HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 November 1978

The SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Nos. 711, 723, 757, 786, 789, 802, 804, 812, 814, 820-4, 832, 837, 840, 841, 844, 846, 852, 858, 860, 861, 865, 866, 870, 876, 879, 880, 882-7, 889, 892, 893, 895, 897, 898, 900, 902-7, 910, 923, 925, 927, 928, 932-4, 941 and 944.

FROZEN FOOD

711. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. How much frozen food, and at what cost, was lost as a result of refrigeration failure at the Royal Adelaide Hospital recently?

2. How did the failure occur and was the fault rectified immediately and, if not, what was the reason for the delay?

3. What auxiliary or other provisions are available in case of electrical or mechanical failure?

4. What similar failures have occurred at other hospitals recently?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. 574 cartons, valued at $19 793.

2. Failure was probably caused by control switches being wrongly positioned. Extensive inquiries have failed to establish when this occurred or whether it was an accidental or deliberate act. Two refrigeration units were made operational eight to nine hours after the fault was reported. The third unit was out of action for two days. The main reason for the delay was that the contractor who is responsible for maintenance took 5½ hours to send a serviceman to attend to the fault.

3. Mechanical Breakdown—Three refrigerating units have been provided. One unit is adequate for normal operation though two are run to share the load. A standby unit is always available.

Electrical Breakdown—The electrical power circuit for the freezer is a separate circuit. In the event of a power failure, a portable generator or power from other live circuits can be used to supply power to the freezer at the main isolating switch.

4. None

LAND COMMISSION

723. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many blocks of land sold by the Land Commission have had to be repurchased by the commission because purchasers were unable to meet requirements?

2. What was the total amount involved in repurchases?

3. Have any blocks sold had to be repossessed due to failure to meet financial repayments and, if so, how many and what was the total amount involved in repurchasing these blocks?

4. What assistance is now given to young people in purchasing building blocks within their financial capacity?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. 25 blocks.

2. The total amount involved in the repurchase of these 25 allotments is $204 870.

3. The Commission has not had to repossess any allotments from private individuals due to their failure to meet financial payments. In one instance, the commission agreed to accept an offer to repurchase an allotment from a purchaser who indicated that he would be unable to keep up payments after his wife stopped work. The amount involved was $6 400.

4. The commission has negotiated a land purchase scheme through the State Government Insurance Commission whereby first mortgage loans for up to 90 per cent of purchase price are made available for terms of up to seven years, with an interest rate of 12 per cent.

Similar arrangements are available through two private financial institutions, where the interest rate is geared to the maximum bank overdraft rate. The availability of subsequent housing finance is an important associated feature.

In addition, the commission now provides a wide choice of reasonably priced land in a large number of locations in Metropolitan Adelaide. The commission has also extended the building time requirement to seven years.

These combined conditions enable people to select a building allotment consistent with their financial capacity, to accumulate equity according to their means and to qualify for suitable housing finance within a reasonable time.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

757. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. When did the Premier make representations to the Federal Minister for Transport to upgrade facilities at Adelaide Airport to international standards?

2. What were the reasons for such a request?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. As far back as 1972 approaches have been made to the Commonwealth Minister for Transport by the South Australian Government to upgrade the Adelaide Airport to provide best facilities for the purpose of attracting more tourists to South Australia and promoting Adelaide as an international destination. This is also in keeping with the Government's policy of providing the best facilities for passengers whether they be intrastate, interstate or overseas. However, as examination of the problems of providing an international airport were progressively examined, it became the policy of the South Australian Government that the Adelaide Airport should not be developed as an international airport.

2. See 1.

ANIMALS

786. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many persons have been prosecuted for ill-treating animals in the past 12 months and how does this figure compare with the previous 12 months?

2. Have there been any reports in the past two years for ill-treating horses, particularly quarter horses, during "breaking in" and, if so, how many cases and what was the outcome of the reports?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows: There are two authorities in this State which undertake prosecution in terms of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act—the South Australian Police and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The year for the purposes of police statistics ends on 30 June and

differs from that adopted by the R.S.P.C.A., which ends on 30 April each year. The figures are therefore not capable of aggregation and are presented individually.

1. S.A. Police Department	1976-77	1977-78
Breaches of Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act	9	10
Breaches of Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Unlawfully kill or wound animal)	7	3
R.S.P.C.A.	1977-78	1978-79
Prosecution in terms of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act	5	7

The R.S.P.C.A. figures for 1978-79 are not for a complete 12-month period. For the 10-year period 1968-1978, the average number of cases prosecuted each year is nine, but there is no discernible pattern from which any conclusions can be drawn, and totals can vary markedly for each year.

2. S.A. Police Department—It is known that a number of offences have been reported to police in respect of the killing, wounding or maiming of animals left unattended in paddocks, etc. However, it is not possible from the records available to identify if there were any incidents relating specifically to the ill-treatment of horses during "breaking in".

R.S.P.C.A.—There have been four reports of alleged mistreatment of horses whilst being broken in over the past two years:

(1) August 1977—Investigation showed no factual evidence to substantiate the allegations.

(2) November 1977—A horsebreaker was charged and convicted of an offence. Notice has been received of the intention to appeal against the conviction.

(3) November 1977—There was no evidence of injury or distress on the part of the horse to which the allegation referred.

(4) January 1978—Investigation showed no factual evidence to substantiate the allegation.

In the case of breaking horses, a certain amount of physical restraint is required, and that which is acceptably humane in the eyes of the experienced horseman or woman may be regarded as excessive by the casual observer. There is, however, a line between the imposition of necessary restraint and an act of unnecessary brutality. In the case of unnecessary brutality being used, the R.S.P.C.A. will always prosecute providing that there is sufficient evidence procurable to establish a *prima facie* case.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

789. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What now is the total cost to the State in investigations and feasibility study reports, etc., into the Redcliff petro-chemical plant?

2. What is the estimated expenditure on the project for this financial year?

3. What is the current value of the Redcliff land held by the Government and how does this compare with the purchase price?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The situation with regard to costs is basically the same as was outlined in broad terms in previous answers to similar questions from the House (e.g. Mr. Venning, October 1976). A total of 2 895 hectares of land was acquired by the Government. The total cost of this land, including fencing, to date has been approximately $130 000.

From November 1973 until August 1975 the Director of the development division was acting as Chief Project Officer for the Redcliff petro-chemical project. About 40 per cent of his time would have been taken up with such duties. A Senior Project Officer of the development division was working nearly full-time on this project during that period. In addition, officers of several Government departments were, in the normal course of their duties, engaged in negotiations and preparation of various reports, surveys and documents.

During the financial year 1977-78, expenditure on the Redcliff project was $12 197. In addition, a Senior Project Officer from the Department of Economic Development and officers from the Treasury and the Department of Mines and Energy worked on this project on a part-time basis, mainly on the preparation of reports and cost estimates to the Commonwealth Government.

Obviously, the costs of the project cannot be extracted readily from the records of the various departments concerned without a great deal of unnecessary and wasteful effort. This is mainly so because the Government in the past has made use of existing resources within departments rather than hiring new staff specifically for the Redcliff project.

2. The initial budget was $12 000. It is now being revised.

3. It is estimated that the current value of the Redcliff land held by the Government is slightly higher than the purchase price when final settlement is made. The value of rural land has been rising slightly in the area over the last few years as recent broad acre sales indicate.

COMPUTERS

802. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What is the estimated cost of the computing requirements investigation?

2. What is the estimated cost of the printing of its report?

3. How many pages are there in such report?

4. How many copies of the report have been printed?

5. To whom have such copies been made available and at what price?

6. To what use, if any, is the report being put?

7. Has the committee of inquiry into the Flinders Medical Centre Computing System been requested to cover any (and, if so, which) of the terms of reference of the computing requirements investigations, and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. $118 000.

2. $2 170.

3. Three volumes comprising 722 pages.

4. 94.

5. Thirty copies of all three volumes have been provided to various members of the Public Service and to the committee of inquiry into the Flinders Medical Centre Computing System at no charge. Copies of Volumes 2 and 3 (Appendices) only have been provided to officers in charge of departmental A.D.P. sections and to Directors-General of departments without A.D.P. sections.

6. The Appendices (Volumes 2 and 3) were issued so that departments could use the information for their departmental planning. Volume 1 was issued chiefly for consideration by senior management in those departments possessing their own A.D.P. sections, seeking confidential comments before submitting the material formally to the committee of inquiry.

7. The committee of inquiry into the Flinders Medical Centre Computing System primarily relates to assessing past decisions, specifically in connection with the Flinders Medical Centre.

The terms of reference of the computing requirements investigation deal mainly with the future needs of the Public Service.

The last of the five terms of reference of the committee of inquiry into the Flinders Medical Centre Computing System, i.e. "subsequently to inquire into arrangements for the selection, development and implementation of computer systems in other Government departments and report to the Premier on any inadequacies identified," does inter-relate with the work of the computer requirements investigation.

The Flinders Medical Centre Committee of Inquiry comprises experts in the field of computing and management, all from outside the Public Service.

In view of the fact that future computer systems and hardware investment in the Public Service is likely to cost tens of millions of dollars, we are taking every opportunity to ensure that these proposals are soundly developed.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

804. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What is now the policy of the Government with regard to the Adelaide Airport becoming an international airport?

2. What are the reasons for such policy?

3. What action, if any, has the Government taken to put such policy into effect?

4. Is it the view of the Government that an international airport at Adelaide would improve the tourist trade of the State and what are the reasons for such view?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Government policy is that the airport will not be permitted to extend beyond its existing boundaries nor will the curfew hours be relaxed.

2. To ensure that the nuisance caused by the location of the airport will not be increased.

3. The Federal Minister is aware of Government policy.

4. An international airport at Adelaide would be advantageous to the tourist trade in South Australia. An inter-Government committee of Commonwealth and State officers has been examining sites for an international airport in Adelaide and its report will be released shortly.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS

812. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. How many of the 3 414 juveniles appearing in the juvenile courts in 1977-78 were—

(*a*) first offenders;
(*b*) second offenders;
(*c*) third offenders; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders?

2. How many of the approximately 4 000 juveniles, as shown on page 8 of the seventh annual report on the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act, who appeared before the juvenile aid panels were—

(*a*) first offenders;
(*b*) second offenders;
(*c*) third offenders; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders?

3. How many of the 146 juveniles appearing before the juvenile courts on charges relating to sex offences in 1977-78 were—

(*a*) first offenders;
(*b*) second offenders;
(*c*) third offenders; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders?

4. How many of the 185 juveniles appearing before the juvenile courts on charges of serious crimes of violence in 1977-78 were—

(*a*) first offenders;
(*b*) second offenders;
(*c*) third offenders; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders?

5. How many of the 22 juvenile offenders convicted of rape in 1977-78 were—

(*a*) first offenders;
(*b*) second offenders;
(*c*) third offenders; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders?

6. How many of the 22 juvenile offenders convicted of rape in 1977-78 had had previous convictions for any other sexual offences, other than rape, and how many of these were—

(*a*) first offenders on that conviction;
(*b*) second offenders on that conviction;
(*c*) third offenders on that conviction; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders on that conviction?

7. How many of the 22 juvenile offenders convicted of rape in 1977-78 had had previous convictions for crimes of violence and how many were—

(*a*) first offenders on that conviction;
(*b*) second offenders on that conviction;
(*c*) third offenders on that conviction; or
(*d*) fourth or subsequent offenders on that conviction?

8. How many of the 22 juvenile offenders convicted of rape in 1977-78 had had previous convictions for rape and—

(*a*) how many had one previous conviction; and
(*b*) how many had two or more previous convictions?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. (*a*) 2 365.

2. (*a*) In 1977-78, 3 031 individual children appeared before Juvenile Aid Panels of whom 2 539 were first offenders.

The remainder of the information sought in the question is not readily available. Numbers quoted in several parts of the question are numbers of offences and not numbers of individual children as appears to have been intended. Therefore, it is not clear what information is actually sought. The estimated cost to supply the remaining answers if the question was clarified is $300 and this expenditure could not be justified.

POLICE INQUIRIES

814. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Were police inquiries conducted by senior officers and local residents interviewed following a meeting addressed by Dr. Nies, a member of the Royal Commission Into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs and, if so, which police officers made the inquiries, what was the reason for such inquiries, and what where the findings?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: During the evening of 17 August 1978, Dr. Nies, a member of the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, addressed a public meeting at the Streaky Bay Area School. It was subsequently reported to the Commissioner of Police that, both during and outside the meeting, Dr. Nies had made comments implying the Royal Commission had evidence that some members of the Police Force were involved in corrupt practices in relation to the illegal drug traffic. Because of the seriousness of these imputations, the Deputy Commissioner of Police visited Streaky Bay on

31 August. He there interviewed a number of local residents who had attended the meeting and obtained statements of their recollection of what Dr. Nies had said in reference to alleged police corruption. A report of the investigation was subsequently forwarded to the Chairman of the Royal Commission inviting comment. The Chairman later advised to the effect that no specific allegations of police corruption had been made to the commission, and further that Dr. Neis had denied suggesting the police had acted corruptly; accordingly, any comments he had made on the topic had been misinterpreted.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

820. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What action, if any, has been taken, or is to be taken, to make the role and activities of the State Emergency Service known to the public?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: State headquarters of the State Emergency Service institutes a State-wide emergency service promotional and information programme for the purpose of promoting the role of the service and stimulating recruitment. The prime aim of the programme is to bring to public notice the role of the service in the community and the services it seeks to provide. It is directed at local government with which units are affiliated, volunteer groups having a capability to carry out a State Emergency Service function and members of the public generally. Publicity material is currently being prepared to reinforce the publicity campaign. The target for additional State Emergency Service units at local government level for the current financial year is four and indications are that this number will be exceeded. Formal personal contact has been made with the following councils: Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Kingscote, Kapunda and Coonalpyn. All have indicated a desire for a State Emergency Service organisation to be set up within their council districts. Public meetings have been held at Kingscote and Port Lincoln. A meeting with a planning committee appointed by the council has been held at Mount Gambier. In addition to the above, State headquarters' personnel will attend at Coober Pedy and Leigh Creek on 6 and 7 December 1978 for the purpose of discussing the formation of State Emergency Service units in those towns. In all cases, it is customary to call public meetings for the purpose of outlining the role of the State Emergency Service and informing the public of its activities and promoting recruitment.

821. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What emergency services operate in South Australia?

2. What action, if any, has been taken to ensure that members of these services exercise together?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Emergency Service is the only service named as such operating in South Australia. It consists of organisations established at local government level on a voluntary basis and administered by a State headquarters. The local organisation operates under a local controller appointed by the local authority.

2. At a meeting of Local State Emergency Service controllers held at Adelaide on 4 October 1978 local controllers were advised that State headquarters would be conducting exercises involving local organisations during 1979 as part of its training programme. The aim of the exercises would be to give practice to State headquarters and local controllers in co-ordination and to develop State Emergency Service skills. Planning has commenced on the preparation of the first exercise. It is anticipated it will be held during the first quarter of 1979. Competitions involving members of the various organisations of the State Emergency Service were held at Port Augusta during October 1978.

However, it is relevant to point out that the functions of the State Emergency Service do not incorporate the day-to-day emergency services traditionally performed by police, ambulance, fire and other similar agencies.

822. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has been taken to give members of the State Emergency Service operational experience?

2. What action, if any, is proposed in the future to give members of the State Emergency Service such experience?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Emergency Service is a voluntary organisation formed at local government level for the purpose of providing support to statutory authorities or, alternatively, in the absence of a statutory authority, providing organised community response in emergency situations. On a day-to-day basis the operational experience obtained by State Emergency Service personnel is subject to the frequency of occurrences of the kind for which it can provide a combatting service. The Police Department, through the Operations Room, as the authority responsible for co-ordinating emergency action is aware of the role of the State Emergency Service, the services it can provide and the nature of the equipment it has at its disposal. All police divisional commanders are expected to advert to the State Emergency Service when considering their requirements for resources and to the services it can provide.

2. The problem of involvement of the State Emergency Service and its requirement for operational experience is a recurring one. It is a voluntary organisation formed for the purpose of providing support to statutory authorities or filling the hiatus created by the absense of an appropriate authority. It is unrealistic to call for the services of a volunteer when there is a paid professional available to carry out the task. The present promotion and information programme is directed at educating the authorities and the public generally on the role of the State Emergency Service, the skills and services it can provide and the equipment it has at its disposal in the expectation that it will stimulate interest in involving the Service more in emergency situations and thereby provide the operational experience sought. State headquarters will be conducting exercises involving local organisations during 1979 as part of its training programme. Planning has commenced on the preparation of the first exercise. It is anticipated it will be held during the first quarter of 1979. Competitions involving members of the various organisations of the State Emergency Service were held at Port Augusta during October 1978.

