

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 23 October 1980

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

### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The President laid on the table the following reports by the Public Works Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Bridgewater Primary School Redevelopment,  
Hahndorf Primary School Redevelopment.

### QUESTIONS

#### MEAT HYGIENE

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, regarding meat hygiene.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** Members of the Council are well aware that earlier this year legislation was passed to control meat hygiene in this State. The period that this legislation took to pass through Parliament was considerable. There were long delays owing to a number of factors, such as the election last year and the holding of a Joint Select Committee of inquiry. I think that most people had hoped that the legislation would be in force to give protection to people, particularly those in the outer metropolitan area of Adelaide, in this coming summer.

The outer metropolitan area is currently not protected at all and unhygienic and uninspected meat can enter the area quite freely. Obviously, people living in the area are at considerable risk. It has been reported to me that the new Meat Hygiene Authority will not be coming into full operation, with regulations, until January next year. I find this quite extraordinary, because the Joint Select Committee that looked at the legislation did forward a set of regulations that it thought were very suitable for the authority to operate under, and it seems extraordinary that this period should be taken to alter those regulations and bring regulations into force.

I ask the Minister whether it is true that the Meat Hygiene Authority will not be operating, as far as slaughterhouses and meat coming into the outer metropolitan area are concerned, until January next year and, if that is the case, whether the Minister can try to speed up the process and provide protection in this regard for people living in the outer metropolitan area of Adelaide.

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

#### PETROL

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about petrol prices.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** A report in today's *Advertiser* indicates that a Mr. Radbone, a service station proprietor, can, by hiring a tanker, obtain petrol at a cheaper price direct from another ESSO service station than a price at which ESSO is itself supplying him. The question of the

problems that petrol retailers have been having in the community has been the subject of some controversy for some time and the subject of questions in this Council. In June, I asked the Minister of Consumer Affairs whether he would support the Fife package and, if the Federal Government was not prepared to act on it, whether the State Government would be prepared to act. Subsequently, the New South Wales Government cut the wholesale price of petrol to try to overcome, to some extent, the price discrimination. I also asked whether the Minister had any intention of doing the same in South Australia, and I understand that at the time he said he did not have any intention of doing so.

The Fife package was not implemented by the Federal Government, although some aspects of it were implemented in legislation that was rushed through Parliament before it was prorogued for the Federal election. That legislation dealt with the number of sites directly operated by oil companies in Australia and also with leasing arrangements between oil companies and their lessees. It also purported to prohibit a company from discriminating between its dealers on the price of petrol and supplies. However, that package does not seem to have resolved the problems. On 17 October a report in the *Advertiser* stated that the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce was making a submission to the Minister to ask the South Australian Government to set the wholesale price of petrol, presumably along the lines of the New South Wales experience. In July last year, the present Minister of Industrial Affairs (then the shadow Minister) stated:

Small independent outlets must be protected from restrictive supply practices by certain oil companies both now and in the future.

The present State Government does not seem to have been prepared to act on any of the submissions put to us to try to correct the problem in the industry. I appreciate that the Fife package partial legislation has not yet been proclaimed and is not yet in effect, but nevertheless the industry and the retailers obviously believe that there is a continuing problem, because of the recent submissions that they have made to the Minister. It is obvious that the problem still exists, because of the situation in which Mr. Radbone found himself yesterday.

In view of the promise that Mr. Brown made last year that small independent outlets must be protected from restrictive supply practices by certain oil companies both now and in the future, will the Minister say what action the Government intends to take to deal with the continuing price discrimination and other problems in the petrol reselling industry? In particular, does the Government agree with the submission that it has received from the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce relating to the fixing of wholesale petrol prices?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I have not received a submission from the Automobile Chamber of Commerce for fixing the wholesale price. Some time ago, I received a submission asking me to reduce the maximum wholesale price by 2c.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** That's in New South Wales.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I have received a submission asking me simply to reduce the maximum wholesale price by 2c, and that is not the same position as obtains in New South Wales, where both the maximum and retail prices were reduced. What the Automobile Chamber of Commerce asked me to do was quite different. The Chamber did not ask me in its submission (and this was clear when its representatives spoke to me) to reduce the maximum retail price; it merely wanted me to reduce the maximum wholesale price by 2c.

I have recently decided to reject that proposal, but I do not know whether that information has reached the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. There have been suggestions in the press recently that the Chamber is going to make a submission to me to fix the wholesale price, retail price and the margin. That submission has not yet been made, but I will consider it when it is made.

Regarding the Fife package, I disagree with the Leader. The Garland package (if one likes to call it that) which has been passed is close indeed to the Fife package, and this is what the members of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce generally (that part of the industry) have been saying for some years is the answer. This Government has been saying since it was first approached on the matter late last year that it believes that this is the answer to many of the industry's problems.

As the Leader has said, that legislation has not yet been proclaimed, and we cannot say what its effect will be. Other than that, the problem of cut-throat selective discounting at petrol outlets has existed for some years. It is not peculiar to the period of office of the present Government. Indeed, it goes back long before that, and retailers were complaining previously.

The former Government took the same stand that the present Government has taken, namely, that we will allow the maximum wholesale price to be fixed by the Prices Justification Tribunal, on the same basis as obtained before the Prices Justification Tribunal entered this area in 1974, when the price was fixed by the South Australian Prices Commissioner.

The former Government had not departed from that principle, either. When the present Government made changes to the price control system earlier this year, we simply formalised in regard to petrol what the previous Government had done. We transferred it from formal control to justification. In fact, we simply rubber stamped the decisions in relation to maximum wholesale prices fixed by the Prices Justification Tribunal. That is what the previous Government had been doing. Therefore, our change in this area simply formalised what the former Government had been doing.

I am satisfied that the basis used by the Prices Justification Tribunal for fixing the maximum wholesale price is wrong. Any formula for price fixation can deteriorate over a period. The bases for fixing the price (matters taken into account and not taken into account) used by the Prices Justification Tribunal are the same as those that were used by the Prices Commissioner in South Australia before 1974.

The effectiveness of those criteria, to be efficient for the purpose, had deteriorated. I think that they were due, if not overdue, for change in 1974. Since then the Prices Justification Tribunal has operated, and South Australian Governments of either complexion have not interfered with the fixations made by the Prices Justification Tribunal.

I believe that the base is quite wrong. The P.J.T. commenced an inquiry on Monday of this week to examine the base for fixing the maximum wholesale price of petrol. The South Australian Government has made a submission which was presented on Monday to the tribunal, saying exactly what I have said, that the base is wrong, and setting out in detail why it is wrong. I know that resellers—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Have you a copy of that?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** First, I will finish with the question, but there is nothing secret about the submission, which was presented to the tribunal by an officer of my department last Monday. The submission sets out in detail why the present base of price fixing is wrong. I do

acknowledge the plight of resellers, particularly in a declining market for motor spirit (there is a declining market, and rightly so, because of the crisis in the availability of motor spirit that is approaching).

From the figures in the possession of my department, it appears that by the end of the year the decline in the sale of motor spirit in South Australia will be from 8 per cent to 10 per cent. There is a declining market, and the problems of resellers and the oil companies will be considerable, because they will be selling less motor spirit. Obviously, it takes fewer people to sell less motor spirit. I appreciate that it is in prices situations such as this that the price ought to be right, and the question of proper trade practices, and so on, should be carefully examined. I acknowledge that.

One thing that I am sorry about in regard to the inquiry is that the tribunal intends to report by the end of March. That may be too late—that is what I have been told—for some of the resellers. Also, the tribunal has changed its procedure for the first time because, in the past, any party that presented a submission was allowed to cross-examine the other parties who presented submissions, but that practice has now been stopped. It has been said that the tribunal intends to follow the practice of the I.A.C., which does not allow cross-examination but which does call for the filing of a draft report that can be spoken to. The South Australian Government representative has asked for that procedure to be followed, and that may, I hope, hasten the outcome, but these are the steps that the South Australian Government has taken in what it acknowledges to be a difficult situation.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I desire to ask a supplementary question. What immediate steps are being taken to relieve the situation of Mr. Radbone, who paid 29.9 cents a litre, which is cheaper than one can buy motor spirit wholesale from ESSO? What immediate steps are being taken to alleviate the position of these resellers?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Pending the investigation of the tribunal, it seems quite inappropriate to take action on a State-by-State basis.

#### BALCANOONA STATION

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment, a question about fluorite mining at Balcanoona.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** It seems that October 1980 should be named National Parks Disaster Month. Yesterday I was attempting to dissuade the Government from putting the bulldozers through the native habitat on Kangaroo Island. It has now been brought to my attention that a major row is looming between South Australian conservationists and the "Big Australian"—B.H.P.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** The "Dirty Big Australian".

**The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL:** The "Dirty Big Australian". B.H.P. holds a mining lease on Balcanoona from the days when it was run as a pastoral property by the McLachlans. The company has mined and stockpiled several thousand tonnes of fluorite. Fluorite is used as a flux in steel-making and is also an important component in aluminium smelting.

The technical information officer at the Mines and Engery Department this morning told me that it is a fairly plentiful substance. Its price varies between \$100 and \$200 a tonne, depending on grade. Apparently, at that sort of value, it is only a proposition if it can be carted out in

trucks. B.H.P. has always intended to do this. It was only when the McLachlans did the dirty on them by selling Balcanoona to the General Reserves Trust that the problem arose. Apparently B.H.P. is still determined to get the fluorite out in the most economical way possible.

At present, the area is only accessible to four-wheel drive vehicles of the Land Cruiser and Land Rover type. What B.H.P. proposes to do is bring in a couple of D9 bulldozers and bulldoze a road to the stockpile of fluorite to carry heavy trucks through the most outstanding wilderness area in this State. Conservation bodies are rightly alarmed and upset at this proposal. It seems that, in order to ensure that the road is built, B.H.P., with a good deal of help and co-operation from the Minister of Mines and Energy, is attempting to have the fluorite classified as being of strategic importance.

Once again, the beleaguered Minister of Environment looks like losing another battle. If strong action is not taken rapidly, another outstanding wilderness area will be desecrated. Will the Minister say whether the fluorite has been declared a strategic material, what plans have been made for constructing a road to the fluorite stockpile and how far those plans are advanced? Also, will the Minister assure the Parliament and the people of South Australia that he will completely resist any proposal to desecrate the wilderness area of Balcanoona by road building?

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

#### DRY LAND FARMING CONGRESS

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of 26 August on the Dry Land Farming Congress?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** The matters raised by the honourable member were referred to the Organising Committee to note. The following points are made in response. The Congress Director, apart from requesting the band to play *Advance Australia Fair* and *Waltzing Matilda*, left the selection of tunes entirely to the band leader. In turn, he announced that the band would play a selection of tunes to represent various countries with delegates in attendance. There was no commitment to cover all 40 or so countries.

The honourable member is quite inaccurate in stating that a Jewish tune was played "to begin with", and that the band "then launched into the Israeli National Song". An Israeli tune was played approximately two-thirds of the way through the selection. He is also incorrect in stating that "there were no Arab tunes, and there were no Chinese tunes".

None of the delegates has expressed any signs of concern regarding the opening ceremony, as alleged by the honourable member, nor is there any evidence to indicate concern resulting from any other element of the Congress. Because there were many nationalities represented at the Congress, a wide selection of meats was presented as a smorgasbord.

Inquiries lodged with the official caterers confirm that there was no pork on the menu, and that therefore the allegation by the honourable member in this regard has also been found to be quite untrue. The totally unsubstantiated inaccurate allegations made by the honourable member have been the only source of embarrassment reported to the Government.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I wish to ask a supplementary question. I do not think it is in order for me to table a document. I think only Ministers can do that.

**The PRESIDENT:** With the leave of the Council, you can.

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** I have a list of the songs played at the Dry Land Farming Congress. I think it would be more appropriate to have the list inserted in *Hansard*, because it proves conclusively that the answer given to me is quite incorrect, as no Arab or Chinese songs are shown on it.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Where did you get that?

**The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON:** It was given to me by the organisers. I seek leave to have the list inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### SONGS PLAYED AT DRY LAND FARMING CONGRESS DINNER ON MONDAY 25 AUGUST 1980

*Advance Australia Fair*

*Around the World* for everyone

*Midnight in Moscow* Russia

*La Vie en Rose* France

*Yanky Doodle Dandy* America

*Brazil* Brazil

*Mexican Hat Dance* Mexico

*Sukiaki* Japan

*La Cumparsita* Spain and South America

*Irish Eyes are Smiling* Ireland

*Bali Hai* South Pacific

*Caravan* Arabia—written by Duke Ellington

*Never on Sunday* Greece

*Hava Nagila* Israel

*Non Domenticar* Italian

*Hawaii War Chant* South Pacific

*Now is the Hour* New Zealand—international

*United We Stand* for everyone

*Waltzing Matilda*

#### NURSERIES

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked about nurseries?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I have a reply to the question asked by the honourable member on 23 October. The Woods and Forests Department has native plant retail outlets in four locations, namely, Murray Bridge, Berri, National Park and Cavan. In regard to privately-owned nurseries, there are currently 82 nurserymen and 21 associate nurserymen registered with the South Australian Association of Nurserymen.

#### ROCK PRICES

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about crushed rock prices.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** On 10 January 1980 significant changes were made to the price control system in South Australia. Many products were removed from formal control to a system of justification, whereby prices can be increased without reference to the Prices Commissioner, but details of the reasons for the increase are to be supplied to the Commissioner after the increase. Effective price control was thus removed from many items. One such item was crushed rock. On 23 September 1980 I obtained an answer from the Hon. Mr. Burdett showing the increases in price from June 1978 until the latest increase, on 23 July 1980.

This indicates that in the six months since 10 January 1980 crushed rock prices have increased by 41.7 per cent whereas in more than 14 months to August 1979 prices increased a total of only 26.8 per cent. In that period the increases were variously 1.5 per cent, 12.4 per cent, 2.2 per cent, 1.3 per cent and 7.2 per cent, whereas in the six months to 23 July 1980 there were increases of 16.9 per cent and 21.2 per cent.

