our Standing Orders preclude it. Ms McHugh is completely misinformed, and one of the big advantages that we had going for us during the uranium debate (and during the life of the Liberal Government we won the uranium debate) was that the opponents were not prepared to stick to the truth. Time and again in this House we could get up and simply place the facts before the House and the public, and there has been a clear shift of opinion in relation to this question, because the longer people go peddling untruths and the more Labor refutes it (with a bit of luck, that refutation might get a bit of publicity) the sooner the public will learn the facts. Ms McHugh is so wide of the mark that I must say that I feel for Prime Minister Hawke in his dilemma.

We know what has been his attitude from day 1, going back to his original speech before he got anywhere near Parliament when he was strutting the Australian stage as President of the A.C.T.U. (no doubt, with the Prime Ministership back there somewhere in the recesses of his mind).

Mr Hawke made a speech at Monash University, when he made his position on uranium perfectly clear. He said, 'It's like saying that we shouldn't mine iron ore because they will turn it into guns. All we are doing by denying the world our Australian uranium is making energy more expensive to the developing world. We will be able to sit back and luxuriate in this warm moral glow which is achieving nothing.' That was the first public statement of note that Mr Hawke made in relation to uranium, and he has made others. He came to South Australia during the debate on this question and, in rather more colourful Hawke language, expressed the same sentiments. I think that he even said, 'Why should we be getting fussed on this question when we can do [and I quote Hawke, not Goldsworthy] bugger-all about it?' He had to give three undertakings to get into Parliament (he comes from the home of the left—Victoria), before they would endorse him, and I would bet my bottom dollar that one of them was to lie low on the uranium question. So, he was duly endorsed, duly had a blow wave, got the leadership, and became Prime Minister. Now he says—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Do members deny that he has had a blow wave? He has bought himself a few new suits, had a blow wave and is now Prime Minister. In my remaining time, let me suggest a further amendment, so that the motion will read as follows:

That this House recognises the Roxby Downs project as a potential to bring major benefits to both South Australian and national economies. It believes that no further inquiry into the project is necessary and its development should proceed under conditions previously determined by the Parliament, and calls upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment of full support for the project.

I therefore move to amend the Premier's amendment, as follows:

By inserting after the word 'that' the words 'except the words "and calls upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment of full support for the project" ' and by leaving out the proposed words 'it further acknowledges that the South Australian Government has taken all necessary action to facilitate the project'.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I support the amending motion, as moved by the Premier, which encompasses a range of matters that we should be considering as the Parliament of South Australia in relation to this project. The first part of the motion as amended states:

That this House recognises that the Roxby Downs project has the potential to bring major benefits both to the South Australian and national economies.

No member of the Opposition has taken the trouble to try to demonstrate to the House what are the actual potential benefits of the project to the people of South Australia. As the time for the debate is short, I do not propose to go into the matter in great detail, but there are some very important facts that I believe all members should know. In this connection, the Deputy Leader was at some pains to suggest that the Premier when speaking did not use properly descriptive phrases in relation to the Roxby Downs project, unless simply delineating it as a uranium mine. Nothing could be further from the truth, and the Deputy Leader knows that. For the purposes of his artificial contribution to the debate, he decided to ignore that. The facts are that copper, uranium, gold, silver and rare earth deposits occur at Roxby Downs on a world-wide scale.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: But the Premier said that this debate was not about uranium.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: That is the whole point that I am making, if the honourable member will be patient. As a result of the joint venturers' drilling programme, the present upgraded size of the deposit is estimated to be 2 000 million tonnes. At indicative prices the average value of ore per tonne is $88, making a total of $176 billion of mineralisation. It is difficult to conceive another mine of such proportions. It was that complex mineralisation aspect that the Deputy Leader was very anxious to gloss over and not give any prominence. The average grade of copper is 1.6 per cent; uranium oxide, .6 kilograms per tonne; gold, .6 grams per tonne; and silver, 4 grams per tonne.

Planned annual production is 150 000 tonnes of copper; 3 000 tonnes of uranium oxide; 3 400 kilograms of gold; and 23 000 grams of silver. The point that the Deputy Leader did not want to address is that initial production would be expected to produce revenue in the proportions of 45 per cent from copper, 45 per cent from uranium and 10 per cent from gold. That was the point that the Premier was making during his contribution to the debate.

The project will bring a range of benefits far in excess of those derived from raw production. The cost of construction, as was pointed out earlier by the Deputy Leader (and for once he was right) is of the order of $1 500 million, for the planned production rate of 6 500 million tonnes of ore per annum. At that production level direct employment in operations is expected to involve about 2 400 people, with an additional 700 jobs in the new permanent town for 9 000 people. Clearly, there would be service and other types of jobs available. During the construction phase the project has been forecast by various studies as generating between 9 000 and 18 600 jobs and, in operation, between 5 700 and 8 300 jobs. Those projections are dependent upon the factor used as a multiplier, but they have been estimated on a reasonably conservative basis.

The total royalties on a low revenue basis for the first 20 years of the project life have been estimated at $450 million (that is on 1982 values). On a high revenue basis, the estimate is $600 million. In addition, the State will receive pay-roll tax payments of $2.4 million per annum. Corporate and personal income tax paid in respect of direct project activity will contribute a significant amount to the Federal Treasury. Clearly, the first part of the motion as amended by the Premier sensibly takes into account the fact that the project has the potential to provide major benefits to both the State and Federal economies.

Members would be aware that there is suitable development land in the vicinity of the town site which allows for a possible ultimate population of 30 000 people and that a standard gauge rail spur from Woomera or Pimba has also been allowed for. The important thing to realise about the details that I have just outlined is that those kinds of figures and the degree of planning involved is clear recognition that the mine life might well exceed 100 years, given the extent of the identified resource. Development of such dimensions clearly is in the national interest. We do not need an inquiry to tell us that. The relevant figures, the drilling programme, the estimates and the planning projections show clearly that the project will have a major impact on the State's economy and the State scene and that, similarly, it has the capacity to be of major importance in relation to the Federal scene and the Federal economy.

The Deputy Leader used a rather unfortunate turn of phrase earlier when referring to 'slippery garbage'. That is how he viewed today's exercise—his chance to give us a another load of 'slippery garbage', which is what we got. For example, he decided to pursue one his favourite pastimes in this House, which is to selectively quote for the purposes of making what he thinks is a relevant point. This afternoon, in criticising the member for Elizabeth, he read only part of an advertisement. This is one of the Deputy Leader's great specialties, and he has done it for many years. Both the member for Elizabeth and I have been here for a few

years, and on many occasions we have had the opportunity to see him in action in that way.

Other information is contained in the advertisement with which I would hope that no member opposite would quarrel. For instance, the advertisement also suggests that people ought to support the notion that there ought not to be nuclear war. Therefore, I am in agreement with at least part of the advertisement. Very many people throughout the world are in support of that notion, and I would hope that every member of the Chamber also supports it. I certainly support the notion that the world does not need nuclear war.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Over the years the member who has just interjected has been a worthy disciple of the Deputy Leader in his misuse of the facts and his efforts to put words into other people's mouths whenever he is speaking. He will have the opportunity today if he wishes to make a contribution, no doubt. I trust that he will avail himself of that opportunity. I am opposed to misrepresentation in Parliament by anybody. In this case it was misrepresentation by the Deputy Leader who, in order to make a point, did not give the full detail about the advertisement. That is all I wish to say on that matter. I will endeavour to return to the point to which I was coming in my remarks. Opposition members have continually suggested—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:—that the Labor Party in South Australia, and federally for that matter, was in some kind of a dilemma over its uranium policy. In South Australia the suggestion has been put forward that the Premier and the South Australian Labor Government have in some way been remiss in their actions and their support for the Roxby Downs project since coming to Government. The Leader of the Opposition asked the House to note when he was on his feet that he had not attacked the Premier over his actions in relation to the situation at any time about where we are now, the fact that we have been in Government for that period, what has happened in respect of the project. But, in so doing he used the other tactic of trying to damn with faint or no praise. Nowhere in his remarks, except once or twice, did he say that the Government and the Premier had done everything one could reasonably expect from the Government to this point in relation to the project.

His Deputy Leader went even further in condemning the Government directly by referring to such matters as 'the problem' (I think that was the term he used) at Canegrass Swamp. His idea of settling problems such as the question of Aboriginal interest in an area is to ignore them, make no allowance for them, and simply plough ahead. That is not the situation with respect to the present Government in South Australia.

When the question arose of whether Aboriginal interests had been adequately provided for at the time of the e.i.s. and through that period leading up to when we were not in Government, the Government quickly and promptly acted to do something about it, to further the project and, at the same time, to take care of the Kokatha people and their allowable interests in the area. Funding was provided by the Government so that a proper survey could take place, sites could be identified and recorded, and arrangements and negotiations concluded with the joint venturers for the proper protection of those sites.

The Deputy Leader attempted to argue that we had reports of that nature running out of the Government's ears. He sneered and derided the efforts of the Government to look after properly the interests of the Aboriginal people. One would not have expected that attitude in this House from the Minister who had some considerable connection with the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act where he often said (and told the House) that he supported certain rights for the Aboriginals in respect of those matters.

I can only assume that, bereft of real information and real ideas for today, he decided to speak "off the cuff" and not really consider what he was saying. I expect that, in order that the project should proceed to its full conclusion, it has to be recognised there will be a need for proper provision for protection of Aboriginal desires and aims in the project area. I would have thought that he would support some move by the Government that attempts to put this matter beyond the normal claim and counter-claim scene that sometimes occurs with provision of funding for a professional person, such as a qualified anthropologist, to carry out a survey in conjunction with the Aboriginals concerned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Certainly, the Government has provided funding for that assessment to be made. The assessment had to take into account certain conflicting claims from members of the Aboriginal community who have an association with that area. I believe that that is the job of the Assessments Branch. Its responsibility is to check the veracity or otherwise of claims, to make sure that where claims are sustained they are recorded, and that reasonable and proper protection methods are provided. To suggest that the State Government has not fully supported the project from the time it was elected is not sustainable, although running through the theme of the Deputy Leader's remarks was that suggestion. The amended motion which we should support, and which was moved by the Premier, states in part:

> . . . acknowledges that the South Australian Government has taken all necessary action to facilitate the project.

I am demonstrating the worth of that part of the amended motion for which I am asking Opposition members, support. It can be shown to be entirely justified. What action has been taken by the present Government? The e.i.s. process has been completed, an assessment report has been prepared, and certain approvals have been granted.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Let the honourable member keep chattering away. The time that he spends in the House is such that he really does not understand all these processes. Yet, I am certain of that and for that reason I am going to some lengths to outline the steps correctly so that at least in future he will have had the benefit of knowing what are the necessary steps to take.

The assessment report has been completed, necessary approvals have been given for the construction of the water supply road and approval has been given to proceed with the pilot stage involving a further $18 million expenditure. Therefore, it cannot be said that the State Government has not done all in its power to facilitate the project. As I have pointed out, the suggestion has been made that in some way the State Government had a policy change, and it did not intend to honour its commitment.

I notice that the honourable member who has been interjecting has gone quiet now. It can be clearly shown that every requirement in the indenture of the joint venturers to this date has been met. I invite the honourable member to ask the joint venturers if he does not believe that that is so. Where there have been difficulties there have been consultation, compromise and agreement. At the time of the assessment report and the approvals that were issued by the Government, it was this Government that negotiated and agreed to 11 additional conditions.

