ALP has realised it must change if it wants to win

MacDonnell MLA, Neil Bell, did not succeed in his challenge to opposition leader, Terry Smith.

In the final event, Bell did not have the

numbers

numbers.

The clear possibility of a challenge arose from Smith's low electoral stocks.

Labor has put a on brave public face, but the picture is quite different privately. Party strategists recognise that unless the ALP changes tactics it is headed for another drubbing at the next election, whenever it is called by the CLP Government.

next election, whenever it is called by the CLP Government.

As part of this recognition a group was formed in the middle of December to map out a three-year plan that will take the party into the next historical phase and, hopefully, government.

The group is made out of three left wingers, ALP president, Col Dyer, socialist left convener, Margaret Gillespie, and unionist, Peter Tullgren; two centre left representatives, lawyer, Ken Parish and Nightcliff branch member, Glenn King; and two centre unity (right wing) reps, lawyers John Reeves and Peter McNab.

The group is, in effect, the much talked about committee to advise Smith on leadership issues. THERE are two significant things about it.

Firstly, the absence

Firstly, the absence of the best manipulator in the Labor Party, Senator Bob Collins, as well as centre left aparatchik and power

aparatchik and power broker, Denis Bree. Secondly, the willing-ness of the left wing to consider strategies to actually win an elec-

on. Both indicate a considerable shift in the ALP's philosophy. It is clear strongman Collins is distancing

Collins is distancing himself from too-close factional allegiances.

He remains arguably the most popular polit-ician in the Territory and he will use his pop ular appeal to influence the ALP machine when

it suits him.

But, unless some thing catastrophi catastrophi wees, Collins with grubb emerges, Collins will stay out of the grubby in-fighting that disting-uishes the inner coun-cils of Labor.

cils of Labor.

Bree is said to have engineered last August's shock coup d'etat against the right wing of the party.

The August 1 conference saw a massive defection of the centre left to the socialist left

fection of the centre left to the socialist left. Word in the party is that the defection was carefully put together by Senator Peter Cook, ably helped by former Palmerston Labor candidate, Tony Henry, and Bree. It is difficult to obtain hard evidence for this, but it is undeniable that without centre left help the socialist left could not have

arty to o slowly pont





□ Opposition leader, Terry Smith. □ His would-be challenger, Neil Bell.

FRANK **ALCORTA**

mustered the numbers for its convincing vicfor its tory.

Bree, a member of Labor's powerful Nat-ional Executive, has nevertheless been ex-cluded from the select Territory group looking at new directions. His at new directions. His place has been taken by Ken Parish, a lawyer with a keen intellect and a firm grasp of fundamentals.

All indications are that Parish, like fellow right wing lawyer, John Reeves, is not so much

interested in vacuous discuss-

interested in vacuous philosophical discuss-ions as he is in winning. The other factor, the left's willingness to par-ticipate in discussions leading to policy changes, is fascinating.

What it means is an emerging realisation on the part of all factions in the ALP that the party has to change if it wants to win. And winning suddenly appears as attractive to the left as it has always been to the right.

Do not, however Do not, however, ex-pect earth-shattering moves overnight. Rather, what will hap-pen is a slow drift towards pragmatism and common sense. Surely this is wel-come news for all Terr-itorians, not just for Lebon supporters

itorians, not jus Labor supporters. Substantial po

Substantial policies for growth and sound economic management are what is needed in a party aspiring to govern.

From all available evidence, ALP strategists, after months of hybernation, are coming out of their winter into the sunlight. Not before time.

before time.

A LL IS not as Simple as has been made out in the recent purchase of equity by the giant French company, Cogema, in Energy Resources of Australia, Ranger uranium operators.

Reports from Paris and Washington dating back to November 16, last year (Nuclear Fuel a biweekly remort - a biweekly report from the editors of Nu

cleonics Week) suggest
that Saarberg
Interuranium Australia
Pty Ltd, a subsidiary of
the West German firm Saarberg-Interplan Uran, intended to sell off one-third of its ERA interests to Cogema.

Apparently Saarberg has clients for about two-thirds of its ERA clients.

It would desperately like to bring the floor price down so it can sell the rest, about 250 000 lb. of annual production.

ion. The The Australian Gov-ernment's mandated floor price is \$30.09 per

lb. ERA's ERA's equity holders, the West Germans, Japanese and Swedes, who be-tween them account for about 75 per cent of about 75 per cent of Ranger's total production, signed the dea fore the market lapsed.

Uranium prices are going up slowly, but they are still below the Australian floor price. Hence Saarberg's willingness to divest it-

Hence Saarberg's willingness to divest it-self of at least part of its equity.

Cogema, a multi-billion dollar company with interests in more than 40 per cent of the 406 nuclear reactors opar reactors op 406 nuclear reactors operated by 26 countries around the globe, has obviously looked at the future and has decided the extra price is worth it as long as it can assure supplies in the years to come.

The important issue here, however, is not the sale of equity in Australian uranium from one European company to another.

The issue is whether ERA has a new con-

ERA has a new con-tract or not.

The clear answer is that it has not. What will happen is that 240 000 lbs of uranium that Saarberg had trouble selling, will now be bought by Cogema. So much for triumphal statements.