LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 10 June 1982

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: IRAQI PROJECT

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I seek leave to make a Ministerial statement on the subject of the safety of members of the staff of the Department of Agriculture in Iraq.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The matter of the welfare and safety of our South Australians currently serving in Iraq is understandably of concern to the community. Recent developments in the Middle East have required close surveillance. Last weekend my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, had discussions with a member of the media on the subject and it is noted that yesterday a related question was raised in this place.

Some weeks ago developments in the Iran/Iraq conflict made it desirable to review contingency plans for the evacuation of Australians from Iraq should this prove necessary. In this review the Australian Embassy based in Bagdhad played a central, indeed a co-ordinating, role. Other Australians in Iraq, including our South Australian team, were also involved in the planning. Those plans are now in hand to cater for several possible situations. For obvious reasons, details of those plans cannot be canvassed publicly. However, officers of the Department of Agriculture are frequently in contact with our people in Iraq and with the Department of Foreign Affairs in Canberra on the situation.

Members will be aware that the Minister of Agriculture recently visited Iraq. For much of the time since his visit we have had a senior officer from his department in that country. That officer is still there and is providing his office with an added communication link. We are most impressed by the high regard Iraqi officials have for the welfare and safety of our people. The comprehensive protection measures they have provided demonstrates this.

Members may not be aware of a very recent media report from Bahrain which indicates that the Iraqi Government is prepared to initiate withdrawal of all its forces from Iran which, if effected, may lead to some greater stability in the region. We certainly hope so. In the event that the situation does deteriorate, I assure the Chamber and relatives of our people that appropriate contingency plans for withdrawal are in hand.

QUESTIONS

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on the subject of under-age drinking.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The problem of teenage alcoholism has increased quite substantially in recent years, as has the problem of under-age drinking in hotels. It has been alleged that there are difficulties in policing the laws relating to under-age drinking. Further, and related to this matter, it has also been put to me that the number of coin-operated fun parlour machines in hotels has increased and that there are no regulations covering their use in that context.

It has been further put to me that these machines act as an inducement for 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds to frequent hotels, rather than unlicensed fun parlours, therefore increasing the possibility of under-age people obtaining liquor from hotels. Does the Government have any information in relation to the abuse of laws relating to under-age drinking? What view does the Government take in relation to the installation of fun parlour machines in hotels that may attract young people to drink?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The present laws are quite explicit about under-age drinking in hotels or in other licensed premises. I am sure that those laws have always been abused to some extent, and that abuse is a matter for concern. The question of under-age drinking in hotels and in other licensed premises is primarily the responsibility of the Police Department. Obviously officers from my department would not normally detect offences of that type. In relation to pinball machines in hotels—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Not pinball machines; fun parlour machines.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Well, fun parlour machines and any related electronic machines or games in hotels. The department has been concerned about this matter and is closely monitoring it.

SPARE PARTS

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about the cost of spare parts for motor cars.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Recently, the Australian Consumers Association has been extremely critical of the cost of spare parts for motor vehicles. There are examples of spare parts costing $4 being sold for $30. Manufacturers list prices recommended to distributors at several times the actual cost of production. I have been told that there are mark-ups from 300 per cent to 400 per cent on some motor vehicle spare parts. The Australian Consumer Association, through its magazine *Choice,* states:

> It is high time consumer affairs departments in all States considered some price controlling regulations or at the very least established investigations into their local spare parts industry.

Such an inquiry was conducted in New South Wales by the Prices Commissioner in 1979 and a report was produced. Is the Minister concerned about allegations of excessive mark-ups on motor vehicle spare parts? Will he consider conducting an inquiry into the price of spare parts in this State?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: For some time (and this goes back to the time before I became Minister), I have been concerned about the cost of motor vehicle spare parts and, probably even more so, the cost of spare parts for agricultural machinery, items that seem to attract very high mark-ups. I have made some inquiries about the reasons for this. One reason for the retail cost of spare parts to the public being much higher than the normal mark-up is that spare parts have to stay on the shelves for a considerable time. There is some legislation which requires spare parts for motor vehicles to be put on the market within a certain time. I am concerned about this matter. I will make some informal inquiries in my department and then consider whether a full-scale inquiry is warranted.

I am not aware of the outcome of the inquiry in New South Wales and I will make myself aware of that. The Leader mentioned that there had been such an inquiry but did not inform us of the outcome and as to whether any control measures had been taken. The answers are really these: while on the one hand the cost of spare parts is

always going to be very high because the parts have to be carried for a long period and may not be sold, on the other hand I am concerned about the apparently high level of these prices and will make inquiries about the matter.

DRY LAND FARMING

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, on the matter of agriculture in Zambia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Last year, following the CHOGM conference in Melbourne, President Kaunda of Zambia visited South Australia and held talks with the Minister of Agriculture in this State. After those discussions were held, the South Australian Minister of Agriculture announced that there were excellent opportunities for the South Australian Government to establish a dry land farming project in Zambia using the South Australian system of medic cereal farming. What talks have been held since that visit and what progress has been made towards the establishment of a project in Zambia using South Australian farming technology?

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

NURSING HOMES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, concerning nursing home standards.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On 22 April 1982 the Health Care Workers Action Movement wrote to the Commonwealth Department of Health, the Minister of Health, and the Corporation of the City of Unley, detailing complaints about a particular private nursing home that will remain nameless for the purpose of this exercise. I want to illustrate the extraordinary lack of co-ordination that exists at the three tiers of inspection. The reply from the Commonwealth Department of Health, signed by J. Y. Hancock, Director of the South Australian Division of the department, states:

> Thank you for sending me copies of documents about . . . nursing home. Some of the alleged physical standard shortcomings at the nursing home have been subject to investigation by officers of my department and instructions have been issued to the proprietor to correct the deficiencies. During inspections my officers attempt to quantify the standard of care given to patients, but as you would appreciate this is a most difficult task and in the absence of specific complaints by relatives and staff almost impossible to assess within the time available.
>
> Complaints made by health professionals and relatives some considerable time after the event are ineffective and difficult to substantiate. Persons concerned about standards of care in nursing homes should contact my officers as soon as a problem becomes evident. Their complaint will be treated in confidence, and verified instances of poor patient care will be taken up with those responsible for the provision of that care. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

There is a clear indication from the South Australian Director of the Commonwealth Department of Health that the department has, and has acknowledged that it has, a clear role in enforcing both physical standards and the quality of patient care in nursing homes. In reply to an identical letter that the movement sent to the Corporation of the City of Unley, a letter from Mr Michael Raggatt, Chief Health Inspector, states:

> Thank you for your letter and accompanying documents dated 22 April 1982, concerning . . . nursing home. In reply I wish to let you know that the matters raised in your letter are being investigated. I will contact you shortly and discuss with you the outcome of the investigation. Thank you for bringing this matter to our attention.

There is the duplication. As far as one can ascertain, there is no particular co-operation between the Commonwealth Department of Health, with its responsibilities, and local government, with its responsibilities. On the same date members of the Health Care Workers Action Committee also wrote to the Minister of Health, and it is interesting to note her reply, or the reply that was made on her behalf by her Chief Administrative Officer, as follows:

> In the absence of the Minister of Health, Hon. Jennifer Adamson, M.P., I have been asked by the Acting Minister of Health to acknowledge your letter of 22 April 1982 enclosing copies of letters of complaint against the . . . . private hospital. The Acting Minister will write to you at the earliest opportunity.

The complaint was lodged on 22 April 1982. The Minister or the Acting Minister has not replied since that time to my knowledge or defined what are the obligations of the State authority. Here we have the Commonwealth Department of Health acknowledging that it has responsibilities, and it goes on to explain how complaints should be lodged. The local government body indicates that it has responsibilities and it says it will investigate and get bck to those concerned. We have a senior Health Commission officer acknowledging in a limited way that the State has a role to play. Clearly, that is an untenable position both in practice and in administrative terms. What action does the Minister intend to take to upgrade inspections with regard to both physical facilities and patient care? What action does she contemplate to change the present impossible system which completely lacks co-ordination between the Commonwealth Department of Health, State health authorities and local health authorities?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

COMMUNITY WELFARE STAFF

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Yesterday in response to an interjection during Question Time the Minister denied that his department was short staffed. This is different from information that I have been given. In fact, I have been told that within the last three months there has been an unprecedented exodus of staff from the department, with something like 33 positions becoming vacant within that period. I understand that some of these people have been displaced as a result of the new arrangements concerning the Magill Home for the Aged, but others in the department have resigned.

I understand that a number of resignations have been due to the growing feelings of dissatisfaction which currently permeate all sections of the department as demand for welfare services in this State grows and as staff to meet these needs declines through lack of money and resources. I understand that there is currently a frenzied effort being undertaken in the department to find replacements by the end of June for many of the officers who have recently resigned because there is a fear that, unless this is done, the positions may be lost altogether. Will the Minister advise how many Department for Community Welfare staff have resigned or have been displaced during the past three months?

How does this number compare with that for the previous three-month period? What positions did these people hold and in which sections of the department did they work? Will the Minister assure Parliament that the positions which have become vacant will be retained?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Staffing, broadly speaking, has been on the basis throughout the year that was allowed for in the Budget, as I referred to in the Budget Estimates Committee debate. There has been no running down of field staff. I emphasise, as I said yesterday, that there has been no running down of field staff. I emphatically deny that there have been growing feelings of dissatisfaction.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: How long does it take to get an appointment for an urgent case?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have recently visited most of the district offices in the State. I have spoken to the staff. In every district office that I went into (with some exceptions for specific reasons) I spoke to the staff. There has been a general round-table conference with the staff. I most emphatically deny any suggestion of growing feelings of dissatisfaction. I also deny most emphatically that there have been frenzied efforts to lift the numbers of the staff before 30 June. There certainly have been some resignations for all sorts of reasons and some people have been replaced.

I will do as the honourable member has asked: I will provide the figures for which she asks in regard to people who have ceased to be members of the department in the last three months and compare that with the figures for the previous three months. I certainly give the assurance that the level of staffing will be retained at that which was allowed for in the Budget and which I referred to in the Budget Estimates Committee debate. There is no reason why that should not be retained. The money is there to do so and the ability to fill the places is there. I give that assurance. The figures (which the honourable member did not expect me to have in my head) I will provide for the Council.

HOMELESS YOUTH

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question on homeless youth.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: One of the most appalling areas of neglect in the Australian community today is becoming evident in this city in increasing numbers; it is that of those who are finding shelter under bushes, in culverts, under bridges, in parks and so on. It has reached alarming proportions in the larger cities of Melbourne and Sydney. It has now been discovered that the homeless children of Sydney are difficult to assess on a numerical basis. The Kings Cross and inner city areas of Sydney are infested with people who are so underprivileged that they hide themselves from society, from themselves and from their families. Those found dead in the streets are picked up and carted away. The situation is much the same in Melbourne and it is becoming increasingly evident in Adelaide.

It is not good enough in this day and age to prop up organisations and bring into being new organisations to replace those which the Government considers are not popular from a political view point. The Unemployment Workers Organisation is a classic example of a body being counselled for the purpose of bringing about its own extinction. It is deplorable for the Government to stoop to this. Had the organisation come to me rather than to someone else, I guarantee that it would not be in its present situation. I believe it was an indiscretion on the part of only one or two members in connection with the allegation that a waste paper basket was dropped on the Federal Minister in the Port Adelaide courtroom. It is a fact that that Minister, Mr Viner, is not held in high esteem by his own colleagues in Canberra.

The department has to take the initiative in this city and metropolitan area in respect to unemployed young people, both male and female, who are open to prostitution. Prostitution with children in Sydney has almost become epidemic in some areas. In Adelaide, during the past few weeks, there have been cases of this kind, although one was a misrepresentation to the police. Cases of molestation and prostitution are mainly caused by the people with whom these young people associate.

One has to recognise, irrespective of what political Party one is in, that full employment is not just around the corner to be achieved next Tuesday morning after the Queen's birthday weekend. One has to recognise—and I put this to the Minister yesterday and he casually cast it aside (and that is not good enough)—that working members in the community may well have to bear a higher tax burden to ensure that their more unfortunate fellows, particularly the young and the elderly, are not left around the ancient churches of this city in freezing cold weather.

It would be wrong for me not to recognise that, in respect to some of the elderly males, their way of life within the city squares of Adelaide is one they have determined for themselves. If one picks them up at night they will return tomorrow. There is no argument with that. What I am saying is that somewhere within the Minister's department something needs to be done to ensure that these people are not left to die under bridges and in the streets. The Government should give them a place of shelter for the night.

Will the Minister set up a mobile field counselling service to ascertain the numbers of people who are destitute or homeless and have nowhere to sleep in this city? Will the Minister call for a report from this field unit, which can be set up swiftly, and will he request it to go around to the churches on Wednesday night of next week, with the police if necessary, not for the purpose of arresting or charging these people, but to collect evidence that such a problem exists? Will the Minister take appropriate measures? This Chamber should not accept that the Government has short arms and deep pockets or has no money available to correct this terrible situation that is accelerating in ever increasing numbers.

I suggest that, after this has been done in the city, the Port Adelaide area should be canvassed for further data. The Government is great at setting up data banks for business purposes, computerised services and all those sorts of things, but when it comes to taking some simple data for meeting human needs, it is very sadly lacking. The Minister has to accept the responsibility. The Minister, his department and the Government have to take the initiative and stop telling this Chamber, in answer to questions, that everything is rosy for the unfortunates outside this Chamber. The Minister knows that that is not the situation and he should have enough courage, principle and money to correct the situation.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have never said that—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I am not concerned with what you are going to say: I want to know what you are going to do.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member has had plenty of time to explain his question, and he should now listen to the answer.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I have never suggested that everything is rosy for the unfortunates. In fact, it is not, and it never has been. I am not satisfied as to the extent of the acceleration of this problem. I say that with all sensitivity and sympathy. The problem has probably increased in recent

times, but there have always been unfortunates—people who sleep under bridges—and regrettably, there probably always will be. I do not think that there are very many of these people dying in this situation. I have the deepest sympathy, as I said, for people in that kind of situation.

I am not far away from the thinking of the Hon. Mr Foster. Everything that can reasonably be done ought to be done to assist these people. Yesterday I said that there are avenues for assistance. There are the district offices of my department. There are a large number—and I am grateful for this—of organisations which help people of this kind. Many of these organisations are funded by my department. The Hon. Mr Foster made a very true statement when he said many of these people hide from themselves and their families. They also hide from the department.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: That is the point I am making: go and seek them out.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Just let me answer. This problem particularly applies in regard to youth—really, homeless youth. When we are talking about homeless youth, the first thing is to define those who are genuinely homeless and do not have anywhere to go. It is not easy for the department to find them, and their friends will not give any information as to their whereabouts. This situation applies mainly to youth.