Certain complaints have been received about this, and the Mayor of Burnside, Mrs. Soward, was reported in the Burnside and Norwood *News Review* as having complained that "South Australia's inflation rate is not the same as the inflation in councils' costs", and referred to a 25 per cent increase in crushed rock prices in the last year. It is interesting to note that Mr. D. Laidlaw, a Liberal member of the Legislative Council, and Mr. Leverington, former Treasurer of the Liberal Party and aspirant for preselection, are directors of Quarry Industries. When weakening the price control system, the Hon. Mr. Burdett said:

We believe consumers will benefit by prices more adequately reflecting supply and demand in the market place.

He said that, yet had presided over a 41.7 per cent increase in the period of six months after those changes were brought in. My questions are as follows:

1. Why has there been a 41.7 per cent increase in crushed rock prices since January 1980?
2. How can that be of benefit to consumers?
3. What role did Mr. Laidlaw and Mr. Leverington play in decisions to change the price control system in January 1980?
4. Will the Minister consider returning the item to formal control? If not, why not?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** To answer the third question first, the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw and Mr. Leverington had no part in this at all. Neither has contacted me or my department directly or indirectly or had any kind of influence on what has happened.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** Or discussion?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Or discussion.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** You don't speak to Don Laidlaw?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Yes, but not on this matter. Certainly, I resent any kind of suggestion that there has been any influence from that quarter at all, and I reject that out of hand. The Leader has suggested that there was a weakening of price control, which I deny. The move from formal price control to justification simply saves time. Justification is still required and the price control is effective.

It ought to be made quite clear that the difference between formal price control, which has been retained for only a few items, and justification is simply this. Previously, the application was made and certain factors had to be stated in the application. The price could not be increased until the application had been granted. That usually took four to six weeks and sometimes eight weeks or longer, particularly if the application was made just before Christmas. The position with justification is that the supplier increases the price, not the department, and he is required within five business days to give to the Prices Commissioner exactly the same details as he had to give previously. There has been no change there at all, and the sanction is that, if prices are not justified, if the justification is not as adequate as it would have been previously, the particular business will be back under formal price control.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** It doesn't seem to have been too effective.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** I do not know about that; just listen to what I am saying. Regarding crushed rock prices, we are still substantially below interstate prices. The prices have been justified to the satisfaction of the Prices Commission exactly as they were previously. Apparent increases in prices over a period of, say, six months can be distorted by all sorts of factors.

**The Hon. J. R. Cornwall:** They're not apparent, they're real.

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** They are not. As I said when I replied to the question that the Leader asked me earlier, we are concerned about the increased price of quarry products and crushed rock, and we have issued a direction that, with future increases where it is sought to justify such increases, we will not accept any increased profit margin. We will expect the increases to reflect only increases in costs.

Certainly, we are looking closely at that area, because we realise its importance to the rest of industry in South Australia, and we will not hesitate, if we are not satisfied that justification has been established, to put those matters back under formal price control. I hasten to add that the increase referred to was justified and was considered by the Prices Commissioner to be justified on exactly the same basis as had been in operation previously.

#### TIME BOOKS

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, on the subject of routine checking of time books.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G. L. BRUCE:** On 28 August, in reply to a question I had asked on the amount of arrears of wages collected from the routine checking of time books and on the amount collected from specific complaints, I was told that in 1978 an amount of \$234 055 was collected for complaints and \$84 621 was collected for routine checking. For 1979 the amount was \$263 290 for complaints and \$84 544 for routine checking. In reply to a question asked on 11 June I was advised that the Department of Labour and Industry had 21 field officers (19 investigation officers and two assistant investigation officers) and that this staff had remained constant over the past three years. I refer to a statement in yesterday's *Australian* which said that Mr. Fraser is going to cut down the ever growing ranks of Federal public servants. The article states:

The Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr. Street, has already forecast that the Industrial Relations Bureau will be subject to review. While the bureau has a staff of more than 200 (nearly half of that of the Industrial Relations Department), its award inspections were 5 000 less than in the previous year.

In the light of that statement and in the light of the information I received in answer to my question, I ask whether the Minister would agree that the \$84 000 collected in 1978 and 1979 from routine checking is out of all proportion to the amount of \$263 290 collected from complaints. The need could exist for more routine checking to take place to correct this imbalance. Could the Minister advise whether the manpower requirements of the department are such that this could occur? Would he be prepared to seek the advice of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment as to its views and attitudes to the request?

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

### UPPER SPENCER GULF

**The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS:** Has the Attorney-General an answer to my question of 16 September on the Upper Spencer Gulf area?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I have been advised that, with the Premier's recent announcement on the Redcliff project, there is no need to pursue the proposal further at this time.

### PRICES JUSTIFICATION TRIBUNAL

**The Hon. C. J. SUMNER:** Is the Minister of Consumer Affairs prepared to table the report prepared by the South Australian Government to the Prices Justification Tribunal on the petrol reselling industry?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Yes, I will table the submission made to the Prices Justification Tribunal—Matters Nos. S16/80/1 and S16/80/10—Submission from the Government of South Australia.

### O'BAHN

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question on the O'Bahn system.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Yesterday I noticed that in the House of Assembly a question was asked by a young fellow with not a great deal of experience, knowledge or understanding of the resources of this State. It was obviously a Dorothy Dixier to permit the Government to laud before all what the O'Bahn system is going to represent. There has been some controversy in respect of what type of transport system will be used between the north-eastern suburbs and the city.

If there is one source of energy that this State will see no shortage of in the foreseeable future, it is the extremely vast and known deposit of coal which can be used to generate the electric power. It is within close proximity of the city and in the remote areas; it is in the South-East, Central Far West, and North-West. Yesterday, in reply to a question asked some weeks ago, I was dismayed to learn that most of the deposits and exploration rights, with the exception of some minor fields—and with that goes a certain amount of ownership—are associated with multinational companies, with only small percentages in the hands of the State through ETSA. Therefore, it is not only surprising but also stupid that an announcement is to be made; the Government is politically locked into the O'Bahn system.

What is the service life of the proposed O'Bahn transport system? Is diesel fuel proposed to be used during the period referred to in the foregoing question? Is that fuel available from South Australian sources, and what is the projected availability, in respect of time, of that fuel? Is the Government aware of the existence of some of the largest power generating coal supplies in the world within South Australian borders? Has not the Government recognised that ETSA has the capability of providing huge amounts of electricity from the known deposits in South Australia? Is the Government aware that in a recent report of ETSA some of the deposits were stated as being within 60 miles of the city? Will the Government, on behalf of the transport needs of the urban developed areas

of this State, undertake a study between the Government and ETSA to ascertain whether or not ETSA has the capability to produce electrification power necessary to replace what is obviously a source of fuel in the form of the present O'Bahn system coming from overseas and requiring large amounts of foreign exchange?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

### COAL FIELD

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question regarding a coal field.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** Honourable members will probably have received an invitation from the General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia to visit Bowmans next Thursday to witness the opening of the field, as it were, by the Premier, in order that a quantity of low-grade coal can be sent away for testing. Honourable members will be well aware of the huge open-cut mining hole that has been created in that area and also of the overburden taken out of the area, which is now known as "Mount Bowmans". Some members may have had the privilege of seeing what is happening there.

I understand that the Premier is to commence the field next Thursday and that the coal will be sent away for testing. I presume that is what the Hon. Mr. Foster was talking about when he spoke of coal being within 60 miles of Adelaide, although he may have been talking about Moorlands as well. Will the Minister seek from his colleague information regarding the extent of these deposits, which I believe are quite large?

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I've got it here if you want it.

**The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS:** I am not asking the Hon. Mr. Foster. I am asking the Minister, from whom I will get accurate information. Does the Electricity Trust of South Australia expect that the coal will be suitable for use, even though it is low grade, if not immediately, fairly soon in the future?

**The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN:** I will obtain answers to those questions and bring them back for the honourable member.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I seek leave to ask a supplementary question. The information requested by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins was supplied to me last Tuesday.

**The Hon. K. T. Griffin:** It was not in the detail requested by the Hon. Mr. Dawkins.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** Reference has been made to coal deposits at Port Wakefield and Lock. The Liberals are hopeless, Mr. President; they do not know what they are talking about.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable member has asked for leave to ask a supplementary question.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I refrain from asking the question, as the Attorney-General interjected. He does not know what he is talking about.

### PINBALL MACHINES

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question regarding pinball machines.

Leave granted.

*The Hon. N. K. Foster interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I ask the Hon. Mr. Foster to quieten down so that the Council can hear the Hon. Mr. Creedon.

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON:** The Minister may have to direct this question to the Minister of Recreation and Sport. Pinball machines have been very forcefully brought to the notice of the South Australian public. We recently had a segment on the Willesee programme, in which it was pointed out how schoolchildren can become addicted to these machines. I have walked past one of these parlours in Hindley Street at 9 a.m., and have noted young people in school uniforms and with schoolbags beside these machines, intently playing them.

When I asked a question about pinball machines some months ago, I specifically made a point of the use of these places by schoolchildren. In reply, the Minister told the Council that no formal inquiry had been made into the matters that I had raised but that the Government was concerned. We now have evidence that at least one 13-year-old child is addicted, and no doubt there are within the community more young people about whose addiction we are unaware. What action can the Minister take to protect the youth of the community from the predators who operate these pinball machine parlours?

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** Pinball parlours are licensed under the Places of Public Entertainment Act, which comes within my jurisdiction as Minister of Consumer Affairs. However, this a very broad Act, which covers motor racing grounds, football fields, and all sorts of things. It is designed merely to ensure that the areas are safe and free from something in the nature of a public nuisance. That is all that that Act is designed for. It is very difficult to try to protect people from this kind of addiction. One might have an addiction for sweets, lollies, or anything else, and it is hard to legislate for that.

The Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and the Department of Community Welfare are both very concerned about these parlours and are looking at them in order to do something under the existing legislation to try to protect young people in this way. However, this is very difficult indeed. The Licensing Section of the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has looked carefully at some of the pinball parlours in the city and has made investigations in relation to certain parlours. The department has been concerned about complaints that have been made. In one case, consideration was given to the revocation of a licence. However, it was decided that the evidence did not justify that course of action.

Regarding the Department of Community Welfare, as I said before (not in this Council but before the Estimates Committee, to which this Council was not privy), we have a neighbourhood youth worker in Hindley Street who is working in this area. Indeed, he has been there for about three months now, working with young people who go to the pinball parlours, and the youth worker has tried to suggest to these young people that they might have something else to do.

We are very fortunate that we have a service club that is prepared to put up quite an amount of funds, as well as a businessman who is prepared to lend us an office. So, we have a youth worker and a voluntary organisation which has some expertise in this field that are prepared to work in this area. Also, the Adelaide City Council has given us great support indeed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J. C. BURDETT:** We like all people, both professional and otherwise. The Government has taken action that the former Government did not take to put a paid professional youth worker in Hindley Street so that he can look at these people who are being addicted to

pinball machines. We are looking at programmes, through the means to which I have referred, to try to arrange trips to the country for unemployed youths, and also to involve them in craft operations such as, for example, making bicycles, and that sort of thing. In a short time, we seem to have gone a long way. We are keeping the area of licensing under close scrutiny, and are trying to do something positive to help young people. We are paying close attention indeed to the matters raised by the honourable member.

#### CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about corporal punishment.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** In February this year I asked a question of the Minister relating to the legal standing of any request made by parents to schools that they did not wish corporal punishment to be administered to their children. I received a reply in August this year (although that reply was not published in *Hansard* until later) which quotes regulation 123 (3) of the Education Regulations. Regulation 123 (3) provides:

... the principal or head teacher or any teacher to whom either may delegate such authority may impose corporal punishment. The said detention and the imposition of corporal punishment shall be governed by such conditions as the Minister may determine.

Under this regulation the *Education Gazette* of 3 October contains conditions under which corporal punishment is to be administered in schools, and the sixth condition provides:

If a parent or guardian makes a request in writing that his/her child is not to be caned, the principal, head teacher or delegated teacher as the case may be, must be given to understand that the child is not thereby exempt from the discipline of the school, but is subject to appropriate action, other than corporal punishment, in the event of a serious misdemeanor.

These conditions in the *Education Gazette* unfortunately were withdrawn a few days later by the Minister of Education, and as yet we have had no indication about when new conditions will be brought in again. I thought the conditions were fairly satisfactory as a first step towards the desirable abolition of corporal punishment in schools. They certainly did not go as far as I would like to see but, on the particular issue of parents indicating that they do not want corporal punishment to be imposed on their children, I understand that there is in regulation 123 (3) clause 6 the following provision:

If a parent or guardian makes a request in writing that his/her child is not to be caned, the principal, head teacher or delegated teacher as the case may be, must be given to understand that the child is not thereby exempt from the discipline of the school, but is subject to appropriate action, other than corporal punishment, in the event of a serious misdemeanor.

In other words, regulation 123 (3) clause 6 states what was written into the sixth condition published in the *Education Gazette*. When these conditions were withdrawn a few days after they were issued, was the regulation also withdrawn along with all the other conditions in the *Gazette*, or is regulation 123 (3) clause 6 still in force? Just what is the position at present with regard to any parents indicating that they do not want corporal punishment administered to their children in Government schools? If

regulation 123 (3) clause 6 is not in force, will the Government introduce this regulation as a matter of urgency? Parents who feel this way can then be sure that the school is acting *in loco parentis* as the parents wish. If this regulation is in force, can the Minister inform principals, teachers and parents that it is still in force, thus removing anxiety amongst those who strongly object to corporal punishment being imposed on their children? What is the status of requests from parents to the principal in this matter at present?

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I will refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a reply.

### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government)** obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1980. Read a first time.

**The Hon. C. M. HILL:** I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It proposes amendments to the Local Government Act that fall generally into three categories. First, there is a small number of amendments of a minor administrative nature. For example, amendments are proposed updating the penalty for fishing in the Torrens River, simplifying administrative arrangements concerning the granting or transfer of leases of Crown land, and delegating to authorised officers of a council the power to sign certificates setting details of rates and other charges outstanding on a property.

Secondly, there are amendments designed to correct some minor errors in the Act. For example, amendments are proposed changing existing references from ratepayers to electors, providing that a memorial addressed to a council requesting particular works must be signed by a majority of the electors affected, and empowering councils to subscribe to life-saving clubs within their area.