It did not hold up the project: the project, which was thought to be necessary, is still proceeding. Full marks to

the joint venturers who, whilst they wanted to negotiate strong and hard, were also reasonable, and as a result a reasonable agreement was gained. In return, actions required of the Government were undertaken, approvals were given, and work is in progress. It is true that there is a problem at present in relation to the area known as Canegrass Swamp, but the Government, in conjunction with the joint venturers and the Aboriginal people concerned, is endeavouring to resolve this. Meetings have been held on the site and views exchanged, but clearly there is some conflict amongst the Aboriginal community or confusion—it may be just that—and it does need to be cleared up. Arrangements are in progress that are allowing for the interchange of views that must take place before any real progress can be made.

Mr Lewis: How many anthropologists do you have now?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member who has just interjected is one person in this Chamber who on occasions has put forward an argument about the need for highly professional people to be given credence and used more often in all walks of life. I am very surprised that suddenly today, for political reasons, he decides to take the opposite view in order to make what he would think is some cheap political point. I am surprised that he is taking that view, because I have heard the honourable member describe scenes where birds were flying under the water, and he has made various other comments in relation to a possible project in his area that were absolutely amazing.

However, I have also heard the honourable member make many sensible comments about the capacities of professional people, and I am surprised that today he seems to have deserted that position altogether just to try to score a cheap interjection or something of that. From time to time the honourable member comes up with what I believe to be reasonably sensible suggestions about the use of professional skills, and yet when the Government provides funding for a professional anthropologist to work on a survey in relation to the Kokatha people's claims, apparently he derides that fact. I am not able to follow that kind of reasoning.

I have already shown why we should be supporting the amended motion as moved by the Premier. First, the statistics involved in this project are such that they impact on the South Australian scene in a major way and in a large way on the national scene. In my opinion there is no need for any further inquiry, and if one lists all of the things that have taken place so far, some of which have been referred to in passing by speakers on the other side, one can see that if we put in the one anthropological report that we have received so far (not the alleged 'running out of our ears' numbers, as suggested by the Deputy Leader) there have been about six reports, inquiries, and investigations into the project, including the Select Committee report on the indenture. One could be pardoned for wondering why anyone could suggest that a further inquiry is needed.

However, in responding to the situation which appears to have blown up at Commonwealth level, clearly any motion from this House should indicate that we do not believe that any further inquiry into the project is necessary. It is also necessary, if we are putting forward an argument that we do not believe that any further inquiry is needed, that we should be satisfied in the general sense that there are parameters under which the project could proceed. The amended motion moved by the Premier takes care of that, because it states:

> Developments should proceed under the conditions previously defined by the Parliament.

That is what we are talking about: something that has gone through Parliament, in this respect the Act and the indenture.

Finally, I have perhaps spent a little longer than I should have in demonstrating that the Government has taken all the steps that one could reasonably expect in order to facilitate the project. I apologise to the House if I have overstepped the time allotted, but I believe that we have gone to great lengths to facilitate and assist the project and I believe that it is worthy of being put on the record. At this stage there may be other speakers, and I propose simply to record the fact that I fully support the amended motion as moved by the Premier, and I urge all members of the House, if they have made up their minds otherwise at this stage, to re-read the motion, understand the import of it, and support it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): So much for this Government's standing up for South Australia! In the contributions made by the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy today we have seen that they are not prepared to stand up for South Australia. The Minister of Mines and Energy, in his speech, has rambled through the subject in the past half an hour and, contrary to the expressions made by his—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Other members have been heard in silence and I would ask that the same courtesy be shown to the member for Torrens.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Contrary to the expressions made by the Premier, who said that the debate was not about uranium or indeed about Roxby Downs, the Minister of Mines and Energy has dealt with those subjects, so obviously he is in conflict with his Leader. The Minister rambled through the subject, and covered facets as widely diverse as the Pitjantjatjara lands, environmental impact studies, and the percentage of copper in the ore, and he talked down the debate, lowered the tone of the debate, which is a well-known tactic, and he used much of his time to pad out the debate.

However, at least he gave the House some information, albeit information that most members should be aware of. That is more than could be said for the Premier's speech. The Premier did not give the House any information at all. Indeed, he made the point that this debate was about politics, not about Roxby Downs, uranium, or about the future of this State. That was the Premier's contribution: it was about politics. It was politicking, it was about cant and humbug, and not about the uranium question. They were the main contributions that the Premier made in his speech on this vitally important matter to South Australia.

The Premier's most important comment was that this debate was not necessary. He said in his speech, 'This debate is not necessary' and I ask you, Mr Speaker, after the events of the past few days in Canberra, how can any loyal South Australian say in this House that the debate is not necessary? I find it absolutely extraordinary that the Premier of this State should say that, and that is the most significant thing he had to say. I will deal with why this debate is necessary in a minute, but the Premier is not standing up for South Australia. He is always telling us that he is standing up for South Australia. What he has done in this issue is to stand up for South Australia in the same way as he did concerning the Alice Springs to Darwin railway, which is also of great importance to this State.

That is how much the Premier has stood up for South Australia on this vitally important question that concerns the whole economic future of this great State of ours. I am absolutely appalled that the Premier should try and pass off this motion in this House with so little concern and so little care.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The point of order I wish to take is that I understand from a study of the register of interests that the member who is speaking in the debate at present has a pecuniary interest in the matter now before the Chamber.

Standing Order 214 of the House of Assembly reads as follows:

No member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed.

My point of order quite clearly is that the member apparently has a pecuniary interest in this matter in that he has declared under the title of Company Beneficial Interests that he holds Western Mining Corporation shares, and there is another member in the Parliament, the member for Hanson—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the member for Elizabeth has completed the point of order in relation to the member for Torrens and in relation to Standing Order 214.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Except to say, of course, it is public knowledge that one of the venture partners in Roxby Downs, with which this debate is concerned, is Western Mining.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order 214 is the key to this point of order. If members look at the phrasing of 214, they will note that the vote is the key and, without forecasting any ruling or any statement that might arise from that or in any way reflecting on the member for Torrens, I do not uphold the point of order, but indicate that there is nothing in 214 that prevents him from speaking.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Standing Order 214 and your decision given in relation to the vote. I draw your attention to the words:

No member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed.

The register of pecuniary interests requires that members state the interest of their spouses and those of their children under 18 years. I tell you and the House, Mr Speaker, that I do not own any Western Mining Corporation shares, and I suggest that, if the member for Elizabeth wants to pursue this chicanery, he might like to telephone my wife and discuss the matter with her. Secondly, for your information, Sir, if a member did happen to own Western Mining shares in this case, or shares in a public company, which were the subject of debate, and this is very important, I draw your attention to Commonwealth Law Reports, Volume 132, the case of *Crown v Senator Webster*, and the judgment of the Chief Justice, Sir Garfield Barwick, at page 287:

However, under the general law it is well established that a shareholder does not have any legal or equitable interest in the assets, including agreements, of the company. Even where a shareholder owned almost all the shares of a company, he had no legal or equitable right or interest in the company's assets: . . . Consequently, it may be said that a person who is no more than a shareholder in a company does not, by reason of that circumstance alone, have a pecuniary interest in any agreement the company may have with the Public Service.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think a couple of things come out of this. First, I have not upheld the point of order made by the member for Elizabeth, for the reason that I gave. Secondly, if someone wishes to take a point of order on the question of the vote that would have to be done at the appropriate time, that is, at the stage of the vote.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I would like your ruling now on the record of the point of order taken by the member for Elizabeth. I noticed that the television camera was operating, and I believe a radio station has also recorded the proceedings. Is that permissible, in view of your ruling last week in relation to the discussion in the public interest of members' pecuniary interests?

The SPEAKER: As I see it, the whole thrust of what I put to the House last week was this: members are at risk, and I put the risk before them twice. Putting it quite bluntly, be it on your own head.

Mr BECKER: I rise for a clarification on your ruling. How does 'Be it on your own head' relate to the media reporting exactly what has just happened?

The SPEAKER: Likewise. That was the whole thrust of what I was putting. There is no difference between the media and the members.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: We now see the true colours of the Government in this matter. It is so embarrassed by this motion, the motion it should be supporting and not trying to amend, that its members are trying this chicanery in the House. I am surprised at the member for Elizabeth. I thought he had more integrity than to do what he has just done.

Let us not draw the attention of the House away from the real issue, which is the speech the Premier has made and the Government's attitude to the motions. I said that the Premier was not prepared to stand up for South Australia. What has the Premier done, in light of the events that have occurred in Canberra over the past few days when the Prime Minister has back-tracked and said that he will bring about a six-month delay in this vital project?

The Premier has said (and this is all he has said) that there is no need for an inquiry. What representations has the Premier made to the Prime Minister? One would have thought that the Premier would have been on a plane the next day to Canberra to see the Prime Minister to press the interests of this State against this ridiculous decision by the Federal Government. What sort of activity have we had from the Premier? We have had a statement to the media that there is no need for an inquiry, a statement that he says the Prime Minister will read in Saturday's *Advertiser*. That is the activity of the Premier of this State, who allegedly stands up for South Australia. What is the real issue in this debate? It is the economic future of this State and the jobs of its citizens.

When talking about the inquiry and what is going to happen to Roxby Downs, what are we really talking about? If the A.L.P. left had its way, the following would be at risk: the $100 million worth of investment made up to the present; $18 million for a pilot metallurgical plant; 500 surface drill holes, all for nothing; 500 m of shaft, all for nothing; and 3 km of drive shaft, all for nothing. What is the potential risk to this State? What will not happen in the future if the Federal Government continues as it is going? This State will lose a potential of $1 400 million worth of investment; the benefits flowing from the mining of an estimated 2 000 million tonnes of minerals; the potential for a new town of 9 000 people, with an upper limit of 30 000; the potential for a work force of 2 500 direct employees; the potential for another 5 000 to 8 000 indirect jobs resulting from the project; and anticipated mineral royalties to this State of $30 million a year (that is $30 million that could go into the hospital system, the education system, or some other area of serious need in this State).

If we lose the investment and the benefits flowing from an estimated 100 years operation at Roxby Downs, the results accruing would be disastrous. That is what this motion and this debate are all about, yet the Premier says that this debate is unnecessary. He has moved to amend the motion by striking out from the Leader's motion the words 'and calls upon the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment of full support for the Roxby Downs project'. In other words, the Premier does not want to ask the Prime Minister and the Federal Government to give a full commitment to South Australia in respect of Roxby Downs.

So much for the Premier's standing up for South Australia. So much for the view that those in the Eastern States have of South Australia. So much for the help that we can expect from Canberra. So much for the help that we can expect from our Premier, who should have been over there, knock-

ing on the Prime Minister's door, and saying, 'This project must go ahead. I have made a commitment to South Australians that the A.L.P. will support it. It must go ahead because otherwise I will have no credibility with the people of South Australia.' The Premier should also be saying (and this Parliament should realise) that the fears expressed by the A.L.P., especially by the left, are unfounded. Those are words not just from this side of the House, but from well reputed bodies.

I draw to members' attention the production of electricity from uranium, because much has been said in this House about the future of such production. I have figures from the International Atomic Energy Agency which show that, on 1 January 1983, 294 uranium-powered stations operated in 25 countries and generated 173 000 megawatts of electricity. As many as 215 such powered stations were under construction in 27 countries, with a potential generating capacity of 198 000 megawatts of electricity. During 1982, 21 new stations were completed and came on line with a capacity of 18 000 megawatts of electricity. In that year, seven new stations were ordered to produce electricity from uranium. According to the O.E.C.D. figures for 1983, uranium will provide more than 26 per cent of world electricity by the mid-1990s. The following socialist countries are generating electricity from uranium: Sweden, 38.7 per cent; France, 38.7 per cent; Bulgaria, 25 per cent; East Germany, 12 per cent; and the U.S.S.R., 10 per cent. All those socialist countries are generating electricity from uranium power.