Regarding the elderly men, people in this situation, as the Hon. Mr Foster mentioned, have created their own situation, but nonetheless they need all the help they can get. These people also are not always easy to find. I am not satisfied that to set up a mobile field counselling service would be a sure way of overcoming the problem. I am not prepared to undertake that on Wednesday night of next week this kind of activity will be undertaken. My department is actively concerned about the problem of the homeless and is prepared to reassess the situation. I am prepared to undertake, as a matter of urgency, to consult with senior officers of my department to see whether there are any further steps which can be taken which are presently not being taken.

HOUSING TRUST

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Housing a question about the South Australian Housing Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: We are all aware of the deep concern in some sections of the community about the amount of tax avoidance going on in Australia. The various States, particularly New South Wales and Victoria, are engaged in exercises to find out how widespread it is and what can be done to assist the Commonwealth and their own Treasuries to gain more funds. Everyone deplores the amount of tax avoidance that goes on, both the sophisticated schemes and the cash-in-hand type of operations that many small operators and business people conduct within the State.

One should not expect this State Government or its instrumentalities to encourage this type of activity. It is my view that one of the largest promoters of this type of activity in this State is the Housing Trust, particularly in connection with pay-roll tax avoidance. My information is that the overwhelming number of people engaged in construction work for the South Australian Housing Trust are so engaged on a subcontract basis, which lends itself to so-called body hire, where a single body is hired at a certain rate, and no pay-roll tax deductions or anything of that nature are made. It is strictly cash in hand.

The South Australian Housing Trust, as I understand it, employs very few people for the construction of its homes. That is of deep concern. How many workers are engaged in building homes for the South Australian Housing Trust? How many are on wages and how many are subcontractors? What is the amount of revenue lost to the State through the non-payment of pay-roll tax by and for workers engaged on South Australian Housing Trust construction?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will endeavour to obtain that information for the honourable member. Any explanation on the matter will probably be divided into two parts. On the one hand, there are the building contractors who actually construct completed units of accommodation for the trust. These people are master builders who tender for the trust's work. Contracts are arranged with each of them to build a certain number of homes. I do not think that any of the fears expressed by the honourable member could occur in that area, since the contractor, the master builder, is the employer and it is entirely up to him to take care of his pay-roll procedures. I have no doubt that those builders, like all employers, are bound and indeed policed so that their pay-roll procedures are correctly followed.

On the other hand, people are either contracted or retained by the trust, in relation to the maintenance of housing. That is a large part of the trust's activity because, as landlord, the trust owns more than 44 000 homes throughout the State. Some of the people who enter into contracts with the trust to carry out this maintenance work may not actually be contractors; there may be some half-way arrangement of employee/contractor. Some of these maintenance tasks are quite small but, especially in emergency circumstances, they must be carried out for the benefit not only of the trust but also of the tenants.

In the past year or two, the trust has been endeavouring to employ only contractors in this area. In those circumstances, even though it would involve contract work, pay-roll tax responsibilities would then rest correctly with the employer who, in effect, would be someone outside the trust. I will endeavour to obtain the information sought by the honourable member in the hope that some of his fears can be dispelled.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Is the Minister aware that the master builders to whom he has referred, who are contracted to build a certain number of houses, do not actually build those houses at all? In fact, does the Minister know that those master builders subcontract work out, particularly Housing Trust work, to individuals? Now that the Minister has been informed of this fact, will he consider letting contracts only to master builders who engage workers on wages for the construction of trust homes, rather than those master builders who subcontract this work out, thereby denying the State the benefit of pay-roll tax.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My answer is a clear and emphatic 'No'.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I wonder why.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The reason is that the State has a clear duty to build homes for welfare people at the lowest possible price. I suggest that the question is now wider than simply the Housing Trust. The honourable member's question relates to all master builders across the State—whether or not they are involved in work for the trust—who build houses as part of their building programme. It is perfectly true that these builders retain subcontractors in the course of their building work, but these subcontractors, if they in turn employ persons—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: If.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, if. If they do employ persons, pay-roll tax must be paid. If they do not employ, they are

businessmen in their own right; they are individuals enjoying the incentives of our free enterprise system.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Tax dodgers.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: They are not tax dodgers at all; they are highly efficient small businessmen, and we should be saluting them for their efforts. If members opposite want the building industry to return to a situation in which master builders have to employ persons and move away from the subcontracting system, I suggest that the buyers in this State, the people about whom members opposite should be concerned, will have to pay between 20 per cent and 30 per cent more for their homes, thereby lowering efficiency in the whole building operation.

STATE LIBRARY

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Local Government a question about the State Library.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: As members will know, computers were recently installed at the State Library to record the borrowing of books. These computers have run into a number of problems, not the least being that they are so slow to operate that tremendous queues form for the checking out of books. While the computers may save counter staff the trouble of writing, they do not save a borrower much in the way of time. Apparently, the computers also break down periodically.

I understand that not long ago the Premier visited the library and while he was there the computer borrowing facility had broken down. Acting on the decision of someone—whom I do not know—the counter staff proceeded as if the facility was working. In other words, they passed the pen over the appropriate place on the books as if the borrowing was being recorded on the computer. However, the video screens were blank and no recording occurred at all.

As the borrowers themselves could not see the video screens, they would have been unaware that this was just play acting and that there was no record made of the book they borrowed. I have been told that it certainly resulted in a number of books being taken from the library with no record at all being retained by the library of their having been borrowed. The Premier made his visit at about 11 a.m., a fairly busy time for the counter staff at the State Library, so quite a large number of books would have been 'borrowed' in this way.

I realise that most borrowers are honest people and will probably return these books, but it does make a farce of the whole borrowing procedure if records are not kept of books that are borrowed and if the library does not know which books have gone out and will be unable to follow up any books not returned in due course. Can the Minister determine how many books are estimated to have been borrowed during this period of charade at the counter, and does the library expect to get these books back? Secondly, can the Minister determine who made the decision for the counter staff to pretend to be marking out books when, in fact, no records were being kept?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I cannot recall the matter of the Premier's visit to the library. It may well have happened while I was overseas. I am rather surprised at the honourable member, because she would know, if she had listened to a serious question asked by her Leader a matter of days ago and the long reply that I gave yesterday, that it is perfectly true that there have been major concerns at the library and it is perfectly true that the problems there are being overcome. I have listed various areas of difficulty, the reasons why they have occurred, the explanation and the expression of our belief that the problems are gradually being solved to the point where the situation at the library is much better than it was during that period of difficulty and, of course, industrial unrest as well. If there was a little humorous incident—

The Hon. Anne Levy: Do you think it is funny to lend books without recording them?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not know whether what the member has said is true. Someone from the library has apparently whispered something in her ear so that she could ask a question, as she has not been asking many questions lately. There are other matters at the library about which I would prefer to be answering questions and giving the Council a full explanation than this little episode when, apparently, the Premier was at the counter, something was wrong with the computer, and possibly some member of the staff, hoping to show a bit of initiative, carried out the exercise of passing over a book or two. I will have the episode looked into and I will try to satisfy the honourable member. I also refute her comment that there are still long queues at the library. I have been informed that there were long queues when the difficulties occurred.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: How long is it since you pinched a book?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is not even a funny comment, and I ask the honourable member to withdraw it and apologise.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Yes, I will, because I will be asking a question soon.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I was saying that I do not think that there are long queues there now. Many of the problems were encountered when the computer came on stream. The decision to purchase the computer was a good one but difficulties were encountered when it first began operating. These are now being overcome and I hope the Council will find that the whole area of library services will be greatly improved in future compared to what it has been for many years.

One of the foundations of that new era is the re-writing of the library legislation. A new Bill was introduced yesteredy to repeal the two old Acts involved. I hope that that will be acclaimed by the Opposition and that it will hasten the passage of the Bill through Parliament so that we can get the State Library and the public library services back on the track and achieve the progress that we want to achieve.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister inform the Council of the number of employees engaged on the front counter service at the library before the purchase of the electronic equipment and the number of employees on the counter now? Will he call for a report from the board or the authority at the library to ascertain whether a return to the original system of labour-intensive service at the counter would mean that the public would receive much better service and the library would know where its books were and who had them? Throw the machines away and put people back.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain a reply to the first question, but I cannot take any action regarding the second, because the course is set to introduce a new era, with a much better service to the public. The Government does not intend to turn back to the dark ages as far as the library is concerned.

INTERPRETERS

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister of

Community Welfare on the subject of interpreters in the Department for Community Welfare.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: One of the complaints often heard by the ethnic communities is that they are not understood by social workers in the department. Perhaps at times there is some exaggeration. However, I believe it is true when ethnic clients say that they are not understood in their cultural attitudes and in their own language. My question is about this second matter and refers to the use of interpreters. I understand that the department does not have interpreters employed. I aso believe that no budgetary allocation has been made for the use of interpreters when they are needed. Will the Minister consider making provision for immediate access to professional interpreters by social workers and clients?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The department has been fully aware of the special needs of the ethnic communities. The objective of the Act passed last year—

The Hon. M. S. Feleppa: It's there and there's been no action.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes, there is action, but let me finish. In the Act passed last year, the special needs of the ethnic communities were recognised. There are a considerable number (I do not know the total number at present because it changes) of ethnic-speaking social workers. When the matter was raised last year, the question of Italian-speaking social workers was considered. I think the Hon. Mr Feleppa said before he was a member of the Council that there were only two Italian social workers in the department. In fact, there were five. Not only were there ethnic-speaking social workers—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What's an ethnic-speaking social worker?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Well, a person speaking in an ethnic language, if you like. Quite apart from the Department for Community Welfare workers, there are a large number of ethnic-speaking community aides, particularly in the Campbelltown office.

The Hon. M. S. Feleppa: That's not true.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Feleppa can ask a supplementary question when the Minister finishes his reply.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It is true that, at the time the matter was raised before, there were five Italian-speaking social workers in the department. I recall that the Hon. Mr Sumner asked me to name them, but I declined, because I said that I did not think that, in ordinary circumstances, it was fitting to name public servants. I note that I have since then been supported by the Public Service Association, which has formulated a policy that in ordinary circumstances public servants should not be named.

At about that time, I had been to the Campbelltown office of the department, an area in which there are a number of Italian-speaking people. I visited the office and actually saw a group of community aides, women who were Italian-speaking and who were being trained as aides to visit Italian-speaking people in nursing homes and hospitals in the area. I cannot say that we are perfect, but we are certainly keenly aware of the need to have available as far as possible ethnic-speaking community welfare workers and community aides.

We have an ethnic affairs consultant within the department whose job it is to look at trying to meet the special needs of ethnic communities. On the question of interpreters, of course it is not always possible to have, as an actual community welfare worker, a person who speaks the language of members of an ethnic community. Therefore, we frequently seek the assistance of interpreters. Interpreters are available through the good offices of the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, and my department frequently uses their services. I am perfectly willing to re-examine the question of assistance to, and consideration for, the special needs of the ethnic community, but the department has, particularly during this year, made an effort to meet the welfare needs (because that is what we are about) of ethnic communities.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Since the Minister pointed out categorically the Campbelltown area, can he state categorically whether the Campbelltown Community Welfare Department office has an Italian-speaking social worker?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: There probably is not one in that office, but I can ascertain that. At the time when the question was raised previously, there were five Italian-speaking social workers in the department. We cannot always specifically place them in particular offices but, as I said, when I was there, certainly within the past 12 months, I did meet a group of community aides, many of whom were Italian-speaking and who were being trained to meet the needs of the Italian community.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Will the Minister ascertain in the adjacent business area of Campbelltown how many banks and business houses employ Italian-speaking staff as a proportion of the number of people employed? Will he ascertain whether Italian-speaking staff are employed by land agents, banks, insurance offices, Target and Coles stores, and the like? As they are everywhere, why does the department not employ such people in an area where there are more Italians than in any other area in the State? Why is that? You must be mad.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not intend to make those inquiries.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Because you know what the answer is.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Inquiries at the banks and so on have nothing at all to do with welfare. In regard to the Campbelltown office, I do not know whether or not at present there is an Italian-speaking person on the staff, which is small. I have mentioned the measures that have been taken to ensure that the needs of the Italian community can be met.

UNDER-AGE DRINKING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I desire to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs a supplementary question to the question I asked earlier in relation to under-age drinking and youth alcoholism. It flows from the non-answer given earlier by the Minister. Will he provide the Council with information on the incidence of teenage alcoholism in the community and, in particular, the situation relating to under-age drinking? Secondly, what action does the department take, as the Minister said it apparently took, to monitor the use of fun-parlour machines in hotels? What is the result of such monitoring.

The PRESIDENT: Call on the business of the day.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: There's still time!

ROXBY DOWNS (INDENTURE RATIFICATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June. Page 4434.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I find it difficult to believe that I am standing in this Council defending such a carefully

negotiated indenture Bill which brings such great benefit to this State. I am defending it in this Council against the concerted attempt of the Opposition, which represented, at the last election, 45 per cent of the people of this State, to torpedo this Bill. It is amazing that the Government may be unable to get going this keystone plank of its election policy and that the Opposition, who constantly in this Council accuses us of not keeping our promises, is setting out, I understand with the help (I have not heard him speak on this matter in this Council—so far he has only spoken in the streets) of the Hon. Mr Milne, to vote against this Bill. That is amazing.

It is even more amazing to consider the attitude displayed by the Hon. Dr Cornwall. One cannot but help believe that one day in the future people will look back on the way in which this Parliament has behaved on the Roxby Downs issue and conclude that the Opposition must have been mad to reject this project, as it purportedly will do. The Opposition is attempting to create a fear cult on the most important development project that has ever been seen. The Opposition has deliberately and maliciously overlooked the main potential product of this project—copper—and concentrated entirely on the uranium aspect. I refer to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition on 21 February 1981 headed 'Uranium rethink urged by Bannon'. He said:

> The A.L.P. should make an objective examination of its uranium policy, according to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon.

Honourable members should listen carefully, because he went on to state:

> I do not think a major political Party has the right to be alarmist or react emotionally on an issue as important as this.

As I read through part of Dr Cornwall's speech, I made an assessment of whether he had reacted emotionally or intended to be alarmist on this issue. The speech by Dr Cornwall yesterday was a disgraceful and weak attempt to smear the project and the Government, yet the Opposition pretends to be in favour of the project. He used an anology of Roxby Downs uranium being able to make 400 Hiroshima-type bombs. What sort of emotional claptrap is that? It is totally against what Mr Bannon said. He has made a fool of himself and Mr Bannon.

Dr Cornwall sat through the Select Committee on Uranium Resources with me. He knows the safeguards that are applied and he knows that the possibility of diversion is extremely remote. He also knows that weapons countries already have their weapons cycles established and do not use uranium in the commercial fuel cycle. The two cycles in all countries are totally separate. No weapons country uses a weapons fuel cycle to produce explosive material for its weapons.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's not what Mr Justice Fox said.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will quote what Mr Justice Fox said in his evidence. It was interesting to note the selective quoting by Dr Cornwall in relation to this evidence. The Hon. Mr Davis asked Mr Justice Fox:

> Your first report, which was produced three years ago, among other things in its findings and recommendations observed that the hazards of mining and milling uranium, if those activities are properly regulated and controlled, are not such as to justify a decision not to develop Australian uranium mines, and that the hazards involved in the ordinary operations of nuclear power reactors, are, if those operations are properly regulated and controlled, not such as to justify a decision not to mine and sell Australian uranium. Has anything that you have observed occurred since that report that has changed your personal view on those recommendations?