Thirdly, there are amendments upgrading the provisions of the Act to meet present day requirements. In this category are some amendments which give effect to the local government policies of this Government as enumerated in the August 1979 statement of Liberal Party local government policy. The general upgrading proposals include—

- (a) amendments relating to postal voting procedures and the appointment of returning officers, deputy returning officers and presiding officers, designed to bring the Act into line with the provisions of the Electoral Act, including an amendment to make it quite clear that a candidate for a local government election may appoint a number of scrutineers to act on his or her behalf, but that only one may be present in a polling booth at any one time;
- (b) an amendment empowering councils to operate community bus services;
- (c) an amendment enabling councils entering into schemes for the establishment of aged cottage homes to have some flexibility in the use of reserve funds to cover any future needs;
- (d) an amendment making it quite clear that a council may expend its revenue on provision of a community bus service;
- (e) an amendment empowering a council to contribute from its revenue to the operation of a community school library;

- (f) an amendment permitting a council which supplies electricity to charge a security deposit in the same way as the Electricity Trust of South Australia;
- (g) an amendment removing the obligation for a council to collect all types of refuse from within its municipality, when, according to the nature of the refuse, specialist firms may be better suited for the purpose;
- (h) an amendment enabling councils to control the drainage of water from land on which any works have been carried out;
- (i) an amendment which, subject to the council complying with other existing provisions of the Act, would enable the Adelaide City Council to enter into a lease with the South Australian Jockey Club specifying an area to which admission can be charged and from which any person can be ejected. The Act presently limits the council to specifying an area of not more than five acres, whereas the present position is that 6.78 acres is devoted to entry by admission and from which any person can be ejected, excluding the grandstand and other buildings. Taken together some 9.88 acres or four hectares is presently under restricted access and this amendment formalises the long standing position. It should be said that this proposal does not mean the question of a lease has been settled. It merely means that the articles of any future lease can reflect existing usage and practice.

The Bill proposes amendments designed to clearly provide for portability of sick leave entitlements for council employees in the same way as applies in the case of long service leave entitlements, thereby further enhancing the mobility of employees between councils.

Finally, and most significantly, the Bill proposes amendments to change the time for council elections to October in each year. In its policy statement of August 1979, the Government undertook to investigate the practicability of conducting annual local government elections at a time which is more convenient for the voters and elected representatives. For several years there has been general dissatisfaction where new councillors elected to office in July who have had no previous exposure to the workings of a council find amongst their first duties the determination of a budget and the declaration of rates. The Government proposes in this Bill that the day of nomination be changed to the first Friday in September with elections to be held on the first Saturday in October each year. The Bill proposes several other significant amendments consequential to this change. The Local Government Association has been consulted on the general provisions of the Bill and has raised no objection to the proposals. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

### Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Subclause (2) provides that the operation of any specified provision may be suspended. Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act, section 5. The clause inserts new definitions of the terms



“returning officer”, “deputy returning officer” and “presiding officer”. These new definitions reflect a rearrangement of the titles and functions of local government electoral officers proposed by subsequent clauses of the Bill. Essentially, the returning officer of a council is to continue to have the same powers and functions with respect to elections, but these powers and functions are also to be exercisable by one or more standing deputy returning officers.

At present, the position of deputy returning officer under the Local Government Act corresponds to the position of presiding officer under the Electoral Act. This has caused some confusion and so it is proposed that local government deputy returning officers are to have the wider powers referred to, while the more limited function of superintending polling places is to be exercisable by presiding officers. The clause also inserts a transitional provision designed to make it clear that any member of a council in office at the commencement of this measure who would have been required to retire on the first Saturday in July may continue in office until the first Saturday in October. This provision is consequential on the amendments proposed by clause 16 under which annual elections are to be held on the first Saturday in October instead of the first Saturday in July.

Clause 4 amends section 8 of the principal Act which makes provision for borrowing by a council in order to satisfy a liability arising from any alteration of council areas whether or not the consent of the ratepayers is obtained. This reference to the consent of ratepayers was overlooked when the local government franchise was extended in 1976 to electors and, accordingly, the clause amends the section by removing the term “ratepayers” and substituting the term “electors”. Clause 5 amends section 57 of the principal Act which provides that a supplementary election is not necessary to fill a vacancy in the office of a member of a council where the vacancy occurs within three months before the first Saturday in July in the year in which his term of office would expire by effluxion of time. The clause amends this section by removing the reference to the first Saturday in July. The amendment is consequential on the amendments proposed by clause 16 under which annual elections are to be held on the first Saturday in October.

Clause 6 makes an amendment to section 65 of the principal Act which is also consequential on the proposed change in the time for the holding of annual elections. Clause 7 amends section 77 of the principal Act which relates to the election of aldermen. This amendment is consequential on the proposed change in the time for the holding of annual elections. Clause 8 amends section 79 of the principal Act which relates to the mode of retirement of aldermen. This amendment is also consequential on the proposed change in the time for the holding of annual elections. Clause 9 amends section 84 of the principal Act which relates to the appointments of auditors. The clause amends this section so that each council is required to appoint an auditor at the first meeting of the council after each annual election rather than in August in each alternate year. This amendment is also consequential on the proposed change in time for the holding of annual elections.

Clause 10 is consequential on the amendments proposed by clause 9. Clause 11 inserts a new section 87 designed to ensure that an auditor may complete an annual audit although he has failed to complete it before the expiration of his term of office. Clause 12 amends section 102 of the principal Act which relates to the appointment of returning officers. The clause amends this section so that each council is required to appoint a returning officer at

the first meeting of the council after each annual election. The council is also, under this clause, required to appoint one or more deputy returning officers at the same time. Clause 13 substitutes a new section 103 providing that a deputy returning officer may exercise any of the powers or functions of the returning officer, but that in doing so he is to be subject to the general direction of the returning officer.

Clause 14 amends section 104 of the principal Act which fixes the second Friday in May as the nomination day for annual elections. Under the clause the first Friday in September is to be the new nomination day for the proposed October annual elections. Clause 15 proposes an amendment to section 105 that is consequential on the expanded powers of deputy returning officers proposed by clause 13. Clause 16 amends section 106 which provides that annual elections are held on the first Saturday in July. The clause amends this section so that it provides that annual elections are to be held on the first Saturday in October. Clauses 17 and 18 are consequential on clause 13.

Clause 19 amends section 111 of the principal Act which presently provides that the returning officer for a council may appoint a deputy returning officer to preside at a polling place. The clause amends this section so that this function is to be performed by presiding officers, as is the case in relation to State elections under the provisions of the Electoral Act. Returning officers and deputy returning officers may by virtue of the proposed definition of “presiding officer” also act as presiding officers. Clause 20 is consequential on the proposed allocation of powers and functions between returning officers, deputy returning officers and presiding officers. Clause 21 substitutes a new section 113 providing that candidates at local government elections may appoint more than one scrutineer for each polling place but that not more than one of the scrutineers may be present in the polling-booth at any one time.

Clause 22 to 30 (inclusive) are all consequential on the proposed allocation of powers and functions between returning officers, deputy returning officers and presiding officers. Clause 31 is consequential on the proposed change in the time for the holding of annual elections. Clause 32 corrects a cross-reference in section 156. Clause 33 amends section 157 of the principal Act in relation to the qualifications and leave entitlements of the council officers. The clause inserts a new subsection empowering the Minister, at his discretion, to waive the requirements as to educational and professional qualification for appointment to any council office. The clause amends subsection (9) to make it clear that sick leave entitlements are portable under the section in the same way as long service leave entitlements. The clause amends subsection (9b) so that employment will not be continuous for the purposes of the section if non-council employment is entered into between the respective periods of council employment. The clause also amends subsection (10) so that the amount of the contribution in respect of transferred leave entitlements which a previous employing council is liable to make is determined in accordance with a formula to be prescribed by regulation.

Clause 34 amends section 167 of the principal Act so that variable fees prescribed by regulation may be charged for extracts from the assessment book of a council instead of the present fixed fee of 10c for each extract. Clause 35 proposes an amendment to section 173 that is consequential on the proposed change in the time for the holding of annual elections. Clause 36 proposes an amendment to section 214 that is of a drafting nature only. Clauses 37 and 38 amend sections 218 and 220, respectively, so that a memorial addressed to a council requesting that specific



works be carried out for the benefit of a specified portion of the council area must be signed by a majority of the electors for that portion. At present a memorial of this kind need only be signed by one or more electors for the portion. Clause 39 proposes various amendments to section 287 which lists the matters with respect to which council revenue may be expended. The clause amends the section to authorise financial assistance to life-saving clubs and libraries situated within the council area or outside the council area if the services of such bodies directly or indirectly provide for the needs of the inhabitants of the area. The clause also authorises contribution towards the provision of bus passenger transport services.

Clause 40 inserts a new section 344b designed to enable councils to bear part of the cost of constructing or repairing private streets or roads. Clause 41 amends section 383 which lists various activities which councils may undertake as permanent works and undertakings. The clause includes in this list the provision of bus passenger transport services. Clause 42 amends section 435 of the principal Act which empowers the Minister to approve special schemes for the performance of specified works or undertakings by councils and provides councils with special borrowing powers to carry out such schemes. The clause amends this section so that it is clear that services or facilities already being provided by a council under any other provision of the principal Act may be continued and maintained under such a scheme. This amendment will enable the provision of services and facilities for the aged, handicapped or infirm already being provided under section 287b of the principal Act to become the subject of such a scheme thereby providing greater financial flexibility. With this particular application in mind, the clause also amends the section so that a scheme may authorise the council to impose charges or receive donations in respect of services or facilities provided under the scheme and regulate the manner in which the council deals with such moneys and to make it clear that, where such a scheme is in force, the provisions of section 287b shall not apply or shall cease to apply in relation to the services or facilities provided under the scheme.

Clause 43 amends section 468 of the principal Act so that the Minister of Lands and not the Governor is responsible for confirming Orders for Exchange of council land. Clause 44 is consequential on clause 43. Clause 45 amends section 500 of the principal Act which relates to the recovery of charges for gas or electricity supplied by a council. The clause inserts a new subsection authorising a council to require a person to whom it is supplying or about to supply gas or electricity to pay an amount not exceeding an amount fixed by regulation as security for payment of the charges for supplying the gas or electricity. Clause 46 inserts a new section 536b requiring the occupier, or, if unoccupied, the owner of any private street, road, square, lane, footway, court, alley or thoroughfare that the public are allowed to use and that is situated in any municipality or township to keep the area clean.

Clause 47 proposes the repeal of sections 542 and 543 of the principal Act. Section 542 imposes on a municipal council a duty to keep public places in the municipality clean and to carry away at convenient times the ashes, filth and rubbish from dwelling-houses and other buildings in the municipality. The clause proposes the repeal of this section for the reason that the duty to carry away household rubbish, if construed literally, would be quite onerous on councils. Instead, the removal of such rubbish will be authorised by sections 533 and 534 of the principal Act, while the clause substitutes a new section 542

retaining the duty to keep public places in municipalities clean. Section 543 provides that only council employees or persons contracting with a council shall remove rubbish from dwelling-houses and other buildings in the municipality. This section is not enforced and its repeal will remove the threat of prosecution for the private contractors currently providing a service of this kind.

Clause 48 amends section 665 of the principal Act which empowers a council to require the owner of a building to construct a drain to conduct into the street drainage system any water that would otherwise drain from the roof of the building across any public footway. The clause amends this section so that it applies not only to water draining across a footway as a result of the construction of a building but also to water draining across a footway as a result of any other works carried out on land, such as the paving of land for use as a parking area. Clause 49 amends section 721 of the principal Act which establishes a procedure under which the Minister may settle disputes between councils. The clause amends this section so that the Minister may delegate the exercise of this power. Clause 50 amends section 778a of the principal Act which prohibits improper interference with council property. The clause increases the maximum penalty for this offence from \$10 to \$200.

Clauses 51 to 62 (inclusive) make amendments to the provisions of Part XLIII relating to the conduct of polls of electors that are consequential on the proposed allocation of powers and functions between returning officers, deputy returning officers and presiding officers. Clause 63 amends section 835 of the principal Act which regulates the issue of postal voting papers. The clause amends this section so that a returning officer, upon receiving an application for a postal vote, is authorised to deliver the postal voting papers to the applicant. At present returning officers are required to post postal voting papers to the applicants in all cases.

Clause 64 amends section 841 of the principal Act which in its present form requires postal voters to post their voting papers to the returning officers in all cases. The clause amends this section so that an elector who will be absent on polling day may, having applied for a postal vote and received the postal voting papers over the counter, mark his vote on the paper and then deliver the papers back over the counter. Clause 65 is consequential on clause 64. Clause 66 amends section 854 of the principal Act which authorises the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to lease certain parklands for use as a racecourse. The clause amends the section by marginally increasing the areas that may under such lease be made subject to restricted access.

Clause 67 amends section 858 which relates to borrowing by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide. The clause amends this section to make it consistent with the corresponding provision in relation to other councils under which a demand for a poll on the question of borrowing must be signed by not less than 10 per centum of the electors for the area. Clause 68 amends section 866 which regulates fishing in the River Torrens by increasing the maximum penalty for an offence against the section from \$10 to \$200.

Clause 69 amends section 875 of the principal Act so that a certificate setting out details of rates and other charges outstanding on a property may be signed by any officer authorised by the council. At present the section provides that such certificates must be signed by the clerk of the council. Clause 70 amends section 881 of the principal Act to provide that, where a lease of any Crown lands is granted or transferred, the Registrar-General shall furnish the council for the area with particulars of the

lease. At present the Registrar-General is required by the section to provide unnecessary information relating to the terms of such leases.

Clauses 71 to 73 (inclusive) make amendments to the schedules to the principal Act that are of a consequential nature only.

**The Hon. C. W. CREEDON** secured the adjournment of the debate.

**The PRESIDENT:** Will those two honourable members standing and holding a discussion in the Chamber please take a seat by the person to whom they are speaking.

### BUDGET PAPERS

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. K. T. Griffin:

That the Council take note of the papers relating to the Estimates of Expenditure, 1980-81, and the Loan Estimates, 1980-81.

(Continued from 22 October. Page 1294.)