The Premier referred to the aspects of health and safety. From the International Atomic Energy Agency and the World Health Organisation reports of 1982, members will see that one year of operation of the nuclear power industry at the 1981 level was estimated to yield a collective exposure, delivered at a varying rate over the next 10 000 years, corresponding to about one day of natural background. The Central Electricity Generation Board of the United Kingdom in 1982 stated:

> Britain's commercial power stations have been producing electricity economically, reliably and safely since 1962 and during that time there has been no evidence that their operation has harmed any member of the public.

The United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority in 1981 stated:

> The radiation dose to the public from nuclear electricity generation is demonstrably quite trivial and those working in nuclear industry have one of the safest occupations. The residual risk is easily justified by the associated benefits.

Regarding non-proliferation, a special committee set up by the American Nuclear Society reports that the world-wide expansion of nuclear power reactors has not been and will not in the future be an influential factor in determining whether additional nations will choose to become nuclear weapon States. Even in the absence of uranium power the nuclear weapons potential would remain. The same committee reports that it is clear that nuclear weapons proliferation is primarily a political issue related only marginally to uranium power development. Sir Mark Oliphant said this:

> Withholding Australian uranium would not prevent the erection of a single reactor, or the production of one nuclear weapon, in a world where 50 000-60 000 such weapons already exist.

I believe that that places this debate in perspective. This debate is about uranium; it is about Roxby Downs; it is about the future of this State and, more importantly, it is about the failure of the Premier and the South Australian Government to stand up to their Federal counterparts.

An honourable member: We are back on it again.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Just relax, John: everything will come in good time.

An honourable member: On your white charger today?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is typical of the sort of comment that one might expect in this debate because, right from the outset, there is no doubt, since the moment we heard through the press that this debate was to take place or that the Opposition was to seek it, that it was being held for political purposes by the Opposition. Of course, one cannot criticise if for that: that is what it is supposed to be doing, in a sense, I suppose, although it is pretty opportunistic at this stage. Nonetheless, that is what it is supposed to be doing. However, that does not stop the House from recognising exactly what this debate is. The opportunistic and political purposes for which it was brought on are patently obvious and clear, and I intend to deal with the debate in exactly that sort of context, that is, the context in which anyone who knows anything about the history of this topic throughout the time that it has been debated in this Parliament would expect one to deal with it.

I think that this is probably the sixth or seventh time that I have spoken in this Parliament in relation to the question of uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle. At least I am one of the few people in the Parliament who, throughout the whole of this debate, have not changed position in relation to it. I make that comment specifically relating it to those members of the Opposition who were here on 30 March 1977, when then Premier Dunstan moved the resolution that there should be no mining of uranium in South Australia until a whole series of safeguard measures had been taken. On that occasion members opposite voted in favour of that proposal, including, I point out to the House, the Deputy Leader, who thought then that there were sufficient problems with the nuclear fuel cycle that we should not commit South Australia's uranium to it. We have come quite a long way since then, as members know.

As I said, I think that this is the sixth or seventh debate which has occurred since that time. A number of events have occurred both of a political nature and events dealing with the general topic of uranium mining and the nuclear fuel cycle. The Three Mile Island circumstances arose and have now passed into history. More importantly, I suppose, when one looks at the landscape of developments that have occurred since that time, one sees that there has been no real movement and no real development in relation to all those issues which were of such concern to this Parliament at that time.

However, that is in relation specifically to the issue of uranium mining and the nuclear fuel cycle. There has been (and I am the first to concede it) a quite major political change which has taken place in this State particularly and, to a lesser extent, in this nation; that is, that two elections have now taken place in South Australia, in both of which the successful Parties were elected on a policy of supporting Roxby Downs. Although I speak in this debate today, and it gives me no great pleasure at all to have to say to the House what I am saying, in a democracy the people have spoken and, as such, I believe that we have to accept that decision, warts and all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Other members were heard in silence, and I ask the same courtesy for the member for Elizabeth. The member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As far as I am concerned (and I make no secret of this personally), I believe that the decision that the people have made in this case has many warts. However, it has been made, and it has been made regardless of how many people die mining at Roxby Downs, how many bombs come back made out of the uranium that has been mined there, how many terrorists obtain plutonium which is subsequently produced from the uranium mine, or how much the pile-up of waste around the world threatens the future of our eco system.

Mr Mathwin: What about the miners in the pits?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The member for Glenelg has already made one terrible intervention in this debate. He intervened earlier by saying that at least the Deputy Leader was not reading his speech in comparison to the Leader, who gave one of those pathetic speeches—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Both honourable members are out of order. The member for Glenelg is out of order for interjecting, and the member for Elizabeth for responding.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In relation to the Leader, I would like to make the point that, after this afternoon's performance, at least everyone is aware that he can read to the House, and I think that that is a worthwhile fact: at least we know that he is literate enough to be able to read, even if he cannot write his own speeches. He needs a bit of help from the speechwriters up there on the second floor and, fortunately, he was getting plenty of it this afternoon and did not commit too many gaffes.

I was going to conclude the passage with which I was dealing by saying that, regardless of how much waste threatens the future of our eco system, the decision has been made by the people of South Australia and although it gives me no great pleasure to see this proceed, the decision has been made and, as such, I would anticipate and expect that the Government of South Australia would carry out its election undertaking and continue to give support to the development of the Roxby Downs mine.

Mr Ashenden: Tell us about the advertisement.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will get on to that in a moment. That has never been in doubt as far as the Government is concerned; in fact, I have gone on record previously as saying that I believed the undertakings that were given by the Government prior to the last election that Roxby Downs should go ahead would be upheld and that Roxby Downs would receive support from the Government. I have expressed that on two or three occasions publicly. Hopefully, now that it is on the record in the Parliament, the Opposition will become a little less tense and a little more relaxed about the matter.

As far as the advertisement in the *Labor Herald* is concerned, I am still perfectly entitled as an individual to express the views that I have always and traditionally expressed about uranium mining and the nuclear fuel cycle. I have not changed my mind about that, but I make it very clear that, the people having spoken, I accept that decision as far as the Government is concerned. If members opposite want to twist and turn that around as best they are able, let them do so. No doubt, they will seek to do so, but they are not as committed to democracy as are the people on this side of the House. They are only too pleased to get up in the Parliament and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —quote at great length from the proceedings of the Australian Labor Party's Federal conferences and State conventions, which are held annually in the case of the State conferences and biannually in the case of the Federal conferences. Of course, our democratic Party deliberations are held in public, unlike the secret star chamber performances that occur on the other side. Members opposite can smile, but the Liberal Party does not have the guts to hold its conferences in public—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the member for Glenelg to order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: —and to let a little sunshine flow in behind the closed doors that confront the press whenever they turn up at Liberal Party functions. I think I have made my position as clear as it is possible to make it as far as members opposite are concerned. If anyone wants to know my views in relation to uranium mining and the nuclear fuel cycle generally, he or she can refer back through *Hansard* to the six or seven speeches that I have made on that subject. I would be only too happy to take another 20 minutes of the time of the House that has been allocated for my contribution today, but I do not think it is worth while my gracing this shabby political exercise any further.

I would have thought that my views on this matter were as clear as were anyone's in this Parliament. I received a back-handed compliment this afternoon when I was described by the Deputy Leader in relation to my views on this matter as being redoubtable, straight and honest, if misguided. A back-handed compliment, maybe, but I do not think the Deputy Leader or any other member of this Parliament is in any doubt as to my beliefs in this matter. I suppose that in years to come, if I have the opportunity to say, 'I told you so', most of us will be dead anyway, so I will not even have the satisfaction of saying that. Nonetheless, people know my views; they are on public record, and my conscience is clear in the matter. I intend to support the Premier's amendment, and I will do so at the appropriate time by voting for it.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): Shortly after the Prime Minister (Hon. Bob Hawke) had made his whirlwind tour to a range of countries and had had afternoon tea with the Royal family, he returned to Australia and did a series of interviews, one of which was on the A.B.C. programme *P.M.* During that interview he was pressed to some extent by the interviewer as to what his attitude would be to the dissident group within his own Party, members of which were voicing openly their objections to a number of policy changes he had introduced since the Federal Labor Government had been elected. He was asked whether or not he would take action against those groups and whether or not he would amend his own policy in the light of the criticism he had received from those within the Labor Party, including Federal Labor members of Parliament.

In that interview the Prime Minister gave an absolute undertaking that in no way did he intend to back off on the issue of East Timor or on other vital issues that had been brought publicly to the fore during that tour. When pressed on the issue of uranium, however, the Prime Minister indicated (and I think the motion before the House this afternoon is significant) that that was a matter for further discussion within the Party. In other words, of all the issues being considered by the A.L.P., this was the only one regarding which the Prime Minister was openly prepared to admit that he would probably compromise his stand and that further consultation was necessary within the Labor Party before he was prepared to say where he stood.

Having borne in mind that interview, and having recorded as accurately as I could what the Prime Minister said on that occasion, I found very significant the preparations made in August and September for a blockade at Roxby Downs, because there was no doubt that the left wing of the Labor Party throughout Australia was focusing its attention on Roxby Downs and attempting to make that the centre of the uranium issue. I found even more significant an advertisement that appeared last week in the Australian Labor Party's official newspaper the *Herald* (which was referred to earlier), in which a number of people objected to Roxby Downs being part of the anti-uranium campaign. I shall refer to that matter in more detail in a moment.

I was not surprised to hear last week that the Prime Minister, in trying to reach a compromise on the one political issue which could split the Australian Labor Party throughout Australia, namely uranium, was retreating significantly from the policy that had been held before the last Federal election

and was willing to compromise with the left wing on that issue. The Prime Minister is a very astute politician: he knows that the uranium issue is the one issue that could split the Australian Labor Party and therefore defeat it at Federal and State levels throughout Australia. Therefore, it is the one issue on which he will have to compromise and compromise significantly. As the left wing has turned its attention to making Roxby Downs the focal point of its anti-uranium policy, it was therefore no surprise whatever to find that the Prime Minister was willing to retreat very significant ground on the issue of Roxby Downs. To put it crudely, the Prime Minister is willing to concede ground on Roxby Downs to the detriment of South Australia and this State's development for the sake of maintaining unity within the Australian Labor Party.

That is the hub of the events that have occurred throughout Australia during the past seven days, and I shudder to think what is going on this afternoon behind the closed doors of Cabinet, where we have a Prime Minister who is prepared, for the sake of his Party's unity, to put in jeopardy the future of a most significant mining operation in South Australia. The whole purpose of the Opposition's putting forward the motion this afternoon is to obtain a bipartisan approach from this Parliament so that we can put before the Prime Minister of Australia, as soon as possible, an indication that South Australia is not prepared to accept that standard from the Prime Minister; that we are not prepared to lose Roxby Downs for the sake of unity within the Australian Labor Party across Australia, that we are not prepared to lose Roxby Downs for the sake of the Prime Minister's trying to reach a compromise on the one very sore issue being confronted by the A.L.P.

This afternoon members of the Labor Party here carefully dodged this issue. The Premier, the Minister of Mines and Energy and the member for Elizabeth were very astute in ensuring that at no stage did they address the issue of what the Prime Minister is doing. The Premier's amendment to the motion refers to how Roxby Downs has the potential to bring major benefits to both the South Australian and national economies. There is no argument about that whatsoever. The amendment further states:

> No further inquiry into the project is necessary, and its development should proceed under the conditions previously determined by the Parliament.