Mr Justice Fox gave a lengthy reply, as follows:

> I am glad that you said 'personal view', because you will appreciate that I am not a scientist, and that many things I have to take on hearsay. I seldom accept the assertion of one person: I try to check and cross-check. So far as mining and milling are concerned, I am not aware of any change in the degree of risk from the time of that report. Of course, that report dealt with open-cut mining. Somewhere in it is a reference to underground mining. At the time, we were looking at the Ranger mine, and, out of the corner of our eyes, anyway, at the Pan-Continental mine. It had produced a draft environmental statement, and it was going in for open-cut mining. I understand that they have since changed that to underground mining. I am not sure of the extent of it, but undoubtedly underground mining requires greater care in terms of ventilation. Underground mining is common. I would not be surprised if it was not more common than above-ground mining. All the risks, etc., are well known.
>
> As far as I know, there has been no change. There are the international standards, of which you know. There was ground for tinkering with those when we looked at them, and there may still be ground for tinkering now. I would not like to suggest that one should be complacent about it. There are the radon risks and the confined gases, but we had problems with coal mining and we gradually introduced a ventilation system through coal mines which for years has been thought to be satisfactory. I am afraid that that is a long answer to a question that could have been answered shortly by my saying, 'No, I do not know of any change.'
>
> You then raised the different matter of reactors. The position in that respect is the same. In most countries, they are constantly under review. One must have constant care and watch the thing, and see what is done, but the risk has not been increased. There have been a number of cases where radioactive leaks have occurred. A number of cases have come to light where it is thought that people who have died of cancer now and maybe were subjected to radioactivity 20 or 30 years ago. I do not know exactly what has been thought of those cases, but I believe that it does not substantially affect any thinking. In substance, there has been no change in my views of those matters.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about proliferation?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will come to that later. Dr Cornwall accused us yesterday of being similar to poppy growers producing heroin. To quote Mr Bannon again:

> I do not think any political Party has the right to be alarmist or emotional on any issue.

If that is not alarmist, emotional and stupid, I do not know what is. If, in supporting Roxby Downs (according to Dr Cornwall's analogy) we are supporting an industry similar to poppy growing, it is because he was stupid enough to support the calling of an early election 2½ years ago. His Government ploughed the ground for the poppies and planted the seed. However, the Labor Party members now want to stop any harvest because they are not now in Government. If they got into Government again, we would see the same performance as we witnessed on Chowilla dam. When they gained Government on the basis of building that project, they then ran away from it.

Enough of Dr Cornwall's claptrap for the time being. Let us look at this project positively. It is unbelievable that this project is in any doubt. I cannot think of anywhere in the world where this project would not be welcomed with open arms, except perhaps in Victoria and New South Wales. Victoria seems to be running into some sort of problem, as it seems to be run by slightly different people now.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: The Cain mutiny.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. Mining people and unions throughout the world are amazed at the extraordinary behaviour of the A.L.P. on this project, which has enormous potential benefits to this State.

What is Roxby Downs? It is a huge mineral find of medium-grade copper, low-grade uranium and some gold and silver. It is approximately seven kilometres long, four kilometres wide and at least 1.3 kilometres deep. When the partners stopped drilling the deepest diamond drill hole was still in the ore zone. The production from this mine will be enormous. The estimate of copper is 150 000 tonnes and uranium is 2 000 to 4 000 tonnes, plus gold and silver.

The project will cost at least $1 000 000 000. The State will provide $50 000 000 in 1981 towards the infrastructure. The joint venturers will provide $150 000 000. They will bear the cost of provision of electricity, water, sewerage, and the majority of roads. I understand the only road the State will provide is the Pimba to Olympic Dam road. These figures relate to a town of 8 000 to 9 000 people. If the town

has fewer than 9 000 people, the State's contribution will be reduced proportionally. If the town reaches only 4 500, the State is only bound to contribute $25 000 000. The project is likely to employ 3 000 or more people on the site. The multiplier effect is something that Dr Cornwall has avoided all through his speech.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: You told me to be quiet last night so you can be silent now. Dr Cornwall totally ignores the multiplier effect because it does not suit his case. The approval of this project may well be the trigger that is needed to ensure that we obtain the uranium conversion and enrichment proposals that are now being examined for Australia.

I noted Dr Cornwall's grudging support of a uranium enrichment plant. This is one of the few occasions on which he has been relatively honest in his presentation on the subject, when he stated that uranium enrichment was a safe process. Everybody knows that except the rather wild people we see on the steps of Parliament House to whom everything in the world is unsafe. Dr Cornwall implied that the State was going into a loss situation when he compared the $50 000 000 financial commitment by the State to his estimate of $8 000 000 to $10 000 000 return. Of course, he deliberately understates the royalties to fit in with the rather stupid statements and figures which he and Mr Foster used in their minority report of the uranium select committee. He could not even now bring himself to believe that he is wrong.

He also completely ignores such returns to the State as pay-roll tax, company tax, personal tax and sales tax. Does he imagine that we are going to cut off this area and not get any of those returns back to the State?

When these taxes are collected by the Commonwealth, and when we get our share, I can imagine the honourable member's feelings when he reads how little the State was committed to in terms of infrastructure costs. The honourable member would then realise what an excellent agreement had been negotiated between the State and the joint venturers. I am surprised at the audacity of the man in criticising the Government on this project after the A.L.P.'s performance on the Redcliff proposal. Redcliff appears to have disappeared in smoke. One wonders whether it was ever likely to come.

Let me make a comparison between Roxby Downs and Redcliff. At Roxby Downs the State will be bound to provide $50 000 000, but it does not have to provide power, water, roads or electricity. At Redcliff, the State was bound, at present-day costs, to provide $400 000 000, but still had to provide power, water, roads, electricity and the pipeline.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And the A.L.P. made so many promises at every election.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will not go through the list of promises: about 15 promises were made and it was reannounced in various forms. It went on and on; it was the most incredible show. In the week before the election two letters were produced on the project. From Roxby Downs, State royalties are estimated at $30 000 000. That is not a figure which anyone is absolutely sure about but the figure quoted by Dr Cornwall is $8 000 000 to $10 000 000. Frankly, I do not accept that. I believe that the figure will be much higher than that. From Redcliff there were to be no State royalties. It was a manufacturing process and there were no royalties. The life of the project at Roxby Downs is estimated to be between 50 and 100 years. The life of Redcliff is estimated to be 25 years. The Opposition criticised the Government for the amount of infrastructure costs we were putting into Roxby Downs.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner interjecting:

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am pointing out, if you do not mind, the differences between what you were prepared to put up for another project—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You do not have royalties on the manufacturing industry, anyhow.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the point I am making. You have just said it again for me. The Opposition was prepared to put up $400 000 000 of taxpayers' money for a project of 25 years with no royalties, yet it criticises the Government for putting up $50 000 000 on a project from which royalties will be obtained. Regarding the life of the projects, as I said, there is a large difference. The A.L.P., on the Redcliff proposal, sold gas to New South Wales and committed this State until 2008 to obtain liquids. Nothing has been said about this and the Government is still trying to get out of that problem which the Labor Party put us into. This State has contracts only until 1986 and New South Wales still has priority. On that particular project there was no proviso in the New South Wales contracts to make that State subject to Redcliff going ahead. The reason for the gas sales was that extra gas was to be sold so that there would be liquids for Redcliff. In that case the then Government should have protected South Australia's interests, but it did not.

The only conclusion I can come to is that the A.L.P. must surely be regarded as the worst negotiator this State has ever seen. It clearly has no knowledge of how to run a State on a sound economic basis. Examples of this are Monarto, the Frozen Food Factory and the Riverland Cannery, as well as the gas sales to Sydney.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Will the honourable return to the Bill?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: A prime example of the A.L.P.'s lack of business expertise must surely be its continuing statements that the Roxby Downs joint venturers can continue to spend money on feasibility studies without any guarantees that they will be able to mine, as provided in this indenture. What an extraordinary situation. The Opposition is filled with people with no business knowledge, but one would expect the Leader of the Opposition to have that knowledge. The Leader of the Opposition in the *Advertiser* of 9 December 1981 said:

> What it all adds up to is that Western Mining, with the indenture Bill, are wanting a one-sided deal. We're not seeking to cancel out any hope of Roxby Downs for the future. We simply know that the deal the Government wants to make now is premature.

A one-sided deal: if it is one-sided it is on the Liberal side. How on earth can one say to joint venturers who have already spent $50 000 000 on a project that a one-sided deal is being sought when they want to know whether they are going to be allowed to develop and mine the project when it reaches the stage where they believe it is feasible?

I do not blame the joint venturers for wanting some sort of indication from the Parliament in view of the statements from the Opposition and the Hon. Mr Milne on this particular project and in view of what is now happening in Victoria, which must reinforce their desire to have some commitment from this Parliament. The joint venturers are facing up to the situation now of having to spend a further $50 000 000 on this project. That makes a total of $100 000 000. Possibly they will have to spend more before they are able to make a decision and proceed with the mine. How are the joint venturers supposed to convince their finance sources that this project should be backed? How will they indicate to those sources how they are going to service the money they are borrowing to proceed with this project which could, in interest rates alone, be anywhere up to $20 000 000 to $30 000 000?

Is the Opposition prepared to indicate that, if it was in Government and it declined to allow the project to continue, it would pay back the money or service the loan? That is really what the A.L.P. is asking the joint venturers to do: it is asking them to service a loan or service funds provided by shareholders of $100 000 000 to $150 000 000 with no guarantee that the project will be allowed to proceed. What a stupid proposition. Does the Opposition think that these companies have unlimited sources of finance? Past A.L.P. Governments seem to have believed that these sorts of people have.

These joint venturers have shareholders and these shareholders quite justifiably may sack the directors if they continue to spend money if this Bill is defeated and they continue with that project. How the A.L.P. expects the joint venturers to commit further funds under the present A.L.P. policy baffles me, particularly when one looks next door to Victoria, where the proposition is now being put forward by Mr Cain for a nuclear-free zone. Let us look at these so-called amendments proposed by the A.L.P. As reported in the *Advertiser* this morning, the first amendment states:

That power to give approval to proceed with mining be reserved for the Government of the day.

That completely destroys the indenture Bill. Anyone with an ounce of commonsense realises that what that does is say to a Government of the future that it can say that mining cannot proceed. In other words, one may as well not have the indenture Bill to start with.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: You can't have much confidence of staying in Government.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Certainly business people could not have much confidence in that statement. Governments change from year to year, from day to day. Look at what happened to the A.L.P. It disappeared at a moment's notice.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: We won't.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I can assure the honourable member of that, particularly with the way that the Opposition is carrying on. This amendment completely destroys the purpose of the indenture Bill, which is to ensure that, after the expenditure of further funds, the joint venturers will be able to mine on the basis laid down by the indenture Bill. The A.L.P. amendment is designed to torpedo the whole proposal. There is no shadow of doubt about it. That is the first point. The A.L.P. is saying that it is happy with Roxby Downs in the future, but it says that it wants these amendments passed and wants to be able to shut down at a moment's notice. The A.L.P. wants to be able to say to the joint venturers that the project cannot go ahead. However, the whole purpose of the indenture Bill is to facilitate the project. If the amendments are passed then one might as well not have the indenture Bill.

Let us look at the second proposal, that the joint venturers be granted a 50-year lease. What on earth will be the use of a 50-year lease if one can only take tourists up there and show them the site of what would have been an exciting and beneficial project?

The Hon. L. H. Davis: It could be the big double: Monarto and Roxby Downs.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is right. That will be the situation. The joint venturers cannot borrow money on a lease of that sort. You really have to be able to do something with the lease. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's second proposal is absolutely absurd. It is a ploy to convince the public that the Labor Party is not really opposed to the project. It is just another part of the A.L.P. camouflage. Members opposite would be very good in the Falklands. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's third proposal is:

That the venturers be obliged to observe radiological safeguards imposed by any other law of State.

That is very clever, too. What is that supposed to do? What would happen if we had an Act imposing a nuclear-free zone? What would happen if the Hon. Dr Cornwall was setting the standards? The Hon. Dr Cornwall attempted to imply that this Government is not interested in enforcing standards. He said:

There is no possibility that if the indenture Bill is passed in its present form any more stringent codes for worker protection can ever be imposed.

That is absolute nonsense. The Hon. Dr Cornwall knows that if there is any alteration to the Australian code it will apply to this project.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall completely ignored the ALARA principle. That principle is legally enforceable. It ensures that, even though international standards may be at a certain level, the joint venturers must take action to maintain a level considered reasonable by the State Government. The joint venturers have estimated that using the ALARA principle, which overrides the existing requirements and which is already more stringent than the Australian standard of four working level months, radiation exposure will be reduced to 1.2 working level months, which is a quarter of the allowable limit.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall has attempted to imply that this Government is not interested in worker protection. That is not the case. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's presentation was quite dishonest. The Select Committee gave special attention to that area. However, the Hon. Dr Cornwall set out to accuse the Government, by implication, of not being interested in this area. Of course we are interested and of course we examined this area. The Government has done everything possible to ensure that safety is maintained at a high level.

Dr Cornwall's attempt deserves total condemnation as a blatant and deliberate distortion of the truth. It is not worthy of him as a person of some scientific training who sat through the select committee on uranium and heard evidence from experts on this subject. He either does not understand the ALARA principle or ignores it for his own shallow political purposes. His gross distortion of the true situation has branded him as a devious and untruthful politician. I say that quite sincerely. I am disgusted with his approach. He is a person who knows the facts but will ignore them in order to maintain his position with his Party political policies which are not based on facts or realities. In his speech the Hon. Dr Cornwall said:

Neither the indenture nor the indenture Bill adequately address the question of worker safety. As I said earlier, it is noteworthy that the recently passed Radiological Protection and Controi Act specifically excludes the possibility of more stringent worker protection standards being imposed than currently exist in Australian and international codes of practice. Yet there is clear evidence that these levels are too high.