STATE DISASTER PLAN

823. **Mr. MILLHOUSE:** (on notice):

1. What is the State Disaster Plan?

2. Has the plan been completely worked out and, if so, when was it finished and, if not, why not, and when is it expected to be finished?

3. To whom may its contents be communicated?

4. Was there an exercise in September 1977 based on the plan and, if so, was it considered a success and, if not, why not?

5. Has the plan been tested since September 1977 and, if so, with what result and, if not, when will it be tested?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. A plan to provide for the mobilisation and co-ordination of State resources to deal with a State disaster.

2. Yes. the plan was completed in July 1978 but may need further refinement as a result of legislation yet to be introduced.

3. The contents of the plan have been communicated to all participating organisations concerned with its implementation. As soon as legislation has been finalised it will be available for interested persons. It is intended that information pamphlets on the plan will be available for interested members of the public at a later date.

4. Yes. "Exercise Shake-up" took place on 22 September 1977 to test the manning and allocation of duties in the Emergency Operations Centre and to test and assess the effectiveness of emergency communications between various Government and semi-government authorities. The exercise was considered a success.

5. No. No further testing of the total plan is contemplated at this stage. However, various participating organisations have conducted tests of their own procedures in an effort to highlight defects and to overcome difficulties. These tests will continue.

NURSE ASSAULT

824. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): Was a nurse assaulted at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Sunday 29 October 1978 and, if so—

(a) was the nurse a male nurse;
(b) was the assault on the 4th level of the East Wing or where did it take place;
(c) was the assault at about 11 p.m. or when;
(d) what injuries, if any, did the nurse suffer;
(e) who committed the assault;
(f) what action, if any, has been taken against the assailant;
(g) what security measures are taken at the hospital to prevent such occurrences;
(h) what action, to improve security, if any, is to be taken as a result of this assault?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: A male nurse with slight bruising to his head was found lying on the floor of a room on the fourth level of the east wing at approximately 11 p.m. Sunday 29 October 1978. This matter was investigated by the police; however, inquiries indicated that there was no evidence to show whether it was an assault or some form of accident.

(a) See above.
(b) See above.
(c) See above.
(d) See above.
(e) See above.
(f) See above.
(g) Security patrols are carried out by hospital staff several times each night.
(h) The Police Commissioner will be asked to advise on any additional security measures which can be taken.

PRISONERS

832. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Is the Government satisfied with the standard of discipline amongst prisoners in gaol and, if not, what action, if any, is it proposed to take?

2. What action, if any, is it proposed to take as a result of the protests of prison officers, expressed in the first days of this month, at the low standard of discipline amongst prisoners in gaol?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The standard of discipline amongst prisoners is believed to be satisfactory.

2. Since the protests by officers, there have been a number of meetings in an attempt to clarify the problem and determine ways to solve it. It is not an easy matter to ascertain the reasons for the statements which have been made, and there can be many interpretations of exactly what discipline is. It is certain that present day discipline is different from that of, say, 10 years ago. There is less marching and formal movement, the meal parades are different with the advent of cafeteria type service and communal messing instead of all meals in a cell. The general atmosphere is more relaxed with the emphasis on voluntary rather than forced discipline.

The advantages of this type of training were shown during the few days of the recent incident when, in spite of the fact that no general duty staff reported, the prison processes continued with the exception of the workshops. The type of discipline the Correctional Services Department is attempting to develop is extensively discussed during officer training courses and in general officers express themselves as preferring to be part of this type of development rather than simply punitive. So far as staff is concerned, part of the problem seems to be the fact that prisoners have greater ability to complain about the system, particularly since the advent of the Ombudsman. However, the procedures have been explained in detail and in fact the Ombudsman has addressed the officers on his role and responsibilities.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

837. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. How many personnel are employed in the Police in the following sections—

(a) drugs;
(b) vice;
(c) crime;
(d) traffic; and
(e) personnel?

2. How many motor vehicles are allotted to each section?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* 19
(b) 15
(c) 356
(d) 327
(e) 15

In addition, some 30 civilians are employed to provide clerical and typing support for the operation of these units.

2. *(a)* 4
(b) 1
(c) 64
(d) 30 motor vehicles and 196 motor cycles.
(e) 1

These are the specific allocations to the various units; however, vehicles held in pool situations are also available to these units in the event of emergency.

HORSES

840. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice): Has the Government received proposals to amend Henley and Grange Council by-laws banning horses from the beach at West Beach and, if so—

(a) when;

(*b*) what action is being taken; and
(*c*) what was the reason for delay?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:
(*a*) Yes.
(*b*) They are being considered.
(*c*) There is no delay.

WEST LAKES BUSES

841. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):
1. Why do buses travelling on routes 33 and 34 not divert into the West Lakes shopping centre?
2. If such diversion has not been considered, will it be considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:
1. Bus routes 33 and 34 operate between Port Adelaide and Glenelg via Semaphore Park, Tennyson, Grange, Henley Beach, West Beach and Glenelg North. The deviation of these routes into West Lakes Mall would add some eight minutes to the journey time of a through passenger not wishing to travel to that mall, and, as other routes provide a service to West Lakes Mall, it is considered that the deviation of routes 33 and 34 is not warranted.
2. See 1.

MINERAL CLAIM

844. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):
1. Was an application for a mineral claim lodged in respect of section 575, hundred of Para Wirra, at the beginning of November 1977 and what was the fate of that application or any subsequent application lodged as a replacement for the original and what are the total details of the matter?
2. Has a mineral claim been granted and, if not, why not and what are the details?
3. In respect of this land, was the owner ever advised to peg and lodge a claim and what are the details.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:
1. On 18 November 1977 a mineral claim was pegged by Raymond Otto Sickerdick of Lyndoch over portion of section 575, hundred of Para Wirra. Application to register this claim was made on 24 November 1977. Registration of the claim (No. 895) was effected on 12 January 1978. On 23 February 1978 Sickerdick made application for a mineral lease over the subject area. This was subsequently granted on 10 October 1978 for a term of 2 years. The area of the lease is ·65 hectares.

In addition to the normal conditions applicable to leases of this class, the following special conditions have been imposed:

(1) No mining operations using declared equipment are to be commenced or conducted until a development and rehabilitation programme for surface facilities and operations, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Chief Inspector of Mines.
(2) Subsequent variations to this programme desired by the lessee shall be approved in writing by the Chief Inspector of Mines.
(3) In the interests of safety any approved development and rehabilitation programme may be varied by order of an Inspector of Mines and shall be endorsed on the approved programme by the Chief Inspector of Mines.
(4) Mining operations and surface installations are to be conducted to satisfy the requirements for water pollution abatement under the Water Works Act.

2. Vide 1.
3. As far as is known the land owner has expressed no interest in mining the area nor has he been known to take any steps to acquire a mining tenement.

STEPNEY BOARDING HOUSE

846. **Mr. TONKIN** (on notice):
1. Is the establishment known as "Mary and Jose Boarding House for Lady Pensioners", located at 138 Payneham Road, Stepney, registered as a nursing home or rest home under the Health Act and if not, what supervision do health authorities give its activities and will it be required to register and conform to the same standards as other establishments caring for aged people?
2. Will the Minister ascertain what complaints have been made to the former Public Health Department, the Community Welfare Department, other Government agencies or local government authorities regarding this establishment and give details of their nature and corrective action taken in each instance?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:
1. No, this boarding house is not licensed under the provisions of the Health Act. The Health Act provides for the licensing of private hospitals, nursing homes and rest homes. Although not licensed, the premises are inspected four times a year by the local Board of Health. Additional inspections are made on receipt of complaints.

A recent inspection showed that care and attention within the definition of rest home under the Health Act is being provided for the occupants. Consequently, the proprietor will be required to license the premises as a rest home in accordance with the requirements of the Health Act.

2. One complaint has been received by the South Australian Health Commission in the last two years. The local board was requested to ensure that additional toilet and ablution facilities were provided.

The Community Welfare Department has received no complaints regarding the establishment Mary and Jose Boarding House for Lady Pensioners.

ROAD TRANSPORTERS

852. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice): Is it the Highways Department's policy to carry out a "blitz" on road transporters in selected areas of the State and, if so, why and who authorised it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Traffic inspectors employed by the Highways Department regularly carry out the weighing of heavy vehicles in order to police the provisions of the Road Traffic Act. On certain occasions, the Collector of Road Charges arranges for more intensive surveillance to be undertaken in selected locations throughout the State in order to more effectively reduce the extent of overloading on roads in those areas.

OUTBACK AREAS DEVELOPMENT

858. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):
1. How much money has been spent by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust to date and how has it been spent?
2. What activities has each of its members undertaken?
3. What results, if any, have been achieved?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Administration grants totalling $4 000 have been paid to community orientated groups actively engaged in providing community facilities in the outback areas. Grants amounting to $86 540 have been approved for community projects at Yunta, Blinman, Marree, Coober Pedy, Andamooka and Penong.

In addition to the above grants, the trust is currently considering applications from Beltana, Olary, Marree, Oodnadatta, Coober Pedy, Andamooka, and Iron Knob. The trust is also negotiating the take-over of the Coober Pedy Power supply and has borrowed $1 000 000 for this purpose.

2. The trust members meet once a month and act in corporate.

3. See No. 1 above.

CLARKE-CASEY REPORT

860. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. Did the Premier or any other Minister request the Lord Mayor or any member or group of the Adelaide City Council not to release the original Clarke-Casey report to the public and, if not, was an agreement reached jointly between the Government and the council not to release the report?

2. If the answer to either of the questions above is yes, why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The original draft submission of Messrs. Clark and Casey was withdrawn, at their request, to enable them to rewrite it. (See my reply to the Leader of the Opposition on Wednesday 8 November 1978.)

2. Vide 1.

NEAPTR

861. **Mr. WILSON** (on notice):

1. Has the River Torrens Committee considered the draft environmental impact study into the NEAPTR l.r.t. route along the Modbury corridor and, if so, has the committee made a submission for consideration by the Government and what was the basis for the submission?

2. Will any such submission be made available to the public either before or after the final e.i.s. has been prepared?

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

1. Yes. The committee's recent submission to Government was based on discussion within the committee and on a report produced by Hassell and Partners who are consultants to the Committee on the River Torrens Co-ordinated Development Scheme.

2. Consideration will be given to releasing the submission to the public.

COMPUTER BETTING

865. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. On how many occasions has the T.A.B. computer broken down since commencement of operations for—

(a) central control functions; and

(b) telephone betting?

2. What delays have been caused in transmitting off-course figures back to on-course totalisators?

3. What actual or estimated loss in turnover on on-course totalisators has been suffered through inaccurate or late receipt of figures?

4. What is the actual or estimated losses T.A.B. has incurred because of the inaccurate number of winning tickets actually held against estimated numbers caused through computer breakdowns?

5. How do T.A.B. turnover figures so far this financial year compare with last year?

6. How do holdings on Melbourne Cup betting this year compare with last year?

7. Why was not manned operation run simultaneously with the computer for a trial period before changing to computer only?

8. Have breakdowns occurred on a particular race and, if so, what race number, when, and what were the reasons for the breakdowns?

9. What action is the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department taking to advise the Government of the problems associated with computer betting, particularly delays by on-course totalisators receiving figures?

10. Are there delays in advising doubles and fourtrella dividends and what is the reason for long delays in payment of dividends and what is the latest time such dividends have been paid on courses?

11. When will city, metropolitan and country agencies be brought on-line to the computer and what arrangements are being made to ensure a smooth changeover?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. Computer breakdowns since 19/9/78—Nil.

(a) System halts since 19/9/78 24

(b) System halts since 16/10/78 42

Total system up-time, 98·5 per cent.

On occasions when a series of system halts exceeded a period of 15 minutes manual backup procedures were used to continue service.

2. Total transmission to on-course 19/9/78-14/11/78:

	Progress	per cent	Final	per cent	Total	per cent
Total No. .	3 392	100	2 830	100	6 222	100
On-time ..	3 342	98·5	2 554	90·2	5 896	94·8
Late.....	50	1·5	276	9·8	326	5·2

3. Reduction in turnover, if any, is not known.

4. Nil.

	$
5. Turnover to 14/11/77	37 210 104
Turnover to 14/11/77	36 641 003
6. Melbourne Cup Day Turnover—	$
1977.....	1 221 052
1978.....	1 171 628

7. Simultaneous operations were conducted.

8. System halts have not occurred in any particular race pattern.

9. The Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport is in close liaison with the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board, which has advised that these initial problems associated with the implementation of computerised off-course totalisator operations have resulted in some delays in the transmission of off-course investments to on-course.

The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport is being kept aware of the situation and the Board has given the assurance that every precaution is taken to prevent late transmissions to on-course.

10. The timing of declaration of dividends on multi-event markets are listed hereunder:

	Double	%	Treble	%	Fourtrella	%
Approx. Div. and Final Div. on-time	96	75·6	37	63·8	14	73·7
No approx. Div. but Final Div. on-time	16	12·6	8	13·8	3	15·8

	Double		Treble		Fourtrella	
		%		%		%
Divs. 20-30 mins. late ...	4	3·1	6	10·3	—	
Divs. 31-40 mins. late ...	4	3·1	5	8·6	—	
Divs. 51-60 mins. late ...	6	4·8	—		2	10·5
Divs. 61-90 mins. late ...	1	·8	2	3·5	—	
	127	100·0	58	100·0	19	100·0

Out of the 204 dividends declared, five double and two fourtrella have been declared after the on-course meeting has been completed. On these seven occasions, because of system halts, it was necessary to go back to the agencies to get the figures retransmitted. As agencies were closed, it was necessary to await the arrival of staff for the night session before these figures were available. The latest dividends for doubles/fourtrella were declared about 60 minutes after the start of the last race of the meeting. Dividends were paid on the following day.

11. It is anticipated that city and metropolitan agencies should be on-line by the end of the financial year. No decision to proceed in respect of country agencies has been made. The system will be tested in the normally accepted manner.

TOTALISATOR RECORDS

866. **Mr. BECKER** (on notice):

1. What storage space is available for keeping totalisator records, and is the space currently available sufficient for future needs and, if not, what plans are being prepared for alternative storage?

2. Is the current storage space easily accessible?

3. What plans have been considered for decentralising this section of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department and, if there are no plans, why not?

4. How many racecourse supervisors are employed by the department?

5. What is the total number of staff employed in this section besides racecourse supervisors?

6. What recommendations have racecourse supervisors made concerning current on- and off-course totalisator arrangements?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. Sufficient space is available for present and future storage of totalisator records.

2. Yes; subject to security constraints.

3. None. The present arrangement is satisfactory.

4. Four.

5. Two clerical officers.

6. None. This is a matter between the South Australian Totalisator Agency Board and the racing clubs concerned.

AQUATIC RESERVES

870. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Will the Agriculture and Fisheries Department consider placing large notices in suitable places near all aquatic reserves to acquaint the public with the presence and the extent of the reserve, and with the penalties which could be incurred for maltreatment of the reserve and its marine life and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A sign is currently being prepared for the only aquatic reserve not yet sign-posted.

MOUNT GAMBIER PROPERTIES

876. **Mr. ALLISON** (on notice):

1. When will new certificates of title be issued by the Housing Trust for those Mount Gambier properties owned by the Woods and Forests Department at 12 Playford Street (Mr. E. C. Wilson) and 9 Lawson Street (Miss Logan)?

2. What has been the reason for the long delay in issuing these titles?

3. Will the recent exterior painting carried out by the Housing Trust be an additional charge against the purchasers or was a firm purchase price negotiated upon signing of the contracts for sale and purchase?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Housing Trust on 22 September 1978 received a Treasury receipt from the Lands Department for 11 of the house properties it purchased from the Woods and Forests Department, including the house located at 12 Playford Street, Mount Gambier. At purchase, these properties had no certificates of title.

It is possible to effect a transfer of land from a Treasury receipt, but the purchaser will not receive a title in his name until the related land grant has been issued. The Lands Department, which issues land grants, has advised that this particular grant will issue in about three to four weeks time.

In the meantime, the transfer documents in respect of the Playford Street property have been sent to the prospective purchaser and, by the time the documents are ready for lodging in the Lands Titles Office, the land grant should be available to complete registration. The Lawson Street property is still going through the resumption process, and it may take some three months before the trust is in a position to deal with a transfer to the prospective purchaser.

2. The houses previously owned by the Woods and Forests Department in Mount Gambier and purchased by the Housing Trust were erected on Crown land dedicated as forest reserve and for which no certificate of title existed. This was satisfactory while the houses remained in the ownership of the Woods and Forests Department.

After purchase, the Housing Trust made application through the Woods and Forests Department and the Lands Department for the issue of certificates of title for 16 house properties which had no title at that time. This action requires the resumption of the forest reserve land and the issue in the first instance of a land grant alienating the land from the Crown, a process which takes considerable time.