The Premier's amended motion fails to tackle the Prime Minister on the very issue relevant to why the Leader of the Opposition has instigated the motion, namely, that the Prime Minister is about to sell Roxby Downs and a significant development in this State down the drain for the sake of his Party's unity and for the purpose of compromising with the left wing of the A.L.P. The object is to secure a bipartisan approach from this Parliament, the media of South Australia and all South Australians willing to stand up and fight for South Australia.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: It is interesting that the Premier should interject. I think I read in Saturday's paper the comment that when the Premier has nothing else to say, which seems to be most of the time, he makes interjections such as that which we just heard. It is rather interesting to note that the Premier has nothing more significant running through his poor mind at present than such a reflection as he just made across the House. The point that disturbs me is that neither the Premier nor the Minister of Mines and Energy (the two Ministers responsible for this State's development as far as Roxby Downs is concerned) would touch on the point or throw out any challenge against the Prime Minister not to hold that inquiry. There are no grounds whatsoever on which the Prime Minister can call an inquiry.

We have had the Fox Inquiry, or what was more commonly known as the Ranger Inquiry, which dealt widely with all the issues involved (or at least certainly these issues involving the Federal Government). This State had a Select Committee on the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill. We appreciate that the Labor Party came in with a minority report but that it has seen the error of its ways and is now supporting the majority point of view expressed by that Select Committee.

Several South Australian Federal Labor members of Parliament have expressed a point of view, and I am delighted to see in the gallery, Mr Jacobi, M.H.R., who has come out so strongly with the statement that there is no justification for the Prime Minister to carry out an inquiry. I am delighted that he has taken on the Prime Minister head on. However, I am disappointed that the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy are not prepared to do likewise. I listened carefully to what the Premier had to say: he talked about Roxby Downs and dealt with all the issues, with which none of us would raise any argument, in terms of the magnitude and the potential of Roxby Downs. He said, referring to Roxby Downs:

> It is a project of enormous significance.

We agree entirely with that. Our concern is that the significance to this State, which will be great in terms of jobs and economic return, will be lost if the Prime Minister continues to have his way and allow Roxby Downs to be used as a pawn for political purposes in an attempt to reach a compromise with the left wing of the A.L.P. The Minister of Mines and Energy tried to create the impression that the advertisement inserted in the *Herald* last week was there simply on the grounds of saying there should be no nuclear war. There is no argument at all in this Parliament, I would think, on the issue of being opposed to nuclear war. But, if one looks at the advertisement, it does not say that it states:

> Write to the Prime Minister and the Premier on the following four issues: (1) no Roxby Downs; (2) no new mines—

that is uranium mines—

> (3) no new export contracts for uranium; and (4) cancel existing contracts with countries testing and/or dumping uranium.

They are the issues about which the signatories ask people to write to the Prime Minister and the Premier of this State. Who is one of those signatories—none other than the member for Elizabeth, the Hon. Peter Duncan (who incidentally is also a member of the A.L.P. Federal Executive) and members of the Executive of the A.L.P. here in South Australia, as well as members of the Federal Executive of the A.L.P.

In the next two or three weeks I have no doubt that we are to see what will be a very vigorous and unfortunate conflict within the A.L.P. trying to resolve its uranium policy. The policy reached at its biennial conference last year was one of political compromise, knowing that a State election was coming up in South Australia, as well as a Federal election. The Prime Minister now (Mr Hawke), the Leader of the Party nationally then (Mr Hayden), and the present Premier of this State, who was Leader of the Opposition at the time (Mr Bannon), obviously wanted a compromise, because they knew that if their Party went to the polls nationally, or certainly in South Australia, opposed to Roxby Downs it would be defeated. They had to remove that obstacle.

So, we are now seeing an attempt by the A.L.P. after it won Government, both in South Australia and federally, to try to wriggle out of this unfortunate position in which it put itself for reasons of political expediency. I have the gravest concern that the one cost of sorting out that problem now within the A.L.P. will be the loss of Roxby Downs for South Australia. It is not hard to imagine what is in the

Prime Minister's mind—'Let us have an inquiry into Roxby Downs. Perhaps we might try to hide the significance of Roxby Downs, as such, and broaden that inquiry to look at other aspects of uranium mining as well.' But, the sole intention and the focus of that inquiry will be, first, to obtain further time; secondly, to appease the left wing of the Labor Party and, I believe ultimately, to gradually prepare the public of Australia for the loss of Roxby Downs.

After all, in the Prime Minister's mind, Roxby Downs is certainly a significant project, but it is a significant project in a very small State, as far as numbers in Canberra are concerned. It is a matter which he probably thinks will not change the fortunes of Government in Canberra and one with which he can live for the sake of Party unity; in fact, one with which he has to live for the sake of Party unity in Canberra. I believe that he thinks it is far more important that there be unity within the A.L.P. and a compromise on this very difficult issue with the left wing, which could otherwise split the Party at the expense of Roxby Downs.

Finally, I come to the very brief speech by the member for Elizabeth. There is no doubt that this afternoon he had a change of heart after he came into this Chamber. Shortly after 2 p.m. we watched how he carried in books and *Hansard* volumes, and there is no doubt that he was to give us a major half-hour speech on the one subject about which he feels more strongly than any other. I find it interesting that the member for Elizabeth has been very honest this afternoon. He said he is opposed to uranium mining and the export of uranium for any purpose whatsoever: that is clearly brought out in the advertisement he supported last week in the A.L.P. *Herald.* However, I find his attitude staggering, and it shows the strength of the gun at the head as regards the honourable member's preselection within the A.L.P. and the declaration he signed. He stood up this afternoon in an almost pathetic way, and I almost felt sorry for him having to say that, despite his personal views, he would have to toe the line and vote for this motion which supports Roxby Downs and the mining and export of uranium.

Mr Groom: He said the people had spoken; he said he was a Democrat.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: That was his way of trying to justify to himself and to this House why he needed to support this motion. We know the reasons why. He said in a very emotional way, and one which obviously hurt him, that he was going to have to support this motion despite the fact that it is against all his personal views. I stress the point that the member for Elizabeth is holding his guns because he knows darn well that he is slowly mustering more and more support, along with his other left wing colleagues in the Australian Labor Party, for an anti-uranium policy and the stopping of uranium exports from Australia.

I come to one other point in the Premier's amended version of this motion: it stresses the point that Parliament should proceed with the development of Roxby Downs under the conditions set out previously by this Parliament. Unfortunately, the indenture Bill passed by this Parliament does not dictate or have any control over exports of uranium from Australia. The significant part is that unfortunately what this Parliament has supported will not guarantee that Roxby Downs can proceed. Sticking to the terms of the indenture Bill will not guarantee the future of Roxby Downs, because it will not guarantee the export of uranium mined from Roxby Downs. Without those exports the uranium would not be viable, because there is no industry within Australia involving the use of uranium, and without those exports, of course, and the mining of the uranium Roxby Downs is not an economic proposition.

So the Premier's amendment is an absolute farce and should not be supported. I will not be supporting it, because it ignores entirely the key points of bringing pressure to bear on the Prime Minister to make sure that he backs down, and of giving a clear message from this Parliament of South Australia, on behalf of all South Australians, that we take a bipartisan approach in supporting Roxby Downs and the export of uranium that may be mined from that area.

Finally, I was disappointed to hear the Premier say that he was sure that the Prime Minister got the clear message that South Australia wanted no inquiry into Roxby Downs because the Prime Minister could have read it in Saturday morning's *Advertiser.* If that is the only basis on which the Premier has communicated his ideas to the Prime Minister, I am disgusted. I ask the Premier to fly immediately to Canberra, if necessary, to take up the issue on a person-to-person basis with the Prime Minister. I know that he tends to be reluctant to do so, and that he is scared to confront the Prime Minister on issues such as the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line but, as to this issue involving South Australia and as to putting forward a bipartisan approach of this Parliament, he must do so. I encourage all members of the House to support the motion as amended by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which represents a fair, non-political point of view on behalf of all South Australians.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): First, in rebuttal, might I put the Premier right on an elementary error he made initially in his speech. I did not call a press conference yesterday to announce my intention to move this motion as he claimed. I did not seek to grandstand. My letter was delivered to his office before it was published or reported by the media. I suggest that if the Premier did not receive the message until the media inquired, he should look into his office procedures, because due courtesy was observed in delivering the letter to him in the initial stages.

Mr Mathwin: We used to hear the day after.

Mr OLSEN: I did not want to resort to highlighting what the Premier did when in this position. I will not resort to those sorts of tactic. We did supply details to the Premier's office, and the fact that it is not an efficient operation is something that he ought to look into; it is certainly none of my business. In addition, the Premier has spent some time suggesting that this motion was not necessary because the Government's attitude was well known. I ask the Premier whether he is suggesting that, because his Government has expressed a view, this Parliament has no right to do so. Of course it has a right to express a view on a matter so fundamental and important to South Australia.

The motion seeks to express a view in relation to an inquiry which the Federal Government is currently considering and concerning which Federal Caucus, in which there are Federal Labor members from South Australia, will have a vote. We have every right as a Parliament to put a point of view to those people who will be making a decision in Canberra that affects one of the most significant issues and projects in South Australia's history. I will not resile from that responsibility. I will not sit down quietly and see by default a project slip through the fingers of South Australia, a project that would supply jobs and investment for South Australia. If the Premier wants to take a 'softly softly' approach with the Prime Minister that is his business, but we as an Opposition will not resile from our responsibility to point up clearly our point of view and, in the forum available to us as elected representatives, to put that point of view to the people of South Australia.

To suggest that it is political grandstanding is not doing justice to the motion. At least the Premier's colleagues in the Upper House were prepared to take at face value the motion on the Notice Paper and to support it. However,

down here it is a different kettle of fish. Down here we seek to amend it. It was a motion that was bipartisan in approach, and I stressed in my speech the necessity for this issue to receive bipartisan support of South Australians, bipartisan support in a resolution of this Parliament, and for that reason the original motion was specifically framed so that all political Parties could support it in a bipartisan approach. But, no, the Premier and his Government seek to amend it and to take a divisive approach to the original motion. At least the Hon. Chris Sumner, Leader of the Government in the Upper House, was prepared to take it at face value and not play petty politics with a motion of such significance for South Australia. Be that as it may, at least through the amendment of the Deputy Leader we are now putting it back in perspective and, as has been pointed out, putting the onus back where it belongs in this issue: with the Federal Labor Government. We are demonstrating that an inquiry is not neccessary. The Premier said that my motion did not mention an inquiry: I suggest to him that, by calling on the Federal Government to give an immediate commitment and full support to the project, it is implicit that there should be no inquiry and that this matter should not be put on ice for six months. For someone with a Tennyson medal (I think that is the award he keeps trotting out in the Chamber from time to time) the Premier ought to have at least understood that in the wording of the original motion. I regret that the Premier introduced politics into the matter.

The Hon. J.C. Bannon: You what?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: The Premier may not like it very much, but specifically I made my speech today on the basis of a bipartisan approach. The Premier talks about consensus, but when he has consensus on major issues he abuses it, and we have seen another example of that today in this Parliament. So much for the credibility of the man leading the Government of South Australia.

Because the Premier himself raised this matter, let us trace a little bit of history. It was not so long ago that the Premier described the project as a mirage in the desert. Those were his own words in this Parliament. It was the efforts of the former Liberal Government that it put life into the Roxby Downs project, and there is no mistaking that fact. The Minister of Mines and Energy implied that, because I had not given praise to the former Government, I had been neglectful in my speech. Yet he also noticed—he ought to have—that in my speech I did not specifically refer to the endeavours of the Deputy Leader, as Deputy Premier and Minister of Mines and Energy, who worked solidly (and successfully) for three years to bring the most significant indenture into this Parliament. I did not resort to that, because it is history and a well known fact.