There is no clear evidence that the levels at present are too high. The figure he used which came from the NIOSH Report is being hotly debated and at present there is no reliable evidence that any excess of lung cancer occurs in people exposed to less than 120 cumulative working level months. He further states:

However it should be noted here that radioactive radon gas is constantly emitted during mining. It is certainly possible to reduce the levels of radon which will be inhaled by miners by reducing dust and installing adequate ventilation . . . However, it is impossible to eliminate it as a problem for miners. No matter how stringent the safety precautions are, it is certain that uranium miners will develop lung cancer at two to four times the incidence in the general population with lead times of between 12 and 30 years.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Do you know whether the figures are the same for other mines, such as coal mines?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is exactly right. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has again misused maximum figures about which there is already some doubt. However, he

deliberately and mischievously ignores the fact not only that the joint venturers are bound by the current Australian and international standards on radiological protection but also that they must operate under the ALARA principle. It is extremely unlikely that any miner will ever reach the total exposures allowable under present standards and in fact it has been estimated, for instance, that the exposure to radon will not rise above 1.2 working level months—one-quarter of the present Australian standard of four working level months and that similar reductions in exposure will occur in other forms of radiological exposure.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall has tried to imply both in his speech and in his proposed amendment that we have agreed to dangerous standards. What absolute nonsense! What the amendment is designed to do is to allow that man of genius, the Hon. Dr Cornwall, to draw up his own standards for the future. I also said that during the previous debate on the Radiological Protection and Control Bill. I can imagine the left wing telling him that he must reduce standards to zero; then, all he would need to do under this amendment is introduce a Bill to give effect to that proposition and the mining operation would stop, because it would be impossible to reach that limit. That is exactly what could happen.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is the most stupid thing you have said all afternoon.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Hon. Mr Sumner might think it is stupid, but the joint venturers do not think it is stupid. The Hon. Mr Sumner can say that, because he is not putting up the money; if he was putting up the money he would have a different attitude. If the standards were reduced to a level that was publicly acceptable that would also torpedo the project. I have already given an extreme example of that fact.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall's proposal in relation to environmental effects was designed to imply that the Government had ignored environmental effects, when in fact the proposal for three-year reviews in the indenture is one of the tightest in Australia. The Hon. Dr Cornwall completely ignored the fact that the project is subject to both State and Federal environmental impact studies. The Hon. Dr Cornwall's final proposal is as follows:

> That, prior to the start of mining, existing leases be subject to periodic review by the Government, in association with the venturers.

What does that do? It means that a future Government will have a second power of veto. Of course, it is another method of ensuring that the project does not proceed. I am absolutely positive that the joint venturers, if they have an ounce of commercial sense, will not be prepared to accept that proposal.

Let us be clear about it: it must be accepted by them as well as by this Parliament. The indenture has been signed by the joint venturers and by the Government. I believe that the Hon. Dr Cornwall has been extremely devious. He has completely ignored the facts. He has used maximum standards to imply wrong attitudes on the part of the Government. I absolutely reject the implications contained in the Hon. Dr Cornwall's speech, which are totally against even what his Leader has said. The Hon. Dr Cornwall has tried to be emotional and has brought up matters which I believe are slanderous on this Government and unworthy of this Parliament's attention.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about the proposal on workers compensation for uranium mine workers?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I will come to that. As the Leader of the Opposition would know, or should know, the joint venturers are already keeping records of people involved in the project and action is under way to draw up a register of those workers. That was accepted by the Government from the major section of the select committee report, which was the only one worth while. The matter is procedural. What were the Leader's other points?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Workers compensation.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is already covered under the Workers Compensation Act, and this is another ploy to try to imply that we are not interested.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: A red herring.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It is a total red herring. The Leader almost says that workers compensation does not apply to miners. It does, and they will be covered in the normal way.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's totally inadequate.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is the Leader's view. His Government had a long time to do something about the matter but did not do it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It is a serious issue that I do not think has been addressed, because at Port Pirie you had a special fund to deal with silicosis. For uranium mining there ought to be provision to deal with radiation problems.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I have answered as far as I intend to answer at the moment. I refer now to the dissenting report by the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster, the authors.

The Hon. J. A. Carnie: Were they the authors?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is as I understand it but I am not sure if that is true. They made the bald unqualified statement that alpha particles in radon and radon daughters constitute a major hazard to the lungs of uranium miners. The Hon. Dr Cornwall made statements that we have not had the opportunity of answering. I think some of them have been used by the Hon. Dr Cornwall in his speech and I think it important that they be answered at least in part, because the second report used every possible emotional matter to ignore facts and used maximum standards wherever possible. I am surprised that people of the intellectual honesty of the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster signed such a document. On page 166 of their report, they state:

> Alpha particles in radon and radon daughters constitute a major hazard to the lungs of uranium miners. The current levels of exposure accepted in the Australian Code of Practice for the Mining and Milling of Ores may be up to four times too high. They should be urgently revised, based on the 1980 NIOSH study.

The implication was that we were prepared to allow procedures that permitted the radon exposure level to reach the maximum, whereas at Roxby Downs, if it goes ahead, the level likely is about 1.2 working level months, or about one-quarter of the allowable limit. The Hon. Dr Cornwall and Hon. Mr Foster made the bald unqualified statement that alpha particles in radon and radon daughters constituted a major hazard to the lungs of uranium miners. However, they omit to state that this hazard can be minimised if adequate ventilation and dust suppression procedures are followed but that did not suit their purpose, and that is to deliberately omit the facts which do not suit their anti-uranium policy.

I was surprised at the intellectual dishonesty of the Hon. Dr Cornwall on this matter, as he should have, from his former profession as a vet, some understanding of this subject. The Government members of the select committee also noted the doubts raised about the rates of exposure. However, it is also well known that uranium mine workers in Australia are not exposed to the full four working level months. All mines operate on the ALARA principle and the Government members would expect that any mines planned will allow for exposure levels to gamma radiation and radon to be well below the maximum permitted limits. The ALARA principle is keeping exposure levels 'as low as reasonably achievable'.

I agree we should seriously investigate the maximum permitted level and follow closely further studies by NIOSH but I regard the way in which this conclusion was worded as dishonest and designed to create an unnecessary fear in the minds of readers. To give some indication of what can be achieved in properly managed modern mining operations, at Narbalek miners, on average, were exposed to .065 working level months, or .3 per cent of the allowable radon exposure, and 230 millirems of gamma radiation, or 9.2 per cent of the allowable limit for a six-month period. Despite the high grade of the ore, the highest exposure to gamma radiation was 38.5 per cent of the allowable limit, or 963 millirems. That was reached by one driller's off-sider, one geologist, and one spotter.

I know that that was an open-cut mine and that people will say that there is not the same exposure there, but in many cases the opposite can be said, because an open-cut mine is subject to weather difficulties and there can be high levels at the bottom of an open-cut. In underground mines, good control can be obtained by ventilation. I understand that at Roxby Downs it is intended to change the air every 15 minutes. A person would almost have to wear woollen coats down there.

Narbalek, it should be pointed out, contained average grades of 1.84 per cent uranium, whereas Roxby Downs is .05 per cent or $^{1}/_{40}$ of the grade at Narbalek. Let us look at the second conclusion, on page 167. I quote:

> Background radiation is an interesting phenomenon which deserves further study. However, it has little to do with the direct safety considerations of workers engaged in the uranium industry or at other stages of the nuclear fuel cycle.

Again they attempted to write off an aspect of radiation that is important but does not suit their anti-nuclear purpose. Background radiation is mostly gamma radiation, which is the main source of exposure in radiation and in the nuclear industry. I quote from evidence received, as follows:

> Air hostesses in Australia receive up to an estimated 670 millirem per year from their hours in the air. Pilots average about 450 millirem per year because they have fewer working hours. As a group these people receive more occupational exposure than any other group in Australia including the workers on the nuclear reactors at Lucas Heights (south of Sydney) who average 200 millirem per year.
>
> Rocks and soils containing uranium will also emit a radioactive gas named radon, the decay products of which may cause lung cancer when inhaled in high enough concentration after a long period of time.
>
> The most important natural source of radon-222 is from rocks and soil. It is estimated that this is responsible for approximately 43 per cent of the total U.S.A. population dose from radon-222.
>
> The use of some building materials can lead to substantially elevated exposure levels indoors from both gamma radiation and radon decay products. These building materials may be of natural origin, as in the case of pumice stone, granite or light concrete derived from alum shale. They may also be made from by-products from industrial processes, such as phosphate slag or phosphogypsum. The dose rates in air from gamma radiation in buildings constructed of granite may be substantially higher than the normal dose rate from terrestrial radiation. The radon levels will also be considerably enhanced for a given ventilation rate.

This is one important area that we should look at in relation to gamma radiation and background radiation. The evidence continues:

> In the Kerala region of south-west India where the soil comprises monazite sand, a thorium resource, very high levels of background radiation are present. In 10 villages surveyed, readings taken from inside houses gave a mean dose rate that ranged from 131 to 2 814 millirem per year.
>
> One village with an unpronounceable name, for example, with a population of 11 000 had a mean dose rate of 2 164 millirem per year.

The allowable limit in Australia is 500 millirem, yet these people have been living at Kerala for many generations.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: Was Sister Bartel wrong?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It would appear so. She was wrong in much of the evidence she gave. I understand that there are no discernible somatic or genetic effects, including Downs syndrome. What A.L.P. members have tried to do is to avoid the disclosure of relevant information; the effects of radiation are directly relevant to exposures encompassed by radiation protection standards. For the Hon. Dr Cornwall to claim that background radiation is just an interesting phenomenon which has little to do with the direct safety consideration of workers in the nuclear fuel cycle is deliberately misleading. Regarding enrichment, the Government did not say what the Hon. Dr Cornwall claimed it said. What the Government said was that this development at Roxby Downs would help in the economic revival of South Australia. Anyone with any degree of commonsense or knowledge of the industry would know that because enriched uranium is worth twice as much as yellowcake.

We can enrich uranium here. We can have the employment here and the returns here. We would have the tax from the returns in South Australia. One can go on and on to show the benefits resulting from the cycle. Further, we were given evidence that after 1990 the Federal Government will insist that 45 per cent of uranium sold in Australia must be enriched.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why after 1990?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: It will take that time to put in an enrichment plant. I refer to the fourth conclusion on page 167 of the dissenting minority report. The wording was extravagant rhetoric designed to cover up the A.L.P. about-face on the issue of uranium enrichment. Last night or yesterday the Hon. Dr Cornwall admitted the process was safe, but I must say that I was amazed at the about-face of the Opposition on this issue when the member for Elizabeth took over the A.L.P. policy in 1978. This was an amazing turn of events that a project that was beneficial and economic changed to an uneconomic project as a result of a meeting of the A.L.P. and the growing influence in the A.L.P. of Mr Duncan. I refer to a press report of October 1974 when the then Premier said:

> We will press for the establishment of the plant in South Australia if we have the conditions required. There is some concern about being able to supply enough water.

It was not a serious matter then. At that stage only water was the problem.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Who said that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Mr Dunstan. He has done a few about-faces on that project. I refer to comments in 1974 by the then State Mines Minister (Hon. D. J. Hopgood). Again in 1974 was the comment by Mr Connor, the then responsible Federal Minister. The *News* of 13 May 1974 states:

> Mr Connor announced a feasibility study into the possible establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the Northern Spencer Gulf region of South Australia.

Again, there is no sign of equivocation on that subject at all, and it had to wait for Mr Duncan to get in charge. To contrast that position, I refer to a report in the *Australian* of 1977, as follows:

> Mr Dunstan said despite compelling economic reasons for the export of uranium especially to Japan, his Government had a moral duty to mankind to ensure that it did not create a monster by providing uranium to customer countries.

There is a complete turn-around by both Mr Dunstan and the A.L.P. He later did another about-turn and again had to change his mind later when he went overseas with various members of his staff. Whilst he was away Mr Duncan got at him again.

I now refer to the seventh conclusion of the minority A.L.P. report on page 167 which again creates a doubt (without giving any details) about from where the information has been derived.

To cast aside these doubts, I should like to give the Council some facts about the Honeymoon project. First, water at Honeymoon is already naturally highly contaminated with salts, uranium, radium and radioactive decayed products and, in the unlikely event that contamination takes place, it would have little effect on water quality as it is already unusable. Similarly in relation to Beverley, there are 200 metres of impermeable clay between the aquifers and, if there was any penetration of the Great Artesian Basin, the water would go upwards and not downwards. Paragraph 8 provides:

Arriving at a level of worker hazard or safety based on a criterion which uses a 'socially acceptable risk' is morally questionable.

This is the normal method of assessing risk in any industry and in personal life. In fact, it is well known that there are many people in Adelaide who have recently indicated that the method of producing power from the nuclear cycle is one of the safest. More people die in coal mines and disasters associated with them than will ever die in uranium mines. In fact, I do not think that I have them here, but there are figures which indicate that clearly.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Be careful, they'll want to stop coalmining next.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is what I wonder about. I do not have the figures here, but it is accepted even by the Hon. Dr Cornwall that that is the case. I refer to the situation in America where there are at least five huge dams used for hydro-electric power. If any one of them burst or was destroyed it would kill at least 100 000 people in one fell swoop. Do we seek to stop the building of such dams? Have people ever protested about the building of those dams to produce power? Of course not. There is more likelihood of this happening than any problem resulting from a nuclear power station, as the Hon. Dr Cornwall knows.

The community does not ban cars because they are a risk. We do not ban the use of alcohol with cars, although we do our best to persuade people not to drink and drive, and this was a responsible decision taken by the Council on this matter. The facts are that every person who drives a car accepts a risk factor of being injured of about one in 200, or a risk of one in 4 700 of being killed. That is certainly a high risk. Almost every industry has an inbuilt risk, and probably one with the highest is the coal industry. As the Hon. Mr Laidlaw said, perhaps we should ban coalmining if risk is the criteria used.

That the economics of Roxby Downs is still being assessed by the companies was not a specific point in the terms of reference, yet the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster went to great pains to criticise the Government and declare that Roxby Downs would be only marginally profitable. At that stage there was no information available to the committee whatever on which to base that statement. In fact, the joint venturers would be happy to have the Hon. Dr Cornwall work for them, because obviously he is an expert and knows that it will not be profitable even before the project starts! Dr Cornwall said:

WMC-BP have indicated that the Roxby Downs prospect would be viable in the price range for yellowcake of $U.S.30 to $U.S.45 per pound based on 1981 prices and exchange rates. The ability to secure large long-term contracts for the majority of the uranium contained in the Roxby Downs orebody at these prices is a matter for speculation.

Where did he get this information? We did not get it on the select committee. I looked carefully at all the evidence and I could not find it. Did he have some special source of knowledge that the other members of the committee did not have? Did it come from the partners in the Roxby Downs project? If it did not come from them, from whom did it come? Perhaps it came from his fevered imagination, of which we have all seen examples in this Council from time to time. He has already stated, on page 137 of the report:

Many factors remain to be determined. The remote location, cost structures and the size, grade, distribution and depth of the deposits must all be considered. Finance, market access, knowledge of the orebody and an overall assessment of commercial and technical 'risk' factors must all be available to complete a final, definitive feasibility statement or what could be more accurately described as a pilot developmental scheme.

Nobody disagrees with that, but he concluded that it would be marginally profitable. How did he do that? He was always trying to destroy this project and the community's faith in the project by basing his calculations on information that he did not have.