3. No. The sale price has already been fixed for the two houses in question.

SAMCOR

879. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): What action, if any, will the Government take concerning the Gepps Cross abattoir in view of the latest annual report of the South Australian Meat Corporation, and why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's attention is drawn to the following:

(1) There has been an overall average increase in productivity of 15 per cent by A.M.I.E.U. members for no increase in wages.

(2) There has been a rationalisation of staff numbers resulting in more productivity at that level.

(3) There has been a reduction in killing charges of an average of 20 per cent and this has resulted in greatly increased throughput.

(4) There have been economies associated with the

"local kill" standards at the southern works. and further announcements on rationalisation of inspection services can be expected shortly.

(5) An inquiry into the current restrictions on entry of meat to the metropolitan area has been held, and the report of the working party is due for consideration in December.

CLARKE-CASEY REPORT

880. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What regard, if any, will the Government have for the report of Messrs. Clarke and Casey to the Adelaide City Council on the proposals for the north-eastern light rail transit system, and why?

2. For how long has the Government had a copy of the report and from whom was it received?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The report is being treated as a submission to the draft environmental impact statement.

2. The transmittal letter from the Deputy Lord Mayor is dated 6 November 1978.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

882. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): At what rate of interest has money been offered to the Government for the purpose of providing the infra-structure for the Redcliff project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A large number of overseas finance organisations have expressed interest in the Redcliff project, but no precise offers have been made. The Government cannot call for offers until such time as the project is to proceed and finance has to be arranged for specific items of infra-structure.

STANCHIONS

883. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Were the stanchions, which have been held in the Islington railways area, for some two years or more, originally purchased for the suburban railways electrification programme and what is the detail of their purchase in respect of origin, cost, and specifications?

2. Have any of these stanchions been utilised for any other purpose and, if so, for what purpose?

3. What is the expected fate of the supply of stanchions currently on hand and what is the current estimated value?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The stanchions referred to were originally purchased for the suburban railways electrification programme from B.H.P. for $137 000. They were supplied to the specification of the Standards Association of Australia for rolled steel sections.

2. The stanchions have been utilised for the bridge beams supporting the Noarlunga centre railway station and for a bridge at Callington.

3. All remaining stanchions have been sold by tender.

RADIO EQUIPMENT

884. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What company, or alternatively public utility or Government department, is responsible for installing the two-way radio equipment in suburban trains?

2. Why was the particular organisation chosen, what equipment is being installed, what was its source and cost and, if not being installed by the manufacturer, or his agent, why were the services of such organisation not utilised?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Two-way radio equipment in suburban trains is being installed jointly by the State Transport Authority and the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

2. The Engineering and Water Supply Department was asked to assist with the installation of the radio equipment as similar equipment owned by the authority is maintained by that department. Two-way radios and an emergency calling system from Philips-T.M.C. is being installed, the cost of the equipment being $297 323.

The equipment was not installed by Philips-T.M.C. or its agent because the railcars are required to be available for the morning and evening peak periods. As the work on the cars could not be continuous, it was considered that it could not be undertaken by a contractor at a lower price than by utilising the services of Government employees who could readily be transferred to other work to complete their shifts.

STEEL

885. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What quantity of steel is currently deposited on the site of the old Northfield railway station, what was its origin and cost and for what purpose is it intended that it will be utilised?

2. What is the current value of this steel and is it still suitable for the purpose for which it was purchased?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. *(a)* 1 078 tonnes.

(b) B.H.P. Co. Ltd. $265 584.

(c) Some steel plate may be required for departmental structures and the balance will be sold with the approval of the Supply and Tender Board.

2. *(a)* The current value is dependent on the demand for steel plate of the particular dimensions and thus cannot readily be determined.

(b) Yes.

CAVAN BRIDGE

886. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Which Government utility or department is providing the pre-fabricated steel for the Cavan bridge and was the supply the subject of a tender process?

2. If no tender process was used, why not and what guarantee is there that the cost involved is competitive?

3. Does the pre-fabricating organisation have access to gantry cranes and, if not, what method of lifting is employed and what is its cost relative to a gantry crane operation?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. The bridges at Cavan are of concrete construction and it is, therefore, assumed that the question relates to the use of steel sheet piling for temporary works at the site. The sheet piling was supplied ex Highways Department stocks. Minor prefabrication was required and this was carried out by the Marine and Harbors Department at the bridge site.

2. Tenders were not called due to the small amount of work required and the fact that this could be capably undertaken by personnel on site prior to the sheet piling being erected.

3. Gantry cranes were not required for this work.

OVERSEAS TRIPS

887. **Mr. VENNING** (on notice):

1. What overseas visits are planned by the Premier during this financial year, when does he propose to travel and what countries does he propose to visit?

2. What overseas visits are planned by Ministers during this financial year and what countries does each, respectively, propose to visit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. At this stage no planning has been done.

2. The Minister of Agriculture plans to visit Libya, Algeria, Iraq, Syria, Jordan, Tunisia and Morocco. The Attorney-General will go overseas but his itinerary is not finalised. The Minister of Labour and Industry will visit Canada, United Kingdom and Yugoslavia.

NATIONAL PARKS

889. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. When is it anticipated that announcements will be made regarding the following positions in the National Parks and Wildlife Services Division of the Environment Department—

(a) Director; and

(b) Superintendent of Field Operations?

2. How many applications have been received for each position from—

(a) within the National Parks and Wildlife Service;

(b) within the Environment Department;

(c) South Australia;

(d) interstate; and

(e) overseas?

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

1. Appointments will be made to both positions when suitable candidates are found.

2. *(a)* 0 (Director); 1 (Superintendent):
(b) 2 (Director); 2 (Superintendent):
(c) 14 (Director); 18 (Superintendent):
(d) 10 (Director); 18 (Superintendent):
(e) 1 (Director); 2 (Superintendent):

DAILY PAID EMPLOYEES

892. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice): When is it expected that the results of the consideration of a notice similar to the Public Service Board Weekly Notice, but for daily paid employees, vide Question No. 796, will be completed and who is responsible for the report which is being prepared?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The honourable member apparently misunderstood the answer to Question No. 796, which was that consideration had been given, not was currently being given. The matter was, in fact, considered in 1974.

OVERSEAS FARES

893. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What specific action has the Government taken to obtain equitable access to overall all-up reduced overseas fares for intending South Australian passengers against the earlier 9 per cent discrimination against South Australian passengers *ex* Melbourne and which has now risen to 19 per cent, and currently 31 per cent via Sydney?

2. Has the Government actively lobbied to improve the position for South Australians and, if so, what are the details?

3. In what areas of the Internal Civil Aviation Policy Review Committee Report does the South Australian position get adequate support?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. On 18 October the Minister of Transport wrote to the Hon. P. Nixon, M.P., Minister for Transport concerning this matter. My Minister pointed out that the Commonwealth Government seemed to be ignoring Adelaide travellers and this was highly discriminatory and in favour of eastern States' travellers. The Commonwealth Minister has not yet replied to that letter.

2. See 1.

3. The Commonwealth Government has not yet taken up the recommendations of the "Domestic Air Transport Policy Review Report—Part II".

In general, the recommendations of that report if adopted would support the South Australian Government's policy of allowing a freedom for commercial aviation to provide service where it saw fit.

PREVIEW

895. **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (on notice): Has the Government made a grant or loan to assist the publication of the weekly newspaper *Preview* and, if so, what was the amount of the grant or loan and when was the grant or loan made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The Minister of Community Development on the recommendation of the Arts Grants Advisory Committee last week approved the payment of a grant of $4 000.

PENALTY RATES

897. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What is the policy of the Government regarding the proposal to abolish penalty rates and why?

2. Is it considered that this would reduce costs and stimulate employment and, if not, why not?

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

1. No proposal to abolish penalty rates has been made to the Government. In any case the Government has no power to interfere with award provisions that have been determined, in accordance with the law, by industrial tribunals.

2. Vide No. 1.

PAY-ROLL TAX

898. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Is exemption from pay-roll tax to be given for apprentices and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

2. Does the Government agree that such exemption would encourage employers to take on more apprentices and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. There are two ways in which a pay-roll tax exemption for wages paid to apprentices could encourage employers to take on more apprentices. Firstly, the exemption in respect of existing apprentices could increase profitability and so induce the employer to take on an extra person and, secondly, the reduced cost of employing an extra apprentice could make it immediately profitable for him or her to be employed. In both these cases, the impact on employment of pay-roll tax exemptions would be greatly reduced by the incidence of Commonwealth company tax. If an apprentice were earning about $5 000 per annum, the exemption would cost the State about $250. Of this

amount, $115 (46 per cent) would go to the Commonwealth and the benefit to the employer would be only $135. Therefore, the improvement in the employer's profitability would be marginal.

The immediate benefit to the employer who takes on an additional apprentice would be even smaller, since the wage paid to a first year apprentice would be only about $3 500. Total exemption from pay-roll tax would reduce the cost of employing such an apprentice by less than $100. Once again, the improvement in the employer's profitability would be only marginal. It is relevant that existing Commonwealth subsidies for the employment of apprentices under the CRAFT scheme amount to about $480 for first and second year apprentices and $320 for third year apprentices. If subsidies of this magnitude fail to induce employers to take on extra apprentices, the further benefit derived from pay-roll tax exemptions would be unlikely to have much effect. There is a further argument against the use of pay-roll tax exemptions as a means of encouraging the employment of apprentices. They are, of course, of no benefit to small businesses which are not liable for pay-roll tax.

2. See answer to 1 above.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

900. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. What number of applications for appointment as justices of the peace have been received in each of the past five years?

2. What percentage of applications have been successful in each of the last five years and, of those which were not successful, what have been the most frequent reasons for non-appointment?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The information sought is not recorded statistically. To answer the question it would be necessary to undertake a count and inspection of individual applications, which would involve a good deal of work, for which staff is not available because of their involvement in more pressing matters.

SHELTERS

902. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Has the Government considered setting up shelters to provide temporary accommodation for young people with serious family/parental problems?

2. Is there a need for such facilities?

3. Does the Government have any alternative facility functioning at present to cater for any such need?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has a policy of providing financial assistance to voluntary organisations on a contract basis to establish and operate youth shelters. $160 000 was provided for this purpose in 1978.

2. Yes.

3. Some youths in this category are accommodated in departmental homes.

GAWLER LAND

903. **Dr. EASTICK** (on notice):

1. Does the State Planning Authority own the land, being sections 91 and 92, hundred of Munno Para and section 91, hundred of Mudla Wirra, or any part of them or adjacent land and, if so, what are the details of land held, from whom was it purchased, and at what cost?

2. What does the authority intend to do with this land, what is it currently being used for, and what are the conditions pertaining thereto?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The State Planning Authority is the registered proprietor of sections 91, 92 and 7590 in the hundred of Munno Para and part sections 38, 93 and allotment 2 of section 94 in the hundred of Mudla Wirra. This parcel of land containing approximately 142 hectares was purchased by the authority on 1 November 1977 from Riverbanks Pty. Ltd. for $370 986·60.

2. The land was leased back to Riverbanks Pty. Ltd. until the end of February 1978, when the company transferred its holdings to the South-East. The property was then leased to R. H. Mooney and D. G. Jordan for three years from 11 March 1978 at an annual rental of $7 280 per annum. The lease is for agricultural purposes. The land was purchased as part of a regional open space for recreation purposes and has been extended to encompass both sides of the Gawler River. It is hoped in the longer-term future that this will form part of a linked system of open space and trails from east of Gawler to the sea.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

904. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. How much does the Government expect to borrow for the purposes of the Redcliff project, in what money markets, and when?

2. Over what period of time does it expect to borrow?

3. How much is expected to be borrowed in each financial year during this time, at what expected rate of interest, and for what term?

4. What proposals, if any, has the Government to find the money to repay the borrowings?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government expects to borrow $186 000 000 (at June 1978 prices) under special Loan Council approvals for the Redcliff project. The borrowing will be over the five financial years from July 1979 to June 1984. It is not yet known in which markets the money will be raised.

2. The borrowings are likely to be arranged for relatively long periods, probably of 15 to 20 years.

3. The financial years of heaviest borrowing and probably of overseas borrowing also are expected to be 1980-81 and 1981-82. It is not possible yet to say what the interest rates are likely to be, as these change from time to time with changes in market conditions.

4. The Government proposes to make such charges to Dow Chemical (Aust.) Ltd. as will be necessary to cover all of the costs of the services and infra-structure provided, including running costs, interest and the repayment of capital.

CHILD-CARE CENTRE

905. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice): When will two child-care attendants be appointed to the child-care centre at the Panorama Community College as originally approved by the Minister of Education in March 1977?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: On 21 March 1977 approval was given for the creation of two positions of child-care attendants at a creche to be conducted at Panorama Community College of Further Education. However, at that time the Panorama college requested that appointments of the child-care attendants be deferred until the required conversion of the creche building was completed.

Subsequently, due to lack of funds and because of the necessity to impose staff ceilings on all Government departments, these two appointments were further deferred.

NEAPTR

906. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. Does the Government still propose to go on with the north-eastern area light rail transit project and, if so, when does it now expect that work on it will begin and, if not, why not?

2. If no firm decision has yet been made, when will it be made and upon what considerations does it depend?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. No decision has yet been taken.

2. When submissions to the environmental impact statement have been evaluated.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

907. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice):

1. What action, if any, has so far been taken against each of those prisoners at the Yatala Labour Prison who took part in the disturbances which preceded the recent strike by prison officers?

2. What further action, if any, is contemplated and when?

3. If no action has yet been taken, why not?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The replies are as follows:

1. The 64 prisoners who took part in the incident on the morning of Monday 30 October were interviewed in groups of 10 by the Superintendent on the same afternoon. They were informed that as a result of their action they were barred from the activities in the Assembly Hall during the following weekend. They were warned that if they breached this order or created any further incidents of public disobedience, they would be charged before a Visiting Justice. This decision followed discussions between the Superintendent and the Assistant Director, Correctional Institutions.

2. None.

3. See 1.

McNALLY TRAINING CENTRE

910. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Of the total telephone accounts for the years 1977 and 1978 for McNally Training Centre of $18 921 and $17 304, respectively, what parts were for:

(a) rental;

(b) metered calls; and

(c) trunk calls,

respectively?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:

	1976-77	1977-78
	$	$
Rental	4 699	6 887
Trunk Calls	818	1 144
Metered Calls	7 176	7 739
Phonograms	465	695
Miscellaneous	5 763	839
Total	$18 921	$17 304

The 1977-78 rental payments covered five quarterly accounts. Only three were paid in 1976-77.

The miscellaneous payments in 1976-77 included $4 722 for a switchboard.

COOBER PEDY STREETS

923. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice):

1. Does the Highways Department plan to re-seal the existing bituminised streets in Coober Pedy?

2. Is the Minister aware that the streets are in need of extensive maintenance?

3. Does the Highways Department, in the next financial year, intend to bituminise any other streets in the Coober Pedy township and, if not, why not?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. No, because of their low relative priority.

WASTE DISPOSAL

925. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. Is the Government studying long-term options for industrial and domestic waste disposal such as far more widespread re-cycling initiatives to promote resource re-use and greater methane (energy) production from sewage effluent and, if not, will it?

2. If studies are being carried out, how far ahead are they being directed?

3. Does the Minister consider that such plans for the future are important and urgent?

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

1. With the exception of the use of methane (energy) production from sewage effluent, the study will be one of the tasks of the proposed Waste Management Commission.

2. See 1.

3. Yes.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

927. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. When will the Government introduce a Bill into the Parliament relating to the setting up of a South Australian Waste Management Commission?

2. Who will be the Minister responsible for this legislation?

3. How many submissions have been received by the Environment Department or the Local Government Department as a result of the Report of the Waste Disposal Committee?

4. Have all councils through their regional organisation commented upon this report?

5. Are these regional organisations in favour of a South Australian Waste Management Commission being set up, as the Government proposes?

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

1. During the session in 1979.

2. Minister of Local Government.

3. The Interim Waste Management Committee has received a total of 68 submissions.

4. 32 individual submissions have been received from councils and from Metropolitan Region No. 2 representing seven councils; Metropolitan Region No. 4 representing five councils; Metropolitan Central Region representing seven councils; and Barossa Community Services Board representing four councils.

5. All Regions generally favour the establishment of a S.A. Waste Management Commission, but each has provided views on the scope of the commission's proposed operation.

PAROLE BOARD

928. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice): Is Clifford Cecil Bartholomew, who is currently serving a term of life imprisonment in Yatala Gaol for the murder of 10 people at Hope Forest on 6 September 1971 about to have his sentence reviewed by the Parole Board, and, if so:

(a) will the Minister inform me immediately of the result of that review; and

(b) how often does this type of offender come before the Parole Board?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS:

(a) The Parole Board reviewed C. C. Bartholomew's case on Monday 20 November, and it was decided to defer the matter until next April for further consideration.