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** In speaking to this motion that the Budget Papers be noted, I must say that this State Government Budget is a terribly good and responsible one. I say that for several reasons. First, it is a balanced Budget and has avoided falling into the area of massive—

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Haven't there been balanced Budgets in the past 10 years?

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:**—deficit spending, which several Federal Labor Governments have indulged in.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What about the \$7 000 000 deficit that Fraser had in 1976?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Dr. Ritson has the floor.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** It is quite clear that, because I intend to talk about something that matters—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** What are you talking about?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will come to order. I have asked for order and intend that it be so.

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** May I say—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I have called for order. The Hon. Dr. Ritson.

**The Hon. R. J. RITSON:** Thank you, Mr. President, for enforcing my right to freedom of speech in this place. As I was saying, this Budget is a responsible one. I think it is responsible because it is balanced and because it does a lot to encourage investment. South Australia is in a rather unique position because we enjoy a standard of living and per capita income similar to those enjoyed by the Western industrialised nations, but we are not a Western industrialised nation. We do not have the volume of manufacturing industry, or the sophistication, which countries such as North America and Japan enjoy, yet we are a relatively wealthy country.

Our wealth is in the ground and it grows out of the ground. In speaking to these Budget papers, I will talk about resource development, industrial confidence, investment confidence, and business confidence as it relates to the manufacturing sector. I want to talk about the political and economic philosophy which motivates both State and Federal Liberal Budgets and compare that philosophy with the Labor Budgetary track record. I will conclude by referring to our moral obligation to other countries.

I will begin with the matter of business confidence and the whole question of the theory of a consumer led recovery and whether that is correct, or whether an investment led recovery is correct. I will have a look at factors affecting investment, because there are encourag-

ing signs since the State Liberal Government has come to power of increased investment activity. Investment and resource development is quite spectacular, as the Premier stated; there is a 1 600 per cent increase in committed investment capital. There are encouraging signs of increases in other areas, in non-residential building and construction industries. There is a projected real growth of 10 per cent in 1980-81.

The only responsible position for the Government to take is one of pursuing policies aimed at instilling confidence in our future economy. A solid investment base will provide sustained growth and employment opportunities. I thought that there would be an interjection at this point, because we have seen what happens when unemployment is attacked by using deficit spending and by undermining business confidence. Unfortunately, the A.L.P. still clings to the belief that unemployment can be solved by creating paper jobs through deficit spending. It was faith in that defunct economic theory that led to the crisis experienced by the Australian economy during the time of Federal Labor rule. The old idea that large deficits can somehow reduce unemployment led to the thinking that the economy could be pumped up higher and higher by bigger and bigger deficits.

What actually happened? The result of the A.L.P. acting on those beliefs in 1973-74 was not full employment: it was an unacceptable combination of soaring unemployment and high inflation. The A.L.P., as recently as a couple of weeks ago, obviously refused to acknowledge those bitter lessons, because Mr. Hayden was promising to spend more money on job creation schemes. Let us look at what happened last time a Labor Government tried to do that. In 1974 the Whitlam Government spent \$60 000 000 on job creation schemes, and unemployment rose from 78 827 to almost 250 000. The next year that Government tried again and spent \$123 000 000 on job creation. Unemployment rose by 20 000 that year.

One cause of this massive unemployment was the massive rate of wage increases. A number of young people and married women were enticed into the work force by these wage increases, but the apple turned to ashes, because the pressure of costs destroyed profitability and business confidence, and the jobs melted away. However, there are signs that in South Australia, since the Tonkin Government was elected here and the Fraser Government was elected nationally, there is a return of business confidence, and the tragic decline of business confidence that occurred in the Whitlam years is being arrested.

I will continue to look at the question of why the consumer-led recovery will not work and why pumping the community with artificial jobs will not work. Let us look at what happened to consumption when the Whitlam Government increased the deficit expenditure. Along with the increase in unemployment, consumption spending slowed. The growth rate in private consumption spending dropped from 5.4 per cent to 3.1 per cent and, in the following year, when the deficit was increased, it slowed to 2.9 per cent. Over those two years, the gross domestic product increased remarkably by 13.2 per cent, but private consumer spending increased by a paltry 2.3 per cent.

What was happening was that the people refused to spend their money in that climate of lack of business confidence. They put it in the bank for the rainy day that they could see the Labor Government creating for them. On the other hand, if we look to stimulation of business confidence and investment, we find the opposite effect. The recovery is coming now. For 1980-81, greater consumer confidence is projected, and the State Government is playing its part.

There are signs that the manufacturing export sector is becoming competitive at last on the world market as a result of the Government's policy of wage restraint, and the Government is providing a number of incentives for export industry. They include export bridging finance, the establishment payment scheme, the motor vehicles assistance scheme, and assistance in the Riverland. In all, a 19 per cent increase in incentive payments is proposed in this Budget. It seems to me that the Government is taking the right and sound approach in restoring the economy.

I refer back to the question of resource development, because, as I have said, our wealth is in the ground and it is in this area that our hope lies. The thing that we are going to need to develop our resources is foreign capital. We have been hearing so much criticism of those nasty multi-nationals that I wish to come to their aid. There are two different sorts of reason why people will go blindly against the multi-nationals, and I will come back to those. I have no objection to foreign capital, but I object to exploitative action by foreign capital. I believe that Governments can and ought to control foreign capital by seeing that that capital does not exploit minority groups, and that Governments control tax evasion and see to the protection of the environment.

I would not quibble at that, but there are two types of thought that motivate people who say that we must not have foreign capital at any price. The first is true Marxist socialism which, by definition, is totally dedicated to the destruction of the Western capitalist system. The other attitude that is commonly quite blindly and unthinkingly directed against the multi-nationals simply for the sake of being against them is the attitude that is motivated by a sort of false nationalistic pride, the sort of attitude that says we should buy back the farm. That is some sort of jingoistic phrase that was designed to touch the heart strings and make one salute the flag.

It was an attitude that the nation could and should develop its own resources as if it was an island standing alone. We are not island Australia; we are not fortress Australia. We do not have the capital and technology to develop our own national resources to the best degree possible. If we are going to argue absolutely against the multi-nationals, either because we are sworn to the destruction of the capitalist system or because we have a false pride founded on a sentimental basis, we must realise that, if we kick out the multi-nationals, we will have paid the price in lack of economic growth. Penalising multinational companies poses a very real risk of causing a capital strike, as happened during the Whitlam era, when people picked up their drilling rigs and took them to Alaska and the Middle East, and it took five years to get them back. I do not believe that most Australians are against economic growth. They are clamouring all the time for increased wages, less taxation, more sick leave—

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** What about the politicians?

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** I think the honourable member and I have some form of growth, but it is mostly around the stomach. One may wonder who is going to pay the price for a decline in economic growth if we are not to have the multi-nationals. Of course, the far left is always the loudest and least in touch with reality. The former Attorney-General, for example, when addressing the "Friends of the Green Bans" dinner in Sydney last year, launched a general attack on multi-nationals on the grounds that they constitute international conspiracies against elected national Governments, and concluded his speech by comparing the style and goals of the campaign against uranium mining with the anti-American pro-N.L.F. campaign during the Vietnam War.

I believe he is not interested in a moderate view of the

multi-nationals. I think he would like to see them go completely. We all remember his criticism of Mr. Hawke's Le Boyer lectures, namely that Mr. Hawke was far too soft on the multi-nationals. Who actually pays the price? When you cut the tall poppies and reduce the total wealth of the nation it is always the little man on whom the burden falls. It is not true that by punishing the multi-nationals you punish the multi-nationals. There is the big threat of a capital strike and loss of development, and it is the little man who suffers. If the boss loses a bit of money, he will fire the gardener. In the interests of the little man, we must pursue economic growth, and we are not going to be able to do that without the multi-nationals.

True, they repatriate some money but it is greatly exaggerated. The amount of money that disappears and where it goes is greatly exaggerated. In the first place, a project of many thousands of millions of dollars would provide large benefits for Australians in terms of taxation, royalties and infrastructure development. But what is left over as profit, first of all, is taxed. Let us suppose that something like 5 or 10 per cent of the total investment is repatriated as profit. That is not all paid out in dividends. The company reinvests in technological development very large slabs of its profits, and that benefit comes back to us through the system of international trade, a system that we do not wish to destroy. Ultimately, some of that money is paid in dividends to people in other countries. What happens when they get their dividend cheque? They probably buy a hamburger with Australian beef in it or a suit made of Australian wool. That money goes around the liberal capitalist trading system throughout the world. We are a part of it and cannot opt out of it, except at the price of destroying our economic growth and hurting the little man.

If we believe that we have a right to opt out of economic growth, a right to keep our minerals in the ground, I submit to the Council that that is a very short-sighted view. I am going to draw a little upon some comments of Professor H. W. Arndt. He says that unfortunately it is universally taken for granted that we are entirely within our rights to restrict imports from low-wage countries or charge the highest price we can for our minerals or, if we should judge it to be in our national interest, to keep uranium ore in the ground. Offensive as this train of thought might seem on moral grounds, if one takes a very short-sighted practical view, the answer is, "Why shouldn't we? It is in our self-interest." He then goes on to point out that perhaps it really is not in our interest if we take a larger view. Perhaps a small country with only 14 000 000 people, who possess a large Continent with a very considerable proportion of the world's reserves of non-renewable resources, would find that it is in its own interest to develop those resources, having regard to the needs of other countries as well as its own, because in an energy-starved world our position is a bit tenuous. We should be warned against under-estimating the costs of gratifying our nationalistic economic sentiments, and we should be warned against pricing, not necessarily just the cost to ourselves but to others who are less affluent, less secure, and less able to press their claims. We cannot leave our resources in the ground and I include uranium in that. We have a duty not only to ourselves but also to the rest of the world.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** I find it difficult to speak after hearing the enlightened views of Dr. Ritson, because he has been talking about multi-nationals and how wonderful they are to Australia and other countries. My colleague the Hon. Mr. Bruce just handed a newspaper article to me. He never assists me very much, but he has

done so today. The article, headed "Polluters 'Moving to Third World'", states:

Many industries were moving to Third World countries to avoid anti-pollution legislation, an Indonesian speaker told a management conference in Adelaide yesterday. Professor G. A. Wardhana, of the University of Indonesia, said many Third World countries offered attractive propositions to industries with serious pollution problems. Business management could not declare its innocence when this occurred.

"To avoid the necessity of having to take costly anti-pollution measures, many companies are locating new plants in areas where anti-pollution legislation is non-existent or is less stringent," he said. "It is not unthinkable that one day the heavy polluters will be primarily located in poor developing nations who can ill afford the heavy cost of countering pollution's detrimental effects on the environment."

Delivering a paper on management and the environment, Professor Wardhana said pollution was caused by ignorance and because it was often cheaper to pollute than not to pollute. Managers and corporate chiefs also had to re-examine the old maximum of being responsible simply to financial shareholders. It was time to take broader responsibilities to stockholders, employers, customers and the public, who were vital to business survival.

That is indicative of the capitalist system that I wish to speak about. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris made a good contribution last Tuesday when he talked about the possibility of an industry making \$80 000 000 a year from mining. He went on to say that it would not necessarily create more jobs.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It could destroy them.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Yes, indeed. The sum of \$10 000 000 is set aside for the department in question but it makes me wonder whether the Budget document is a truthful one. On 13 August this year, in my Address in Reply speech at page 271 of *Hansard*, I said:

I would like to point out that there is no mention in the Governor's Speech—

neither in the Governor's Speech nor in my speech— that South Australia will develop and construct a uranium enrichment plant. I think that should have been set out in that Speech. I first heard of this proposition when watching *Nationwide* last week. It was a very unconvincing Premier whom I observed and listened to intently while he outlined the Government's plan to spend \$50 000 000 to assist with the establishment of such an enrichment plant. The plant is estimated to cost (if one can believe Mr. Tonkin) \$500 000 000. Mr. Tonkin did not have the *Nationwide* platform to himself; there was a person appearing at the same time who has been outspoken about energy requirements in South Australia and about alternative energy needs. That person, Professor DeBruin, was interviewed in conjunction with Mr. Tonkin. Mr. Tonkin intimated clearly that we do have a future in the enrichment of uranium. He pointed out that we need a lead time of eight years to develop such a plant and predicted that by 1990 the demand for uranium will increase and that there will be a world market clamouring for our uranium.

Mr. Tonkin seemed to indicate that this is why he is prepared to use \$50 000 000 of South Australian taxpayers' money on this project, because he believes that the demand for uranium will increase by 1990. I was pleased that Professor DeBruin answered some of the claims made by Mr. Tonkin. I have had the pleasure of listening to Professor DeBruin before. He believes that Mr. Tonkin has underestimated the costs and problems associated with the development of a uranium enrichment plant. Professor DeBruin assessed the cost of such a plant at

\$1 000 000 000—double the cost given by Mr. Tonkin. That means that, if Mr. Tonkin is going to give the same incentive, if it costs that much, the amount provided will be \$100 000 000. Professor DeBruin also disagreed with Mr. Tonkin's statement that there will be a world demand and an increased demand for uranium in 1990. He stated clearly that three or four years ago predictions made by supporters of uranium mining overseas were that demand would increase threefold. This has not occurred. Professor DeBruin produced charts supporting his claims.

Here we find the Government handing out a document which states that the cost is to be \$10 000 000. If we can believe what Mr. Tonkin has said and what Mr. Goldsworthy has said overseas, another \$100 000 000 will have to be found if we are to establish this plant.

Because I am interested in and have been opposed for some time to the mining of uranium, I should like to point out some of the knowledge that I have gained at the recent World Parliament for Peace held in Bulgaria, at which 132 nations were represented by 2 200 delegates. Those delegates represented a broad base of the various communities and nations, and included church leaders, politicians, and representatives of women's groups, youth groups and trade unions. Indeed, the whole spectrum of the political and social arena was represented. Because of the place in which the conference was held, one of my colleagues quipped, "Why don't you have it at Kabul?" The conference was held in a socialist country because that country asked to be the host, and its request was granted by the World Peace Council. Previous Parliaments have been held in Finland, Sweden and many other countries. I believe that the next one is to be held in Madagascar. Many motions were moved at the conference.