The two companies are now assessing the cost factors involved. If this indenture passes, they will not continue to assess. If it does not pass, how can they go on assessing it and justify the expenditure? They cannot. In one section of the report, Dr Cornwall says that all factors will have to be considered. This was absolute nonsense. I believe he does not know what he is talking about.

It seems that one or two groups in South Australia are failing to grasp the significance of Roxby Downs: the A.L.P. and the Australian Democrats. The eleventh conclusion of the A.L.P. Report states:

Further activity at Roxby Downs, at least to the stage of a final definitive feasibility study or pilot developmental project report, is able to proceed without an indenture act.

There is the beginning of the ridiculous concept that people should be prepared to go on spending money on a project while the A.L.P. policy is to ban uranium mining. On top of that, we have the Victorian Government setting out to declare all nuclear activity absolutely banned. It must think these companies are run by mad men—people who are prepared to go on spending their funds for no reason and with no return. That is an absurd conclusion and one which I find impossible to denigrate enough. It is ridiculous. It exposes the complete economic stupidity of the A.L.P. It would appear that it expects two companies to continue spending $2 000 000 a month in the hope that the A.L.P. will change its mind at the end of a $200 000 000 exploration programme—the largest amount of money that will be spent prior to a project's proceeding in the history of Australia.

The head of Western Mining gave the lie to this paragraph before this report was presented when he stated quite categorically that, if the indenture Bill did not pass, the project would be put on ice. However, nobody with an ounce of common sense would ever have written that paragraph in the first place. The company quite properly expects some security after the expenditure of $50 000 000. What would change the A.L.P.'s mind in the next two years? Does it expect that radiation hazards will suddenly disappear from the face of the earth? Will radon, which it claims is the major hazard, stop being emanated from the orebody? Will waste disposal be to its satisfaction?

The Opposition will not agree that the Swedish project is safe and feasible. It says that no waste has yet been put in the ground. Of course that is so, because it is not ready for that yet. It has to be above ground for 20 to 25 years before it is at a heat level where it is suitable to be put under the ground permanently. Are Labor members going to hold up the project for 20 to 25 years until the Swedes put this waste down into the granite rock formation where Mr Dunstan has been quoted as saying it is safe?

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: One country.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: There are six other countries involved in the project. They are involved in the one project because they do not believe it is sensible for all countries of the world to set about proving the same thing. It is better for it to be done in one place and, when it is considered necessary to proceed with disposal, all countries will use

the same method. Do not talk to me about one country. The Leader was not on the select committee.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It is one country. A lot of other countries are producing nuclear waste.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The Leader is talking on a subject when he has not been sitting on a select committee and does not have the full information. The following report of 2 March 1981 refers to Mr Dunstan:

> Speaking at the opening of the Nuclear-free Pacific Week exhibition at Sydney Town Hall, Mr Dunstan said his fact-finding mission to Europe in 1979 has revealed that only Sweden had devised a means of safely disposing of toxic nuclear waste . . .
>
> 'It was plain the only country which had developed a safe process for isolating wastes permanently was Sweden where they are sealed in granite,' he said.

That has not been said by the A.L.P., although Dr Cornwall hinted at it. In the past the Labor Party has deliberately run away from it. Dr Cornwall used this problem as the major reason for being opposed to the mining of uranium. In fact, as has been stated, the disposal of waste is being carried out safely. We all know what happened to Mr Dunstan when he came back from overseas. There was a summary to which he agreed while overseas, but that was suddenly changed when he got home. That matter has been put before the Parliament before and I will not go over it again. Conclusion 12 in the A.L.P. report states:

> Despite its size, the Roxby Downs project may be only marginally profitable. It is significant that, when Western Mining were seeking a partner for the joint venture, several multinationals, including Utah Australia, declined their offer.

I would like to know what companies declined beside Utah Australia. Would Dr Cornwall and Mr Foster provide this Parliament with the evidence they have that Utah Australia and others declined? The Labor Government was in power at that time. One can only assume that Dr Cornwall, as a Minister, would have been privy to at least some of the company negotiations of that time.

I believe that information in that report was totally untrue and that the authors of the document misled the Parliament. In fact, a number of companies were interested in joining Western Mining in the Roxby Downs venture. What do they mean by the statement that Roxby Downs may be only marginally profitable? It was a repeat of the ridiculous statement when he gave all the reasons why it had to be looked at further. Yet he comes down to that conclusion. I quite frankly do not know how he came to the conclusion. If he has any information that could lead to that conclusion he should provide it to the committee. I do not recall any evidence on that basis. Dr Cornwall fancies himself as an expert on everything. He tends to operate that way in the Council. He talks about operating costs being too high, but nobody knows the final result of the feasibility study in relation to operating costs. He was trying to create public doubt about the whole of the Roxby Downs project. The select committee did not receive any information on that subject, nor did we seek it, because it was not in our terms of reference. As with almost all the A.L.P. dissentient statements, these paragraphs ignore uranium mining as such because the A.L.P. knows that it is safe and wants to divert public attention away from that fact.

The honourable member further stated that, even with the best possible ventilation and safety features, uranium mining was a hazardous occupation for miners. Of course uranium mining will be hazardous, but not as hazardous as coal mining. The major cause of hazards in uranium mining will be from accidents, not from lung cancer induced by radon. The Opposition had a further conclusion about reactor core meltdown, and said:

> The ultimate reactor failure, a core meltdown, would have disastrous consequences of enormous magnitude. Estimates of the possibility or probability of that occurring are based on theoretical calculations rather than experience and vary widely.

The reason for the possibility or probability of that occurring is based on theoretical calculations, because it has never happened nor is it likely to happen, as Dr Cornwall knows from the evidence we received. It is a very unlikely possibility.

Nuclear power is now a big feature in the world's production of electricity. In France, 62 per cent of that country's power is produced from nuclear energy. In Sweden, I understand that 43 per cent of the power is produced from nuclear energy. Why do members opposite want to stop this? What do they expect to happen if suddenly it is said, 'Right, no more nuclear power,' yet that would be the effect of the defeat of this Bill. That is a ridiculous proposition. How would that power be replaced? There is no oil; there are limited supplies of coal. Where else is power to be obtained?

The A.L.P. needs to go to those countries and discuss the subject and find out what alternatives there are. It is like the ridiculous sticker that one sees around: 'Solar—not nuclear'. Last year when I visited Scotland in the month of December there was only six hours of sunshine a day. I would like to see a solar power station operating there at that time of the year. I was very close to Dunreay, where there is nuclear power.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: One could return to foot pedal power.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: That is probably what the A.L.P. wants to do. What the A.L.P. seems too want is to close these power stations down and transform us back into the past. That is not possible. Fossil fuel is being completely used up. Some other form of energy may appear in the future. In the meantime, nuclear power is the only prospect that these countries have. One cannot get away from that. What the A.L.P. is trying to do is to stop countries from using it and saying that they should not use it. The A.L.P. might not like the alternative, because it could well be a fast breeder reactor and we do not know enough about that. I certainly would want to know a lot more about it before I took any step which would lead to an increase in such reactors.

I was pleased to see that the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster accepted that the use of fossil fuels was a substantial hazard to the biosphere. I agree with that. One of the problems with fossil fuel is that emission into the atmosphere from coal-fired power stations is irrecoverable, whereas there is virtually no pollution of the atmosphere from nuclear power stations. The waste is contained, and can be treated and stored. A fair amount of nonsense is talked about waste. From a 1 000 megawatt station the amount of solid waste produced per year is approximately three cubic metres. One has the idea, from what is said, that there is a huge quantity of waste.

The Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster both know that, in the foreseeable future, the only feasible alternative to coal is nuclear power. As coal-fired power appears to be permanently damaging the biosphere, there is no doubt what the choice must be. Yet it appears that the A.L.P. is not prepared to stand up and do anything about it. It states that no final disposal is taking place. I agree with that; it is not. As I stated earlier, the technical knowledge is now available, but no final disposal of vitrified waste is planned on an industrial scale for many years. In fact, it would be irresponsible to do so until the vitrified waste is in a proper condition for final storage. As I said earlier, the project in Sweden is well advanced and is now accepted. As the Hon. Mr Sumner has said, it is accepted as the safest method for the future disposal of vitrified waste.

Mr President, I believe that the report presented by the Government members of the select committee was a balanced, informative and thoughtful report. It certainly went through all of the risks and benefits of uranium mining in

South Australia. A final conclusion from the Hon. Mr Milne said:

Evidence presented during the hearings of the select committee establishes to my satisfaction that mining, milling, transport and further treatment of uranium up to the stage of fabricating fuel rods will occasion no greater public or occupational exposure to harm than arises from the operations of other extractive industries, provided that current 'best practices' in respect of health and safety are strictly enforced, and provided also that current standards for the isolation of mill tailings are made more stringent.

Any fair-minded and honest person reading the evidence would inevitably come to the same conclusion. The Hon. Mr Milne has expressed reservations about the further stages. However, that is a matter for him to elaborate on at a later date. The select committee's major general conclusion states:

The major conclusion of the supporting members is that they are satisfied that the hazards in connection with the mining, milling, transport, further treatment and storage of uranium in South Australia can be overcome by the imposition of stringent applications of safeguards at all stages of the nuclear fuel cycle.

The select committee was also satisfied with the benefits of mining the various deposits in the State, which included uranium, and that this would be of considerable benefit to the South Australian community. Members recommend that people accept these two conclusions. The A.L.P. members presented, in my opinion, what is a superficial, uninformative anti-nuclear report which was written to conform with Party-political policy and is not a balanced summary of the evidence. Many of the conclusions those members reached appear to have been based on material not given in evidence and, in most cases, seem to have been plucked from the air in order to substantiate an anti-nuclear, anti-Roxby Downs bias. In many cases they appear to be figments of the imagination of the Hon. Dr Cornwall. It is important that we look to what has been said by Sir Mark Oliphant, who is a man of great knowledge on the subject of nuclear power and uranium.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: And a man of peace.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes. An article in today's *News*, discussing what Sir Mark Oliphant believes, is as follows:

'As has been found in the U.S., this is quite a hazardous occupation—

he is talking there about underground uranium mining—

unless extreme care is taken,' he said. 'I wanted to see what was going on [at Olympic Dam] and in fact I was quite impressed with the responsibility of the mining people. I thought they were doing everything right and were not going to subject miners to any hazards. Now that the problems are understood, I think it would be much safer than most coal mining. There's no gas to cause explosions; the chances of roof falls and things like that are much less.'

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you think the Hon. Mr Milne has read that?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: He will read it. The article continues:

Sir Mark said Western Mining Corporation, in safeguarding the health of miners at Olympic Dam, had learnt from other people's mistakes. Inadequate ventilation and lack of radiation level checks meant that men involved in underground mining of uranium 20 years ago now were starting to suffer circulatory system problems and cancer.

Defending the Roxby Downs project, Sir Mark pointed to the expected economic benefits. 'The development of any resource of that kind leads to employment. 'South Australia is in a difficult situation economically and needs any economic development, unless there are very grave reason for not carrying it forward,' he said. South Australia would be 'foolish' to leave uranium in the ground.

'If Australia doesn't provide uranium to countries that want to build reactors, they can easily get it elsewhere,' he said.

So Sir Mark Oliphant is also a poppy grower, to use the analogy of the Hon. Dr Cornwall. I wonder if Sir Mark has read the *Advertiser* this morning. He might not be too happy with the Hon. Dr Cornwall. The article continues:

'It's running out of people's ears.' Instead of protesting against uranium development in Australia, or 'a little bit' of radioactive fallout from French explosions in the Pacific, anti-nuclear forces should concentrate on the real problem—the nuclear arsenals of the super-powers.

I agree with that. The problem is not with the commercial nuclear fuel cycle—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: We never see you protesting.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: You won't either, following clowns around. They dress like clowns and they are clowns. It is a well known fact that problems relating to the spread of nuclear weapons are not related to the commercial fuel cycle. The problem is with those countries which sell the high level technology which leads to the production of these weapons. Members opposite are trying to imply that the commercial nuclear fuel cycle and nuclear weapons cycle are the same thing. The Hon. Dr Cornwall and anyone else who sat on the uranium select committee would be aware that that is not the case.

Members opposite are deliberately trying to merge the two in an attempt to torpedo a project that will be of enormous benefit to this State. If this Bill does not pass, we will have a lot of maintenance work to do on the roads in the north of this State, not for the development of the north, but to get all the machinery and drills back to Adelaide. There will be an enormous drain of resources back to this city and interstate where they will be allowed to carry out what is regarded overseas as a worthwhile project. This project would be a worthwhile addition to this State.

The Hon. Mr Milne will be making a very important decision in this Council. In fact, he will be making the most important decision in his limited time in this Chamber. If the Hon. Mr Milne and his Party continue with their present attitude they will be turning away from the future development of this State. The Hon. Mr Milne's suggestion that we leave it in the ground for 30 years is just stupid, and I say that quite deliberately.

The Hon. K. L. Milne: I've never said that.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If the Hon. Mr Milne did not say it, the fellow who sits behind him—Mr Gilfillan—and tells him how to do things said it in a press release. This is a very important project to this State which will lead to great benefits. I agree that it will not create 15 000 jobs overnight. However, it will create confidence in this State and it will start the march forward. If this project does not go ahead it will be a large step backwards. The people who prevent this project proceeding will be remembered. However, they will not be remembered as they would like to be remembered. They will be remembered as the people who halted the development of South Australia at a very vital time. I support the Bill.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: It has been quite distasteful for me to sit through the last half an hour or so listening to the Hon. Mr Cameron's rather sneering and cynical dismissal of the views of thousands of people in this State. I do not know why the Hon. Mr Cameron and other members opposite are not capable of accepting that there are people in this community who hold different views from their own in relation to this matter. Those people happen to be informed about the issue and should not be dismissed in the way in which they have been dismissed this afternoon.

I think it is rather interesting that the Hon. Mr Cameron spent so much time this afternoon dismissing and abusing the contribution made by the Hon. Dr Cornwall as some sort of emotional nonsense. The theatrical and emotional tirade to which we have just been subjected is an indication of the double standards by which the Hon. Mr Cameron lives. I hope I can now return this debate to a more rational and less emotional footing.

Cornwall in this place yesterday. He covered the issues surrounding this Bill comprehensively, and I do not intend to repeat those arguments.

During my maiden speech in this place 2½ years ago, I spoke at length on the hazards of the various stages of the nuclear fuel cycle. Very little has changed since then, and it is not my intention to cover that ground again. In fact, I feel quite angry that we should have to discuss this matter at this time at all, because it is very clear that the introduction of this Bill is nothing more than a political stunt. It is a waste of this Chamber's time. We should really be out in the electorate doing something useful.

Today I will restrict my comments to three aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle, which are integral to this debate and form part of the overall argument in which my Party bases its policy in relation to uranium. Two of the matters I want to discuss concern the safety of the nuclear fuel cycle further down the track from the mining process, which is the central topic of this Bill, and finally I want to make a few remarks about the economic context in which we are discussing this measure.