What we are on about now is to make sure that this project proceeds, as it ought to, and that clearly we do not need another inquiry. To suggest that we are morally bankrupt because we do not give consideration to environment and safety factors completely overlooks the fact, purposely I would suggest, that it was the former Government that brought in the radiation protection standards and safety for workers. We did address those problems. We are a Party with a conscience; if we were not, we would not have brought that legislation into the Parliament at the same time as we introduced the Roxby Downs indenture Bill. We have accepted our responsibility right across the board, as it relates not only to the economy of this State but also to the workers on site at Roxby Downs. That is evidenced, not in rhetoric but in action and in legislation on the Statute Book of South Australia; no-one can deny that. No-one can question our motives or direction in relation to this project.

I want to refer specifically to the markets. One of the critical factors in relation to Roxby Downs and the feasibility study required to be completed by the end of 1984 is the examination of possible markets. I remind the Premier of what he said during the Estimates Committee debates when he was talking about his forthcoming trip to Japan. Referring to uranium mining, he said:

> I am not pursuing the issue in Japan, as I do not think it is relevant to our economic future.

One can only interpret that as meaning that the Premier is totally confused and is doing a soft-shoe shuffle for the benefit of the left wing of his Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I am disappointed that the member for Elizabeth is going to walk straight through the Chamber—what an incredible contribution we have heard from him today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OLSEN: One can always tell when a raw nerve of the Government is touched. Obviously, a raw nerve has been touched somewhere.

Members interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: Do not worry about the people on this side of the House, my good friends. People on this side clearly know where they are going, and they have known all along the line. If it had not been for the persistence of people on this side of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If this state of disorder continues I shall vacate the Chair. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: I re-emphasise some of the points I have made in summarising this debate. My original motion called on the Federal Government specifically to give an immediate commitment of support for the project. The Premier's amendment is silent on that point, and purposely so. We have seen what happened regarding the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line: he sent that heavy negotiator, the Deputy Premier, to Canberra to look after South Australia's interests. So much did he look after South Australia's interests that goodness knows where that rail link to Darwin will end up, despite the clear unequivocal election promise of the former Liberal Leader and the present Labor Leader in Canberra. That represents yet another promise broken by the Federal Labor Government. I and the Liberal Party want to make sure that a further promise is not broken by the Hawke Labor Government.

This bipartisan point of view embodied in this motion (which I had hoped the Premier would be prepared to take on face value and to practise a little of the consensus that he attempts to preach) would be a clear indication to the Federal Government of the position of the South Australian Parliament and, more particularly, it would at least express a point of view to the Federal Labor members of Parliament going to the Caucus meeting. I suggest that the Premier ought to have a meeting with them, but he said it was not necessary. Obviously, he has Messrs Scott and Bolkus on side: they will support the Roxby Downs project in the Caucus vote. If that is the case, I am delighted. Having had this motion put up publicly, however, if the Premier is not prepared to take up the issue with them directly, they will at least see a bipartisan approach by the people of South Australia through this Parliament indicating that the project ought not to have any further inhibiting factor applied to it. For that reason, I ask the House to support the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the Premier's amendment.

The SPEAKER: The question is 'That the amendment of the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to the honourable Premier's amendment be agreed to'. For the question say 'Aye', against, 'No'. I believe that the Noes have it.

A division on the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy's amendment to the Hon. J.C. Bannon's amendment was called for.

While the division bells were ringing:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is this the appropriate time to take the point about the two members who hold shares in Western Mining Corporation? If the amendment is agreed to, the prices of W.M.C. shares may be affected. Therefore, the members to whom I have referred have a direct pecuniary interest.

The SPEAKER: I have noted the point of order. I do not uphold it, and I cannot countenance it at this stage. It is clearly out of order. It can be raised only at the time of, or subsequent to, the vote.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am at a loss to understand when the time would be appropriate. This surely is the time of the vote?

The SPEAKER: The appropriate time is after the vote has been taken.

The House divided on the Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy's amendment to the Hon. J.C. Bannon's amendment:

Ayes—(19) Mrs Adamson, Messrs P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Ingerson, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (21)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Allison, Chapman, and Gunn. Noes—Messrs Lynn Arnold, Gregory, and Keneally.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy's amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. I understand that this is the appropriate time to raise a point of order in relation to the vote that has just been taken. I direct the House's attention to Standing Order 214, which states:

> No member shall be entitled to vote in any division upon a question in which he has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of any member so interested shall be disallowed.

As I said, I understand from a review of the register of members' interests that the families of two members opposite hold shares in Western Mining Corporation, one of the joint venturers in the Roxby Downs project, and quite clearly the result of this vote in the House today could affect the shares of Western Mining Corporation; as such, the members concerned would be likely to benefit directly from the change in the value of those shares. Therefore, Mr Speaker, I ask you to rule that the votes cast by the honourable members should be whatever the appropriate word is.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member for Elizabeth to identify the two members he alleges to be disqualified.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The two members are the member for Torrens and the member for Hanson.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I propose to make a general statement and then, as I see my duty, I have to ask two specific questions. The general statement is quite clear. Following the practice of Erskine May and our own Standing Orders and also, in particular, *Webster's* case and the decision of Sir Garfield Barwick, Chief Justice of the High Court, sitting as a judge in a court of disputed returns, the holding of shares in itself is not a disqualifying factor. I have no intention of constituting myself a judge by investigating the quantum of shares and what effect that might have. Therefore, I shall restrict myself, as I see it, to the one relevant question to each honourable member, and the one relevant question will be, 'Do you hold a public office in Western Mining Corporation?' The honourable member for Torrens?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: No, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hanson?

Mr BECKER: No, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. Mr Speaker, I think that you may have misunderstood my point of order, and I would like to recap it. The question that I have put to you, Sir, is not whether or not Western Mining Corporation, as such, will or will not benefit as a result of this vote, and the associated question of whether, as office holders or the like, the two members concerned would benefit. The point I am putting is that they will benefit personally because of changes in the share values, and that is a different proposition from the one on which I believe you have ruled.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will now rule on that specifically and say that, to the extent that the honourable members might benefit (and I make no comment on that) or that their families might benefit (and I make no comment on that), I am guided by the decision of Sir Garfield Barwick, and I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and ask whether it is your intention to direct the same question to me or any other member of the House who happens to hold shares in one of the unit trusts. I am not appreciative of the actual portfolio of a unit trust but, because the unit trust in which I have shares (and have so declared) is the Natural Resources of Australia Trust (No. 5), it is conceivable that part of its portfolio is Western Mining Corporation shares; indeed, other members in this place with any of the other unit trusts may find themselves indirectly in a similar position. We are, if I am allowed to make a single comment, in a farcical situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whether or not we are in a farcical situation, we must disagree on it. I think that we are in a very clear situation. I believe that I made myself clear last week, whether it was liked or disliked. I believe that I have made myself clear this afternoon again, whether it was liked or disliked, and I have no intention of putting such a question. In fact, my next duty is to put the next matter before the Chair, which is, 'That the amendment moved by the Premier to the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition be agreed to'.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Section 58 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act makes it an offence for a person to commit an act of gross indecency with or in the presence of a person under the age of 16 years or to procure the commission of an act of gross indecency by or in the presence of a person under the age of 16 years. The Mitchell Committee thought that this section probably covered the taking of pornographic photographs of a person under the age of 16 years, but suggested that the section should be amended in order to remove any possible doubt. In 1978 the section was amended by the addition of new provisions dealing with the taking and dissemination of pornographic photographs of children. These amendments provide that a person commits an offence if he takes photographs of a person under the age of 16 years while that person 'is committing an act of gross inde-

cency or is in an attitude or pose calculated to give indecent prominence to sexual or excretory organs'. The section also prohibits dissemination of such photographs.

In December 1981, and again this year, charges based upon these provisions were dismissed by a magistrate. In dismissing the charge the magistrate made a number of criticisms of the provisions and suggestions for reform. I shall deal briefly with the matters raised by the magistrate. His first criticism is that the Act, as presently framed, is restricted to acts of gross indecency as distinct from acts of indecency.

The magistrate's second criticism relates to the expression 'indecent prominence to sexual . . . organs'. He suggests that photographs that merely give prominence to sexual organs should attract the operation of the provision. This criticism appears to ignore the fact that there are circumstances in which children's sexual organs might legitimately be photographed—for example, for the purposes of medical case histories. The magistrate's third criticism is that the amendments, while dealing with photographs taken of a child in an indecent pose, do not deal with the case where the pose is innocent but the indecency is produced by lens manipulation or other techniques of photographic composition. There is perhaps some force in this objection. There appears, however, to be little force in the magistrate's final criticism that the amendments would permit prosecution of a parent who took a photograph with merely 'humorous intent'. It is questionable whether a parent whose sense of humour extends to the taking of indecent photographs of his children merits sympathetic consideration at law.

The magistrate concluded that there is clearly a need for prohibition of photography of naked children without parental consent for purposes of lust or commercial gain. This sugestion is at once too wide and too narrow. It would allow parents to consent to the photographing of naked children for the purpose of lust or commercial gain. On the other hand, it would catch quite innocent behaviour: for example, a commercial photographer photographing a crowded beach scene where some of the crowd are naked children. Moreover, such a provision would, in relation to material coming into the State from overseas, create insuperable problems in proving lack of parental consent and the purpose for which the photographs were taken.

It should be clearly borne in mind that the 1978 amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act are directed against pornographic material involving children, and the material, the subject of the unsuccessful charges, could not be described as pornographic. Of the 37 photographs the subject of the second charge, 20 were of a girl under 16, some fully naked, some partially naked; two were simply facial photographs of the girl aged under 16; 12 were photographs of a girl over 16, some partially naked, some fully naked—these photographs were taken in the presence of the girl aged under 16; and three photographs were of a girl aged over 16 giving prominence to the pubic area, breast or buttocks—these photos were taken in the presence of the girl aged under 16. None of the photographs depicted a child in a pose calculated to give indecent prominence to sexual or excretory organs and consequently did not come within section 58.

The Government has looked closely at the problem of the exploitation of children for the purpose of sexual gratification. In the Government's view, it is unacceptable that children should be made use of for sexual purposes, even though this does not involve physical contact with the child which would be an offence under any other provision of the law, or the production of material that is pornographic or indecent by today's standards. Accordingly, the Government proposes that a new section 58a be inserted in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act providing that it shall be an offence if a person, with a view to gratifying his own or some other person's prurient interest, incites or procures the commission by a child of an indecent act, or causes or induces a child to expose any part of his or her body. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act a new section 58a which provides that it shall be an offence if a person, with a view to gratifying prurient interest (whether of that person or some other person), incites or procures the commission by a child of an indecent act, or causes or induces a child to expose any part of his or her body. The proposed new section provides that such conduct shall constitute an indictable offence punishable, in the case of a first offence, by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or, in the case of a subsequent offence, by imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years. A 'child' is defined for the purposes of the section as being a person under the age of 16 years.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 September. Page 729.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): The Opposition supports the Bill. However, I point out that the Bill as introduced into this Chamber from the Legislative Council is a far cry from the measure that was introduced in the Upper House. In introducing the Bill into the Legislative Council in his second reading explanation the Minister of Fisheries said:

> Extensive consultation has taken place with the Australian Fishing Industry Council, representing industry, and the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council, representing recreational fishing interests. These bodies and the Department of Fisheries strongly support the concept of Ministerial notices.