(b) All people serving indeterminate sentences are reviewed annually under Section 42g (2) of the Prisons Act Amendment Act (No. 2) 1969, which states:

> The Board shall, whenever so required by the Minister and, in any case, at least once in every year, furnish the Minister with a written report on every prisoner serving a sentence of life imprisonment or of indeterminate duration.

YOUNG OFFENDERS

932. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): Are mature adults who are living in either *de facto* or homosexual relationships considered for caring for young offenders under the Intensive Neighbourhood Scheme, vide Question No. 863?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: *De facto* couples would not be excluded from consideration for that reason alone but would need to meet the same criteria of high levels of understanding, stability and dedication. Adults living in homosexual relationships would not be considered.

933. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice): What course of action is taken in the case of the 87 per cent of young offenders requiring care, vide Question No. 864?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Question No. 864 was interpreted to refer to all juvenile offenders who appear before a Juvenile Court or Juvenile Aid Panel. According to the decision of the Juvenile Aid Panel or Juvenile Court, courses of action taken will include warnings, counselling, undertakings, placement in the child's own home or a foster home or residential facility. Supervision and ongoing counselling and support will be provided as required by community welfare workers of the department.

RESEARCH OFFICERS

934. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Who were the officers from South Australia who attended the research officers' conference in 1972 and what were their qualifications?

2. Where was the conference held?

3. Did all delegates from all States agree with the classification of offences into broad groupings, as per table 6 of the annual report on the Administration of the Juvenile Courts Act and, if not, how many delegates disagreed and from which State or States were they?

4. Now that the other States are unable to implement the system, is it the intention to continue it in South Australia and, if so, for what reason?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. Merilyn Joy Sorell, Bachelor of Arts.

2. Sydney.

3. All delegates agreed on an interim basis to classify offences according to broad guidelines developed at the conference. Final decisions regarding classification were deferred until a national policy on Uniform Crime Statistics could be decided.

4. Yes, until a national policy on Uniform Crime Statistics has been determined.

ETHNOLOGICAL COLLECTION

941. **Mr. WOTTON** (on notice):

1. What measures are being taken at the South Australian Museum to care for in the best possible manner, and to display to advantage, valuable items of the Australian ethnological collection?

2. Does the Minister consider that South Australia possesses one of the most diverse, extensive, and valuable collections of Aboriginal artifacts and Aboriginal cultural history in the whole of Australia and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government has received reports from the South Australian Museum Board pointing to the deficiency for storage accommodation and care of the Australian ethnological collection.

The Minister is now taking up proposals with the Museum Board with the aim of rectifying the situation.

2. Yes.

JUVENILES

944. **Mr. MATHWIN** (on notice):

1. Who made the decision to not record the statistics of "·08 driving offences" in relation to juveniles, as a result of the recommendations of the conference in 1972?

2. Was it a matter of Ministerial control that the other States were unable to implement the agreement?

3. When did the standardised programme lapse?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The replies are as follows:

1. The presentation of statistics of ·08 driving offences in the present form was agreed between the department and the Adelaide Juvenile Court following the 1972 conference.

2. This question should be asked of the appropriate interstate Ministers.

3. In 1975 the forwarding of standardised statistics to New South Wales for publication on an Australia-wide basis was discontinued.

HILLS FIRE PROTECTION

In reply to **Mr. GOLDSWORTHY** (26 October).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The general position in respect of Country Fire Services and council authority on fire precautions in the Adelaide Hills and country areas is as follows:

1. Municipalities and townships: Councils have sufficient authority under section 667(1)6 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, to make by-laws to require owners and occupiers to destroy inflammable grass, weeds and other growth upon their property which is, or may become, inflammable in the course of the season, to require effective firebreaks and to carry out any

requirements and recover expenses. Other provisions include the power to make by-laws for:

(1) the prevention, suppression, and speedy extinguishment of fires;
(2) the regulating, controlling, and prohibiting the lighting of fires in the open.

2. Broadacres: Section 81a of the Bushfires Act provides for the council to require owners or occupiers of land to remove shrubs or bushes, or clear firebreaks to inhibit the starting and spreading of fires. The Country Fires Act, 1976, has been proclaimed but all but the administrative provisions have been suspended pending the preparation of regulations. Provisions are contained in section 51 of the Act, however, for the board, or the council, to require the owner to clear the land as specified to inhibit the outbreak or spread of fire.

Although both the Local Government Act and the Country Fires Act when fully promulgated, provide considerable powers to local councils, obviously in a season such as this with good growth, there will be a greatly enhanced fire danger. In practice, a great deal of the responsibility must lie with the individual householder to carry out sensible safety measures that have been frequently advertised and discussed.

MOTOR VEHICLE CONCESSIONS

In reply to **Mr. EVANS** (25 October).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When applying to register a specific vehicle at concession rates a pensioner is required to complete an undertaking on which all relevant conditions are fully explained. Subsequently, an abridged undertaking is printed by computer on applications to renew registrations at the concession rate. The decision to require pensioners to produce their entitlement card to verify their eligibility for the concession was made in the knowledge that some persons were still receiving the concession although they were no longer eligible for it.

The Commonwealth Department of Social Security is not prepared to provide facilities to check pension numbers in order to verify entitlement to concession registrations and reduced fees for driving licences. Even if this could be done it would impose a costly burden on the Motor Registration Division to check in excess of 40 000 pension numbers annually. It would also cause delays in processing transactions whilst checks were undertaken. It is, therefore, considered more appropriate to request applicants to produce their entitlement cards to verify their eligibility for the concessions.

As at 1 July 1978, 37 387 motor vehicles were registered at concession rates, and 41 273 driving licences had been issued at the reduced rate to pensioners. The cost to the Government of these concessions is almost $1 300 000. The rebate which applied when the concession was first introduced on 1 July 1971 was 15 per cent of the general registration fee applicable. The rebate was increased to 30 per cent on 1 October 1974 and further adjusted to 50 per cent on 1 August 1976. In addition, pensioners are entitled to exemption from the payment of $3 per annum stamp duty levied on the third party insurance and to a reduction in the annual licence fee from $6 to $2.

GUN LEGISLATION

In reply to **Mr. BECKER** (24 August).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The Firearms Act, 1977, which will be proclaimed next year when the regulations currently being drafted are implemented, does not provide a very satisfactory method of dealing with the problem of imitation firearms. However, the Police Department has prepared a report on specific types of offensive weapons, including imitation firearms, and an amendment to the Police Offences Act was introduced on 15 November to provide adequate control in these cases.

BLOOD TESTS

In reply to **Mr. RUSSACK** (18 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The following hospitals are authorised to take samples of blood:

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
Royal Adelaide Hospital
Flinders Medical Centre
Modbury Hospital
Lyell McEwin Hospital Incorporated
Mount Gambier Hospital
Port Augusta Hospital
Port Lincoln Hospital
Port Pirie Hospital
The Whyalla Hospital
Wallaroo Hospital
Millicent and Districts Hospital Incorporated
Penola War Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Naracoorte Hospital Incorporated
Bordertown Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Meningie and Districts Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Mannum District Hospital Incorporated
Renmark District Hospital Incorporated
Berri District Hospital Incorporated
Loxton District Hospital Incorporated
Barmera District Hospital Incorporated
Waikerie District Hospital Incorporated
Angaston and District Hospital Incorporated
Clare and District Hospital Incorporated
Peterborough Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Hutchinson Hospital (Gawler)
South Coast District Hospital Incorporated (Victor Harbor)
Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital Incorporated (McLaren Vale)
Strathalbyn and District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Mount Barker District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Onkaparinga District Hospital Incorporated
Mount Pleasant District Hospital Incorporated
Gumeracha District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Repatriation General Hospital
Adelaide Children's Hospital Incorporated
Balaklava Soldiers' Memorial District Hospital Incorporated
Laura and District Hospital Incorporated
Southern Yorke Peninsula Hospital Incorporated (Yorketown)
Minlaton District Hospital Incorporated
Maitland Hospital Incorporated
Woomera Hospital
Cummins and District Memorial Hospital Incorporated
Tumby Bay Hospital Incorporated

Murat Bay District Hospital Incorporated (Ceduna)
Kangaroo Island General Hospital Incorporated

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE BUS SERVICE

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (18 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The State Transport Authority operates a number of bus services to Flinders Medical Centre:

The City-Darlington-Marion shopping centre bus service, route 611. This service has a stop immediately in front of the medical centre.

The City-Panorama-Flinders University bus service, route 21D.

The Brighton station-Marion shopping centre-Flinders University bus service, route 680.

Other bus services along South Road.

Routes 21D and 680 have a stop in University Drive, behind the medical centre. Residents of Brighton and Glenelg have several choices for travel to the medical centre:

Bus route 680 from Brighton

Bus route 660 from Glenelg to Brighton, then route 680

Bus routes 663 or 665 from Glenelg to Marion shopping centre, then route 680 or route 611

The tram service or the Anzac Highway bus service to South Road, then bus route 611.

There are no plans for extra services to the medical centre. In addition, patronage on early morning and late evening buses indicates that there would be insufficient demand for extra buses at those times.

NEWTON BUS SERVICE EXTENSION

In reply to **Mrs. ADAMSON** (18 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At present, the State Transport Authority's programme for bus service extensions is under review and it is not possible to forecast a likely implementation date for the extension of the Newton service. However, the extension is still included in the authority's plans and is regarded as a high priority.

DRUG SQUAD

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The present manpower of the Drug Squad is seven detective sergeants, 12 detective senior constables, and two first-class constables. Overall supervision of the squad is carried out by detective chief inspector. A planned increase of three officers to the squad will shortly occur. A further six additional officers are expected to be appointed at a later date; however, these latter transfers will be reviewed periodically in order to assess the Drug Squad's work requirements. Dogs have been used by all sections of the operational police for the purpose of locating hidden cannabis. The success rate in this kind of operation has been particularly encouraging. Because of the difficulty in locating small quantities of the narcotic, heroin, the Police Department can see an increasing need to extend the use of dogs for this purpose.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr. DEAN BROWN** (12 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill, the honourable member made serious allegations regarding members of the Education Department in regard to overseas travel. Although he nominally attempted to hide their indentity, he has caused considerable embarrassment to the people concerned. In addition, the unsubstantiated allegations he has made regarding a far wider number of teachers has been strongly denied by the people concerned in the daily press. It is clear from my investigations that, apart from one minor incident, the allegations made were completely inaccurate and obviously designed to attack the reputation of reputable members of the teaching profession.

The specific matters raised by the honourable member were:

1. Did the woman, Miss X, who toured China, receive Ministerial approval for leave with pay?
Answer—No. My only assistance to this person was to grant her an extra week's leave without pay, in addition to her normal recreation leave which she used to tour China.

2. On how many occasions has the Minister of Education signed letters to be used for the purpose of making overseas trips by departmental or teaching staff eligible for taxation deductions?
Answer—I have signed a total of 30 such letters, almost all of which related to one particular tour by a group of physical education teachers. Despite the honourable member's assertion that education in China is at least 20 years behind ours (an insult which I am sure his colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister, would wish to dissociate himself from), I would suggest that, in physical education in particular, this country has a record that, while different to ours, could still hold many lessons for our teachers to study. Even so, the officers concerned were simply provided with a letter that they could submit with their taxation returns. Any decision as to whether they would be granted taxation concessions would be a matter for the honourable member's Canberra colleagues.

3. Did the Minister sign such a letter to be used for taxation purposes by Miss X?
Answer—No. However, a senior officer of the department did provide a letter for Miss X to use on the basis that he believed any travel studying different ways of life to our own as a broadening experience. Again, whether a taxation concession is granted is entirely the prerogative of the Commonwealth Government. I would point out again that my department's attitude in this was simply to grant the officer leave without pay. No payment by the State was involved.

4. Did a guidance officer visit China without the knowledge of his supervisor and without prior leave being granted?
Answer—No officer has visited China without the knowledge of his supervisor. In one instance a formal application for leave in connection with a trip was submitted retrospectively, but I would point out that verbal knowledge of the trip was known by the supervisor in advance.

5. Did a guidance officer spend a 14-day stint in Melbourne without the knowledge of his supervisor?
Answer—The honourable member has managed to find one small breach amongst his randomly fired broadside. It is true that a guidance officer spent five working days in Melbourne examining Victorian aspects relating to his work without gaining his supervisor's approval. Discipli-

nary action has been taken in respect to this officer's actions.

6. During the past three years how many departmental saff have been granted leave with full pay whilst travelling overseas?

Answer—The numbers of departmental staff who have been approved to undertake overseas activities of benefit to the department and who have received a salary while doing so is as follows:

1976—22; 1977—21; 1978—19.

The general criticism made by the honourable member that "supervision in some sections of the Education Department is extremely sloppy and at times, apparently, virtually non-existent" is an unwarranted reflection on the professional officers of my staff.

The inaccuracy of the allegation is also supported by specific administrative directives which I have authorised to be issued from time to time, and which include a detailed manual of procedures for recording hours worked and for seeking approval for leave of absence. I am sure that the one isolated incident that did occur will not be repeated, but I would call on the honourable member to retract the aspersions he has made on the integrity of the professional officers of the Education Department.

POLICE DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The questions asked by the honourable member relate to issues which are under continual review by the Police Department. Comments in respect to each subject are as follows:

Radio equipped motor cycles: As a matter of policy, V.H.F. radios are now fitted only to motor cycles issued to Traffic Task Force personnel attached to Central Traffic Headquarters. The primary function of the task force is the escort of over-dimensional loads. These duties require members to travel long distances, often on country roads outside the range of U.H.F. portable radio. There is often more than one member involved in an escort and communication between them is essential for the effective and safe control of traffic. Communication is also essential in the event of a breakdown of the haulage vehicle where roadways may be completely blocked by the load.

There are currently 23 motor cycles equipped with V.H.F. radio and five task force motor cycles are in the process of being fitted. In addition, eight motor cycles attached to metropolitan regions are equipped with radios; however, these sets will not be re-fitted to replacement machines when the motor cycles are taken out of service.

The long-term proposal is to equip solo traffic personnel in the metropolitan regions with U.H.F. personal portables, which will be issued to each member at the commencement of a shift. The advantage of the U.H.F. portable is that the radio remains with the member if he leaves the motor cycle and he is in communication with his base at all times. Full utilisation can also be made of the portable from shift to shift whereas the V.H.F. unit fitted to the motor cycle is idle when the member is off duty or the machine is off the road for any defect.

Safety clothing for traffic police: In 1975 a feasibility study was undertaken to determine the most suitable waterproof protective clothing for use by motor traffic police. Designs, colours and makes were thoroughly researched. The survey revealed that the majority of personnel preferred, at that time, a one-piece suit.

In conformity with the department's safety policy requiring members to wear a light coloured garment during inclement weather and to encourage a similar pattern with civilian motor cyclists, the silver coloured suit was chosen. Favourable comments were received from the public during the testing period and it was reported that the colour was partially luminous and could be readily seen at night.

The Police Department has not had complaints of difficulty in sighting police motor cyclists wearing the silver suit and there have been no accidents involving police motor cyclists attributed to this cause. It is pointed out that members are not generally detailed for duty on motor cycles during the hours of darkness; if the occasion arises, they are required to wear reflective vests and sleeves, which are most effective. Continuing research is being undertaken to improve the safety aspect of clothing worn by motor cycle police and, to illustrate this, the Department has currently under test a silver one-piece suit, similar in pattern and design to the present suit, but with a yellow reflective strip on each sleeve and the word "Police" in blue reflective material on the back. This is identical to the clothing worn by Victorian traffic police. In addition, a two-piece waterproof suit, bright yellow in colour, has also recently been under test. However, a firm decision has not yet been taken on the acquisition of either garment.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

In reply to **Dr. EASTICK** (10 October, Appropriation Bill).

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The actual expenditure in the financial year 1977-78 was $7 979 as against a provision allowed for that year of $7 500. The expansion of the role of the State Emergency Service and the involvement of that service in the requirements of the State Disaster Plan will incur additional ongoing costs in future years. For the financial year 1978-79 an additional amount of $49 201 has been provided in the contingencies line "operating expenses, minor equipment and sundries", to meet the estimated expenditure during the current year. The following table shows details of the anticipated increased costs:

Contingencies:	1977-78 $	1978-79 $
Telephone, telex and radio charges	1 720	4 980
Maintenance of plant and equipment	185	15 000
Printing, stationery and postage	482	1 800
Accommodation and rent	—	11 000
Motor vehicles expenses	82	5 200
General office expenses	1 310	4 600
Travelling expenses	—	3 000
Personal accident insurance	4 200	5 200
Conference costs	—	600
Training aids, films and publications	—	2 550
Research and P.R. programmes	—	3 250
Total	$7 979	$57 180

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 307 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility to adequately control pornographic material were presented by Messrs. Hudson and Wotton, Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Wilson, Dean Brown, and Evans.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

Petitions signed by 253 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences were presented by Mr. Wilson, Mrs. Adamson, and Mr. Harrison.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES

Petitions signed by 213 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Messrs. Wilson and Wotton.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MARIJUANA

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia praying that the House would not pass legislation seeking to legislate marijuana was presented by Mr. Nankivell.