As I have said before, the Labor Party is concerned about the safety of the entire nuclear fuel cycle. The Legislative Council select committee report and the Government focus primarily on those parts of the nuclear fuel cycle which would take place here in South Australia, that is, mining and milling. It would be just as improper to ignore what happens after uranium leaves our shores as it would be to ignore what happens to opium, to use Dr Cornwall's analogy, when it leaves a country like Thailand to be turned eventually into heroin. One of the matters which fits into this category is the safety of nuclear reactors.

I notice that whenever the Government talks about these matters it studiously ignores things such as the safety of nuclear reactors, international safeguards and other things, because it knows that they are the areas on which it is weakest. The multi-billion dollar accident at Three Mile Island in the United States has already brought home to ordinary people just how dangerous nuclear power plants can be. I should point out that only one paragraph was devoted to this crucial issue in the Upper House select committee's report, or at least the one prepared by Government members.

Helen Caldicott, the well known international anti-nuclear activist, who was recently in Australia, has this to say about reactors in her book *Nuclear Madness:*

> The nuclear plant accident which poses the greatest threat to public safety is termed a 'meltdown' or the 'melt-through-to-China syndrome.' Such an event could be initiated by a pipe breakage or safety failure—whether accidental or the result of sabotage—that would permit the coolant water at a reactor's core to drop below the level of the fuel rods. The rods would become so hot that they would melt, then the whole mass of molten uranium would burn through the 'container' (the concrete base of the plant) and into the earth, possibly triggering a steam explosion that would blow the containment vessel apart, releasing its deadly radioactive contents into the atmosphere. Soon after a meltdown with release of radioactivity, thousands would die from immediate radiation exposure; more would perish two to three weeks later of acute radiation illness. Food, water, and air would be so grossly contaminated that in five years there would be an epidemic of leukemia, followed fifteen to forty years later by an upsurge in solid cancers. The genetic deformities that might appear in future generations are hard to predict, but they surely will occur.

Such a meltdown could have staggering consequences. The Union of Concerned Scientists recently conducted a two-year study of a hypothetical 'expanded nuclear economy' and concluded that before the year 2000 A.D., close to 15 000 people in the United States may die of minor reactor accidents. Moreover, they estimated that in the same time period there is a one percent chan that a major nuclear accident will occur, killing nearly 100 000 people; most will die of radiation-induced cancers.

Many people argue that these sort of claims are alarmist, and that nuclear reactors are the safest power generators in the world. They refer to the massive and comprehensive study of reactor safety known as the Rasmussen Report, published in 1974. However, the University of Melbourne Radiation Protection Officer, Rob Rowbotham, points out in a book called *Uranium*:

> The most comprehensive study of reactor reliability is the Rasmussen Report, also known as the Reactor Safety Study (RSS). The RSS is cited optimistically by the nuclear hawks as having found the answers. However, since its publication in 1974 the RSS has been the subject of extensive and detailed criticisms. In particular, its methodology and health physics assessments have been adversely reviewed.

Later he states:

> One reason why the RSS methodology consistently underestimates failure rates is that it cannot identify all the ways in which a complex system can and actually does go wrong. Because of this approach, the RSS data yield absurd results when used to predict the likelihood of major multiple fractures which have actually occurred in reactors. RSS calculations would yield a predicted rate of 2.5 per 10^{18} reactor years, yet 15 such events have already occurred in the U.S.A. with little more than 10^3 reactor years of accumulated experience. Similarly, the RSS calculated that high-pressure-coolant-injection systems (HPCS) designed to deal with small pipe breaks will fail 7.8 times per 1 000 demands. In 47 tests at four reactors near Chicago, the observed HPCS failure rate was 2.1 per 10 demands.

Later he states:

> In January 1979 the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission withdrew the RSS (five years after publication), saying, in so doing, '. . . the Commission withdraws any explicit or implicit past endorsement of the executive summary'. The executive summary has been the section most quoted by nuclear proponents because of its optimistic assessments of reactor accident risks.
>
> However, a major factor Rasmussen could not include is human fallibility; and just how important a factor that is is best illustrated by what is now known as the Brown's Ferry incident, when one old-fashioned candle put two reactors out of operation for well over a year. Brown's Ferry, however, is only part of the growing American nuclear folklore. Others include Millstone 1 whose condensers corroded and leaked sea water into the primary coolant; Quad-Cities 2, which operated with a forgotten welding rig sloshing around inside the pressure vessel; Vermont Yankee, on which the control rods were installed upside down and which by an ingenious combination of malpractice was later started up with the lid off the pressure vessel; Indian Point 2, in which a major steam pipe split over half its circumference and allowed leaking steam to buckle the steel liner of the containment for more than 12 metres.

There are many more examples. He also states:

> But by far the biggest blow to both the nuclear industry and its concepts of reactor safety as embodied in studies like Rasmussen's came on 28 March 1979 at the Three Mile Island nuclear power plant, near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
>
> The Harrisburg accident was the consequence of a build up of relatively small events in sequence. Nuclear engineers both pro and anti-nuclear power have usually assumed that only major events, like cold leg pipe breaks, etc., would lead to major problems. Three Mile Island has reopened the whole question of reactor safety: a question the nuclear industry had hoped was closed.

In light of information such as this, what amazes me is that this question of nuclear reactor safety is ignored almost completely by this Government. It seems to think that it is none of its business or responsibility. Of even greater importance than reactor safety or waste disposal is the problem of international safeguards and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It is now widely recognised that nuclear war is one of the gravest risks facing humankind. This risk is exacerbated by proliferation of nuclear weapons to more and more nations. Israel is reported to have already some 200 nuclear weapons; South Africa may have them; and Pakistan, Argentina and Libya are attempting to acquire nuclear weapons, as are a number of other countries. In this increasingly dangerous context, it is imperative that the very strictest safeguards be

maintained so that uranium for power reactors is not used to make nuclear weapons.

It was interesting to hear the Hon. Mr Cameron state quite categorically that the countries of the world that currently have nuclear weapons do not use uranium from their commercial fuel cycle for making those weapons. This is not true, because recently we have learnt that the United States is now diverting material from its nuclear power plants for the creation of new nuclear weapons. The Reagan Administration plans to produce 17 000 new nuclear warheds over the next 10 years.

The Legislative Council Select Committee on Uranium Resources report, or at least that part of it prepared by the Government members, paid no serious attention to the problems of international safeguards. It devoted only a page to repeating what has been said elsewhere. I think this gives some indication of the frivolous, short-sighted view of this matter so often displayed by members opposite, on this issue.

In a situation where there is an overwhelming need to tighten up already inadequate international safeguards we find that the Liberals at the national level, in the Federal Government, are doing precisely the opposite. Since 1977, when the Fraser Government announced the conditions which would apply when Australian uranium was exported, those conditions have been watered down four times, to the point where they are almost useless.

It is interesting to look at this watering down process. It shows what can happen in the tough world of international bargaining when a Government like the Fraser Government, with little social conscience and few real principles, is desperate to sell as much uranium as possible as quickly as possible. In 1977, when Australia's uranium safeguards policy was announced, the world outlook for uranium markets was rosier than it has been since. The Fraser Government's policy relating to safeguards was consistent with one introduced by President Carter a month before.

Essentially it required that no contracts would be entered into until a safeguards agreement had been signed with the customer country; Australia would only sell to countries which were signatories to the non-proliferation treaty; Australian uranium would be subject at all times to I.A.E.A. safeguards after it left Australian ownership; and, finally, Australian consent would be required before a customer could reprocess our uranium and obtain plutonium (which could be used for non-peaceful purposes), transfer it to a third country, or enrich it to a grade higher than that needed for normal civil power plants.

When the Federal Government tried to implement these conditions it met considerable resistance, and three years after the introduction of the safeguards policy only two small contracts had been signed which met the Government's safeguards standards. Neither Japan nor France would agree to Australia' prior consent clauses on reprocessing and transfers to third countries. And in the meantime, the Ranger mine had started up. It needed markets.

The Government had a little think and asked itself what it could do. It decided to water down the safeguards requirements. The Government shifted the weight of bargaining power concerning safeguards from Australia to customer countries by announcing that contracts could thereafter be entered into without safeguards agreements being signed as long as agreements were reached before deliveries began.

The second weakening of the safeguards requirements came shortly thereafter when the Government decided to sell uranium to South Korea and Iran—both countries of rather dubious political stability—despite its previous assurances that wider foreign policy considerations would be taken into account when sales agreements were being considered and that the Government would not do business with unstable regimes.

So, once again, the realities of the failing uranium market caused the Government to cave in. A few months later, the Government weakened still further when it dropped the Australian ownership provision of the safeguards which had been recommended by the Fox Inquiry in the first place. The idea was that Australia should retain ownership of yellowcake until it was processed into a form attracting I.A.E.A. safeguards inspection. This was designed to provide an extra accounting measure against hijacking and diversion to weapons which, as we all know, is one of the most serious problems that we face.

In commenting on this change, Martin Indyk of Macquarie University and formerly Chief of the Middle East Desk of National Assessment, made the following observation in a *National Times* article in February this year:

> That meant that a country which bought Australian uranium and then stockpile it in raw form would have an unsafeguarded source of material which it could then enrich in a clandestine facility to weapons strength without the I.A.E.A. or Australia being able to detect the diversion. If this seems rather far-fetched, one then has to explain why the Government took the trouble to include the now rescinded provision in its original safeguards policy.

Dr Indyk's observation clearly indicates that this, the third watering down in the Government's policy, has very serious implications indeed. But that was not the end of the story. In 1980 the policy was weakened still further. The Government decided that in future countries wanting to reprocess uranium could do it without prior Australian Government consent, which they had been required to obtain under the original conditions.

Now they would only have to provide Australia with confidential details of why and where the uranium was to be reprocessed and then they had only to assure Australia that the plutonium produced would be used only for legitimate energy uses and waste management. As the *National Times* observed in the report to which I have already referred:

> This new 'programme approach' on safeguards—replacing the former practice where Australia's consent was to be sought for each batch of delivered uranium—effectively abondoned Australia's right of veto in the case of any irregularities after consent to reprocess had been given in advance. The program approach is embodied in the five agreements Australia has finalised since November, 1980: with Euratom, France and Sweden (all signed) and with Japan and Switzerland (soon to be signed). In all these treaties, prior Australian consent is no longer needed for the transfer of Australian uranium to third countries which also have safeguards agreements with Australia.

I think it's clear from this sorry history that Australia's safeguards agreements are hardly worth the paper they are written on. I agree entirely with the conclusion reached by Robert Milliken in the *National Times* article to which I have referred. He said this:

> The most that can be said about Australia's safeguard's agreements after five years of policy is that they continue to operate. But the original relationship propounded by Fraser—that the nuclear fuel suppliers should call the tune on how the nuclear consuming countries behave—does not. As each of the tinkerings has shown that relationship is now reversed.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Mr Acting President, I draw your attention to the state of the Council. I would have thought that the Government would consider the importance of this debate to be such that there would be more than one Government member in the Council.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I have spent time spelling out this sorry tale to indicate the hopelessness of the safeguards question—as things currently stand in Australia. Governments with little integrity, which are desperate for economic wealth at any cost and which want to cling to

political power at any cost, will bend rules and take risks if they think it serves their interests.

It seems the Tonkin Government is prepared to go along with this dreadful situation. A few months ago I asked the Minister of Mines and Energy whether he was aware that Australian uranium was to be exported to the U.S.S.R. for enrichment. He said 'No'. I also asked whether he was satisfied with the safeguards arrangements for the uranium being shipped to the U.S.S.R. since the I.A.E.A. inspection system does not operate there. Further, I asked whether the South Australian Government would allow uranium from South Australia to go to the U.S.S.R. The Minister of Mines and Energy once again displayed his frivolous approach to this whole question with this glib response:

> This is a Federal responsibility and the South Australian Government is satisfied that the application of I.A.E.A. inspections and the conditions of Australia's bi-lateral safeguards agreements with customer countries will ensure that nuclear fuel from South Australia will be used only for peaceful purposes.

So either the State Government is ignorant of the facts and the limitations of the watered down safeguards which operate in this country or it just does not care whether or not the safeguards are adequate. Either way, it is disgraceful.

Finally, I would like to come back briefly to the question of the economic viability of the Roxby Downs project, or the uranium market in general. As my colleagues have already pointed out, by the early 1980s it became clear that the anticipated mushrooming of nuclear reactors was nothing more than a mirage. New orders for nuclear power plants have faded away to almost nothing.

The authoritative Massachusetts Institute of Technology reported late in 1980 that, excluding the Communist bloc and the U.S.A., present nuclear plants would require 23 280 tonnes of uranium by 1990. But the actual and planned production for 1990 was 49 550 tonnes—more than double the projected need. The sales situation by 1990 will be even worse than figures indicated because of large consumer inventories. These are mainly due to stock-piling. For example, the report states that Japan and France are in danger of holding of the order of 10 to 25 years forward supply. This is interesting when we consider that it is the prospective Japanese market on which the Federal Government places so much hope for Australia's uranium sales.

Further, the report predicts that these large stocks will make the holding nations not just unwilling to buy, but eager to sell. This is likely to cause the price to fall even further. And what did the M.I.T. report have to say about Australian production? It refers to Australia's 'relatively weak market position; with production coming on line in an era of rising inventories, excess production and softening prices, Australia has had difficulty in making sales at all'. And still Governments like the Tonkin and Fraser Governments want to push ahead with uranium development projects, as though the future depended on it. Heaven help us if it does! As Michael Gill said in *The Age* in December last year:

> A wider look at the industry and its prospects shows how little sparkle remains on what was once the bright star of the Australian mining industry. Uranium salesmen world-wide are bumping into solid political and economic obstacles which some Australian politicians seem to have overlooked in their yellowcake dreams.

In conclusion, I want to emphasise that when we are looking at something as important as the nuclear fuel cycle, we cannot afford to take only one part of it into consideration and forget about other parts. We cannot afford to say that mining uranium is okay and what happens further down the track is not any of our business because it will happen somewhere else. That seems to be the Government's position and it is grossly irresponsible.

Some of the questions I have raised here concerning the safety of nuclear power plants, international safeguards, and proliferation of nuclear weapons are matters which should be of vital concern to all of us. We must all bear some responsibility for the decisions made in this country and in this world. On this whole question there are sharp differences of opinion throughout the world.

What the A.L.P. is arguing is not that we are implacably opposed for all time and under all conditions to the nuclear fuel cycle, but simply that at the moment there is not compelling evidence that it is either safe, efficient or economically viable enough to warrant support of this highly premature indenture Bill which lays down conditions and commits the people of this State to pay costs for a project which may never be viable. Common sense, prudence and logic suggest that, if there are disagreements between eminently qualified experts on whether or not something is highly dangerous, we should wait until those arguments can be resolved in one way or other before we commit our resources and the population of our State to this project.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare): I support the Bill. Honourable members will be aware that I chaired, from November 1979 to the time of its report in 1981, the select committee of this Council on uranium resources. The Hon. Martin Cameron was a member of that committee and I commend to the Council as strongly as I can his learned and lucid contribution earlier in this place when he referred to its conclusions. The only substantial argument advanced against the indenture Bill is that the nuclear fuel cycle is unsafe. In saying that I include the argument put by the previous speaker on the question of proliferation. I shall therefore refer mainly to the issue of safety.