In reply to some of my critics, I should explain why I attended the conference. Like many Australians, I have never really been concerned with international politics. I have been parochial, and my outlook has not extended beyond Australia. Because of the people from overseas whom I have been meeting, I thought, having been offered the chance to represent Labor politicians at the conference, that I would accept the offer to go. This involved considerable expense to me personally and, on my return, I was asked how I felt. As well as feeling tired because of the amount of travel that I had done, I also felt depressed, feeling that the world situation is not as rosy as we were led to believe it was by prominent politicians during the recent election campaign and by statements of the type made by the last honourable member to participate in this debate. The threat of war was on the lips of every delegate who spoke at the conference.

I know that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who is at present Acting President, has been to many international conferences and, having done likewise, I believe that I am able to sift propaganda from the truth. I was indeed impressed by the social contact involved at the World Parliament for Peace. Many persons speaking different languages contributed to the debate on the various motions, and the people whom I met and with whom I spoke impressed me greatly.

Australians consider that they live in a lucky country. However, some of the people who attended that conference could, on returning to their home countries, be subjected to imprisonment. I refer, for instance, to the delegates from South Korea and those delegates who came from countries in which there are dictatorships and who could get short shrift on their return home because they attended the conference.

I now refer specifically to some of the people whom I met, including two delegates from the African Congress Party. These young men were exiled and now living in

Zambia because of their opposition to white rule in South Africa. In last evening's *News*, one saw the report about a well-known churchman from Sydney, Rev. Alan Walker, who has just returned from South Africa. This man, who had not been to South Africa for 17 years, is reported as saying:

On returning after 17 years I am shocked to find how little is changed in the country's racial policies. Apartheid continues to hold South Africa in a vice-like grip, denying justice to millions of people. In terms of racism South Africa is the worst country in the world.

Rev. Walker was speaking not from Sydney but from South Africa. Having spent many hours travelling with the Jamaican delegates, I was indeed saddened to hear from them that 450 people had been killed during the run-up to this year's elections there. All of these things have happened because of the actions of multi-nationals and the exploiters of people whom the Hon. Dr. Ritson defended a short time ago.

I am proud to say that I am a vice-president of the South Australian Peace Committee, and I was indeed impressed by Sister Rosalie Bertell, who is an American expert on the dangers of low-level radiation and who visited Australia for a month from 11 February. Sister Bertell, a Roman Catholic nun and a member of the Grey Nuns of the Sacred Heart in Buffalo, New York, visited all States and the Northern Territory to address workshop meetings and public rallies on her extensive studies of deaths and illness being caused in the U.S.A. by radiation pollution. After gaining a PhD in mathematics at the Catholic University of America in Washington, Sister Bertell, 51, undertook a post-doctoral study on the environmental causes of leukemia.

The following article is taken from a speech given by Dr. Rosalie Bertell at the Rocky Flats Nuclear Weapons Plant, 16 miles from Denver, Colorado, during a demonstration held on 29 April 1978. At that time, Dr. Bertell was a biostatistician at the Roswell Cancer Research Institute in Buffalo, New York, specialising in the relationship of radiation to cancer. Sister Bertell stated:

I do not expect today to try to persuade you to take some particular road at this nuclear crossroad—this unparalleled crisis in the history of the world. You are no doubt as outraged as I am with so many experts telling you what to do, and claiming unlimited wisdom and omnipotent control relative to technology, human health, and even the existence of the biosphere which maintains life.

Instead, I will share with you my knowledge and experience, and also let you see some of the anger I feel at the cruel and unnecessary deaths and debilitating illness being caused by radiation pollution; anger over the corruption of human dialogue to the point that truthfulness in presenting information to the public has become a rare virtue; and anger at the destruction of scientific and professional integrity through blatant manipulation of financial support and status. I see my role as unmasking as much as possible the local, national and global implications of the Rocky Flats nuclear installation and all radiation-related industries.

The crisis we are facing is one of physical survival and moral rectitude both for ourselves and for the global community. We the people of the United States are producing extremely hazardous radio-active materials both as weapons of unbelievable destructive capability, and also for so-called peaceful uses such as generation of electricity. Nuclear generators are partly a facade for weapons research, partly a source of electricity needed to power a sophisticated weapons technology, and partly a weapon in their own right in the international economic war in which we are presently engaged.

Sister Bertell then refers to the truthfulness of people and the corruption of people, and I think members will be interested in her comments, as follows:

The uranium miners waited and trusted. American uranium mines were opened in 1946, and it had been known since 1920 that radon gas—  
we never hear about radon gas—

had killed the uranium miners in Eastern Europe. The mining companies did not properly ventilate the mines—saving about \$6 on the cost of mining a ton of usable uranium. In 1957 the U.S. Department of Health predicted an excess number of deaths from lung cancer among these miners. In 1965 it was confirmed that such deaths were occurring. It took another six years for action—and then the action was called for by Secretary of Labour Willard Wurtz, not the Atomic Energy Commission, the U.S. Department of Public Health or the Bureau of Radiation Health. In fact, at the hearings called by the Department of Labour, the mining companies were still producing "expert" witnesses to say that the radiation levels from radon gas in the mines were not harmful to human health! Their witness, Dr. Robley Evans, is now known to have received millions of dollars in grants from the A.E.C. and to have been a consultant to Kerr-McGee, the mining firm. Scientists need to be accountable to the public, not the tools of industry and its related governmental agencies.

She goes on to mention other scientists who prefer to remain anonymous. They refute the points that Sister Bertell has stated, yet they remain anonymous and are unwilling to expose themselves to the public. However, Sister Bertell has shown that Dr. Robley Evans prostituted scientific knowledge for millions of dollars. I had the pleasure of talking to Sister Bertell, and I asked whether it was regular practice in the United States for scientists to try to hide information from the public in regard to health, and write out reports to suit people who are interested in profits and not people. Sister Bertell said that of course this was so.

Sister Bertell is a sister of the Grey Nuns of the Poor and is still active in that church. As a baptised Roman Catholic (not practising very well), I can say in regard to that order of nuns that they are honest and truthful. In fact, Sister Bertell has spoken all over the world and, if the Hon. Mr. Blevins was immediately present in the Chamber, he would tell how Sister Bertell spoke to over 600 people at a Whyalla meeting. Before the meeting began several people were in favour of mining uranium at Roxby Downs. However, after Sister Bertell spoke for over an hour without notes, the Chairman of the meeting (Mr. John Scott) asked for people to indicate whether they believed uranium mining should be permitted in South Australia. Not one hand was raised.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** Her information was 25 years old.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** It is not. She merely referred to the situation in 1945, and much of the information on what is going on is up to date. The honourable member is wrapping these people up and saying that multi-nationals are paying millions of dollars to scientists. Is the honourable member saying that this is all right?

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Is B.H.P. a multi-national?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** B.H.P. would not know how to be a multi-national. I do not think it would prostitute people the way American multi-nationals do—they lie to people. I am concerned about people who refute this evidence with supposedly scientific knowledge and tell young children in schools that the mining of uranium is satisfactory.

I am not opposed to uranium mining *in toto*. I have met

people from countries such as India who have told me that they will mine uranium. They have explained why they will mine it and how they will use it, that is, to obtain an electricity power supply. I believe that the mining and production of uranium could be used in Australia for peaceful purposes and to produce power, if necessary, but I learnt overseas that 95 per cent of uranium waste is the result of the testing of atomic weapons. Only 5 per cent of the waste comes from uranium used in power generation.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** We are only using it for peaceful purposes.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The Hon. Dr. Ritson claims that it will be used only for peaceful purposes, yet I heard Mr. Goldsworthy say that international safeguards were important to ensure that uranium was used for peaceful purposes, and I have already indicated that only 5 per cent of uranium is used for peaceful purposes. How does Mr. Goldsworthy know what the position will be, especially when only a couple of years ago he and his colleagues voted in support of a proposition that we put up? We knew the situation then and we know it now, and I will prove to the honourable member shortly that the uranium is not being mined for peaceful purposes.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** Not in Russia and probably not in America, because of all the atomic weapons that are made, but that is not so in Australia.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The uranium from Roxby Downs will be used for atomic weapons.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** Prove it.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** One point that I wish to impress on the Hon. Dr. Ritson is that at the World Peace Council many countries were represented by many representatives. The U.S. spoke strongly against some of the propositions and the use of the neutron bomb, to which I will refer later. The U.S. was represented by 65 delegates, including some of the following people:

Harold Washington	State Senator
Erwin Salk	Business Executive for Peace
Jack Hart	International Organiser, United Electrical Workers Union
Rev. Joseph Frazier	Episcopal Peace Fellowship
Akida K. Sababu	Ohio Civil Service Employees Association
Sandra Graham	Mass. State Senator
Mark Solomon	Professor, Simmons College
Ms. Cheaber Farmer	Women's Council of Concerns
Daniel L. Walker	Colorado Committee for Economic Survival
Gerena Valentin	New York City Council
Cecilia Pollack	Queens Coalition for Peace and Justice
Michael Myerson	Executive Director, U.S. Peace Council
Stanley Faulkner	National Lawyers Guild
Judge Bruce Wright	
Gus Newport	Mayor of Berkeley, California
Mario Fernando Vazquez	International Brotherhood of General Workers
Mary Bates	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Maria Gerena	New York City Council
Howard da Silva	Actor
John Summerwill	Professor Emeritus, City University of New York
Rev. Wendell Foster	New York City Council

One can see, Mr. President, when these resolutions dealing with the American build-up of nuclear arms were moved, that these were the most outstanding speakers at the conference. I was impressed prior to going overseas by an article written by Clive Holding, a colleague of mine

from the Federal sphere, that I believe is true and probably would apply to some people on each side of the House, as follows:

The great mass of the Australian people, if they think of the possibility of war, see it as a military extension of the 1914-18 war and the last world war: pitched battles, with highly mobile armies, a civilian population at home involved in the war effort, and having at worst to deal with the disaster of air raids.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** What line of the Budget is this?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** This deals with uranium and what it leads to. I am speaking of things that must affect us as people and politicians if we worry about the hundreds of millions of dollars the honourable member's Government wants to give to multi-nationals to build a uranium enrichment plant here, the uranium from which will be used for nuclear purposes. That is what I am talking about.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** If we enrich it to fuel-grade strength and not weapon-grade strength—

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** How are you going to police what happens to it?

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. M. B. Dawkins):** Order! The Hon. Mr. Dunford will ignore interjections.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The report continues:

This "Ocka" concept of war is a bit like a television mix between *The Sullivans* and *Red Berets*. When the Prime Minister assured the Olympic Federation of the certainty of war in June 1983, and talked of "sending our fleet" into the Indian Ocean, he is postulating war in the same "Ocka" terms; although in truth such predictions from Malcolm Fraser also contain that "Gung Ho" quality that makes him so beloved in some parts of America, a kind of "poor girls" studio stand-in for Ronald Reagan.

I have seen reports in the press of Mr. Fraser strutting the world stage, a big powerful man, a strong man with a loud voice, talking about war in 1983. "With a small stick", is what they said about Fraser internationally.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** What did they say about Fraser on Saturday?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I am pleased the honourable member mentioned Fraser and Saturday, because the Liberal Party was trying to win the seat of Grey, but we had a 2 per cent swing all over South Australia. Laurie Wallis talked against uranium and increased his vote by 7 per cent.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** What about Richie Gunn?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** Honourable members opposite should be ashamed of themselves for mentioning a man like Richie Gunn in this Council after the campaign against him during the election. Liberal members stand condemned for that and should be ashamed of themselves. It is a shocking thing that a man has to be in the same Chamber with people who will denigrate a gentleman who went to impoverished countries at his own expense to save lives. There has been a shocking vilification of Mr. Gunn, and lies were told about him. Just prior to the election SAN congratulated both Parties for not talking about a khaki election. I would have thought that it was a great opportunity for the Labor Party and those people opposed to war to let people know the dangerous course Fraser is taking in having 40 U.S. bases here, which I will talk about shortly, and B52 bombers here with atomic warheads.

**The Hon. R. J. Ritson:** How many Afghanistan moratorium marches have you organised?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I listened to the Afghanistan delegates, and made some inquiries. They invited the Soviet Union into Afghanistan on 24 September. They have a great rapport with the Soviet Union, which is assisting them to put down the landlords and money sharks that you people are so dedicated to. I

was talking to a Pakistani delegate who told me about refugees leaving Afghanistan and crossing the border. Overnight they became rich and wealthy because the United States, through the C.I.A., was giving them homes and cars, so it was in their interests to leave Afghanistan for publicity reasons. That came from a delegate from Afghanistan who owes no allegiance to the Russians and does not even like them. I believe that statement to be true. It is interesting that honourable members opposite mentioned the presence of the U.S.S.R. in Afghanistan. Let us look at the country that members opposite say is the foundation of democracy, the United States. I have been to the United States, where the young people are loaded with heroin and where the police and judges are crook. I will now list the bases that the United States has around the world, and the number of personnel involved at those bases: Federal Republic of Germany, 238 300; Great Britain, 23 000; Italy, 11 700; Spain, 8 700; Turkey, 4 900; Greece, 3 300; Iceland, 2 900; Netherlands, 2 200; Belgium, 2 000; Portugal, 1 400; other European countries, 800; Sixth Fleet, 25 000; a total of 325 200 in Europe. In the Far East and the Pacific, which is a little closer, we have Japan and Okinawa, 46 200; South Korea, 39 000; Philippines, 14 100; Guam, 8 800; Australia, 1 700; Midway, 500; other countries, 300; 7th Fleet, 22 000; a total of 132 600. Turning to Latin America, Panama Canal, 9 500; Puerto Rico, 3 500; Guantanamo, 3 100; a total of 16 100. Other countries are Bermuda, 1 300; Diego Garcia, 3 000; Canada, 700; Saudi Arabia, 400; U.S. Navy, 3 500; Fifth Fleet, 16 000; a total of 23 900.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** What is your source?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** The source is as follows:

Department of Defence Annual Report FY 1981. United States Foreign Policy Objectives and Overseas Military Installations. Prepared for the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate by the Congressional Research Service, Washington, 1979. U.S. News and World Report 31 December 1979-7 January 1980.