Petition received.

PETITION: MURRAY PARK COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION

A petition signed by 219 staff and students of Murray Park College of Advanced Education praying that the House would remove the words "de Lissa" from the Murray Park College of Advanced Bill 1978 was presented by Mrs. Byrne.

Petition received.

TERTIARY EDUCATION AUTHORITY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

APPEAL COSTS FUND BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COMMONWEALTH-STATE HOUSING

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister for Planning): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I wish to report to the Parliament, and thus place on record, some events which I believe are of significance in relations between the States and the Commonwealth. A Commonwealth-State meeting of Ministers charged with the administration of funds and policy for housing was held in Adelaide on Friday 17 November. As the responsible Minister in the host State, I was Chairman of the meeting.

Ministers from every State spoke very strongly to the Federal Minister, Mr. Groom, about the present critical state of the housing industry. All Ministers supported the following resolution:

> State Ministers emphasised that the effective 25 per cent cut in Commonwealth funds in 1978-79 has resulted in up to a 50 per cent reduction in new contracts because of the need to control closely forward fund commitments for the 1979-80 financial year. As a result there will be further reductions in public housing commencements, and further increases in unemployment. We request urgently, therefore, that the Commonwealth restore immediately the $70 000 000 cut in housing funds.

Following further discussion involving Mr. Groom and Federal officials, as well as senior officials of each State, it was resolved to prepare a detailed submission to the Commonwealth for an immediate increase in Commonwealth funds, as well as an adequate forward commitment of funds from the Commonwealth for future financial years. It was agreed that this document, in addition to containing information collected by the Commonwealth for forward estimates, would include supporting statistics for the last four quarters, covering:

1. Outstanding applications.
2. Government housing commencements.
3. Government housing completions.
4. Government housing under construction.
5. Employment in the housing industry.

At no stage did Mr. Groom indicate anything but agreement to this course of action, and willingness to take the case presented by the States to the Commonwealth Government.

It was, by this stage, mid-afternoon and Mr. Groom indicated that he had to leave the meeting to catch his plane. Some minutes later I was informed that Mr. Groom was being interviewed by an A.B.C. television team in another room of the building in which the conference was taking place. The A.B.C. had also requested an interview with me. When I went to take part in the interview, I was presented with a press statement that Mr. Groom had presented to the press as soon as he had left the meeting and within an hour of agreeing to receive the States' submission. The three-page statement, which I have here, was obviously prepared before Mr. Groom had heard the case made by the States.

It begins by saying:

> "State Housing Ministers' calls for a massive increase in Commonwealth funds for housing are quite unrealistic," the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development, Mr. Ray Groom, said today.

Mr. Groom had, by that time, left the premises, and the meeting had concluded.

When I had completed the interview, I drew the attention of the other Ministers to Mr. Groom's statement. They spontaneously decided to reconvene the meeting, Mr. Hayes, the Victorian Liberal Minister, commenting, as recorded in Saturday's *Advertiser*, "This is frightful behaviour. I think it is the rudest thing I have seen in the whole history of Housing Ministers' meetings." As a result of that extraordinary session a telegram of concern and protest was sent to the Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser. Its text was agreed to by every Minister: Liberal,

Labor and National Country Party. It states, in part:

> Commonwealth-State relations will become a complete farce if the behaviour of the Commonwealth Minister, Mr. Groom, becomes standard. Within an hour of having agreed to the States doing detailed work to enable submissions to be made, by Mr. Groom on the States' behalf, to the Federal Government, Mr. Groom publicly repudiated the submissions behind the backs of the State Ministers. In the conference Mr. Groom gave every indication to the State Ministers that the submissions made for restoration of housing cuts would be seriously considered.
>
> None of the relevant statements made outside the conference to the press by Mr. Groom were said to State Ministers face to face when he had the opportunity. Mr. Groom's behaviour was grossly discourteous and destroyed the spirit of co-operation which the States tried to achieve and believed was part of the Commonwealth approach. The Commonwealth policy on housing ignores the needs of low-income people and seriously disadvantages the building industry.

I believe that all members, irrespective of political allegiance, will deplore political behaviour of the character indulged in by the Commonwealth Minister. I was pleased, therefore, that all State Ministers who were present on Friday shared my sense of outrage, and indicated their feelings directly to the Prime Minister.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: ATTORNEY-GENERAL

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

> That Standing and Sessional Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice, forthwith, and that such suspension remain in operation no later than 4 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: I move:

> This Parliament no longer has confidence in the Attorney-General because of his repeated dishonesty in misleading Parliament and the people, and his ineptitude and misconduct as Attorney-General, and calls upon him to resign forthwith.

The appointment of the member for Elizabeth as Attorney-General of South Australia was one of the most tragic blunders ever made by the Labor Party in this State. From the outset, he has demonstrated a frightening lack of consistency and honesty in his dealings with Parliament. Obviously committed as he is to the extreme policies of the left wing (and he has made no secret of those), he has earned for himself the reputation of being a man who will stop at nothing to achieve his own ends. In working to achieve these ends, he has shown a complete contempt for the true democratic process, for Parliament, and even, it seems, for his own Cabinet colleagues. There is a widespread and growing fear throughout the community that this man is dangerous and that he cannot be trusted. He has misled Parliament, the people, and his own colleagues. He now commands no respect at all in the community, other than from that small group of fanatical supporters who believe any means are justified to achieve their left wing objectives.

Mr. Venning: What was his—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a serious matter. The honourable member for Rocky River is out of order.

Mr. TONKIN: South Australians do not trust, and do not want, the present Attorney-General. It is a very serious matter when one considers that a man who is the first law officer of this State is held in such contempt and disrepute as is the Attorney-General.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He has a—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach is out of order.

Mr. TONKIN: If the Attorney will not resign, he should be dismissed, and the Premier has a clear duty to the people of this State to ensure that this action is taken.

There is all the evidence necessary to explain this deep-rooted fear which has built up towards him in the community because of the events of the past few years, and particularly of the past few weeks. The most significant beginnings were associated with his speech on homosexual law reform. That was the matter that really sowed the seeds of distrust in the minds of the people of South Australia. I will not go into detail, but I remind this Parliament that on 27 August 1975, when he was speaking about homosexual law reform, the Attorney-General said:

> Suggestions have been made that homosexuals should go into schools to discuss their attitudes, and I do not support that in any way. On Friday evening, 24 October, however, Mr. Duncan was reported by the A.B.C. in Sydney as saying he had said this to ensure the passage of the Bill through Parliament.
>
> Mr. Duncan reportedly told an A.B.C. journalist he would, in fact, support homosexuals entering South Australian schools to speak with students provided it was done under supervision and as part of a human relations course. The furore was immense. The Minister of Education immediately issued a counter-statement saying he would be opposed to any such move.

The Premier called the Attorney-General to his office in the next day or two and asked for an explanation, and alame and unconvincing explanation was made at the time.

The Attorney-General told the meeting he was addressing at that time that homosexuals should be allowed to address schoolchildren in their classrooms. He said he would like to see homosexuals speaking to students provided it was done under supervision. He said he had told the South Australian Parliament at the time of debate on the homosexual law reform legislation that he would abhor homosexuals going into the schools. However, he admitted he had said this to ensure the passage of the Bill through Parliament.

That matter first started the very grave degree of mistrust of the Attorney-General that now exists in the community. The Attorney-General would not release the transcript of the A.B.C. interview when he was asked in this House to do so. He had a copy of it, but took no steps whatever to defend his attitude, or to explain it. The matter has been ventilated thoroughly before, but it probably sowed the first major seeds of doubt in people's minds.

While not hesitating to use the Parliamentary forum to protect himself, the Attorney has also used that process to attack other people. He has named both companies and individuals in this House under Parliamentary privilege, and his comments about the alleged activities of an insurance company made in this place seriously embarrassed the Government at the time. Comment was made by Rex Jory in the *News* in November 1976, as follows:

> The political career of the Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan, has been short and punctuated by controversy.
>
> . . . He has become the self-appointed leader of a new, youthful leftish faction in the Labor ranks. And in the past week his career may have reached the crossroads.

I believe it did reach the crossroads at that stage and that he was kept on the wrong road by the lack of action of Cabinet at the time. The report continued:

> He has become the centre of yet another public, parliamentary storm—this time concerning comments he made about the Commonwealth General Assurance

Corporation. There has been talk in political circles that Mr. Duncan's stand has privately embarrassed the Premier and the Government—although Mr. Dunstan more than once threw his debating talents into his Attorney-General's defence. And there have been other incidents—a controversial ABC interview about homosexuals and allegations that he subsequently misled Parliament, his criticism of the Public Service, and his publicly stated opposition to uranium mining.

This week's Parliamentary attack was arguably the most serious setback to his public image. It has revived talk that Mr. Duncan—for all his undoubted skill, energy, and passion—tends to make statements without the depth of research required to sustain them under a determined attack. His real problem is that people—especially influential people—are beginning to regard Mr. Duncan as "accident prone".

In May his reaction to the tragic Hilton bombing was to comment that the Federal Government's response to the Hilton bombing showed how conservative forces would use "Reichstag tactics" for their own ends.

In an address on "Police powers and your freedom" at a public meeting held by the Citizens for Democracy in Sydney, he said Australia was faced with a serious drift towards authoritarianism. What sort of a comment was that in response to the most tragic episode of terrorism, and indeed the first major episode of terrorism, ever to be experienced in this country? In September, after a well publicised broadcast to the Fretilin in East Timor in June, he involved himself in what was described as a serious indiscretion over the transfer of Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. D. F. Wilson. The slur that he cast on that officer of very high standing was again the subject of extremely disturbed and very worrying comment in the community. An editorial in the *Advertiser* at the time headed "An unworthy slur", read in part:

> There are some highly unsatisfactory aspects of the circumstances which led yesterday to the transfer of Supervising Stipendiary Magistrate, Mr. D. F. Wilson, from the Adelaide Magistrates Court to the Local Court. He appears to have become the victim of a serious indiscretion by the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan):

The facts of the case were that on a radio programme, in commenting on a case which had been heard by Mr. Wilson, the Attorney-General (or, as he likes to call himself, the first law officer in the State) commented that there seemed to be one law for the rich and one for the poor. He undoubtedly reflected on the Judiciary generally, on Mr. Wilson, and on that case in particular. The situation is that the Attorney-General, the Minister responsible for the administration of justice in this State, was content to allow to remain in judicial office a man whom he accused of bias; all he did was to arrange for the transfer of Mr. Wilson. The whole situation had the bench and the Judiciary generally in an uproar, as well they should have been, and representations were made to the Attorney-General and the Premier on the matter. Whatever happened, the Attorney-General was not in any way prepared to make any apology for the slur he had cast on a man who I believe has the respect of all members of the legal profession in this State.

The comment was made at the time that in failing to make an apology the Minister was unworthy of his position, particularly when one considers that in the same radio interview he said that it was not for the Government to assess court sentences or to interfere. That attitude brought forth a letter to the editor from a past justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Chamberlain, and I know the Attorney-General is not particularly enamoured or fond of Mr. Chamberlain, because his letters to the editor are very frequently full of the truth, something which the Attorney-General does not like to face. At that time, Mr. Chamberlain wrote:

> As Attorney-General, Mr. Duncan is nominal head of the legal profession and among other things the guardian of public faith in the impartiality of the Judiciary. His remark was not only a personal insult to a conscientious senior magistrate, but was calculated to bring discredit on the institution which it was his duty to uphold. The proper remedy is to find a position for Mr. Duncan where his irresponsibility can do no harm.

I believe that is what we are talking about today. There have been more recent episodes than that. We have seen reports of a speech made in Brisbane on the wealth tax, and the fact that the Attorney-General believes that it is vital that over the next two years the Labor Party develop a national economic plan which has as its basis the democratic extension of public ownership in those areas in which it is vital to eliminate exploitation. He advocates a wealth tax and a graduated system of taxation. The wealth tax not only attacks the savings of every single person in the community (because he put a figure of about $7 000 on the value of the wealth tax), but it is also a very real disincentive and discouragement to any industry or individual wanting to invest in South Australia.

The Attorney-General quite obviously wishes to destroy the private sector in South Australia. While he is doing this and discouraging investment and industrial development in this State, he is in fact destroying jobs, and that is something we cannot afford with the current level of unemployment in South Australia as high as it is, in relation to the general Australia-wide average. The Attorney-General misleads other people. Whyalla seems to have a fascination for him. He is reported as saying in Whyalla recently:

> The uranium enrichment plant as proposed by the Uranium Enrichment Committee would provide only a handful of jobs.

That is virtually no jobs at all, if the Attorney-General is to be believed. We know perfectly well that the report of that committee indicates that thousands of jobs could be created. The Attorney-General was not above distorting the facts publicly to bolster his own attitude of total opposition to uranium mining.

The Attorney-General has gone further than that recently in an address on another matter given to the Australian Institute of Credit Management on 17 November, during which he said:

> There has already been established in Whyalla a pilot project enabling people to have u.j.s. proceedings dealt with at night, and this has been reasonably successful and when the pilot has been completed it is proposed to consider seriously the introduction of such courts throughout the State. I hope that night courts will be in operation in the near future . . .

I understand from inquiries that I have made in Whyalla that night sittings of the court are held once a month, during which the only cases heard are traffic cases. There has been no hearing of unsatisfied judgment summons hearings in night courts in Whyalla, yet the Attorney-General has made this comment publicly, presumably because it is good copy. He does not check the facts, and he is not concerned if he is misleading. The latest episode involves the whole question of industrial democracy—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Incorporated Associations Bill is presently on the Notice Paper. Standing Order 230 states:

> No motion shall seek to anticipate debate upon any matter which appears upon the Notice Paper.

I therefore rule that any reference to the Incorporated

Associations Bill is out of order.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you for your ruling, Mr. Speaker. The next episode relates to the Attorney-General's attitude to industrial democracy. I think it is worth while investigating the events which have led to the sorry performance of this Government when it comes to the whole question of industrial development; in fact, it is keeping industry away from South Australia. The ludicrous situation is that, while the Premier was overseas conducting businessmen's seminars in New York and on the West Coast of America trying to persuade people from a private enterprise group to come to South Australia to invest, he was at the same time advertising the industrial democracy programme of this State by holding here an international conference. It is important that we understand this. I refer to the document presented to the 1975 annual State convention of the Australian Labor Party, the Working Environment Committee Report and Recommendations. I believe that it is important to put this on record. Industrial democracy is covered in the working paper—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Leader could indicate what connection the material to which he is now referring has to the Attorney-General. There is a motion now before the House relating to the Attorney-General. The Attorney-General had nothing to do with the document from which the honourable member is about to read.

The SPEAKER: Order! I was not listening just for the moment, because I was attending to something in relation to the business of the House. The honourable Leader should stick to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I trust your ruling will keep me firmly on that course.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make that decision.

Mr. TONKIN: The whole question of industrial democracy is very pertinent to this motion, because the Attorney-General is a member of a Cabinet which is taking steps to promote industrial democracy, according to its brand, throughout the community. The Attorney-General has indeed made comments about this matter outside of the House, and not in relation to the matter that you, Sir, so rightly advised me I should not refer to. I do not intend to refer to it. I am referring to a statement made outside the House. The plan for industrial democracy, as presented in that working paper, is quoted at the top of page 9 of the document, and states:

> The Labor Government should institute this programme of organisation in all its industrial undertakings and utilities. It should, in the next three-year period, use its influence to obtain in a number of selected organisations in the private sector the necessary amendments to the Memoranda and Articles of Association and the organisations concerned should allow of these structures being used in those organisations.
>
> From the experience so gained the Government should then be able to frame legislation of general application in the following Parliament. It should be emphasised that trade union organisations have, in those countries already experimented in this area, urged caution and organic growth rather than the imposition of some general structure in the short term.

This, of course, is the present Government's method of introducing worker participation through the back door. If it had not been caught out in doing that—

The SPEAKER: Order! I want the honourable Leader to stick to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: If it had not been caught out, the wishes of the left wing, headed by the self-styled leader of the left wing, the Attorney-General, would have been brought into law before now. The industrial democracy policy, worker participation, is generally regarded as being one of the matters that is actively keeping industry and investment from coming to this State, and basically it is helping to close some industries down, persuading them to go to other States. The Premier has tried to clear the air. Within Cabinet—and I am speaking now of the Attorney-General's position in the Cabinet—there has been much discussion and concern expressed about the effect this policy is having.