The strange part is that after having discussed this proposed legislation with the recreational fishing interests, we found that virtually none of those interests knew anything about the measure. In fact, in one instance one of the bodies concerned recalled the matter having been raised in passing some two or three years earlier. But the measure introduced into the Legislative Council went a lot further than the provisions in the measure that was previously discussed with the South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council. In fact, the Bill went as far as amending sections 25, 46, 47, 49, 51 and 55.

As there had been no specific negotiations or discussions with the recreational fishing interests, the Legislative Council saw fit to amend the Bill by deleting from the proposed amendment to section 25 reference to 'declared waters'; from the amendment to section 47 reference to undersized fish; from the amendment to section 49 reference to use of devices; from the amendment to section 51 reference to bag limits; and from the amendment to section 55 reference to noxious fish. The lack of consultation was certainly borne out by a letter that was received from the Australian Anglers Association in which it clearly spelt out that the association had had no detailed consultation with the Minister or his Department on this matter. I will not read into *Hansard* the entire contents of the letter, as I believe that its contents were read into *Hansard* in another place.

The letter clearly indicated that the Minister, in his second reading explanation to the Council, had not been completely honest with the Parliament, and amendments that were moved by the Opposition in the other place were accepted by the Minister. I have no personal objection to the Minister or the Department being able to make, by notice in the *Gazette* specific changes that were discussed some time ago with industry and with recreational interests: that was particularly in relation to section 46 referring to closed seasons, closed waters and protected species. I accept that if there is some need or if it can be demonstrated that it may be of benefit for the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to be able to extend a closed season for a further fortnight.

However, it can also be pointed out that a special Executive Council meeting can be called at very short notice. Certainly, in my experience I have never known his Excellency the Governor to refuse to receive a special Executive Council meeting to enable a proclamation to be made. In fact, in some instances with a special Executive Council meeting and special gazettal it could be done more quickly and provide a result more quickly than would be the case with the Minister giving notice in the *Gazette*. In regard to the other matters to which I referred, namely, declared waters, undersized fish, devices, bag sizes and noxious fish, there is no reason on earth why those matters should be subject to alteration by the Minister by his giving notice in the *Gazette*.

Those areas are based on extensive scientific research and investigation and not on decisions that are made overnight. Therefore, we believe that those areas should be left as they are. However, the Opposition accepts that there is some validity in giving the Minister and the Department the opportunity to vary, by the Minister's notice in the *Gazette*, the area in relation to the closed season. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I add my support to this measure. I think it is probably designed for the purpose of management of a fishery, more particularly in respect of the prawn fishing industry. I think this year is a classic example of what could happen. Members will obviously be aware that the fisheries management of the prawn industry was developed by the industry itself with no assistance whatsoever from the Government of the day and, particularly, I think it is fair to say, with hindrance from the Government of the day at the time that these policies were developed. It was from their own research and devices that these people were able to bring in closures. They implemented those closures through their own decisions, despite the fact that the Minister of the day was saying, 'No, you should not have closures.'

The situation has now developed where there is general recognition that proper fisheries management should take place. Now we have within the prawn industry certain days of the month when it is closed. That is often referred to within the industry as 'moon closure'. For the eight days just preceding and just after the full moon, the management of the prawn industry closes any form of fishing for prawns.

There is a two-fold reason for that. One is that it does not excessively harvest prawn stocks. More particularly, during that month the prawns moult, and during those eight days the prawn itself has a very soft shell, so it is a poorer quality fish. If the prawn is taken during those eight days because of its soft shell, obviously a lot more damage occurs when it is brought up. They cannot be packed in shell; they can only be used for prawn meat. Therefore, it is a much lower quality. Generally speaking, arguments in favour of moon closures are overwhelming.

Those closures were planned on the experience of previous years, but for some reason this year at the normal opening period prawns are still soft shelled. It is in such cases that the Government is able to make proclamations almost overnight if it is found after the first night or two of fishing that it is necessary for some closures to take place. The industry itself embarked on a closure or a delayed opening of the season for this year.

So, I think the reason behind this closure is well known and well documented, but I do agree with the member for Chaffey that it is not necessary to incorporate those other facets of the Bill for which the determination has been made over months, if not years, of research. Why should they be brought in when such reasons for closures are developed over a long period, and do not need to be made over an *ad hoc* or immediate period of time? I support the measure from the point of view of the prawn industry. I think that is the reason for which it was intended. However, the Minister has spread it far wider than is necessary in practice to operate.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In supporting the member for Chaffey's remarks, I simply want to place on the record an instance of recent consultation that took place in a form outlined in correspondence dated yesterday, 24 October, to the prawn fishermen in Investigator Strait. It is a schedule of proposed closures for St Vincent's Gulf between November and December of this 1983 season and between February and June of the next 1984 season. The main closures, the days involved and details in relation to actual times on each of those respective days are outlined in the correspondence. The signatory to the letter, Mr Ian Kirkegaard, Acting Director of Fisheries, says in conclusion in that letter:

> The Minister of Fisheries in approving your continued operations in Investigator Strait said that closures in Investigator Strait and St Vincent's Gulf would be complementary. Before proceeding with equivalent closures for Investigator Strait I invite your comments on this proposal as it applies to the area you fish.

In reading that final paragraph, I place on the record that the Minister as of today confirmed that the proposal is subject to consideration of the Investigator Strait fishermen or their response to the Minister with respect to the proposed details as they apply to St Vincent's Gulf, later applying to Investigator Strait. It is not a direction. It is simply an invitation wherein the two fishermen in those most southern waters of Investigator Strait are invited to agree with or in other words apply closures complementary to those which are proposed in the upper reaches of St Vincent's Gulf. I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I have one very strong point to make. I support this proposal, as does the Liberal Party. I do so on the clear understanding obtained not from any of my Party colleagues but from the Minister of Fisheries that this amendment to section 46 of the principal Act to give this power to him in this fashion will never be used in any circumstances to control the harvest and sale of fish which are produced by commercial fish farmers. It will be used only where it relates to fish taken from the wild by licensed fishermen who have authority to do so by virtue of the Act under which they are licensed.

I think it would be quite wrong in relation to people who were engaged in farming fish, just as I believe it would be quite wrong if people engaged in farming animals were to find that their right to harvest and sell those animals was impaired by resort to this measure. The only circumstances, of course, in which it would be justifiable is if it were necessary to prevent the spread of any disease of that fish species or any disease affecting human beings as consumers of the fish, if it was certain that the fish species was the vector of the disease.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 September. Page 729.)

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Opposition supports the Bill in the form in which it was received from the Legislative Council. It is a short Bill that seeks to do three things, the first of which is to make changes to the basis of rating, for local government purposes, of Samcor land. The second is in relation to payments that will be made from the deficit fund to the new Government Financing Authority, instead of to vendors of the corporation and, thirdly, stock and meat will be able to be held at Samcor for all charges owed to it, not just for slaughtering or delivery charges.

The debate in the Legislative Counsel took stock of the comments made in the Minister's second reading explanation and indeed in part was referred to by one or two members of that place, I think in sufficient detail to demonstrate the Liberal Party's support for the measure. The points raised in this Bill were canvassed and researched while we were in Government, and the proposition was approved in principle by the previous Tonkin Government. There are no departures from the principles incorporated in the approval of those times, and on that basis in this House on behalf of the Liberal Party I support the Bill.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 September. Page 999.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition supports this Bill, which amends the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act, 1972, to provide for another class of persons entitled to claim benefits from the principal Act. At present, the persons who can claim are a spouse, a divorced spouse, a child or the child of the spouse for whose maintenance the deceased has been responsible, a grandchild or a parent. The Bill extends those categories to include a brother and sister of the deceased.

The circumstances in which this legislation might be required are rare, but it must be a source of a great sense of security and satisfaction to the whole community to know that these provisions are here and that indeed in South Australia we have a situation where, if people die without making a will, their estate can be directed into those areas of the family to which most of the community would believe were appropriate areas for an inheritance to pass. So, it is a fairly simple and straightforward Bill designed to cover a rare occurrence, and the Opposition supports it.

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

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 21 September. Page 999.)

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): The Opposition supports this Bill, which was introduced by the Attorney-General via the Minister of Agriculture in another place. It seeks to overcome an anomalous situation relative to the fixing of fees which hitherto has been undertaken by the courts but which now, except in one position that is addressed in this Bill, will be undertaken by way of regulation. It is recognised as being a worthy alteration which will tidy up a great deal of the legislation in this area. It is consistent with other action taken as recently as last Thursday in the Enfield General Cemetery Act Amendment Bill and others.

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister for Environment and Planning): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this grievance debate I wish to refer to my concern about the utilisation of artificial sweeteners in all sorts of products in Australia. I am particularly concerned about the use of cyclamates and saccharin, two products which are extensively used in so-called 'diet drinks'. Cyclamate has been banned in the United States since 1969. It is able to be exported from the United States to other countries. It has not been banned in Australia and is used frequently. A recent attempt to lift the ban in America has failed. Saccharin is restricted in use in the United States to sales over the counter with a health warning. No such ban exists in Australia, and I believe that the Australian public is being put at risk because of the fact that these two substances are being marketed. A new artificial sweetener named Aspartame (marketed as Equal) has been approved for use recently in the United States and is also being used in Australia. Aspartame has been rigorously tested and to this point in time has been found to be harmless to the general public.

There are one or two other artificial sweeteners also developed in the United States, but so far as I know none of these sweeteners is being used in Australia. The problem relates to the possible cancerous effect of the two mentioned sweeteners, cyclamate and saccharin. Saccharin is made from petroleum materials and is a product of the Sherwin-Williams Paint Company (a United States company). Saccharin is also produced and imported mainly from Japan and Korea. The United States Food and Drug Authority proposed the banning of most uses of saccharin in 1977, when various studies showed that the chemical caused bladder tumours in rats. The United States public, however, protested strongly and the Food and Drug Authority alone received 100 000 public comments mostly opposing any ban.

Further extensive tests have taken place since that time. The American Food and Drug Administration, after having surveyed these tests, recommended to Congress that the only legal uses for saccharin would be in foods offered for calorie control and labelled as such or certain technological uses. Congress eventually accepted the recommendations from the Authority, and any saccharin that is sold must now contain the following label:

Use of this product may be hazardous to your health. This product contains saccharin which has been determined to cause cancer in laboratory animals.

Furthermore, any store that sells saccharin must have a notice containing the following:

Saccharin notice—this store sells food including diet beverages and diet food that contain saccharin. You will find saccharin listed in the ingredients statement on most foods which contain it.

The National Academy of Sciences in America, on 4 November 1979, released the first part of its report for the Federal Drug Authority on saccharin. The report was ordered by Congress as part of the Saccharin Study and Labelling Act enacted by the Congress in November 1977. That law placed an 18-month moratorium on any regulation action taken by the Federal Drug Authority against saccharin and required that warning labels appear on saccharin-containing foods and that further studies be conducted.

The N.A.S. Report affirms the validity of the studies that led to the Federal Drug Authority's proposals to prohibit the addition of saccharin to foods and beverages. The Academy's 14-member committee concluded:

1. Saccharin is a carcinogen in animals, albeit of low potency.
2. It is a potential carcinogen in humans.
3. The impurities in saccharin are not the carcinogen agent.
4. 50-70 million Americans consume saccharin with some frequency; one-third of children under 10 are among the users, leading the panel to express particular concern because of the latency period for cancer.
5. Saccharin seems to promote the cancer-causing effects of other cancer-causing agents.
6. There is no evidence that saccharin has any health benefits.

In a statement on the report, Federal Drug Commissioner Donald Kennedy said:

The N.A.S. Report is a comprehensive, objective and thoughtful evaluation of the available scientific information on saccharin. The report's main conclusion fully reinforces that reached earlier by the Federal Drug Authority and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, namely, that saccharin is a weak carcinogen. This report thus confirms the scientific judgment of the two Government agencies which have studied the risk of saccharin.