America is the country that would not let its people go to the U.S.S.R. to the Olympic Games, which were a resounding success. I am pleased to say that I saw the villages used for the Olympic Games, and they are now occupied by Soviet citizens. The U.S. is a country that banned international sport, where freedom and friendship go hand in hand, because of Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** Who paid for your trip?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I paid for my own trip—not all of it, because I got a bit of assistance from the Peace Council.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Is that a multi-national, too?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** They have a fairly good budget. They would not let the honourable member in, because he is too big a reactionary.

World expenditure on arms is \$1 000 000 000 a day. Expenditure by Australia is \$7 000 000 a day, or about \$2 500 000 000 a year. I understand that it has been increased to \$3 400 000 000 a year. Australia is one of America's largest customers for arms, and three-quarters of Australia's capital expenditure on arms is spent overseas. The R.A.A.F. is currently intent on buying 70 super-sophisticated American F15 fighters at a cost of \$20 000 000 each.

Australia is the 18th "big spender" on arms; Australia spends \$100 000 000 for Leopard Tanks; Australia has 400 000 unemployed; Australia spends only \$39 000 000 on Aboriginal housing per year; Australia spends only \$25 000 000 on school dental services per year; Australia spends only \$71 000 000 on community health services per year; Australia spends only \$5 000 000 on solar research at

the A.N.U. over five years; and Australia gave \$25 000 000 in military aid to Indonesia between 1975-77.

It is true that the arms industry creates jobs. That is less so in Australia because we buy our arms overseas, primarily from the U.S.A., but U.S. Government and United Nations research discloses that one billion dollars spent on arms equals 76 000 jobs, and one billion dollars spent on civilian needs equals 100 000 to 120 000 jobs. I know that many people believe that we need the support of America because of the ANZUS treaty. Some people on the Government side and in my Party believe that, as a result of the treaty, the U.S. will come to our aid if Australia is attacked. I will clear this matter up. We have had many treaties since 1945. I refer to a report on Article 102 of the United Nations, as follows:

The Australian Government's policy on Article 102 in regard to defence ties with the U.S. has three implications. First, it is breaking the basic treaty of public international law. Second, it is withholding information from the public about the defence agreements it has with its major ally. Third, since the treaties do not receive the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, they are not binding on the U.S. Government.

When it comes to the crunch the U.S. Government will be able to claim (quite rightly) that it is not bound by secret treaties since they have not been ratified by the Senate.

Turning now to the particular case of the Security Treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the U.S. ANZUS—the basic treaty underpinning Australia's defence. Unlike the "treaties" which are of a secret nature, this has been publicised widely—and largely misunderstood.

ANZUS, which entered into force on 29 April 1952, obliges the three parties to work together for their mutual defence in the Pacific area. There is no specific mention of any other geographical area other than the Pacific or to any political ideology (like communism).

This is not an obligation upon Australia (or New Zealand) to provide bases on its territory to enable the U.S. to carry out operations outside the Pacific area (such as spying over the Soviet Union or mainland Asia).

ANZUS runs indefinitely. But any party may leave after giving the other two parties one year's notice. It has two major limitations from Australia's point of view.

First, ANZUS does not contain a specific guarantee that this country would be defended by the U.S. if attacked—the President would need to go through the "constitutional process" and the Congress could refuse to act.

Indeed, as we have seen over the U.S. recognition of the Peking Government the U.S. was willing to reverse its old policy towards Taiwan in its own best self-interest. The same could happen if Australia were invaded.

Second, the ANZUS mentality creates a mental block for the gullible, which all Australian Governments have boosted. ANZUS is said to be the basis of our defence policy and anything aimed at disrupting ANZUS is seen as a threat to national security.

It would be unwise, then, for peace activists to call for the immediate serving of one year's notice to quit ANZUS—it would create too much of a shock to the body politic.

But we should start immediately to campaign to show the limitations and disadvantages of ANZUS, so as to prepare people for a later demand that Australia serves notice to quit. There are more than 30 U.S. bases in Australia but I will refer to the two most important ones, the North-West Cape and Pine Gap bases. A report states:

The North-West Cape base in Western Australia (Harold E. Holt Communications Station) is covered by an agreement of 1963 which runs for 25 years. It is one of the U.S.'s three principal very low frequency communications stations.



VLF is important for naval warfare because it penetrates water to a depth of about 100 feet and so enables contact to be maintained with submarines, as well as enabling submarines to work out their locations.

The base may have another task (which has not been admitted by Canberra), that of being part of the U.S. National Security Agency's spy operations.

The Pine Gap base is covered by an agreement which was renewed in 1977 and runs until 1987. The U.S. (and Soviet Union, though on a lesser scale) has a mind-boggling system of spy satellites. One part of the network is monitoring Soviet missile tests and other military activities.

The satellites are able to peer through camouflage and the dark of night to see what is going on. Pine Gap receives this information from the satellites hovering over this side of the globe; it controls the satellites; it relays information to North-West Cape (for example, the instructions for submarines to commence hostilities).

It also monitors Australia's external—and possibly internal—telecommunications traffic. All these functions have grave implications.

For example, ASIO is under some (though not great) limitation over the direct telephone tapping it can do via Pine Gap it can acquire this information (if the U.S. is willing to part with it) quite legally.

More importantly, the base is the most important U.S. base outside its territory.

In the event of a nuclear war, it is a sure target since its destruction would metaphorically blind the U.S. in one eye as it would lose control over some of its extensive satellite network.

Some people that I met at the conference were members of legislative bodies, municipal bodies, international and non-governmental bodies, mass movements, religious groups, political Parties and trade unions. There were patriarchs from many churches. Other people attending were Melena Mercouri, Greek film star and M.P.; James Aldridge, Australian writer of world renown; and Nino Pasti, General (retired) Allied Supreme Vice-Commander in Europe for Nuclear Affairs NATO, and now a Senator in the Italian Senate.

Pasti, together with 13 other retired officers, including three admirals and eight generals from Portugal, Bulgaria, Greece, U.S.S.R., Chile, France and Brazil, issued a joint declaration at the congress opposing the U.S. Presidential Doctrine 59. Honourable members know what that is, do they not?

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** We all know what that is.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** It is the limited nuclear war. The United States believes that the neutron bomb is the perfect bomb. Members will not laugh when they know what the neutron bomb does. It is called the clean bomb. It kills people and leaves property intact.

**The Hon. C. M. Hill:** I would like to know what line this is.

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** My remarks relate to social welfare. About 100 000 000 000 children suffer from hunger, poverty and disease while \$100 000 000 000 is spent daily on arms. Today, nuclear arsenals contain the equivalent of nearly 1 500 000 Hiroshima-type bombs, enough to destroy the world 15 times over. I marched in the streets of Adelaide on Hiroshima Day and heard a very good speaker—a man sacked by the Government—Mr. John Coulter. He spoke about a Senator (I forget his name) who is very close to the button and high up in the United States Senate. This speech was made at the time when the nuclear count-down was on. He said, "If we are going to have a war, let us have one. Wipe the whole show out. Start the world again, and I hope that they are two Americans." That is similar to what Mao said. The

last two speakers mentioned the last election, so I believe I am in order in doing so. The arms race has not made us safer or improved our security—on the contrary. Not only does the danger of war increase both the quantity and quality of nuclear weapons but also the danger of accidents is increased. On 15 September 1980, a strategic B52 bomber with nuclear weapons on board caught fire a few minutes before take off from a base in North Dakota. A few weeks later an explosion occurred at an Arkansas launching pad with a Trident 2 intercontinental missile in the launch silo.

Faults and troubles are becoming more and more frequent—in direct proportion to the mounting war hysteria (for example, the U.S. helicopter fiasco in Iran). In 1956, a B47 bomber plunged into an atom bomb depot at a base in Britain. It was a U.S. bomber, but British people would have suffered in the event of a disaster. The same thing will occur in Australia if one of those bombers with bombs aboard were to come here and crash. No-one would be left.

We should think about these accidents now that Fraser has agreed to provide B52 facilities in Darwin. In 1966, a B52 bomber crashed near Polomares in Spain losing its four hydrogen bombs in the fall. Two years later another B52 with four hydrogen bombs crashed in Greenland.

While opposing the mining and export of uranium, the development of nuclear power in Australia and the dumping of nuclear waste in the Pacific, it should be remembered that 95 per cent of all nuclear waste comes from the nuclear arms industry. If we had a magic wand which was able to bring about the abolition of all nuclear reactors, we would still be confronted with the current and ever growing stockpiles of nuclear weapons. It is these weapons which threaten the extinction of mankind.

I wish to relate a message from the General Secretary of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, to the World Parliament of Peace as follows:

The establishment of peace means much more than the absence of war. The arms race is a threat to security not its guarantor. The similarity of concern by the U.N. and the Conference of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace is most encouraging.

A resolution giving support to Fretelin in its struggle for the independence of East Timor was moved by the Minister of Justice of Mozambique. There were many resolutions carried at the meeting. In fact, I brought them all home. I do not want to go into them at any length. I did ascertain that the uranium that is being produced here in Australia may be being used in a production of a neutron bomb. I stated before that the neutron bomb is called the clean bomb because it leaves the property intact and the people dead. If death is not instantaneous, people die a horrifying death over between two months and four years. Some very important people in the world had this to say about the neutron bomb. Theodore Weiss, member of the United States House of Representatives, said:

The neutron bomb could lead to an escalating nuclear exchange between our country and another nuclear power, and it is unlikely that a nuclear war would remain limited. Dr. Linus Pauling (United States of America), Nobel Prize Laureate, said:

I am against the development of the neutron bomb. Karin Söder, Foreign Secretary of the Kingdom of Sweden, said:

We oppose these schemes because this is an unheard-of cruel weapon.

Shirley Amerasinghe, President of the XXXI United Nations General Assembly, said:

The best memory for the victims of the atom bomb is the struggle to avert the danger of a new war.

Cardinal Bernard Alfrink, President of PAX-Christi, said:

When the human race wants to survive they must resist the introduction of such misanthropic weapons with all their power.

Dr. Ritson was talking about developing countries, and it was interesting to note that an honourable member spoke clearly and reported on 20 October and quoted the Minister of Mines and Energy who said that he had \$10 000 000 to spend. I do not know how he is going to start the enrichment plant with that. The press report stated:

"There are moral as well as economic reasons why they must be developed."

This had to be done if South Australia was to play a role in alleviating poverty and starvation in the developing world and helping to avoid depression in more advanced countries.

I can tell him that people have got different ideas about what one can do, rather than build uranium enrichment plants. We can do as stated in the following report:

The total annual military expenditure of the developing countries rose from \$7 200 000 000 in 1960 to \$33 800 000 000 in 1975 (1973 prices). Whereas in the world as a whole military expenditure (at fixed prices) increased by an annual average of 5 per cent from 1965 to 1970 and by 1.1 per cent from 1970 to 1975, the figure was 8.1 per cent and 14.7 per cent for the developing countries. The share of these countries in the world's overall military spending has risen from 4.6 per cent in 1960 to about 18 per cent at present.

When one considers the low level of economic development in the majority of these countries it is clear what a burden the imperialist inspired arms race represents to them.

Expenditure on military purposes in the developing countries is today 2.5 times as high as allocations for the health service and 1.5 times as high as the funds set aside for education.

Many developing countries are robbed of huge resources on account of the arms race fuelled by imperialism and the arms exporting policy of the military-industrial complex—resources urgently needed by them in their struggle to attain economic and political independence.

Mr. Goldsworthy says that we must build this plant and get the uranium going so that we can help these people. If Mr. Goldsworthy is as concerned as he says he is, he may take notice of the following report from a publication entitled *The Military Industrial Complex: a Threat to Peace*:

Overall arms spending in the world exceeds the total gross national product annually produced at present by the developing countries of Africa and Asia. In the period from 1945 to 1978, some million million dollars (1975 price level) were spent on armaments in the world. This sum is equivalent to the gross national product or the national income of all the world's countries in 1975. This huge world arms expenditure is contrasted by the following appalling facts which testify to a disregard for human beings:

18 000 000 officially registered unemployed in the advanced industrial countries—including 40 per cent youth under 25 years of age—and several million workers on short time. The total figure of registered jobless people in non-socialist countries amounts to roughly 80 million.

Nearly 800 000 000 illiterates. They are concentrated in countries whose development has for generations been scarred by imperialism.

Some 450 000 000 people, or roughly 12 per cent of the world's population, live below subsistence level; between 250 000 000 and 300 000 000 children in the developing countries suffered from malnutrition.

In 40 out of 132 countries one doctor has to look after an average of 10 000 people and in seven countries more than 40 000 persons.

The thesis advanced by the military-industrial complexes that an arms build-up is indispensable for ensuring internal stability and prosperity flies in the face of reality. Rising armaments burdens and accelerating inflation, continuing currency erosion, permanent mass unemployment, mounting national debts and many other ailments of capitalism are inseparably bound up with one another at present. The arms build-up curbs economic growth. It involves an ever more relentless exploitation of natural resources and ever greater hazards to the environment. American scientists stated in an analysis in 1975:

The belief that military expenditure has a positive effect on the economy is a myth. There are no facts to support it. Every thousand million dollars spent by the Pentagon leads to a loss of jobs in the economy, to higher taxation for employees and a lower quality of life for all.

The document continues that from 1970 to 1974, an average of 907 000 jobs were lost in the U.S.A., while during these five years arms spending in the U.S.A. rose from \$77 850 000 000 to roughly \$90 000 000 000.

The Republican politician Hatfield characterised in the following mordant terms the situation in the U.S.A.:

If the people no longer place trust in their Government, if their most urgent needs of life are not satisfied and if the environment ensuring the life of the nation is disintegrating, then the conditions of our country are and will continue to be distinctly insecure, irrespective of the fact how many thousands of millions of dollars we spend on other purposes . . . Our nation has placed its hopes for ultimate security in the hands of false Gods, idols which it itself has created. We believe that we are able to attain our security by means of military power. Hence, we build up this power to the frontiers of militarism, and then get into the trap of an ever growing need for more and more funds.