Mr. Whitten: How would you know?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Price is out of order.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order. I think this is the third time he has interjected. I hope the honourable Leader will stick to the motion before the House. He is now straying from it.

Mr. TONKIN: I will accept your ruling on that matter, Sir. The Premier has been trying to get over this difficulty of the deterrent effect worker participation has had, and he has not been helped, particularly by members of his Cabinet. Two members of his Cabinet who have not helped him in the slightest way in reassuring industry have been the Minister of Labour and Industry, who is quoted as saying, in almost the same breath as the Premier reassured industry, that industrial democracy needs teeth, and the Attorney-General, who has taken steps to make quite clear that he is totally in favour—

The SPEAKER: Order! The no-confidence motion refers to the honourable Attorney-General. I hope the honourable Leader will stick to the motion.

Mr. TONKIN: The Attorney-General has taken steps to make quite well known in the community the fact that he totally supports the recommendations in that 1975 report to the A.L.P. convention. In so doing, he has, I believe, added to the disturbance that exists in the minds of industrialists, and he has helped decidely to keep industry away from the State. I will not go further into the question of worker participation and industrial democracy, and I will not refer, as I realise I am not allowed to refer, to the fact that the Attorney-General managed to slip a clause into the Bill I am not allowed to refer to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader immediately went into action after I told him that he was not allowed to move in that direction. If he does that again, I will warn him.

Mr. TONKIN: The introduction of a great deal of legislation in this session of Parliament has been the Attorney-General's responsibility. Of the 42 Orders of the Day now appearing on the Notice Paper, 17 have been introduced by him. Also, a great number of other matters already dealt with by the House have been his responsibility. Something that has come through clearly from remarks from the community is that the Attorney-General does not consult with members of the community if he can possibly avoid it. Many interested bodies which have been specifically concerned by items of legislation that have come into Parliament have been denied any consultation by the Attorney-General. I am not sure whether I am in order in referring to the Bills themselves, so I will not refer to them, but door to door booksellers and people associated with the insurance industry have approached me about the lack of consultation. People involved in selling secondhand cars have approached me about a total lack of consultation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now moving away from his motion. I do not want to have to warn him. Secondhand dealers have nothing to do with the

Attorney-General, and that legislation appears on the Notice Paper.

Mr. TONKIN: With respect, that is why I have deliberately not referred to legislation before the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader did refer to it.

Mr. TONKIN: With respect, I referred to groups in the community who have approached me expressing their extreme concern at the lack of consultation with the Attorney-General. Many members of private companies and bodies have also had exactly the same reservations. I believe that the Attorney-General has made what has been generally recognised as an error recently. The Premier, for all his defence of this matter, has agreed that a particular action that was taken was made in error, and that legislation has been brought into the House in great haste. I believe it would be a very wise move if all of the legislation that has been brought in hastily in the name of the Attorney-General could be withdrawn and re-examined by Cabinet. I am pleased that the Government does not intend to proceed with some of the major items until the House returns next year, because I certainly would not stand for a situation where we had to consider all of these major items in the small hours of the morning. In view of the circumstances, I believe that the Attorney-General's legislation could well be reviewed by Cabinet before it is proceeded with in the House. We would be pleased to allow additional sitting time in February, if that is what the Government wanted, for the proper consideration of it.

The Attorney-General does not hesitate to give advice to people at any time, and the advice he has given on one other matter is, I think, worth quoting. We have heard in the House recently of a difficult situation that developed at Elizabeth. The Attorney-General, as the local member, at the time addressed a public meeting called by the Elizabeth Ratepayers Action Group. He told the action group that the difficulty which had arisen over the rates was entirely the Town Clerk's fault. "If I were in council," he said, "I would long ago have called for his resignation." The Attorney-General is prepared to call for the resignation of a public officer when he believes that the officer has made a mistake.

He has made a number of mistakes in this place. He has misled Parliament, the community, and his own colleagues in Cabinet. If that does not mean that he should be subject to the same provisions and requirements which he places upon the Town Clerk of Elizabeth, he is a hypocrite of the first order.

There is every reason for this motion. The Attorney-General has been the subject of no-confidence motions before. Nothing he has done since those previous motions has improved his reputation as a man of probity and trust in the community. He enjoys a reputation as a dangerous young man, a man who cannot be trusted by the community of South Australia. This Parliament, I believe, no longer has confidence in the Attorney-General because of his repeated dishonesty in misleading Parliament and the people, and his ineptitude and misconduct as Attorney-General. The Parliament has every reason to call on him to resign forthwith.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I listened with attention to what the honourable Leader had to say, in an endeavour to distil from it, with all the effort I could muster, some reason why the Leader should have brought this motion into the House this afternoon. I must confess that, from what he said, the reason escapes me. I can only speculate upon the reason; I would think it has something to do with some matters about which the Leader has been prominent in the press in the last week, because if ever there was a case of the Leader's having justified, in this House and publicly, the very low opinion that the populace has—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. What does the standing of the Leader by way of an opinion poll (of which this House has no knowledge) have to do with this motion? That ranks alongside other material that has been ruled out of order during this debate.

The SPEAKER: I doubt whether the Leader of the Opposition would be able to substantiate some of the remarks he made about the Attorney-General.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He certainly did not produce evidence; however, the Government has some evidence. The Leader and his colleagues were more than a little troubled during the past week. Therefore, it appears that today they have sought some diversionary tactic, and it is for this reason that my remarks are relevant to the motion before the House. The Opposition is attempting to take the people's attention away from its own low standing publicity and put it on to the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable Premier has covered his subject pretty well.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought I had done it pretty well, and I was passing on to the next point.

Mr. Dean Brown: You've had the blessing of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The first part of the Leader's speech was based on tired old topics, which have been debated some years ago and dealt with by the House; replies have been given, and votes have been taken. A rehash of those matters (which the Leader has had an opportunity to take to the public of South Australia) does not do him any better now than it did then.

Then, the Leader condemned the Attorney-General for his remarks relating to Mr. Wilson, S.M., and said, without evidence, that the Attorney-General had arranged for Mr. Wilson's transfer from one court to another. He had no evidence of that. Mr. Wilson is not in the Attorney-General's Department, thanks to a decision of the Full Court of South Australia. In fact, he was in my department. The decision to move Mr. Wilson, however, was made by the Public Service head of the department as a result of communications between Mr. Wilson and that head, and no arrangement whatever was made by the Attorney-General in that matter.

The Leader then delivered himself of some remarks on the subject of industrial democracy and the working environment committee report to the Australian Labor Party in 1975. The Attorney-General was not a member of that committee. I was. The committee reported to the conference of the Labor Party, which established a policy in this area. The carrying out of that policy has been the subject of policy statements made by me. The Leader accused the Attorney-General of having made a whole series of statements publicly on this topic, but he did not mention one. That is not surprising, because the Attorney-General does not know of any, and I do not know of any, either, and I am the Minister responsible in this area. The Leader's thesis that somehow or other the Attorney-General is pushing a different line in relation to the policy of the Government on this subject has no basis, nor could he quote any.

Mr. Tonkin: I wasn't allowed to.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, the Leader was unable to produce the speeches that he said the Attorney-General had made outside this House on this topic, and that is not surprising, because we do not know of them,

and would be interested to find out what the Leader is referring to, if he is not misleading the House on the topic, as he has so vociferously accused the Attorney-General of doing.

Finally, the Leader delivered himself of some remarks on the subject of the Attorney-General's remarks in his own district concerning a ratepayers' dispute over some mistakes in rating that had been made by the Elizabeth City Council. He referred to the Town Clerk of Elizabeth; I presume he means the former Town Clerk of Elizabeth. That was a local matter for which the Attorney-General was able to take full personal responsibility before his electors, and I have no doubt that they will judge him upon that matter in the proper way. The Attorney-General has consistently had the overwhelming support of the electors of his district and I have not the slightest doubt that he will continue to do so, particularly when he receives the kind of help he has had from the Leader today.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not think that anyone in this House, the press gallery, or indeed in South Australia would not know just what is the nub of this motion. I do not think one needs to be particularly gifted to know just what this motion is about. Because of the interpretation of Standing Orders that has been placed upon this debate it will be necessary for members on this side to complete their speeches outside of the House. For the Premier to stand today and seek to delude the House into the belief that we do not know what this debate is all about is beyond the bounds of credibility. Every member of this House knows what this debate is about.

A member interjecting: A diversion?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member says 'diversion'. I suggest that he read the editorials in the press today and he will know perfectly well what this debate is about. We know that the Attorney-General's record with legislation before this House has been completely inept. We do not have to refer to matters on the Notice Paper to know the way in which the Attorney-General has handled legislation before this House. It has been inept, and in some cases dishonest. I can think of recent examples of amendments that came from the Upper House to some of the debtors legislation. They were agreed to by the Government in the Upper House, but because the Attorney was so confused he would not accept the amendments. That indicates to a degree (not to a major degree) the ineptitude of the Attorney-General. We know there is a far more glaring case.

I understood it was accepted Parliamentary practice for a Minister, when he intends to introduce legislation to the House, to present it first to the Cabinet. The Minister is then charged with the responsibility of explaining that legislation to the Cabinet and obtaining the concurrence of Cabinet in its introduction. It is inconceivable that some of the legislation which the Attorney-General has introduced and which has passed this House could have had Cabinet approval. The Landlord and Tenant Act, which was amended quite heavily, is one example, and I can think of others; one does not need to have a very vivid imagination to know the most serious and glaring example of what I am talking about. I shall conclude my speech to anyone who cares to listen (and the Leader will do likewise) outside of the House if the Premier, by some mental block, does not know what this is all about.

Ever since he got into this place, the Attorney-General's behaviour has been less than satisfactory. We have only to look at his political philosophy to try to find some explanation for this ineptitude, misconduct and dishonesty. The Attorney-General has been long recognised in the community as being brash, intemperate and, indeed, immature. Despite the sniggers of members opposite, I believe that the Leader used the correct word (and this word has been used to me by many people in the community), when he said that the Attorney-General was dangerous. People are worried about him, and it is not simply the expression of people on this side of politics; it is the expression of quite a number of journalists who go into print about the Attorney-General.

The newest fledgling Minister, who has probably headed off the Attorney-General in the battle for leadership which will be looming in the Labor Party, has enjoyed this debate, because we know he is on the left wing of the Labor Party, along with the Attorney-General. It is the near communist, if not communist, left wing views of the Attorney-General that have put him into the situation in which he has found himself. The Attorney-General's own statement on his political philosophy is shown from the following report:

> Mr. Duncan's political philosophy is based in a study of Marxist thought, and relating it to Australian society. It seems to me it is not possible in present day Australian conditions to either foresee any sort of revolution taking place in Australia which is going to dramatically change people's lifestyle. So I've rejected the philosophy of revolution.

We know the Attorney-General has aligned himself with all sorts of left wing causes; he is unashamedly on the far left wing of the Labor Party. He is commanding, and has commanded in recent times, increasing support within the Labor Party. We have had introduced into both Houses of Parliament, fellows of fairly extreme left wing views, and it appeared for a time that the Attorney-General would assume the leadership of the Party; he was counting his numbers. However, I think he has fallen foul of a number of his Parliamentary colleagues for the gaffe, ineptitudes, misconduct and, indeed, dishonesty which is becoming apparent to the public. I believe the Attorney-General has been headed off, and I do not believe it was a matter of pure chance that we have had a recent addition to the State Ministry.

The Attorney-General's political philosophy has got him into all sorts of hot water. His adherence to Marxism and the fact that he does not believe we can bring about a Marxist society by revolution (but the implication is there that, if he could, he would) certainly line up with the sort of activities and statements he has made which has led the public in South Australia to say, on numerous occasions, that he is dangerous. As an example of the sort of fellow we are dealing with, I point out that on his entry into Parliament the Attorney-General (a Minister of the Crown), when explaining why he would not take an oath of allegiance, said outside the House:

> I am an agnostic. I think religion is quite irrelevant to anything.

If he wants to be an agnostic, that is his affair. He continued:

> I would prefer to swear my allegiance to Australia and not to the Queen. I do not hold any allegiance to the Queen: but you have just got to say that.

That would be enough to make a large section of the community say that he is dangerous. He continued:

> There is no other choice.

This brash, intemperate, immoderate, immature and dangerous young man, who has accepted all the trimmings of the office of the Minister of the Crown, has no allegiance to the Crown. That would be enough to turn me off, and I believe a large section of the public of South Australia would feel the same.

We know of his activities in relation to Fretilin

organisation when he sought to shelter behind the fact that he was acting as a private citizen, Peter Duncan, he was no longer the Attorney-General, yet he used the weight of his office to make statements supporting Fretilin.

Mr. Millhouse: He might have been on the right side of that issue, though.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Maybe he was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The *Advertiser* reported as follows:

> In the broadcast Mr. Duncan said he was speaking to Fretilin "as a private individual"—

not too many private individuals would have had access to radio in this situation, but the Attorney-General did, and I believe it was a case of his doing so illegally—

> and urged them to continue to battle against Indonesia. "I want you to know that you have the support of the Left in Australia, of all progressive working people in Australia, of trade unions and a great number of politically aware people in our community."

The Attorney-General said that whilst he was speaking as a private citizen, Peter Duncan.

The Attorney-General has complained in the past about students being too passive. I suppose he was harking back to his own student days when he was editor of *On Dit* and a leader of a student group, when there was nothing better than a good stir. I suppose it was about that time when he was dabbling in Marxism, or soon after, that he decided the best way to achieve his ends was not revolution. He has also complained that he was worried that university students were not making enough noise. That would be enough to make many people believe he was a dangerous man, trying to incite university students to protest, demonstrate, and make thorough nuisances of themselves. The *Advertiser*, under the heading "Silent Students a Worry—Duncan", stated:

> The new silent generation of "ivory tower" university students was a disturbing phenomena, the Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) said last night. "It is an indication of the right wing mood that Australia appears to be going through," he said. The universities had largely returned to the stupour and conservatism that they have usually displayed after the radical flirtation of the Vietnam period.

What an extreme and inept thing to say—that because university students are not marching down the streets, creating a disturbance, and making a nuisance of themselves, they are under right wing control. We know also that the Attorney-General had been a supporter of the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Where is the support for that statement?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I will try to find some support for his wish to get spokesmen of that terrorist organisation, the P.L.O., to Australia.

His ineptitude was demonstrated in his outburst against a Liberal candidate for election to this Assembly recently, when he lost a case for libel. Damages of $1 000 were awarded against him in that case.

Mr. Chapman: He attacked a defenceless woman.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course he did. He is rather prone to attacking defenceless women. The Attorney-General's attack on Mary Whitehouse was a cowardly affair. If she was someone from the extreme left or a conference was to be held on world socialism, they would be welcomed to South Australia with open arms, but someone with a conviction that we ought to do more to protect children from sexual exploitation or exploitation generally is called an 'agent of darkness". The Attorney-General did not even have the guts to debate the issue with the lady concerned on the media. The Attorney-General is a coward; he is quite prepared to attack the woman on false premises. If he knew anything about the legislation which was passed through this House and which was based on the English law he would know that Mary Whitehouse was largely instrumental in getting that legislation passed in the British Parliament. That the Attorney-General ignored that and would not front up shows that he is a coward. One would come to the conclusion that he was seeking publicity. If one looked at his outburst, one would believe he was publicity mad, but that conclusion does not go far enough. I think the matter has its roots in his make-up, and I believe that the adjectives used in this House to describe the Attorney-General are in no way exaggerated.

The Leader has referred to the fact that the Attorney-General has used Parliamentary privilege to attack individuals and companies. He has a long record in this House of that sort of thing. I think one of the most serious activities of the Attorney-General is related to his dishonesty. I refer again to the matters the Leader mentioned when the Attorney-General sponsored a Bill before this House to liberalise the law in relation to homosexuality. The Attorney-General said, in effect, that he did not believe that homosexuals should be allowed in schools, but when he was in front of a quite different audience in Sydney and had to play to the gallery it was a different story. Under questioning, he said that he said that only to get the Bill through the House. I believe that is a blatant example of Ministerial dishonesty. He was not a Minister at that stage, but it indicates the sort of man with whom we are dealing. What sort of activity is it for a man to sponsor legislation before this House and to seek to deceive this House simply to get his legislation through? There is a much more recent example of his dishonesty which I believe falls into precisely the same category but to which I am not allowed to referr inside the House, although I will do so outside the House.