There was, of course, a dissenting statement by two members of the select committee and a dissenting conclusion and recommendation by one member. The Government members provided what is, in our view, a balanced summary of the technical evidence. We gave this evidence in summary form for the interest of members of Parliament and the public. There was, to say the least, a plethora of evidence to that committee. Dissenting members took what can only be construed as a political stand. They now suggest that they are opposed to the Bill on the grounds that they are not satisfied with the safeguard provisions. How ambivalent and hypocritical can one be? What else can it be other than a political ploy to assert that Roxby Downs mining is not safe until it is clinically proved to be so, because we will not know until we have mined it? Clearly the select committee had paramount in its mind, particularly the Government members, the possibility of uranium mining being recommenced in South Australia, namely, at Honeymoon, Roxby Downs and some other places. We realised that the report of the committee could well be used as the basis for radiation protection and control practices which could be applied, having been agreed to on rational and reasonable grounds for the Roxby Downs project.

Government members supported current practices and standards which we consider to be acceptable. However, where we considered that practices and standards might not be adequate we made recommendations aimed at improvement. Our committee heard evidence from a wide range of people, from avowed anti-nuclear groups to authorities on various aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle. Our report, we believe, presented and still does present, six months later, an up-to-date document based on authoritative information. Our published report has, as the basis for its findings, a document labelled 'A summary of some evidence and other technical matters'. This summary comprises 12 volumes and runs over 600 pages. It was based accurately on the massive evidence filling the boxes which the honourable members saw on a trolley in this Chamber when the report

was tabled on 11 November 1981. If anybody wishes to obtain a more comprehensive discussion on any aspect of uranium mining or the nuclear cycle I recommend that the document be studied. I suggest that all who doubt the wisdom of this Bill should study it. For any brave soul who wishes to delve any deeper into this subject then they should refer to the summary for the full evidence. In the major conclusion by the Government members the word 'safeguard' may be misleading and the word 'standards' may be more appropriate.

I shall now summarise some of the main conclusions and recommendations of the three Liberal members of that select committee. We were and still remain satisfied that the protection standards applied for exposure to gamma and X-radiation are adequate and once in practice actual exposures to workers are only a fraction of these maximum permissible limits. We recommended that the National Health and Medical Research Council be requested to review the present maximum permissible limits of exposure to radiation in Australia with a view to recommending a reduction in the allowable limits.

We have already demonstrated our concern for uranium miners and all radiation workers and I refer to this Government's radiation protection legislation. Such a system allows continuous monitoring of a worker's exposure, no matter how often he or she changes employment in uranium mines and whether this employment is in different states or territories. It also provides data for future epidemiological studies.

In view of the doubts cast by the 1980 report of the U.S. National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health of the adequacy of safety of the current exposure standard of four working level months per year to radon decay products, we recommended that the National Health and Medical Research Council be requested to review the present maximum permisssible limit of exposure with a view to recommending a reduction in the allowable limits.

It is appropriate to point out that at Narbalek miners during the mining phase were on average exposed to the equivalent of .065 working level months or .3 per cent of the allowable exposure to radon and 232 millirems of exposure to gamma radiation or 9 per cent of the allowable limits.

The Hon. R. J. Ritson: It is safer than living at Victor Harbor.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Yes it is. Victor Harbor is close to the granite, which always has a great degree of emanation of radioactivity. These percentages are based on the maximum exposure allowed for six months (not 12 months) because the total mining occupied only 4½ months. It should also be pointed out that, at Narbalek, the orebody was mined and the waste was stored above ground and later returned to the original mine site.

However, it is well known that modern mines with up-to-date ventilation and dust suppression techniques have exposure levels well below the allowable limits, and it is intended that at Roxby Downs there should be a total air replacement every few minutes which can only lead to greater protection for workers. We recognise that the exposure of uranium miners to radon decay products is a hazard that entails stringent precautions. Nevertheless, we do not wish attention to be directed away from the more usual hazards of mechanical accidents and dust in mines, which has caused far higher casualties than lung cancer in poorly ventilated mines.

Uranium mining in South Australia will entail the production of yellowcake and consequent low hazard to workers. However, the evidence presented to us did not establish that there were any deleterious effects to workers from exposure to yellowcake even though past protection standards were not as stringent as today's standards. Nevertheless, lack of evidence was not accepted as proof that no hazards exist.

Consequently, we have recommended that the packing and sampling of yellowcake be carried out by remote or automatic control in completely enclosed areas in order to minimise yellowcake dust hazard to workers. Old uranium processing operations simply did not employ this safety standard, yet we do believe it is important, even though there is a valid assumption that exposure is not a problem, that every possible safety precaution should be implemented.

In addition there should be strictly controlled access to yellowcake storage areas, to minimise exposure to gamma radiation from yellowcake. But we emphasise that in this procedure exposure to gamma radiation is extremely low. In uranium mines that involve open cut or underground operations uranium oxide concentrate yellowcake will be extracted in a mill adjacent to the mine. The ore will be ground down into sand-sized tailings at the mill and will be contained in suitable retention systems depending on the site.

From the evidence we have concluded that mill tailings can be safely contained for long periods if correct techniques of tailings retention systems are used and suitable treatment of the tailings are carried out prior to disposal. We do not disagree with the conclusion of the A.L.P. that the ideal disposal site would be back in the mine or in the associated quarry. However, we strongly query the economics of the Australian Democrats' proposal that the uranium should be thrown back down the mine with the tailings. This is sheer economic lunacy without a vestige of economic commonsense. The main risk must be, and it is not a big risk particularly in the Roxby Downs area, from the radon emanating from the mine. Throwing uranium back down the mine does not really make much difference. It would not have a visible effect on the world's uranium supply. The only possible effect it would have would be on the potential economic return to South Australia, because clearly this exciting project would not proceed.

Our contention is that in South Australia there is already adequate provision in legislation covering the financial responsibilities for the proper containment of tailings. However, there does not appear to exist legislation covering the longer term monitoring, marking and recording of such tailings retention systems.

In the apparent absence of legislation covering the recording, marking and long-term surveillance of the sites of any types of tailings retention systems of most types of mines, we recommended that legislation be enacted so that such sites be registered on official land tenure and water resources records, that any restrictions on the future use of the site be recorded, and that permanent and obvious forms of markers be erected on the site carrying notice of the nature of the site, the possible hazard and the restrictions that may apply.

Let me now concentrate on the marketing potential for Australian Uranium. A large proportion of the anti-nuclear evidence to the committee was based on the supposed lack of markets for Australian uranium in a situation of oversupply of both yellowcake and enriched uranium. Despite the over capacity to supply yellowcake, it is quite apparent that the market has not been saturated as evidenced by the fact that operators of both Narbalek and Ranger have already secured contracts for the sale of most of their yellowcake production up to the mid-1990s.

In addition, evidence from various inquiries of international standing have also concluded that there will be a long term market and I remind members that the 240 nuclear power reactors already in operation will continue to require uranium fuel as will eventually the 230 that are now under

construction. In fact, each of the new reactors will require an initial fuel loading which is approximately three times their subsequent annual requirement.

I agree that a standing committee to oversee the industry be established. It should consist of appropriate senior officers from the relevant Government departments and statutory authorities. Also I accept the Hon. Mr Milne's former suggestion that some members of this committee should be independent of the Government.

I turn now to modes of transport. The present transport of yellowcake in Australia conforms to the regulations of the I.A.E.A. In addition, each year the Australian Atomic Energy Commission dispatches by air and ground about 50 000 radio-isotopes in containers built to international specifications. These radio-isotopes are sent all over Australia to various medical, hospital and industrial users.

Our own evidence and that from other national and international inquiries, including the Ranger Report, conclude that adequate safeguards exist to prevent the diversion of fissile material from the commercial nuclear fuel cycle. The principles expressed in our report can be applied to Roxby Downs, Honeymoon, Beverley and other future uranium mines, conversion plants and enrichment plants that may be established in South Australia.

In addition, these principles enable us to put South Australia's activities in the broader context of the nuclear fuel cycle with the relevant safeguards. The Hon. Mr Cameron referred in detail to the evidence of Mr Justice Fox. I propose to refer to several parts of that evidence. The Hon. Mr Cameron's quotations from Mr Justice Fox's evidence showed quite conclusively how terribly selective the Hon. Dr Cornwall was in his selection from Mr Justice Fox's evidence. The Hon. Dr Cornwall was very selective indeed. The quotations cited by the Hon. Mr Cameron showed quite clearly that Mr Justice Fox was not saying that there is a major hazard in proliferation. He was saying that there are matters which must be addressed.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Is there any connection between the civil use of nuclear power and the military use?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: That is not what I am talking about at the moment. At the moment I am referring to the evidence given by Mr Justice Fox. Let us look at what he had to say about non-proliferation and safeguards at page 1718 of his evidence, as follows:

> My main concern has been to encourage the development of non-proliferation measures and to do so in the international arena. I feel that some positive progress has been made in that area in a practical sense.

At page 1722, he said:

> It has to me been a rather warming experience to see 20, 30 or 40 nations represented at some of these meetings dealing with the non-proliferation aspects and how those present seem to tackle the problem with their sleeves rolled up and with a high degree of honest purpose.

At page 1735, Justice Fox indicated his belief that such efforts would be successful when he said:

> I do not believe that there will be proliferation. I believe we can control it within all reasonable limits.

At page 1730 of his evidence he agreed that conversion and enrichment in Australia, as opposed to the exporting of yellowcake, would reduce the risk of diversion of Australian sourced uranium for military purposes.

In more general consideration of the proliferation questions, one other comment by Mr Justice Fox, not referred to in the report of the A.L.P. members, should be pointed out. At page 1723 he stated:

> It would seem likely that no significant material, while safeguarded under international atomic energy agency safeguards, has ever been stolen for any purpose that could be in any way related to military purpose.

There seems to have been an impression left that the Government members of the committee have reached a conclusion all on their own and based only on a preconceived party line. We wish to reject that absolutely. In fact, the Government members stepped into new ground in some recommendations. That fact was not altogether recognised by the press. The A.L.P. members did not wish to discuss uranium mining because they know as well as I know that the overwhelming mass of evidence supported the fact that uranium mining is safe, and would be extremely beneficial to the South Australian community.

This contention has been clearly supported by two other inquiries since the Ranger Inquiry and, in fact, the A.L.P. dissenting statement is the only report which has been anti-uranium since Ranger anywhere in the world. First, we have the Ranger Report and Justice Fox's comments in 1981 given to the select committee. Second, we have the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry completed in 1978. The A.L.P. members were critical of the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry. I will quote the conclusion in the Cluff Lake Report on nuclear power and waste disposal.

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: They appointed an inquirer who was known to be pro-nuclear.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was a completely independent inquiry and, in fact, it was a board—not a single person. The conclusion states:

> We reached the following conclusions regarding the hazards to the public and the unborn from the production of electricity in nuclear reactors and from the radioactive waste which reactors produce:
> 1. Since there is now no nuclear reactor in or near Saskatchewan and none is planned for the immediate future, the hazards associated with the use of nuclear reactors do not constitute a direct potential harm to the people of Saskatchewan in the immediate future. Those hazards are nevertheless important to the people of Saskatchewan for a different reason. If those hazards were to be of such magnitude as to make it immoral or unethical for the people of Saskatchewan to repsond to a request from other people in the world to supply and sell uranium to them for use in their nuclear reactors, then there would be a reason not to mine and sell Saskatchewan uranium to them even though they have freely chosen to subject themselves to those hazards. From our findings on the evidence it is our conclusion that the hazards, taken by themselves, are not of that magnitude and even more so when compared to other hazards from nuclear reactors are not a reason for withholding Saskatchewan uranium from the world market.
> 2. Similarly, the hazards associated with the long-term disposal of nuclear wastes do not constitute a direct risk to the people of Saskatchewan in the immediate future. However, if those hazards were to be of such magnitude as to make it immoral or enethical for the people of Saskatchewan to respond to a request from other people in the world to supply and sell to them Saskatchewan uranium for fuel for their nuclear reactors thereby producing nuclear waste, then there would be reason not to mine and sell our uranium to them even though they had freely chosen to subject themselves to those hazards. From our findings on the evidence it is our conclusion that the hazards, taken by themselves, are not of that magnitude. It follows that the hazards from long-term storage of nuclear waste are not a reason for withholding Saskatchewan uranium from the world market.

The ultimate recommendations of the Cluff Lake Report are as follows:

> We now turn to the ultimate recommendation. We recommend that the Cluff Lake Mine/Mill proceed subject to the conclusions we have reached and the recommendations we have made in this report. We place particular emphasis on the conclusions and recommendations in the areas of health and safety of the workers, the distribution or rechannelling of economic benefits to the northerners, and the need for additional baseline data. It should be noted that the nature of some conclusions and recommendations is such as to require action before the mine/mill goes into actual production and in the case of others is such that action can be postponed, if necessary, until a later date.
>
> In Chapter 1, we indicated that it was implicit in the terms of reference that we could choose to recommend whether Saskatchewan should proceed with the expansion of her uranium mining and milling industry, should not proceed or should proceed on specified conditions. We also indicated how five of the issues outlined in relation to the Cluff Lake proposal apply equally to

the expansion of the industry generally. In this respect, we recommend that the expansion of the uranium mining and milling industry in northern Saskatchewan proceed beyond the Cluff Lake Mine/Mill subject to the applicable conclusions we have reached and the recommendations we have made in this report. In this regard we place particular emphasis on those conclusions and recommendations in areas: (I) of health and safety of workers; (II) of distribution of economic benefits and the amelioration of the social costs burden; (III) of orderly development of the north with a high percentage of northern participation; (IV) of sequential and gradual development of uranium mines/mills in Saskatchewan, and (V) of preservation of the northern environment.

That Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry was composed of three people who were not politicians with existing party policies. How could the Hon. Dr Cornwall and the Hon. Mr Foster write off with those few throw-away words a carefully researched report which examined evidence from all over the world and based on very careful terms of reference?

There is no reference as to who has made these criticisms or of the standing of the people whom the authors purport to have made the criticisms of Cluff Lake. In other words, they have attempted to denigrate the report without giving any evidence why they should do it. Or perhaps the authors, Messrs Cornwall and Foster, considered themselves to be the ultimate authorities and decided nobody else in the world could possibly have had the right answers. The word 'arrogant' covers their attitude in this section of their report extremely well. The conclusions of the Cluff Lake Board do not suit their anti-nuclear purpose, so they dismiss it with an unsubstantiated throw-away line.