When I returned to Singapore, I was able to buy a newspaper that was written in English, having read several from the Soviet Union. I was indeed impressed by the *Morning Star*, which is, I believe, a communist publication and which reported on the Labour conference in Britain. It stated that historic decisions to go all out against Cruise and Trident missiles, and for a British lead on nuclear disarmament, were taken by Labor's conference. So, one country in Europe is waking up to the fact that it should not have more foreign nuclear bases on its soil.

**The Hon. L. H. Davis:** Which country is that?

**The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD:** I am referring to Great Britain. The honourable member is very ignorant of the world scene, and I hope that what I have said today gets through his thick skull, although I doubt very much whether it will. I have put the proposition regarding the World Peace Conference as best I can. I know that I have not stuck strictly to the lines, so I thank you, Sir, for your indulgence.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** On 18 September, I asked a question concerning the Government's plans for the child care studies course currently being conducted at the Elizabeth Community College.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Did you get a reply?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Yes. On Tuesday I received a reply which informed me that during the 1981 academic year the course at Elizabeth Community College would be amalgamated with the one being conducted at Croydon Park College of Further Education. It was stated that the focus of the last few years on full-time training in child care courses was no longer justified as there was now an increasing concern for the provision of residential care services and parenting courses for the general community. In addition, it was stated that the demand for graduates had decreased, and from 1981 the full-time student intake

for the child care studies course would be reduced to 20 per year.

Based on the information that I have been able to gather about the course and demand for trained child care workers and the demand for child care services, I believe that the decision to close the Elizabeth Community College is wrong and has been prompted by financial considerations rather than educational considerations or response to the needs of the community.

As I pointed out at the time I asked my question about this matter, since the child care studies course began there have been four groups of graduates totalling 88 people, of whom 82 have been employed. That is an employment rate of 98 per cent, and must compare more than favourably with other vocational courses being conducted by the Department of Further Education, and, contrary to the information supplied by the Government, employment prospects are still quite healthy. For example, between June and August this year the Elizabeth Community College received 10 inquiries from Government centres that were seeking full-time or part-time staff.

There is still a very healthy interest in the course on the part of prospective students. The centre currently receives about 15 inquiries per week from people concerning the course and entry requirements. Approximately half of these people have subsequently expressed their intention to enrol and have been sent course information.

In an area like Elizabeth, where there is a high rate of youth unemployment, opportunities for vocational study are extremely important. Apparently, the department believes that the decision to amalgamate the Elizabeth course with the Croydon Park course will not significantly disadvantage people in the Elizabeth and Salisbury area. This is just not true. I personally am aware of at least four people currently taking the course who will be unable to continue if the course is moved to Croydon Park. There are countless others who will be deterred from applying to take the course because they will find it physically and financially impossible to travel to Croydon Park each day.

However, the lost study opportunities for people in the Elizabeth area are not the end of the story. Over the years, the staff of the child care studies course, all but one of whom will move to Croydon Park under the new arrangement, have developed strong and valuable links with community groups outside the college itself.

For example, Elizabeth staff are currently represented on a number of community groups in that area. These include such organisations as the Salisbury Supporting Services Council, the Elizabeth Early Childhood Supporting Committee, the Elizabeth West Resource Centre, the Para Districts Health Services Advisory Committee, the Northern Districts Advisory Services Community Board for Social Development, and Elizabeth Counselling Services.

In addition, the staff are involved in a lecturing capacity in other courses, for example, family day care orientation courses, and presenting courses with groups from the women's shelter in the region and groups suggested by the Family Support Services in Salisbury. They also run Link courses with local high schools. In addition to this the students who are taking the child care studies course are often requested as volunteer staff for creches run by community groups, and so far the people of Elizabeth Community College have been invited by kindergarten committees and community nurses to participate. There has also been an Opportunities for Women's Course run by the Department of Further Education. Occasionally, they are asked to help with handicapped children's programmes. It is clear that the staff and students at Elizabeth Community College are much involved with the

community outside, so that the aspects involved in closing this course are much broader than those that seem to have been considered by the department.

In the Elizabeth area there are about 1 000 sole-supporting mothers, many of whom rely on the child care services provided at Elizabeth Community College. In addition, a great number of women in the area have become involved in Department of Further Education courses at the Elizabeth College as a result of their initial contact with the child care centre or its staff.

In summary, there appears to be no justification on the grounds of community need for the Government's decision to close the child care studies course at Elizabeth. I understand that the decision was taken with little or no consultation with the people concerned with the course, and it coincides with decisions to cut other Department of Further Education courses, which I understand have been made necessary by the reduced funding to the Department of Further Education in this Budget.

It is unfortunate that the Government has cut spending in this important area of education, but it is deplorable that the courses being cut first, as a result of reduced spending, are courses like the child care studies course and other courses like the garment and pattern construction course which, not coincidentally, I believe, are courses with a high female enrolment.

I now want to turn my attention to the question of the provision of child care services in this State. The Government has suggested that there is now not as much demand for child care centres as there was in the early 1970's.

I have to acknowledge that it is very difficult to accurately assess demand or need for child care in Australia. A great deal depends on the way one defines the terms "demand" and "need". Does one assess the needs only of the children whose parents work? Does one count only those people who approach child care centres for placement? How does one define child care? For my purposes today, I want to talk about day care, which can be provided in varying forms, excluding pre-school facilities.

I suppose the people who would have the greatest need for child care facilities are those already in the work force. In May 1977 in South Australia 33.9 per cent of those responsible for children under six years were in the work force either part or full time. That is, about one-third of people (mainly mothers) responsible for pre-school children were in the work force. That is a vast departure from society's stereotyped view of the way families are structured and of who is taking care of pre-school children.

Very few of those children have some formal minding arrangement. A survey conducted by the South Australian Council of Social Services in 1978 estimated that official programmes were catering for only 15 per cent of children under 12 years whose parents were employed.

According to the Judith Healy, a lecturer in social administration at Flinders University, who has produced an excellent paper on child care in South Australia, it appears that family arrangements are the major method of child care (especially for part-time workers) for about half of those with pre-schoolers and almost 70 per cent of those with schoolchildren. Care outside the family is dominated by private arrangements, while centres provide less than a quarter of the care for under-school-age children.

One might assume from this that families were quite happy to make private arrangements for their children's care. But this is apparently not so either. Surveys conducted in Sydney in 1977 which included women industrial workers, nearly half of whom were from foreign language groups, found that the children were cared for

mainly by friends and relatives, but nearly all would have preferred some organised and supervised arrangement if it had been available. I understand that a similar survey has been conducted by the Childhood Services Council in the western suburbs of Adelaide among migrant women. It will be very interesting to see the results of this survey when they are published later this year.

But parents in the work force are not the only ones who would use child care facilities if they were available. An Australian Bureau of Statistics survey conducted in 1977 showed that about 10 200 South Australian women responsible for children under 12 years had stated that they would return to work if appropriate child care was available.

So what is the situation regarding the provision of services in South Australia? The provision of day care facilities started to grow in South Australia after the Federal Government began funding child care programmes in 1972. Between 1973 and 1978, there was a 70 per cent increase in day care places. In terms of utilisation of day care centres, emphasis has moved away from private centres to Government-subsidised centres. In fact, a number of private centres have closed during the past few years. The reasons for this have not been investigated, but it may be that people prefer subsidised centres because they consider the quality of care is better or that maybe the fees are lower. Whatever the reason, there has been a shift, and I understand that currently almost all the subsidised centres are catering for a maximum capacity of children. All the indications are that there is a strong need and demand for day care facilities in South Australia—more than the current establishments can cater for.

Let me now examine the funding situation. The Federal Government really became involved in the provision of child care when the Whitlam Government came to power in 1972. It commissioned three reports on early childhood services and allocated more funds than had been allocated previously.

However, its work had only just begun when the Government changed in 1975. The Fraser Government's attitude has been that it should provide services only when the normal mechanism of social supply, the family and the market, breaks down. Therefore, day care funding is now intended for those with special needs, including children from poor families, children of lone parents, those whose parents both work, and children with handicaps, etc. Since 1977 the Federal Government has cut child care spending. By 1979 it had effected a 6.3 per cent reduction on its 1975 Budget allocation, a figure which represented a 38.3 per cent cut in real terms.

This year the South Australian Office of Child Care, for which the Federal body is responsible, has been allocated \$1 100 000, which will not be enough even to meet existing costs, let alone allow growth. There are currently a number of applications awaiting funding, but unless the Government reconsiders its position and allocates further funds those applicants have no hope of establishing day care centres. At the State level the record is not very good either, and I include the previous Government in my criticism.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** You can't do that.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I can. In 1974 the Childhood Services Council was established to advise Federal and State Ministers on the need for services in South Australia and to recommend the allocation of funds. It was responsible for pre-school facilities as well as day care facilities.

State Government contributions to day care have been minimal. From 1974 to 1978, while the Federal Government had made capital grants via the State of over

\$3 500 000, South Australia had contributed only about \$19 000, and its recurrent funding share for day care was also small, amounting to approximately \$33 880 in 1977-78. However, having said that, I must also point out that one important factor which inhibited the former State Government's ability to contribute funds in this area was the need to meet the shortfall in Federal Government expenditure on pre-school after 1976. Since that time the Federal Government has contributed nothing to capital funds for pre-schools, and the Federal share of the State's pre-school operating costs has declined from 70 per cent to around 30 per cent.

As the State Government had fostered consumer expectations by electoral promises, that it wished to fulfil to provide universal, free pre-schooling for all four-year-olds, it had to make up the difference, contributing over \$5 000 000 to the 1977-78 operating costs. So, if the Federal Government had maintained its commitment to pre-school funding, the State Government would have been free to contribute more generously towards the provision of day care facilities in South Australia. But, even so, I believe that more could have, and should have, been done in this area during those years.

As for the current State Government, it appears to have about as much commitment to the provision of child care facilities as the Federal Government has. It certainly has not made any verbal commitment to it. I keep remembering Mr. Tonkin's words on the eve of the State election last year when he assured us that the Fraser Government's policies were his policies. Funds allocated in this Budget to the Childhood Services Council are about the same in real terms as those allocated last year. It is not yet clear how much of that will go to day care centres but my guess would be that very little will go to day care.

In fact, I think one might be forgiven for believing that the State and Federal Governments have no intention of increasing funding for child care, because they are afraid that this might encourage mothers (who are usually responsible for child rearing) to leave their homes and seek work. And, of course, that would be very embarrassing, because there are no jobs, and those women would merely increase the unemployment statistics.

In conclusion, I want to say that this question of child care is a very complex issue, as I have discovered during the last few months as I have tried to unravel some of its complexities. Since 1966, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of married women who have re-entered the work force. As a result, there has been a rapid expansion in the need for child care services. Governments at the State and Federal levels have been much too slow to respond to this change in our society.

As I said earlier, the Whitlam Government made an extremely promising beginning. Reports and surveys were commissioned to establish an information base on which to work. Organisations and authorities were established to advise the Government on need and to allocate funds. The same sorts of organisations emerged in some States, too. In South Australia, for example, at least three Government departments have some responsibility for child care arrangements, as well as the Childhood Services Council and the Kindergarten Union, not to mention private organisations. However, because Federal Government involvement in providing child care services in this country is a relatively new concept, some serious organisational and administrative problems have emerged as procedures have been established during the past few years.

There has been a duplication of effort and competition among the various groups responsible for the provision of

childhood services, and there has been inadequate information about the need and demand for services. There has also been insufficient information about the type of day care parents want for their children. In the early 1970's, the emphasis was on funding large-scale child care centres which were also very costly. In some areas it has been discovered subsequently that this type of care does not suit people's needs.

As a result, more recently emphasis has moved to funding smaller scale house-based accommodation which is sometimes more suitable and certainly less expensive to establish. Greater effort has been made to provide flexible hours of care, vacation care, out of school hours care, and occasional care. After all, it is not only parents in the work force who wish to use child care facilities.

Another problem with the procedures involved with the current system of funding is that community groups themselves must make a case for funding. This clearly favours those people with education and skills in writing submissions over those who do not possess such skills. And very often it is the people who do not know how to apply for child care services who need them most.

**The Hon. J. C. Burdett:** Have you any opinion about the relevance of the role of the Childhood Services Council in this matter?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I think it is relevant, and I think there needs to be some body which takes an overview of childhood services in South Australia and which can keep some track of where the needs are and where they are likely to arise in the future. That is in order that some long-term planning can take place. I think, probably, that since the Childhood Services Council exists it is already established as a reasonable body to undertake that task. As I was saying, the people who most need child care facilities are the ones who do not have the skills to make submissions in order that funding can be made available.

In short, the whole question of child care has become quite confused. It was for this reason that the previous State Government proposed to set up an inquiry into early childhood services which would have looked specifically at the roles of all the agencies in South Australia currently involved with child care services.

However, soon after the new Government took office in September last year, the Minister of Education advised Parliament, in answer to a question, that he did not intend to proceed with this inquiry. Instead the Government has established the Keeves Inquiry into education as a whole; that is, childhood services right through to secondary and further education.

Mr. President, that is an enormous brief, so large, in fact, that the committee's inquiry into childhood services cannot possibly be as detailed or as thorough as the previous Government's proposal would have been. Because of the complexities in this area and the problems I have outlined, a detailed and thorough examination is exactly what is needed in order to establish a system that is as simple and as easy as possible to manage.

In conclusion, I appeal to the Government to look at the question of child care very seriously. I recommend to the Premier that at least in this policy area he ought to depart from Malcolm Fraser's policies, use his own initiative, and do something worth while. The future well-being of thousands of South Australian children depends on it.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I support the motion and the principle established for the first time by the Tonkin Liberal Government of having Budget Estimates Committees, which have provided four times the amount of time for debating the Budget papers than has been available

previously. It is interesting to note in *Hansard* that Opposition members of the other place who were members of the Committees seem to have devoted much time in debating matters not connected with the lines. Whilst there would be uncertainty in the early stages of the Estimates Committees, it seems disappointing that, in the time provided, little questioning of Ministers took place.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** They didn't answer all the questions.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** That suggests that the Leader did not read *Hansard*, because it was clear from the attendance of Ministers and the barrage of advisers that they had that they did attempt to answer. The second volume of the *Hansard* report of the proceedings of the Committees shows that answers that were not available at the time were given later.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** One Minister was asked about a proposal in the morning and he said he did not know. In the *News* that day, there was a press release about the proposal.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** If the Opposition wishes to use Estimates Committees for other than what they are intended for, that is the Opposition's business. I am inclined to agree with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that there is merit in members of the Legislative Council being members of Estimates Committees in future.