The Attorney-General has claimed that he has had consultation with groups before introducing legislation into the House, and those statements have been patently false. The people concerned with the legislation have come to us and said that there has been no consultation. That is dishonest; there is no other word for it. He is more than inept—he is dishonest. It is unfortunate that Standing Orders preclude elaboration of the matter which is in the mind of the public today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition should be careful not to transgress the Speaker's ruling on this matter, as it will be enforced.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, Sir. I commend as interesting reading the editorial in today's *Advertiser*. I will be happy to make comments outside the House, as I am sure will be the Leader. The outburst of the Attorney-General on uranium mining was a similar case.

Mr. Chapman: He has not the support of the full Cabinet on that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We know what the Minister of Mines and Energy thinks in relation to mining. We know that he has a realistic attitude.

Mr. Wotton: I think he has a similar view of the Attorney-General.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He subscribes to the view espoused by the Liberal Party. He agrees with the Director-General of Mines and Energy. The Attorney, in discussion on the Bill, has a completely typical far left wing attitude to uranium mining. A report of a speech he made on the matter is as follows:

> A nuclear-power industry could lead to a fascist State where "vast numbers" of police spied on political groups, the

> South Australian Attorney-General (Mr. Duncan) said last night. Mr. Duncan said this in an attack on uranium mining interests during a speech to the Society for Social Responsibility in Science. He said some lawyers were "extremely concerned" about the potential ill-effects a uranium mining or nuclear power industry would inevitably have on the Australian legal system.

He advanced no evidence to back up that far-fetched claim that, if we go in for uranium mining, we will have a fascist State. What absolute nonsense! Is he suggesting that all countries engaged in uranium mining are fascist States? We know that Soviet Russia is heavily involved in the uranium industry, and I do not know whether he was looking there for his comparison, to his near-political colleagues, if not his comrades in arms. If he were to look there, he would find a highly developed nuclear industry, but he has looked elsewhere, to the so-called fascist States. I cannot find them.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: South Africa.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is one State among many.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Iran—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We can look at Switzerland, West Germany, England, France, most of the European countries, Japan, and America. What a nonsensical statement to make, to suggest that because they are involved in the nuclear industry they are near fascist or fascist. That is absolute twaddle. He is talking about four-fifths of the nations. We know there is division within the Labor Party on this matter. Probably the most realistic view is that espoused by the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Acting Leader of the House at the moment. The leader of the far left in this matter, as in all the matters I have canvassed, is the Attorney-General.

I turn now to an editorial on this matter. I shall quote from the *News*, the first editorial I have quoted so far. The other quotations I have mentioned have been almost entirely direct quotations of the Attorney's own words. The editorial states:

> Even by the lax standards of political rhetoric, Mr. Peter Duncan's outburst on uranium mining yesterday was extraordinary. The Attorney-General's statements were totally illogical and the cause for concern about his intentions. First, he tells an audience of scientists in Canberra that he is worried that a nuclear power industry would somehow turn us into a fascist State filled with police spies.
>
> Then he publicly supports action to prevent uranium producers putting their case before the public. Let's not mince words. That is censorship, the hallmark of fascist societies. Also in the course of this tirade he lightly brackets heroin smuggling with uranium mining, finding heroin smuggling "somewhat less dangerous." It was a remark as offensive as it was silly.

I could digress to mention the Royal Commission investigating drugs, and to look at the attitude of the Attorney and what appears to be the attitude of his colleagues in relation to it, but I do not intend to do that. To suggest that, by mining uranium, we are doing something worse than trafficking in heroin is the height of irresponsibility and absurdity, as the *News* editorial points out.

The Attorney-General has been the most uninhibited spokesman on the front bench of the Labor Party for many years. I believe that is cause for grave concern. There is hardly anyone in the community at whom he has not had a swipe. He attacked the Public Service, and the Premier had to give the Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Inns, permission to refute what the Attorney-General said. Of all the way-out statements he has made, that was the one which perhaps commanded some vestige of support, but the Premier had to repudiate it. It would not be the done thing for the Premier to say in public, "I am sorry my brash, irresponsible young Attorney-General has shot off his mouth again, as he has with Mr. Wilson"—and so it goes on.

Mr. Chapman: It must be most embarrassing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier said, "Mr. Inns has my permission to refute it", and that was done. As the Leader has pointed out, the Attorney-General bought into the row in the Salisbury council, saying that the Clerk should be sacked. I always thought that a Government or local government body made its decisions, accepted them, and did not seek to attach blame to its servants. To his credit, the Mayor took a different line from that of the Attorney-General. That is one plus for the Mayor of Salisbury, but not for the Attorney-General, who does not care whom he gets stuck into.

Mr. HEMMINGS: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am Mayor of Elizabeth, not Mayor of Salisbury.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologise for my lack of intimate knowledge of the geography of that part of the State, but I think the point is well taken.

The Hon. J. C. Bannon: Peope live there.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: People live there, and there is a district clerk, a mayor, and a meddling Attorney-General who, in typical fashion, bought into the argument and sought to blame the servant of the council for what went wrong. Any Government that seeks to blame its servants and its officers for its own shortcomings is corrupt in the extreme, and that is the case we are all thinking of today.

Mr. Tonkin: The Parliamentary Counsel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, that is what we are thinking about, but we cannot talk about the legislation he drafted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow the honourable member to get in by the back door against a ruling given by the Speaker. This is an important debate, and the Speaker has already given his ruling. Interjections will be treated seriously.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: One could go on and on; the examples are almost innumerable. For those reasons, I believe that we should support the motion, which refers to the ineptitude, the dishonesty and the misconduct of the Attorney-General. In any court of law, the case would have been proven.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I was interested, in walking into this House this afternoon, to hear that the Leader of the Opposition was to move this motion of no confidence. However, I was more interested to hear the comment of the member for Mitcham, who said, "Thank heavens you're doing something." I think that about sums it up. If it had not been for this, the Opposition would have sought to move motions of urgency, or motions of no confidence over something else, because, for the whole of this session, members opposite have been unable to find anything of any consequence at all, including this matter, to move against the Government, because of their own internal difficulties and problems.

Mr. Millhouse: I had in mind what happened last week.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

Mr. Millhouse: I'm just explaining—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is doubly out of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Let us look at what

members opposite are doing. No wonder they are considered an inept and incompetent Opposition, when we see this amazing body on the Opposition benches actually moving a motion of no confidence over an issue which they are not allowed to debate in this House. Could anyone have thought of an Opposition being so incompetent and so stupid? That about epitomises what the Opposition does, and it indicts its members, showing exactly how pathetic and weak they are as an Opposition. The Government believes that the Opposition has moved this motion in a rather pathetic attempt to bolster up the flagging position of its Leader. He is down, but they are trying to indicate that he is not completely out.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: In just a moment I will get to some of the points the honourable member has made. The Opposition has moved a motion in relation to a matter which is before the House and which cannot be debated. It is a motion of no confidence that could well be described as a motion of no consequence, because that is exactly what it is. It has been plucked out of the air by the Opposition, because obviously members opposite realise that they have not, so far in this session, brought forward any motion condemnatory of the Government. Thinking that this is the last week of the present sittings, they said "Surely there must be something about the place that can be used as a peg to hang our hats on for a bit of a lash at the Government". It was completely and utterly a diversionary tactic, and the Opposition has failed in its attempt to do anything at that level.

It is extraordinary that the Opposition should have moved this motion over the matters on which it has moved it, because it indicates Opposition members' personal dislike for me, particularly over the fact that I am an active Minister, and I do not apologise for that. The quantity of legislation in the House has a significant effect on Opposition members: it forces some of these lazy loafers to do a bit of work, and what a pity that is for the people of South Australia! Members opposite actually have to do some work, organise themselves, make a few speeches, and sit late at night, doing some work. Being the bunch of incompetents they are, they do not like having to do that or being put in the situation of getting down to doing some hard Parliamentary work.

Mr. Slater: They want to get back to their farms.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is right. It is the time of year when they want to be getting back to the problems of the farms and the other businesses and the like with which many of them are associated; that sort of thing is basically what the motion is about. There is certainly nothing in it. I will speak for only a few minutes longer, because so little of the debate from the Opposition has had any contemporary relevance that it is really hard to see what I can deal with in answering. All the matters have properly been answered in the past. There are a couple of matters with which I ought to deal, the principal one being the situation of the Opposition itself. Undoubtedly, as we have all seen in the past few weeks, the Opposition and the Liberal Party in the State have within their ranks a gang of four who are determined to undo the Opposition's present leadership. The gang of four is well known to people. They have not been named, and I do not intend to name them in the House, but they are well known in political circles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable Attorney-General will stick to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: This gang of four in the Liberal Party is making life difficult for the Leader of the Opposition, but I will not refer to that matter any further.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already instructed the honourable Attorney to go back to the motion before the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: What I will refer to are a couple of matters to which the Leader of the Opposition referred and one matter to which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition referred, to place it on record. I do not recall having made any speeches on the question of industrial democracy at large. I tell the Leader for the record that I support the policy of this Government on the matter and the policy that has been espoused on many occasions by the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You thought you'd sneak it through.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I believe that to be an important policy initiative that this Government has made, one that is being pursued, and I support it. I simply place that on record.

Mr. Chapman: Whom are you supporting—the Minister of Labour and Industry or the—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Secondly, I deal with the allegation made, first, by the Leader and, secondly, by the Deputy Leader, namely, that I do not consult with people concerning legislation. That is an interesting allegation, but it was not supported by facts. The only fact before the House was the ridiculous Dorothy Dixer that the member for Alexandra asked during Question Time the other day when he sought information concerning the consultations I have had with respect to the secondhand motor vehicle Bill. I was able to tell him that I had had appropriate consultation both in person and in my department with Mr. Bennett, of the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. That is on public record. There are no other instances where any allegations have been made about my not consulting. If details of allegations are made, I will certainly consider them. Do Opposition members expect me to consult with every single individual person or legal personality affected by every Bill I introduce in the House? I do not doubt that some of them would like that to happen, because they would like to see the Government's legislative programme completely jammed up by administrative matters. That is not likely to happen.

I do not seek to consult with every individual, but I do seek to consult with the relevant bodies concerned (industry groups, consumers, associations, tenant unions, and other groups affected by the legislation), but I do not intend to seek to consult with every person affected by legislation I introduce in the House. However, I will continue to seek to consult with the various interested groups concerned in the legislation, as I have done previously. That allegation made by the Deputy Leader was spurious and without basis.

He then went back to talk about some activities of mine concerning my views on students and various speeches I have made to students over a period. All I can tell him is that it is the widely-held view of students in this State, both high school and others, that the people of Kavel did the students and the school system in the State a great service when they got him out of the school system and into Parliament; at least, he is no longer able to influence young minds with his sort of reactionary views.

I particularly make the point, because the Opposition does not like to listen to it, that I am on public record (and I have said this on a number of occasions) as criticising both the U.S.S.R. and China over their attitude to uranium, and the U.S.S.R. recently over its attitude to human rights. All Opposition members know that. The

very thing the Opposition does not like about my attitudes is that I am basically honest in what I say. They do not like that. The Deputy Leader described me as uninhibited. If that means that I am prepared to say what I believe, I do not think there is anything that can be criticised about that, and I do not believe that members of the community at large could criticise me for that, unlike the Opposition, which does not like to hear someone who is prepared to espouse views which may not be popular now but which might be correct as judged by history.

Mr. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already spoken.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There is no doubt that the sort of concern which the Opposition has expressed in the debate thus far is not concerned about my situation as a Minister of the Crown: what it has really been expressing its concern about is the poor standing of the Liberal Party and that of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Slater interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Putting it another way, he should be as ashamed of himself, as I have no doubt members of his own Party are ashamed of him over the poor and pathetic performance he has put up in the House today. I will not take the time of the House any longer over a matter of so little significance that Opposition members have been unable to make any relevant points. I simply finish by making the point that I believe that the Opposition has set a pattern throughout my Ministry. I am now in my fourth year as Attorney-General, and this is the fourth time I have had a motion of no confidence moved against me.

I was beginning to think I must have strayed from the path that I had set myself in that the honourable Leader and his supporters had not moved any motion of no confidence during the session. Some of my colleagues said to me, "You'd better take a second look at yourself". That shows the level to which the Opposition has degraded the Parliamentary procedures by moving these motions of no confidence based on matters of no consequence. This matter should have not have been brought before the House. There is no basis for it, and I have no doubt that rational thinking and reason will prevail and the whole thing will be thrown out.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): The Attorney-General classifies this motion not as a motion of no confidence but as a motion of no consequence. If the matters raised this afternoon are of no consequence to the Attorney-General, the Opposition has news for him; the matters raised are of great consequence to the people of South Australia, who have had more than enough of the kind of conduct in which the Attorney-General engages, his repeated dishonesty in misleading Parliament and the people, and his ineptitude and misconduct as Attorney-General of the State. He has referred to the Opposition as a bunch of incompetents. He has denigrated members on this side of the House in a vain attempt to put the heat on to the Opposition and deflect it from himself. However, the heat is not on the Opposition but on the Attorney-General, who has demonstrated repeatedly that he is unfit to hold his high office.

An Attorney-General, of all Ministers of the Crown, would be expected to remain on the right side of the law. Any Attorney-General worth his salt would have that as a minimum qualification, yet the Attorney-General in South Australia has been before a court of law for libel, which has been proved. In the case of the *Attorney-General versus Liz Pooley* (who was, in September of last year, a Liberal candidate for the House of Assembly), in his summing up Mr. Justice Jacobs said:

> It is admitted that he (the Attorney-General) is the author of the statement as it appears, except for the headline which, in bold type, reads "Untruths, Distortions and Mis-statements: Duncan Slams Pooley".

That statement appeared in the local paper at Elizabeth on 22 June 1977. The statement of the Attorney-General was as follows:

> Liberal candidate for Napier Mrs. Liz Pooley had shown herself to be a knocker of Elizabeth and totally unscrupulous by her statements in last week's *News Review*, Attorney-General and Elizabeth M.P. Mr. Peter Duncan claimed today.

Mr. Justice Jacobs said:

> That is the alleged libel complained of, but the statement goes on to say, "Mrs. Pooley's statement contains so many untruths mis-statements and distortions that it is difficult to know where to begin to answer them, Mr. Duncan said."

Mr. Justice Jacobs went on to analyse the statements Mrs. Pooley had made, and then said:

> For that purpose it is necessary to examine the statements made by the plaintiff, which are said to be so untrue, or deliberately misleading (to use the defendant's own words), as to justify the description of her as a person who is "totally unscrupulous" in the plain and natural meaning of those words as pleaded. It is the defendant's case that the plaintiff's statements were a lying attack, not only upon the Government of which he is a member but upon him personally as the sitting member for the seat of Elizabeth.

I do not think anyone will disagree with the further remarks of Mr. Justice Jacobs when he said:

> Courts must, I think, be extremely liberal, and give the widest possible latitude, in examining comment on persons who undertake to fill public offices. Such persons "offer themselves to public attack and criticism, and it is now admitted and recognised that the public interest requires that a man's public conduct shall be open to the most searching criticism".

Acknowledging that the courts must be liberal in their interpretation of these cases, Mr. Justice Jacobs nevertheless went on to find the Attorney-General guilty of the charge. He commented:

> For the purpose of this plea, the defendant has partly provided his own dictionary for the meaning of the words "totally unscrupulous", quite apart from the plain and natural meaning of the words admitted on the pleadings or in evidence.

What an indictment of an Attorney-General, that he himself cannot understand correctly, or properly use, common words in the English language. What kind of Attorney-General is it who, in the words of a judge of the courts of this State, is described as having used his own dictionary in order to provide the meaning of the words "totally unscrupulous"? It is to the Attorney-General that the legal profession and the people of this State look for guidance on matters of law. Mr. Justice Jacobs said:

> His remarks passed beyond the domain of criticism, indeed almost beyond mere invective, and into the domain of an unwarranted attack upon her character.

Regarding Mrs. Pooley, Mr. Justice Jacobs said:

> The plaintiff impressed me as a perfectly honest and respectable person. I have no doubt she was deeply aggrieved by the libel . . . Apart from the unwarranted injury to her political aspirations, she was, at the time of her publication, an officer in the Public Service.

Regarding the Attorney-General, Mr. Justice Jacobs said:

> The defendant's conduct is also relevant. Normally, the contempt with which he treated the plaintiff's original

> complaint, by ignoring it, and his refusal to apologise, goes in aggravation of her damages, although I recognise that it might well have been politically inexpedient for him to apologise at the time the apology was sought.

Mr. Justice Jacobs continued by saying that Mr. Duncan had, moreover, persisted with his plea of justification. Here we have an Attorney-General who has been found guilty of libel in the courts and who has been described by the presiding judge as using his own dictionary to interpret words in common usage, yet the Labor Party considers that this man is fit to be the Attorney-General of South Australia.