It is particularly significant that the N.A.S. scientists expressed concern about the exposure of children and women of childbearing age to saccharin and concluded there are no demonstrated benefits from the use of this artificial sweetener.

Cyclamate was discovered by accident after experimentation in laboratory work by Michael Sveda, a chemist at the University of Illinois. It was introduced into the American market by the drug company, Abbott, in the early 1950s and was hailed in the first instance as a competitor for saccharin. It was sold extensively in the United States in the 1950s and the early 1960s. It was originally given a clean bill of health by the American Food and Drug Administration, and it was not until 1966 that experimentation by two Japanese scientists discovered that the consumption of cyclamate produced some undesirable chemical changes in the human body. Cyclamate also contained a particular chemical substance that scientific evidence showed could cause dermatitis and even lead to convulsions when inhaled or when applied to the skin.

Following changes to the law in the United States, it was necessary for all additives to be proved safe, and experimentation continued on this particular substance. During experimentation by Food and Drug Authority scientists, it was found that the injection of cyclamate into fertile chicken eggs led to deformities in the embryos. Further experimentation suggested that certain chemicals within cyclamate caused a breakage in a significant proportion of chromosomes of test animals studied. The studies also concerned the possible involvement of cyclamates in causing cancer, although the initial earlier tests in the early 1950s had revealed no cause for alarm. By June 1969, scientists at the University at Wisconsin reported to Abbott that they found a significant incidence of bladder tumours in two experiments with white Swiss mice, and Abbott communicated these findings to the Federal Drug Authority and the National Cancer Institute.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Tonight I want to speak on an issue that causes me considerable concern. On separate occasions I have been approached by two constituents in relation to complaints that they have about the Transport Workers Union. When the first of those constituents came to me some months ago I thought that possibly he was referring to an isolated incident and that it had been just one of those unfortunate things that might occur. However, a second constituent has outlined to me an almost identical set of circumstances in relation to the way in which he was treated by the Transport Workers Union. Therefore, I think it is time that the actions of that union are brought to the attention of this House.

The constituent who has contacted me most recently informed me that about five years ago he was employed in a position that required him to join the Transport Workers Union. Members opposite, of course, would tell us that there is no such thing as compulsory unionism, but my constituent has put to me that the company from whom he accepted employment had stated that a condition of any such employment was a requirement to join the Transport Workers Union. Therefore, he approached the union and, as he had been unemployed until that time, he was unable to pay immediately the full amount of $55 which was the annual subscription required by the union at that time. He said that he could afford to pay half of the required amount and that he would pay the balance in two weeks' time on pay day.

At that time the union said that that arrangement was quite satisfactory. Because he anticipated some difficulties in his driving position, he asked the union to provide him with a membership card so that if he was challenged he could show any person on request that he was in fact a member of the T.W.U. However, the union stated that until he had paid the full amount he would not be given a membership card. He was also informed (and this is most important) that until that time he would not be regarded as a member of the T.W.U. Less than two weeks after having commenced his employment the person involved was able to obtain another position that was more suited for his talents, and he resigned from his position as a driver. I stress that this occurred less than two weeks after having commenced his duties and after he had been told by an official of the Transport Workers Union that he was not and would not be a member of that union until he had paid his full annual subscription.

Mr Mathwin: In other words, they wouldn't accept him.

Mr ASHENDEN: Correct. It was made quite clear to him that he was not a member of that union. This occurred about five years ago. He resigned from his position as a driver and joined a bakery, at which time, for the same reasons, he joined the union that covered the workers at that bakery. He immediately became a financial member of the union involved. He heard no more from the Transport Workers Union until a couple of months ago. There was a break of five years since having been told that he was not a financial member of the T.W.U. Suddenly, the Transport Workers Union, through its debt collectors issued a summons on my constituent which was delivered to him. The summons demanded payment of the balance of the $55 subscription fee.

My constituent telephoned the T.W.U. after receiving this summons and pointed out the situation that had existed at that time, including the fact that he had been advised that he was not a member of the union and that he had never been issued with a card to indicate that he was a member

of the union. Despite that, when he telephoned the T.W.U. he was told that the union had issued a summons for the outstanding amount of money. It was suggested that he write a letter to the union, giving notification of his resignation, even though he had been told that he was not a member of the union and also he had never been issued with a card.

Mr Lewis: I'll bet he never had a book of rules, either.

Mr ASHENDEN: That would be for sure. He informed the union that he would send the letter immediately, which he did. Then the Transport Workers Union informed him that it was unable to accept his resignation until he had paid the other half of the amount outstanding. The union was quite adamant about that. My constituent considered that that was quite ridiculous as he had never been a member of the union, on its own statement. He informed the union that he had no intention of paying the other half of the amount. He then received in the mail an unsatisfied judgment summons; in other words, the union was determined to get its pound of flesh at any cost.

Naturally, my constituent was very upset about this and he took legal advice. An injunction was issued against the union asking for a stay of proceedings. Negotiations then continued and the T.W.U. was advised that the injunction would be removed in an attempt to come to an amicable arrangement. However, the T.W.U. simply responded by saying, 'We want our money.' My constituent is now in a position of having received a further letter from the union, now demanding that an amount of $120.50 be paid to that union, or else he will be sent to gaol. I would like to read a paragraph from a letter that my constituent received from the Transport Workers Union which is as follows:

> Please note that if the total amount owing is not received in our office within seven days or alternatively mutually satisfactory arrangements for its payment are not made within that time, we will have no alternative but to issue a warrant for your imprisonment.

That was written on behalf of the Transport Workers Union, that bastion of democracy. If members wish to do so, they may read that quotation again in *Hansard*. Of course, my constituent does not want to spend time in gaol, so he contacted the union requesting that he be allowed to pay the amount in monthly instalments of $10. At this stage the union has not informed him whether or not that is a satisfactory arrangement.

This is a disgraceful situation. It is but one incident, and I have raised this matter only because it follows another similar incident where a constituent contacted me with a similar story. He was a member of the Transport Workers Union and the company with which he was employed dismissed him because of redundancy. Having been sacked from his job, my constituent then went on to unemployment and he naturally did not realise or remember that one of the obligations imposed by the T.W.U. is that a member must resign. My constituent did not resign, so the T.W.U. also summonsed him to pay his dues for the forthcoming financial year. When this man was sacked he was a full financial member. He had had some months to go before his financial membership expired.

When he received the letter from the T.W.U. demanding payment, he telephoned the union to explain the situation. However, the union official said, 'I am sorry, you have to resign in writing, and you still owe us money.' This was the position, even though the chap was unemployed, had three children, and was in no financial position to pay the dues covering the time when he was not even in a job that required him to be a member of the T.W.U. So, he came to me, and on that occasion I wrote to the Transport Workers Union outlining the case. The T.W.U. then wrote to my constituent informing him that in his case they would let it go. In that letter they also made some quite pointed and derogatory remarks about me. I would be happy for honourable members to see the letter that I had sent; it was purely and simply an outline of my constituent's situation, and I asked that he be not required to pay the money.

Mr Becker: Read out the letter.

Mr ASHENDEN: I will take up the member's suggestion, and in a future grievance debate I shall read to the House the contents of my letter to the union and the reply from the union, which can only be described as rude. Here was I, as a member of Parliament, simply trying to help a constituent, and all I got from the T.W.U. was abuse. I hope that members of the House have taken note of the two incidents to which I have referred. I would certainly hope that the Transport Workers Union wakes up to the fact that it is there to represent its members and not to bleed them financially.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In the 10 minutes available to me I would like to address myself to a matter I raised previously in the House in the form of a question about security alarms installed by security firms in South Australia. As I pointed out on 18 October, I distributed throughout my electorate a newsletter in which I encouraged people to lock their homes securely and advise their neighbours if they were going away and prevail upon them to keep an eye on their property. That sound advice was offered to me by the Police Department on numerous occasions, and by other people. Subsequently, I was contacted by two constituents about the matter. I went to see one man at his premises in Lockleys and looked at the manufacture and operation of security alarm systems. He informed me that many people were concerned about the unsavoury element which has allegedly crept into the industry, which they believed should be policed more closely in terms of legislation.

I could not disagree with that view, because I believe that there are those elements within security firms (not widespread, but a small minority) whose character is suspicious. They are employed in an area which should be policed more closely. Going back many years when I worked in the railway industry I recall coming home one day, after a security firm had visited previously on a couple of occasions trying to sell a security chain and key for my front door, which I declined. Some time after their visit my house was burgled. I tried to pursue this firm after that happened only to find that they were no longer to be contacted. This made me very suspicious, and subsequently I advised Angas Street police headquarters about the matter.

Three or four months later I spoke with a railway colleague who told me about returning from a wonderful holiday in New Zealand, only to find the icing taken off it because his house had been burgled. I asked him whether he had had a visit from a representative of a security firm, and he replied that that was exactly the case. A man had asked whether he wanted a burglar alarm fitted. This is an area into which the Government should look very closely, not only at the manufacture and installation of these alarms but at people employed in the industry, who should have character references and be checked very closely.

Mr Becker: A security clearance.

Mr HAMILTON: A security clearance, as the member for Hanson has pointed out. I hope that the Government will check this closely. The Minister has indicated that he will pass on my remarks to the Attorney-General to investigate the matter of security alarms. This is a question to which I have paid a great deal of attention over a number of years, particularly in light of my experience. I believe

that it is worth while drawing it to the attention of Parliament and my colleagues in this Chamber. I suggest that they could perhaps convey the information to their constituents.

Another matter I wish to raise results from a question which was asked in Parliament on 20 October by the member for Davenport, to which a response was given by the Minister of Transport. It related to a level crossing accident at Ovingham at 8.20 a.m. that day. I remember the question vividly, especially because of the manner in which the Minister of Transport was asked it. As I perceived it, some criticism was implied of railway staff. I listened intently; people may accuse me of bias in this area, but it is an area that I know very well. I make no apology for my previous comment. The honourable member asked this:

> Will the Minister inform Parliament whether railway staff were aware that vehicles were driving around the malfunctioning but lowered boom gates? If so, what action was taken to alert approaching trains? . . . I am not sure whether or not the lights were still flashing and the bells ringing, but vehicles certainly were driving around the lowered boom gates because there were no trains in sight.

I would have thought that anyone in this place, before making a criticism, would have had the opportunity to contact the Minister's office to find out why certain events took place. But the member for Davenport was prepared to try to make cheap political capital out of a railway crossing accident.

I know from my experience in the railway industry that level crossing accidents are a very emotive issue in the community. If someone is killed or injured, that fact receives a great deal of publicity in the media. But, I suggest that the member for Davenport was prepared to jump in, when he asked this question, to try to make some cheap political capital and imply, as I read from his statement, that railway workers were not doing their job.

Clearly, from my experience in the industry I believe that those workers would not have known (and the Minister's statement today verified that fact) what had taken place, nor could they have known, because of movements not only of S.T.A. services but of the Australian National ballast train operating in the area. If the honourable member had taken time to check that information he could have perhaps asked a constructive question of the Minister, and suggested that where ballast trains were operating in the area both Australian National and the State Transport Authority train control staff should have conferred. But no, he was prepared to jump in. I believe that he should be criticised very strongly for the statements he made and the implications in that question on 20 October. Railwaymen whom I represented for many years have enough to contend with, without people like the member for Davenport standing up in this place, without having done their homework, and implying criticism of railway employees.

Motion carried.