It is pertinent to note that the Labor Party has discovered the joys of open government only after discovering the slings and arrows of being in Opposition. Estimates Committees are just one aspect of the Liberal Government's policy of open government. I am pleased that the Labor Party is not averse to that principle, it having had a decade in which to introduce a similar proposal that would give not only Parliament but also the public a greater knowledge of what was happening with revenue and expenditure in South Australia.

I should like to draw a distinction between the two Parties in their approach to the Budget. The Liberal Party is moving to introduce planned programme budgeting and has emphasised the need to examine the effectiveness of spending, and the Labor Party is preoccupied with how much is spent. The Liberal Party, through introducing planned programme budgeting and Budget Estimates Committees, is providing the Parliament with an opportunity to know what the Government is trying to perform, the costing involved, and how well the job is being done. Budget Estimates Committees provide for the initial scrutiny of the revenue and expenditure plans for the year.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Do you agree with our proposal to set up a committee to inquire into how the Committees worked?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I do not think there is need to set up a committee. I think that normal dialogue between the two Parties will achieve the same thing. It seems that the Labor Party, when in Opposition, will set up a committee into anything that moves.

One of the problems of Government budgeting that is highlighted in the line budgeting system is the tendency for departments to inflate their requests. That is something that will not be solved easily, no matter what system is adopted, but the present system gives a better opportunity for reviewing what has been done. Another problem with Government budgeting of which I think everyone is aware is unspent allocations. Government departments and statutory bodies have unspent funds towards the end of the year. They are reluctant to disclose that they have excess allocations, and they spend the money at the end of the year. I remember my days at an academic institution where that procedure occurred. That procedure was used

to ill effect, in that equipment was purchased that was not to the benefit of the institution or the department.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Was that at the University of Adelaide?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** No. I am sure that that policy has to be faced and, if departments and statutory bodies can be encouraged by the closer liaison that has been introduced by the Government, this problem of spending what seem to be excessive allocations in the fear that allocations will be cut back in the following year will be overcome.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** What is your solution?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I suggest planned programme budgeting, which I understand has been introduced in four departments. That will enable closer scrutiny of individual programmes so that at the end of the year the Government will have a far better appreciation of the worth of programmes and, hopefully, a better idea of what should be allocated in the year ahead.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** That won't solve the problem of getting funds and using them up at the end of the year.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** There is no panacea for Government budgeting, but this Government is doing something about the matter.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** We set up a Public Accounts Committee.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Well, the Labor Party set up a Public Accounts Committee. Its effectiveness in the last decade is something that I have seriously questioned. It is noted that the most significant report of the Public Accounts Committee since its inception in 1972 or 1973 was in fact produced under a Liberal Government with Liberal members comprising the majority of the committee.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** When was that?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** That was fairly recently.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Didn't you think the hospital report was very good?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** It was a start but it was slow in coming. After the success of the first Tonkin Budget, the 1981 Budget has been prepared for the first time completely by a Liberal Government. In it is enshrined the reality that, as at September 1979, South Australia had the slowest population growth, a very narrow manufacturing base with the slowest rate of development and a high level of unemployment. They are legacies of the Dunstan decade. They are not statistics that are going to be easily turned around, and the Hon. Mr. Sumner well knows that. So, the Dunstan decade was long on culture—and for that it is to be commended—but it was short on financial common sense. It has left South Australia with a legacy of economic problems.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Is that all the Dunstan Government's fault?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Very largely it is the Dunstan Government's fault. There are geographical and other reasons, but I certainly strongly subscribe to the view that the Dunstan Government did nothing to promote industry and encourage growth in South Australia.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** It will be the Tonkin Government's fault in 3½ years time when we have not got the jobs.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I am making the speech and the Hon. Mr. Sumner can listen. It is interesting to see that the Government encourages employment, particularly in skilled areas. In the Estimates Committees, questions were answered, contrary to what the Hon. Mr. Sumner said. On pages 6 and 7 of Estimates Committee A, the Minister of Industrial Affairs discussed the lack of

manpower planning under the previous Government. On page 6 he stated:

For the years 1977, 1978, 1979, there was about a 27 per cent reduction in the number of new apprentices taken on within South Australia. For the last three or four years, everyone has been forecasting a critical shortage of skilled tradesmen throughout Australia, particularly because of resource development programmes, but little action was taken.

On page 7 he stated:

I am delighted to say that in the first seven months of this year I think there was an 18 per cent increase in the number of apprentices taken on, compared with the first seven months of last year, and the biggest area of increase was in the metal trades, which has the biggest area of shortage.

Since then the Government has announced a proposal with the Master Builder's Association where a group apprenticeship scheme has been established. So, this Government is doing something positive to encourage skilled employment to cover some of the gaps that are existing.

That is emphasised in today's *News* where the large South Australian based engineering group of T. O'Connor Holdings and Sons is reported as trying to attract 80 employees from overseas because it cannot fill vacancies with local skilled labour. We have the sad situation of the Dunstan Government which, although allegedly the Government for the workers and caring for the people, during the last three years of the past decade presided over a fall in apprenticeship training involving the very trades and skills where we now find ourselves with a shortage.

Mr. George Polites, who is the Executive Director of the National Employers Federation, has also emphasised the need for the Australian education system to keep pace with technological change. Mr. Polites, at a seminar in Canberra recently on educational training on technological change, emphasised the nexus between secondary education and the job market and believed that a lot more could be done. Mr. Polites stated:

The failure to prepare youth for careers at levels below those served by the universities and colleges of advanced education constitutes a significant gap in the structure of Australia's secondary education system.

He went on to say:

Much of the instruction that young people receive at school bears no real relationship to the demands which will be made on them when they eventually enter the labour force.

So, one of the dilemmas and paradoxes of the 1980's is that, whilst there are severe levels of unemployment which no Government, whatever its political colour, would condone, we have this real problem of a shortage of skilled labour which has been allowed to occur because there has not been adequate manpower planning. I know that this Government in South Australia is very much aware of the problem.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Is Mr. Fraser in favour of manpower planning?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I am sure that Mr. Fraser is in favour of manpower planning, and I think Saturday's results indicate that he is better equipped to preside over Australia, which includes facing up to technological change, than is the Labor Party.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** But he got a minority of the votes—how do you work that out?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** The Hon. Mr. Blevins is trying to distract me. I am easily distracted when he puts up a facile argument like that. If he wants to peddle facts, I suggest that, when we look at the two-Party preferred vote last Saturday in the Federal election, throughout Australia

he will find that the Liberal and Country Party Coalition outpulled the Labor Party. If Mr. Blevins wants to take a wager on that on the side, I will be happy to see him afterwards.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** That's an improper suggestion. Do you think this is the front bar of your local hotel?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Mr. Blevins puts up a proposal and then ducks for cover, which is not unusual from the Labor Party benches. Mr. Blevins need only look at the Senate figures for South Australia to see who did better as between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. He may like to look at that and ask a question later. If he is unable to interpret the figures, I am sure that one of the Ministers will be pleased to help him.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** The Coalition Government had a minority of the votes in the Senate in this State. Even if the facts are unpleasant, we have to face them.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Much has been said about the potential of South Australia's mineral development. I want to make clear that I support mineral development but not at any price. There does have to be a balance between development (whether we are talking about mining, oil or gas) and the environment. There has to be a consideration of all factors, and this Government accepts that. The real benefits of mineral development in the Roxby Downs area and other such areas will not necessarily be on those sites. One has to look at the multiplier effect that mining has. My personal view is that the real benefit that will accrue to South Australia from the mining boom here and in other parts of Australia is the opportunity that it provides this State to broaden its manufacturing base.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** It'll destroy the State's manufacturing base. This State, more than any other State, will be adversely affected by the mining boom.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** It depends on how the unions react.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I am glad to see that the Labor Party has come to life after last Saturday. It has taken a while, but it has finally happened.

Obviously, members opposite have not read the Myers Committee report, which makes quite clear that a strong gearing factor, ranging between 1.38 and 3.73 jobs per worker on site, attaches to mining developments. This relates to ancillary industries and to engineering equipment.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** How many shares have you got in W.M.C.?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I have none.

**The Hon. J. E. Dunford:** Have you got any shares in any mining company at all?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I have no shares in any mining company. Roxby Downs will be a great benefit when eventually it comes to starting point in 1986 or 1987, given that it is said to contain as much as several Mount Isa mines, and it will provide South Australia with an opportunity to establish infrastructure industries. I emphasise that South Australia must look beyond its State boundaries, not only to the potential of Roxby Downs and the other areas for development that exist in South Australia but also to the other States and overseas. We cannot be introverted or parochial in our approach.

One of our problems (and this has largely been a condition of the last decade) is that we have come to accept that we are a second-rate State. That should be far from the truth, because South Australia was established by people who were entrepreneurs, and that entrepreneurial

spirit is to be encouraged at all costs by this Government. It can be South Australia's salvation.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** At all costs?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** The Labor Party believes that Governments know best, and the Liberal Party believes that the people know best. This was demonstrated only last Saturday. The Government has a role to provide encouragement, to provide an economic climate, and to provide people with a confidence in the community in which they live. This Budget does just that, by seeking to prune unnecessary Government expenditure, as we have done by abolishing gift and stamp duties and by minimising taxation. It is important that the people realise that they, too, have a role to play, and that Governments cannot do it all, as the Labor Party would have them believe.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Why do you keep saying something as stupid as that?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** What is stupid about it?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The honourable Leader should cease interjecting.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I agree, Sir, that the Hon. Mr. Sumner is a bad interjector. South Australia needs entrepreneurs. Indeed, it was formed by entrepreneurs and its frontiers were rolled back by entrepreneurs. The people who are doing well in South Australia are those with an entrepreneurial spirit. I refer, for example, to Simpson Pope, John Shearers, and Seppelts and Son.

It ill behoves the Opposition members to call B.H.P. the dirty big Australian. That is typical of their attitude. There seems to be this terrible ambivalence in the Labor Party. On the one hand, Opposition members say that there has been a \$16 a week reduction in Australians' living standards (this was stated in their slogans during the Federal election campaign), yet on the other hand they knock any form of economic growth. Labor members do not seem to realise that there is in the equation a relationship between economic growth and living standards. They will knock anything.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Where did we say in our policy that we would knock economic growth?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Let us look at one example. It is a bit tiring for one to have to mention this again and to beat Opposition members around the ears with this example, which was resurrected in the Federal election campaign. I refer to the issue of mining development. We had the Federal Labor Leader, Mr. Hayden, saying that he had no doubt that uranium mining would proceed shortly because there were only some "small technical problems". He said that it would be only a short time span before mining would proceed under a Federal Labor Government.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** Where did he say that?

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** He said it in all the daily papers and on television.

**The Hon. Frank Blevins:** He didn't say that.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** Mr. Cliff Dolan, the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, would not have anyone believe that. Now, we come to the tremendously two-faced attitude of the Leader of the Opposition closer to home. Mr. Bannon, the Leader of the Opposition in another place, said on 4 June 1980 that he was opposed to Roxby Downs and would stop the project.

**The Hon. N. K. FOSTER:** I rise on a point of order, and ask you, Sir, whether I would be able, if I participated in this debate next week, to canvass matters in a manner similar to the way in which the Hon. Mr. Davis has done. Statements on uranium have been made by the Deputy Leader of the Government in London and Canada.

**The PRESIDENT:** We will have to play it by ear. If what



the honourable member says at the time is contrary to Standing Orders, or in any way offends, I will perhaps have to deal with it. Otherwise, I can see no reason why the honourable member should not state what he wants to state. However, I could not give the honourable member a blanket ruling now.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** I would like to reassure the Hon. Mr. Foster that I am quoting strictly from *Hansard*, and I will give the page numbers for his own reference.

*The Hon. C. J. Sumner interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** The reference is 4 June 1980, page 2275 of *Hansard*.

**The Hon. C. J. Sumner:** Read it out.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** It has been read before to this Council, but if the Leader wants me to read it again I will do so.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Interjections are out of order and, in any case, they are getting tiresome.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** The *Hansard* report is as follows:

**Mr. GUNN:** And you do not support the mining and export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

**Mr. Bannon:** No.

**Mr. GUNN:** As the Premier, you would stop that project?

**Mr. Bannon:** I am opposed to it.

Honourable members should contrast the attitude of Mr. Bannon, which I have quoted directly from *Hansard* of 4 June with the statement on page 74 of the *Hansard* report of Estimates Committee B of 30 September, by the Deputy Premier (Hon. Mr. Goldsworthy) in another place. The report states:

... the Liberal Government would encourage the development of Roxby Downs, which is precisely what the Government is doing.

**Mr. BANNON:** It has done nothing that we had not proposed.

Clearly, Mr. Bannon is saying there that "we go along with that". So Mr. Bannon's position in respect to Roxby Downs is rather curious in the sense that he suggests that it is quite all right to go along with the exploration of the minerals. That was made clear when the Labor Government was in office last year, but when it comes to mining, "perhaps we may not agree." I should like to draw an analogy which may be closer to home for Mr. Bannon. It may be a point that he can appreciate a little more clearly. It is a bit like inviting Mr. Bannon, whose prowess as a runner perhaps outstrips his prowess as a politician—

**The Hon. N. K. Foster:** Careful—I can be personal towards you, too.

**The Hon. L. H. DAVIS:** You often are, so that is no shock. It is a bit like saying to Mr. Bannon that he should train for a marathon race to be held in three months, with Mr. Bannon undertaking training only to find that when he gets to the start he is not allowed to enter the race. Just as he would not be happy about that proposition, neither are companies like B.P. or Western Mining happy with the very erratic attitude of the Labor Party towards what is a serious matter.

In that respect economic development in South Australia can be jeopardised at the whim of a Labor Government. Of course, the Labor Party now finds itself out of Government. I suspect in one way that it is sad that it was not allowed to remain in Government, if only to support Roxby Downs. I see that the opposition of the Labor Party to Roxby Downs has developed only since it has gone into Opposition. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5:45 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 28 October at 2.15 p.m.