Mr President, to impede the passage of this Bill would be to act contrary to the interests of all South Australians, and I make no exceptions or qualifications whatsoever. I commend the Bill in its present form to all honourable members, urging some of them to rise above their ill-based Party-political opposition to it.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON secured the adjournment of the debate

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 June. Page 4337.)

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill gives me no great concern, but I have some questions that I wish to ask of the Attorney in relation to some clauses. The Bill is basically a tidying-up proposal because the Attorney could not get the amendment to the Justices Act correct earlier in the year, but we will forgive him for that.

I have three questions and the Attorney can advise me of his view. The first question relates to clause 3, which provides that this Act shall come into operation immediately after the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982, comes into operation. Clause 2 provides for a proclamation sequentially of the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982. If this Bill comes into operation after that Act, how can he proclaim the Justices Act Amendment Act, 1982, sequentially? It is obvious that he cannot, and once again he has done some appalling drafting, but that is not unusual for the Attorney-General regarding the Bills that he introduces.

The next question that I have is in respect of clause 10. This introduces a new procedure of the payment of fines and other sums adjudged by the court to be paid. At present there is a procedure, particularly in private prosecutions, where moneys can be ordered to be paid to a complainant and the money not given through the court. This causes some concern for justices when they have to consider whether payment has been made when they receive an application to issue a warrant.

The procedure in the Bill is that the money should all be paid in the first instance to the clerk of court and he is responsible for the disbursement of moneys due to any other person. My question relates to procedure. First, how will those persons who pay the fines or other money know that the money in all cases is to be paid to the clerk of court? I think it important that a procedure be adopted for this, because money will be paid direct to complainants.

Under the industrial legislation, often orders are made for the payment of money to a complainant. Certainly, they used to be. Those orders could still be made and a person ordered to pay the money could pay direct to the complainant, not knowing the provisions of clause 10. I suppose that a similar situation could arise with respect to local government prosecutions. Under this procedure, money will have to be paid to the clerk of court. I think there needs to be an indication of the procedure to be adopted.

A question raised by the Hon. Anne Levy was whether there will be a time limit within which the clerk of court should pay out any money. She thought that perhaps there should be provision for that.

I refer now to clause 12 and again this seems to be a matter of drafting. I will get myself into trouble if I keep this up, but this clause needs to be looked at. Clause 12 deals with section 171.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: There is a new section.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: The Attorney-General has now advised me that there is a completely new section and in that case I will reserve my comments until the Committee stage. There seemed to be a problem as it was drafted.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I appreciate the diligence with which the Leader has examined this small Bill. In respect of clauses 2 and 3, I think he has a good point and I will have to consult Parliamentary Counsel so that next Tuesday we can resolve the matter.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader is rarely diplomatic but I accept the point that he has made on this occasion as perhaps being of some substance. In Committee, hopefully that difficulty will be sorted out.

With respect to the next point the Leader raised, he asked, when there is a private prosecution and fines and costs are to be paid to the clerk of the court, what will be the procedure by which the defendant will be notified of the requirement to pay into the clerk of the court. I understand that that will be dealt with administratively, that the magistrate or justices will make the order of payment to the clerk of the court on behalf of the complainant, and there will be some written material available to the defendant which will inform the defendant of the fact that the payment must be made to the clerk of the court. It will be dealt with administratively.

The next point raised by the Leader on behalf of the Hon. Anne Levy related to the time in which the fine and costs should be passed on by the clerk of the court. It could present some difficulties if there is a strict time limit but, in the discussion which led to this amendment, the Courts Department Director indicated that he felt that one month was a reasonable period within which the fine and costs should be paid to the complainant. That would be the general standard which the Courts Department would seek to meet in passing on fines and costs paid to the clerk. The Leader of the Opposition also raises the question about clause 12. I draw his attention to the fact that there was a new section 171 enacted in the Justices Act Amendment Bill of 1982 which provides in subsection (1) as follows:

An appeal to be instituted by filing notice of appeal in the Supreme Court.

What the amendment seeks to do as a result of further consultation with the Courts Department is to provide for the convenience of the appellant—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why didn't you get it right the first time?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: We believed it was appropriate to be filed with the Supreme Court. The Courts Department has reviewed it, and I agree with the result of the review that the notice of review should be filed with the court of summary jurisdiction against whose decision the appeal is instituted. That deals with that particular amendment.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Just to show that I am not infallible, I do admit that I was looking at the original Act, and perhaps that will make the Attorney feel better about his earlier drafting mistake.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I appreciate the Leader's admission. It is good to see that on both sides we are prepared to admit that on occasion we are wrong. I thank the Leader for his indications of support for the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) (1982)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In view of the hour, I seek leave to have the entire second reading speech inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for the appropriation of $290 000 000 to enable the Public Service of the State to be carried on during the early part of next financial year. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no Parliamentary authority for appropriations required between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. It is customary for the Government to present two Supply Bills each year, the first covering estimated expenditure during July and August and the second covering the remainder of the period prior to the Appropriation Bill becoming law.

Members will notice that this Bill provides for an amount greater than the $260 000 000 provided by the first Supply Act last year. The increase of $30 000 000 is needed to provide for the higher levels of costs faced by the Government. I believe this Bill should suffice until the latter part of August when it will be necessary to introduce a second Bill.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the issue and application of up to $290 000 000. Clause 4 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount. Clauses 5 and 6 provide the normal borrowing powers for the capital works programme and for temporary purposes, if required.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) (1982)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In view of the hour, I seek leave to have the entire second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

I propose to make a few brief comments about the State's general financial position before explaining the items in the Supplementary Estimates. I will give a detailed account of the financial operations for 1981-82 when I introduce the 1982-83 Budget to the House later this year. In presenting the Budget to the House last September, I said that the Government planned for a small deficit of $3 000 000 on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1981-82. I pointed out to members that this would increase the accumulated deficit of $6 600 000 recorded as at 30 June 1981 to $9 600 000 as at 30 June 1982.

With three weeks of the financial year still to go, there remain some uncertainties which make it difficult to predict with confidence the final budget outcome for 1981-82. For instance, the Commonwealth Government has yet to give the States final advice of the stocks it will allocate to finance their borrowings under the Australian Loan Council programme, and the interest payable thereon. However, present indications are that, without any special new provisions, a surplus of more than $10 000 000 could be achieved on the operations of the Consolidated Account for 1981-82.

The major contributing factor in this anticipated surplus on Consolidated Account is an improved position on the capital account. Departmental recoveries and repayments are now likely to exceed budget by about $10 000 000, largely as a result of greater than expected receipts from land sales and the early repayment of advances under the Loans to Producers Act by two South Australian co-operatives following their corporate restructuring. For several reasons, including a steady reduction in the labour force, competitive tendering for many contracts and work not proceeding as quickly as originally anticipated, it now seems likely that an underspending of some $10 000 000 may emerge on payments.

Before I detail the proposed appropriations contained in this Bill, it is fitting that I pay a tribute to the South Australian Public Service for the way in which it has worked towards this anticipated Budget result.

This financial year has been another one where finances have had to be controlled tightly. Stringency has been the by-word of 1981-82. I appreciate the co-operation of departmental heads in facing considerable challenges of the past two years. The two main challenges have been:

1. The need to reduce manpower numbers within the public sector. This objective was endorsed by mandate from the 1979 election, and was given even greater urgency by continuing shortfall in Federal-State tax-sharing. The objective is being achieved without retrenchment, and the credit must go to Public Service managers—not only heads of departments, but also middle management.
2. The need to introduce p.p.b. and adopt a cost-benefit approach. 'It is easy to manage by expansion; it is a great challenge to manage by contraction.' Taxpayers have benefited by savings from these initiatives, and I recognise the enormous effort that the public service has put in to implement this pro-

gramme. Programme performance budgeting is now regarded by its members as an essential management tool.

Because of this effort by South Australia's public sector managers, our anticipated 1981-82 Budget result compares favourably with the situation in other States, in that we have done better than was expected on Consolidated Account. The States of Queensland and Western Australia, assisted by their royalty income, may well end up with near-balanced budgets.

It looks as though New South Wales will end the financial year with a deficit on recurrent account of at least $100 000 000 more than expected and Victoria at least $70 000 000 more than expected on recurrent account—despite both these States imposing and now apparently maintaining a 1 per cent increase in their pay-roll tax for pay-rolls over $1 000 000 per annum. Likewise, Tasmania is looking towards a larger than expected deficit on recurrent account this year of over $30 000 000. Therefore, our result can bring some satisfaction both to the Government and to members of the South Australian Public Service.

It is appropriate to place on record, too, the Government's great appreciation of the fine work by the Under Treasurer and his officers and the Chairman of the Public Service Board and the officers of his department.

As to the expected surplus of about $10 000 000 on the 1981-82 operations of the Consolidated Account, the Government proposes to apply it towards meeting inescapable capital repayments for Monarto and commitments for Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd (receivers and managers appointed). Members will remember that the Government bought out the Commonwealth Government's interest in Monarto ($15 100 000, including capitalised interest) for $5 100 000 in 1980. Land sales are expected to realise over $5 000 000 in 1981-82. We have used part of the proceeds of those sales to recover State Loan funds advanced to the project ($2 500 000) and now propose to redeem part of the semi-government borrowings, which presently stand at $7 700 000.

We propose to set aside up to $3 000 000 in 1981-82 towards the redemption of those borrowings as they fall due. Proceeds from the sale of remaining land at Monarto will be applied, first towards redeeming debt and only when all debt has been discharged will the excess be used in the Budget. Regarding Riverland, all members are aware of the difficult circumstances which surround the canned deciduous fruit industry in Australia and the Riverland Cannery at Berri in particular.

Considerable financial assistance has been provided to the cannery over recent years and now the sharp down-turn in market demand for canned deciduous fruit has created even greater problems for the cannery. The cannery is incurring large losses, due in part to its highly geared capital structure. The Government has left no stone unturned in attempting to find a practical solution to the problem which this Government inherited, being acutely aware that there is a limit to which taxpayers' money can be used in these circumstances.

The Government now has a number of commitments to meet with respect to the operation of the cannery which has been continued in the public interest, and in the hope that some solution can be found.

1. A payment of $2 100 000 (with interest) is now due to the State Bank of South Australia as part of an agreement to reduce its financial involvement in the cannery, which has placed some strain on the bank's liquidity position.
2. A liability for $3 900 000, being an advance (by way of a State Bank commercial Bill line) to the Co-operative by Riverland Fruit Products Investments Ltd —a company wholly owned by the former South Australian Development Corporation, whose administrative functions were absorbed by the Department of Trade and Industry.
3. Receivership losses which are guaranteed by the Government are expected to amount to some $7 500 000 at 30 June 1982.

The present intention is to allocate as much as practicable this financial year to make payment to the State Bank, redeem the commercial Bills and meet part of the receivership losses. The extent to which that allocation can be met under special Act authority is not clear at the moment and, accordingly, some special provision is being sought also under the line Minister of Industrial Affairs—Miscellaneous.

The Industries Assistance Commission is undertaking an inquiry into the industry on an Australia-wide basis. It recently issued an interim report with a final report expected before the end of 1982. Finally, the Government is seeking appropriation for one other purpose which will have no effect on the outcome of the Consolidated Account. In November last, after considerable negotiation, we reached an agreement with the Commonwealth Government with respect to the South Australian Land Commission (now the South Australian Urban Land Trust). In brief, the Commonwealth Government agreed that for a payment of $36 000 000 it would relinquish in full its interest in the commission ($89 000 000, including capitalised interest, at June 30, 1981), and that it would accept three instalments; $25 000 000 in 1981-82 and $5 500 000 in each of the two succeeding financial years.

The Supplementary Estimates seek the necessary appropriation to make the first payment of $25 000 000. It will be offset by the payment of a corresponding amount into the Consolidated Account by the South Australian Urban Land Trust before 30 June 1982. As a result of all these proposed transfers to meet previously incurred commitments, the Consolidated Account is expected to show an approximate balance in 1981-82 and thus the accumulated deficit of $6 600 000 recorded at 30 June 1981 will remain virtually unchanged as at 30 June 1982.

Appropriation:

Turning now to the question of Appropriation, members will be aware that, early in each financial year, Parliament grants the Government of the day appropriation by means of the principal Appropriation Act supported by the Estimates of Payments. If these allocations prove insufficient, there are four other sources of authority which provide for supplementary expenditure, namely, a special section of the same Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, a transfer of appropriation from another purpose and a further Appropriation Bill supported by Supplementary Estimates.

Appropriation Act—Special Section 7 (1) and (2):

The main Appropriation Act contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased costs resulting from wage awards. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover most of the cost of a number of salary and wage determinations, with a small amout being met from within the original appropriations. However, it is avaialable to cover only these increases in salary and wage rates which are formally handed down by a recognised wage-fixing authority and which are payable in the current financial year.

The main Appropriation Act also contains a provision which gives additional authority to meet increased electricity charges for pumping water. Tariffs have increased at a rate

greater than that provided for in the Budget and there will be a call on this special appropriation.

Governor's Appropriation Fund:

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund, which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may be used to cover additional expenditure. The operation of this fund was explained fully to members when I introduced the Bill to amend the Public Finance Act in December 1980. The appropriation available in the Governor's Appropriation Fund is being used this year to cover nearly all individual excesses above allocations.

Transfer of Appropriation:

The Public Finance Act provides for adjustments to the amount of moneys appropriated from Consolidated Account so that excess money for one purpose may be transferred to another purpose where there is a deficiency. No such transfers are proposed this year.

Supplementary Estimates:

Where payments additional to the Budget Estimates cannot be met from the special section of the Appropriation Act or covered by savings in other areas, and where excesses are too large to be met from the Governor's Appropriation Fund, Supplementary Estimates must be presented. They may also be used as a means of informing Parliament of particularly significant Budget developments even though extra appropriation authority is not technically required. The details of the Supplementary Estimates are as follows:

Treasurer—Miscellaneous:

As I mentioned a moment ago, the Government has negotiated a settlement with the Commonwealth Government with respect to its interest in the former South Australian Land Commission. Appropriation is sought now to enable the first instalment of $25 000 000 to be paid.

Minister of Industrial Affairs—Miscellaneous:

The appropriation of $7 500 000 now sought is in accordance with my explanation about Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative Ltd.

Minister of Health—Miscellaneous:

The revenues of health units from patients' fees are now likely to be much less than originally expected. New fee arrangements came into operation on 1 September 1981, and all States are in difficulty because their actual revenues are running well below the estimates determined by the Commonwealth after consultation with the States. Also, health units have been unable to reduce the cost of medical and pathology services to the extent anticipated. As a result of these factors, it is likely that an additional $9 000 000 of State funds will be required by the Health Commission in 1981-82.

Minister of Lands—Miscellaneous:

The appropriation of $3 000 000 now sought is in accordance with my explanation with respect to the repayment of semi-government borrowings for Monarto.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

FISHERIES BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 and had disagreed to amendment No. 2.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING) BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 15 June at 2.15 p.m.