At 6.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 26 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 October 1983

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

72. **The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Which units of the South Australian College of Advanced Education provide instruction to student apprentices under the CRAFT scheme?

2. Are assessments provided by the College to the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The SACAE has no involvement in the training of apprentices. TAFE Colleges at which apprentices are trained are as follows:

Adelaide College of TAFE
Croydon Park College of TAFE
Elizabeth Community College (TAFE)
Gilles Plains Community College (TAFE)
Marleston College of TAFE
Noarlunga College of TAFE
O'Halloran Hill College of TAFE
Panorama Community College (TAFE)
Port Augusta College of TAFE
Port Pirie College of TAFE
Recency Park Community College
South East Community College (TAFE)
Whyalla College of TAFE
Kensington Park College of TAFE

All of these have apprentices whose employers receive the CRAFT rebate.

2. A copy of the statement of results prepared by TAFE Colleges is forwarded to the Commonwealth Department of Employment and Industrial Relations so that the number of days attended by each apprentice can be confirmed as a check against each CRAFT rebate claim.

I suggest the honourable member direct any further inquiries to the Commonwealth Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

142. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Treasurer—

1. Has the portrait of Her Majesty the Queen been completed and presented to the Government and, if so, when and where has it been hung and, if not, when will it be completed and where will it be hung?

2. What opportunity will be available for public viewing of the portrait?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The previous South Australian Government signed an agreement in April 1982 with Bryan Westwood, an Australian artist living in the United States of America, for the painting of a portrait of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II.

Sittings were arranged in May 1982 and first sketches submitted at the end of July. Since then, there have been delays in completing the work. An understanding has been given to the artist's agent that the portrait would be finished by the end of the year.

When the painting is received, it will be made available for viewing by the general public in the Art Gallery before being shifted to Government House where it will be displayed in the ballroom. A second version will be the property of the Art Gallery. The cost of this project is $15 000, plus the cost of frames and expenses in London.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

157. **Mr BECKER** asked (on notice) the Minister for Environment and Planning:

1. What studies have been undertaken into aircraft noise in the residential environment surrounding the Adelaide Airport since its establishment?

2. What are acceptable noise levels for similar areas?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. Control of aircraft noise is essentially a Commonwealth Government responsibility. A study was undertaken by the National Acoustics Laboratory as part of a national survey between 1977 and 1980. The results of this study were published by the Australian Government Publishing Service in 1982 as N.A.L. Report No. 88—'Aircraft Noise in Australia: A survey of Community Reaction'.

2. The N.A.L. study supported the use of a Noise Exposure Forecast (N.E.F.) as an indicator of the exposure of nearby residents to aircraft noise. This index is being used by planning authorities to determine future land use in the vicinity of airports in line with Australian Standard AS 2021—1977 'Code of Practice for Building, Siting and Construction against Aircraft Noise Intrusion' and is supported by the Commonwealth Department of Aviation. The N.A.L. report showed that similar noise levels are experienced in the vicinity of all present Australian airports. The only variation is in the number of people affected; Adelaide ranking second to Sydney (82 000 to 310 000) in the number of people who are moderately affected or worse, that is, within the 15 N.E.F. contour.

PERSONALISED NUMBER PLATES

171. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: How many personalised number plates have been sold to motorists, how much money has been raised through this scheme and how much of it has been spent on road safety?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The replies are as follows:

(a) Approximately 16 500 personalised registered numbers had been allocated as at 31 August 1983. A further 3 000 number plates have been manufactured to replace damaged plates.

(b) Revenue raised from personalised number plates at 31 August 1983 was $1 013 830.

(c) $350 000.

HEALTH COMMISSION RECEIPTS SHORTFALL

173. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary representing the Minister of Health: What caused the shortfall in receipts of the South Australian Health Commission of $21 million for the year ended 30 June 1983 and where did it occur?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: This question has already been fully addressed in the debates on the supplementary appropriation in May 1983. The specific information relating to the $21 million shortfall in initially budgeted receipts is as follows:

(1) *Initial Estimates*

The original estimate of S.A. Health Commission receipts contained in the 1982-83 Budget was $125 million which was made up of $116 million in recognised hospital income and $9 million in other income.

Estimates of hospital income in times of changing health funding arrangements are inevitably fragile and the initial 1982-83 estimate of $116 million in hospital income is now

accepted to have been unrealistically high. It was made in the light of:

considerable pressure from the Commonwealth Government to accept a 1982-83 hospitals income estimate of $130 million as part of the hospital cost-sharing budget (to include Commonwealth estimates of the full-year, full-implementation effects of the Fraser Government's 1 September 1981 amendments to health funding arrangements, and

extremely limited information provided by the Commonwealth in relation to the full year impacts of the 1 September 1981 amendments, especially in regard to the actual numbers of Commonwealth health cards issued and being issued.

The eventually accepted estimate of $116 million in recognised hospital income was made up of two components—$106 million in normal 1982-83 fee income and $10 million to be achieved in 'once-off' reductions in the levels of outstanding accounts. The estimate of $106 million in normal fee income was subsequently increased to $110 million to take account of the 1 February 1983 fee increases.

(2) *Reasons for $21 million Shortfall in Receipts*

The reasons for the $21 million shortfall in Commission receipts are as follows:

(a) Unanticipated changes in the numbers of fee-paying patients.

The estimate of $106 million in normal 1982-83 fee income was based on an expected continuation of the numbers of fee-paying patients experienced in the 6 months period November 1981-April 1982 (the most recent period for which figures were available at the time the estimate was made, and excluding the months immediately after the 1 September 1981 changes to health funding arrangements which significantly affected public behaviour).

During 1982-83 an increase above expectation in the number of patients entitled to receive free treatment as hospital inpatients and outpatients occurred, together with a 2 per cent overall reduction in the number of bed days utilised.

The fee-paying private bed days were 15 per cent less than the original estimates and fee-paying public bed days 14 per cent less. The downturn in fee-paying occupied bed days resulted in reduced revenue in 1982-83 of $17 million.

(b) Failure to achieve 'once-off' reductions in the levels of outstanding accounts.

Criticism of the level of outstanding accounts owed to South Australian hospitals has been current for some time. In the light of the pressures to maximise hospital income in 1982-83, the Commission resolved to reduce this level of outstandings by $10 million in 1982-83 and a target of this amount was included in the estimates of income.

It is estimated that the level of outstanding accounts were reduced by only $2 million in 1982-83. The failure to achieve the target of $10 million in reductions in the level of outstanding accounts is in retrospect directly related to the unrealistically high levels that were specified for 1982-83 hospitals income.

Total Impact

The combined impact of the factors discussed above is a shortfall of $25 million against the initially budgeted 1982-83 hospital income. This has been reduced to $21 million by the inclusion of the $4 million fee income generated by the 1 February 1983 fee increases.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

177. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What action is being taken to ensure that adequate and satisfactory accounting procedures are being adopted by the Department of Correctional Services to prevent a repetition of the Auditor-General's comment, 'The system of accounting is regarded as unsatisfactory and this has been raised with the Department over a number of years by both audit and private consultants'?

2. Does the Auditor-General's comment in relation to the canteen at Yatala mean that the Public Accounts Committee recommendations have been ignored?

3. When will all matters raised by the Auditor-General in his current report be attended to?

4. Will the Minister establish an internal audit section in the Department to improve efficiency and monitor cost effectiveness of programmes and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Correctional Services is reviewing its accounting procedures and is developing new procedures where necessary. Assistance in this regard has been given by the Financial Consulting Unit of the Public Service Board including the secondment of various officers on specific projects.

2. No.

3. All of the matters raised by the Auditor-General in his current report are being attended to.

4. Not at this time. In the short-term, an internal audit section in the Department of Correctional Services is not considered to be the most effective way to improve efficiency and to monitor the cost effectiveness of the programmes. It is more appropriate to develop the activity of the Finance Branch to overcome deficiencies in the systems and procedures available to control the Department's finances.

EMU DOWNS/MARALINGA SURVEY

182. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Lands: Are officers of the Department of Lands engaged in survey work in the Emu Downs/Maralinga areas and, if so, what is the purpose of the survey, and how long will it take?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: A team of eight survey officers from the Department of Lands is engaged in maintenance survey work in the northern part of the State in a region bounded by longitudes 132°-136° and latitudes 27°-29°. The area immediately surrounding the Emu site lies within this region.

The purpose of the work is to maintain the survey marks forming part of the State horizontal and vertical networks in that area. These networks are being developed over the State to provide the basis for its survey infrastructure. The positions of the marks have been very precisely determined by survey in latitude, longitude and elevation, and it is necessary that they be periodically inspected and be replaced if disturbed or removed so that they are available to surveyors for the integration of their surveys into the State survey system. The work commenced on 5 September 1983 and is expected that it will be completed in mid October 1983.

ENDANGERED SPECIES

183. **Mr LEWIS** (on notice) asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Has the Minister determined a list of endangered species of native animals and native plants in South Australia, ranking them in order of importance for Government action to ensure their survival and, if so, what are those lists, when were they determined and what are the reasons for the rankings being so determined for the species within each list and, if not, why not, and does the Minister consider that such lists should be determined as an essential part of setting priorities for Government environmental management policy of native plants and animals?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: No. Although there are lists of rare and threatened species of animals and a list of protected species of plants in the schedules of the National Parks and Wildlife Act, the species within those lists are not ranked in priority order. The information available tells only that these species are in low enough numbers or of sufficient interest to collectors, to give concern as to their future survival. In order to rank these in a priority order which would have any meaning, far more information requiring a considerable amount of survey work would be needed. Even with such information, unpredictable effects of seasonal variation and threat from other organisms would distort priorities and action would be taken irrespective of priorities. The Government is constantly monitoring activities which may be of threat to these lists of species and is, therefore, conscious that any change in an apparently stable situation warrants prompt action. This has happened in the past with yellow-footed rock wallabies, and freckled duck.

RESOURCES AND PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

196. **The Hon. D.C. BROWN** (on notice) asked the Premier: Which Ministers are members of the Resources and Physical Development Committee of Cabinet?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The members of the Resources and Physical Development Committee of Cabinet are:

Dr Hopgood (Chairman), Minister for Environment and Planning/Lands
Mr Wright, Minister of Public Works
Mr Payne, Minister of Mines and Energy
Mr Abbott, Minister of Transport/Marine
Mr Slater, Minister of Water Resources/Recreation and Sport
Mr Hemmings, Minister of Housing/Local Government.

CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING ADVISORY SERVICE

200. **The Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (on notice) asked the Minister of Local Government: Has the Minister received a submission from housing co-operatives seeking the establishment of a co-operative housing advisory service and if so:

(a) what are the details and its stage of consideration and what is the likely role of such a service;
(b) if the Government has not yet made a decision on the proposal, for what reasons has a decision been delayed, what specific parts of the submission are unacceptable and why, and when, if at all, will the Minister be placing detail before Cabinet for decision; and
(c) what particular strengths does the Government see in the proposition?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The replies are as follows:

(a) Yes—a submission has been received from Shelter (S.A.) to provide:
Management and tenancy services to existing co-ops.
Assist new organisations to establish.
To cost $83 351 in the first year.
No decision has been reached at this time. It is being considered by the Office of Housing in conjunction with the S.A. Housing Trust.

(b) Careful consideration is being given to planning financial and managerial aspects of the Government's strategy for co-ops and the proposal is being assessed in the light of these factors. Co-ops could be a significant innovation in public housing and the Government will thoroughly investigate the possibilities in this area before proceeding with development commitments.

(c) Should the Government decide to significantly expand the co-operative tenure, a developmental mechanism will be required. Shelter's efforts should be commended in putting forward this proposal. It is, however, one of a number of options available.