The Leader and the Deputy Leader have already canvassed matters relating to the Attorney-General's naming of people in Parliament and using Parliamentary privilege in order to achieve cheap political points, irrespective of the effect on innocent people. The principle behind the practice of naming people and using Parliamentary privilege is as ancient as Parliament itself. From time to time throughout history it has not only been used but abused, and the Attorney-General will certainly go down in the annals of this State as one who has abused that privilege. Only a few weeks ago I asked a question of the Attorney-General relating to his intention, if any, to put further consumer commercials on television prior to Christmas in a manner similar to that relating to the commercials he arranged to have televised the Christmas before last. In my question, I did not mention the name of the company that had claimed that the commercials were improper, but in his reply the Attorney-General said it just so happened that during the Christmas period John Martins had decided as part of its Christmas advertising that it would use the slogan saying "Come to Johnnies and charge it". The Attorney said, "John Martins, which has spent a large sum of money on its advertising campaign, is one of the largest shareholders in Channel 10 and has considerable influence over the amount of money spent on commercial television in this State. Accordingly, it was able to bring sufficient pressure to bear to ensure that the television channels concerned cracked under the pressure and did not run that commercial."

The Attorney-General had no evidence whatsoever on which to make that claim. He made it under Parliamentary privilege. It has never been proved. In doing so, he maligned a company while trying to get himself off the hook. He was unsuccessful, I believe. It is a matter of record that there was no proof whatsoever that John Martins used any influence to have the commercials, which were apparently acknowledged by lawyers in whom the Government put some trust, if it does not put trust in the Attorney-General, to be unsuitable, and consequently they were withdrawn by the television channels.

The Leader referred to the Attorney-General's incompetence and dishonesty in misleading the House in 1976 when he charged an insurance company with acting without humanity or morality over the payment of an insurance policy to one of his constituents. The fact is that the claim involved a duodenal ulcer, the company was getting medical reports before it accepted the proposal, and in the meantime the man was admitted to hospital suffering from a heart attack. The company immediately paid out on existing policies. There was no question of paying out on the policy to which the Attorney-General referred, because it had not been approved. On and on it goes.

As the Deputy Leader has mentioned, the Attorney-General is noted for his use of intemperate language—a quality which I think most South Australians would find not only unattractive but completely inappropriate in an Attorney-General for this State. In a report in the *Advertiser* of 10 May this year a report stated:

> At present Australia is still faced with a serious drift toward authoritarianism. The response of the Fraser Government to the Hilton bombing indicates how the conservative forces will employ Reichstag tactics for their own ends.

What kind of language is that to describe a Government which is acting responsibly to protect its own citizens? "Reichstag tactics", says the Attorney-General. I think there is a word for the tactics he uses—to use the words in the motion, "dishonest, misleading and inept".

On 12 August 1976 the Attorney-General had a go at the Public Service (there are very few people he has not had a go at) as follows:

> . . . a structure that is overly bureaucratic, inefficient, and worst of all, clothes its operations in secrecy and seems to take a delight when dealing with the public, in reducing them to unbearable levels of frustration.

How can we in this State expect a Public Service to fulfil its functions efficiently when it has Ministers of the Crown beating it around the ears like that?

The Attorney-General has made comments about the Law Society, about his own profession, and has described it as the "union covering practising lawyers". He gives it no more status than that. If members of the Government oppose this motion they are saying to the people of South Australia that it is all right for a Minister of the Crown to smear innocent people under the cloak of privilege. If they oppose this motion they are saying to the people of South Australia that it is all right for the Attorney-General of this State to interfere in the foreign affairs of the nation and claim to speak for the left wing of the Australian people by making radio broadcasts to the left wing faction in another country, namely, East Timor.

If Government members oppose this motion they are saying it is all right for the Attorney-General to initiate the sacking of an honest servant of local government in his area. They are saying it is all right for the Attorney-General to make vicious attacks in the press on individuals who have no redress other than through the courts and a costly, time-consuming and worrying court action had to take place to prove that when the Attorney-General is so free with his words he can be guilty of libel. If members of the Government oppose this motion they are saying it is all right for a Minister of the Crown to rush legislation through this House without proper consultation with the people who will be affected by it. It is hard to believe that each member on the benches opposite is so full of support for the Attorney-General that he is going to cross the floor and oppose this motion, but no doubt that will happen.

It is worth referring to an event earlier this session when I made an attack on the Attorney-General's policies and actions, not on the Attorney-General personally. I wondered who on the Government side would stand up to defend the indefensible. The Government selected the hapless member for Napier. What did he do? He said:

> I am not on my feet to defend the Attorney-General. I am on my feet to expose the member for Coles for exactly what she is.

He then went on to say that no-one called me a Christian, or said that I was civil, courteous or tolerant. There was nothing in my attack on the Attorney-General that was personal. There was everything in an attack on me by a member of the Government purporting to defend him that was personal. Members on the Government side defend the Attorney-General at their peril, because the people of this State know that he is a man who is dangerous to the interests of freedom-loving people in South Australia. I urge the House to support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Attorney-General,

when he spoke in this debate, drew attention to my interjection, as soon as the motion had been moved by the Leader, that the Liberals had to do something this week to divert attention from the lamentable state of their own Party. Even though the Attorney-General is always, in the eyes of the Liberals, good for a bash, I rather thought they would do something better than have another go at him this afternoon.

Mr. Keneally: We've heard it all before.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right. It is pretty obvious from what has been said in this debate already that, when they were preparing their attack, members of the Opposition forgot all about Standing Orders, which prohibit discussion of business on the Notice Paper, and as there is an Incorporated Associations Bill on the Notice Paper its contents cannot be debated. Of course, that was the precipitating factor for this debate and, because they cannot go on with it (and, as I understand it, the Bill is not to be debated until after 6 February), even though the explanation which has caused such consternation in the press in the last couple of days has been in *Hansard* since 25 October, they are not able to deal with that matter today, and that has meant that the attack on the Attorney-General has been rather lame and empty. All they have been able to do is go over and over matters that have already been canvassed in this House.

Although I thought some of the points she made were rather weak, and indeed silly, I feel that the member for Coles made easily the best speech of any member on this side of the House.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You aging Lothario.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Maybe members on the other side preferred the speech of the Leader or his so-called Deputy, but I thought there was more in the member for Cole's speech.

The Hon. Peter Duncan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Attorney-General is out of order. At the beginning of this debate I said it was a serious matter, so I hope interjections will cease.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He did speak sense in what he said, though, particularly from the point of view of his own Party. I say to her that I think it is rather unfair to use a judgment in a civil action to berate the Attorney-General. From what she said, I thought for a moment (and maybe she makes no distinction between civil and criminal proceedings) that at some time he had been prosecuted for an offence.

Mrs. Adamson: It's the same kind—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect to her, it is not, and I thought some of those comments were rather inappropriate. Although there is nothing in what has been said in the debate this afternoon that would cause me to vote for the motion itself, nevertheless I must say that I do propose to support the motion on general grounds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On several occasions I have spoken to the member for Gilles, and I call him to order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Until I said that, I was doing rather well with the Labor Party, but once I said that the position changed. There is no doubt at all that there is (whether he deserves it or not is another matter) widespread fear and distrust of the Attorney-General in the community, particularly in industry and commerce.

Speaking with charity to my friend the Attorney-General (who is, technically, my professional leader), I believe that fear and distrust over-rate him; nevertheless, it is there. I do not think any other member has drawn attention today to the survey which was commissioned last week by an unnamed group of business men to test the rating of various members of the Liberal Party. Apparently, it also tested the rating of various members of the Labor Party. In that survey, along with the Leader of the Opposition and the former Leader (the member for Light), the Attorney-General achieved a minus score. I would like to congratulate the Minister of Community Development on his neutral position. He was just on the edge—he got nothing. At least, he did not get a minus score. The member for Davenport, according to that survey, is easily the most popular member of the Liberal Party in South Australia. If he were in the Chamber, I would congratulate him, too.

Mr. Max Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That poll was an indication of what I believe is the standing of the Attorney-General in the community, and I believe there was some accuracy in it, although I know nothing more about it than what I have read in the papers. In my view (and I have often said this publicly), all Government members should resign. I would like to see this Government out of office, because I think it has had long enough; it is played out, and it is about time it had a turn in Opposition. Alas, if only there were, amongst the majority of the Opposition Party, a little more experience and ability to take over the reins of Government, I do not think there would be any doubt at all about the result of the next election. However, it is time for a change in Government. I would like to see all Government members out, and therefore, logically, I must say I would like to see the Attorney-General out of office. Therefore, I support the motion.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): This is quite an extraordinary motion. As has been pointed out by one or two members, including a member from the other side, the motion has been founded on the basis of a totally out-of-order proposition. It was significant that the Leader of the Opposition, in outlining what he wanted to do, had gone no more than two or three minutes into his address when he came to the real substance of the motion he was about to debate, and he had immediately to be called to order by the Chair because, in referring to a Bill which was on the Notice Paper before the House, he was about to traverse on a matter which the Standing Orders had totally rejected. The Leader checked himself at the point, but it is significant that his speech had taken some two to three minutes, and at that point the debate stopped.

In fact, we have gone on talking for about two hours on this topic, and really it was all said in those first two or three minutes. In a feverish attempt to divert attention from the appalling showing of disunity and unpopularity on that side, the Opposition tried to drum up some kind of unpopularity and disunity on the Government side. In seizing at whatever straws it could find, it decided to focus attention on the Attorney-General.

Opposition members had come across what they believed was a public issue. As is so often the case with the Opposition, the public issue had been discovered not by its researchers, investigations or political knowledge, but by the media. In fact, all major political issues brought forward by the Opposition in this House stem from something discovered by the media. The media is the only effective Opposition, if one can term it that, in this State. The media having discovered an issue through which the Opposition raised a motion of no confidence in this

House, it proceeded to launch into it only to discover at the eleventh hour, when it was committed and it was too late, that there could be absolutely no substance in the proposition, first, because there was not substantial merit in it, in view of certain actions that had been taken in the House, and secondly, because it was totally out of order since it was on the Notice Paper for consideration by this House.

That is the extent of the Opposition we are facing in this House today. In the dying stages of this year's sittings, the Opposition has decided to divert attention from its own shoddy and spectacularly bad performance. It has drummed up some issue which it cannot air properly in the House in any case, and it is finally forced to resort to going back into historical debates on issues of days gone past which have been debated in this House and which have been disposed of adequately and appropriately at that time. The recitation of history that we have had from all the speakers on the opposite side has been absolutely negative. It has been absolutely useless in assessing the current performance of this Government, and in fact it has had to ignore the whole weight of evidence of the past few years. The Opposition has constantly predicted that this Government has made a major mistake; that we have badly misread public opinion; that the Attorney-General is in imminent danger of being forced to resign or give up his portfolio. At each stage in this House the Opposition has found that the arguments presented by our side, and more importantly the support we can muster in support of the policies that the Attorney-General represents on behalf of the Govenment, have completely decided the day in our favour; and they will continue to do so.

If one believes in the Westminster system of Government, it is a depressing situation that in a system which relies on there being an alternative Government ready to take over if the Govenment in power loses the confidence of the people, makes errors of major proportions, misreads the way in which our economy or other policies are going—

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for this debate has now expired.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allison. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

GLANVILLE TO SEMAPHORE RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the discontinuance of the railway between Glanville and Semaphore. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Semaphore to Glanville railway line was closed on 29 October 1978 and was replaced with a feeder bus service. It is proposed to remove the railway track from the roadway so that the roadway may be completely rebituminised including a better car parking arrangement for the centre at Semaphore. To enable the railway track to be removed it is necessary for legislation to be enacted. This Bill provides for the removal and disposal of the track.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 is the interpretation clause. Clause 3 empowers the authority to take up and dispose of the railway. The schedule lists the Acts under which the whole railway (including the portion to be taken up) was constructed. The Act of 1917 was amended in 1922 but the amendment did not affect construction.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): On this occasion the Minister has provided the Opposition with a copy of the second reading explanation and I thank him for doing so. The explanation is brief, as is the Bill. We support the Government in its proposal to take up the railway line between Semaphore and Glanville. From the inquiries I have made, I understand it will allow that area to be upgraded and enhanced in the public interest. This is not one of those issues on which I had the chance to make extensive inquiries and I do not believe this is necessary in this case. The second reading speech simply explains the desirability of getting on with the job. The Minister has the labour to do the work, and I see no reason to retain the existing trainline, when the last scheduled train on that route ran three weeks ago.

I read a report in the newspaper of the events that occurred and, from that and after speaking to a couple of district members from that and a neighbouring area, I believe there seems to have been minimal concern expressed by anyone about the closure of the line, and there is much support for it. I understand there may have been some desire for historic purposes to retain such links with the past. In fact, I have used that argument in an effort to ensure the retention of the railway line to Victor Harbor, and I will continue to use that argument in the future, but I do not think a fair parallel can be drawn between the two cases. It is not just a matter of one line being in the District of Semaphore and the other being in the District of Alexandra, as a colleague of mine suggested earlier today. It is a matter of common sense.

No real tourist promotion is to be gained by retaining that rail link, as much as the Semaphore area might offer itself generally to tourism. The Historical Society, I understand, has made one approach to the local member in order to have the trainline retained, and I understand further from the member for Semaphore that it is apparent that one other person has contacted him in an attempt to retain the line in case we might have to use it in a future fuel crisis. I believe the gentleman in his explanation said that it might be necessary in case a horse-drawn tram will have to be used. I do not intend to spend any more time on this subject. The Opposition supports this Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I congratulate the Minister of Transport on once more getting the full co-operation of the Liberal Party for his legislation. I regret, however, that I cannot offer him the same co-operation given by the member for Alexandra on behalf of his Party. I do not believe we should push Bills through in this way. I know it is traditional to do this in the last week of a sitting, with no notice to anyone outside the Chamber that Bills are coming in, and no notice, as far as I am concerned, to members within the Chamber; and the Government

expects them to be passed straight away, and it is a *fait accompli*. I personally do not know whether it is a good or a bad thing to rip up the railway track along Semaphore Road but I do remember—

Mr. Becker: They will probably put a tram line down in 10 years time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know what the hell they will do in 10 years time. I do remember seeing a photograph in the paper of an old man almost weeping because the line was being pulled up, so that someone does oppose the ripping out of this trainline. It is all very well for the member for Alexandra to say it is three weeks now since the last scheduled service ran. That may be so, but that is no reason why the service should not be reintroduced next week as long as the line and facilities are there, but once the line is ripped up—

Mr. Chapman: It would be handy to have a passenger or two.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that is the end of it. I have been amazed by the Opposition for its ineptness already once this afternoon in bringing in a motion it could not debate, and now we have the member for Alexandra, the natural Leader of the Liberal Party, saying it would be all right if there were a few passengers to go on the train. That is not the point, and apparently the Liberals do not see the point. They talk a lot about individual rights and how they will protect those rights, but when the chips are down they do not give a damn about anyone outside this House.

There is a right for members in the community to know what Parliament is doing and to have an opportunity to protest if they like, and our Standing Orders are framed for that purpose. Perhaps, if I may suggest it modestly, I can give the member for Alexandra a small lesson in Standing Orders.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the House has suspended Standing Orders for the purpose of passing this Bill. I think the honourable member should be brought back to the subject before the House.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Standing Orders have been suspended, and I think the honourable member knows that. I hope he will stick to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was not for a moment reflecting on that vote; I did not oppose the motion. I was merely pointing out to the member for Alexandra that the aim of Standing Orders is to allow only one step a day in a Bill, so that there can be reaction by members within the House and by members of the public, if they are lucky enough to get a report in the *Advertiser* of what we are doing. It was unknown to me that the damn thing would be pushed straight through and that the member for Alexandra was not even going to ask for the adjournment on motion, so that he could look at the Bill.

We are told that the Bill is to go right through, so there will be no opportunity for the constituents of the member for Semaphore to complain to him or to anyone else about the Bill. I stayed sitting down as long as I could, in the hope that he would say something about the Bill before it was pushed through, but he made no sign that he would get up, and I had to nip to my feet before the second reading was put through.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not reflecting on you, Sir; that was your job. I expected that the member for Semaphore, whose district I presume is affected by this, would speak on the Bill and say what he thinks about it. To me, while even one person is opposed to this, that person has a right to make his voice heard through his member of Parliament, and we are taking away that right by putting through this Bill straight away. I do not know whether what the Bill proposes is good or bad. I am sorry, in a nostalgic sort of way, to see the line go. I think it is the last line down a main street or any street in Australia.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Where is there one?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Port Adelaide.

A member interjecting: Glenelg.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no trainline at Glenelg. Members are living in the past. The trainline at Glenelg was pulled up before I was born.

Mr. Chapman: What about Victor Harbor, clot? Get with it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am talking about down a roadway, clot.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think this is a personal disagreement between the honourable member for Alexandra and the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Chapman: I know there is disagreement between us. Don't worry about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will stick to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There does not seem to be as much in that point as I thought there was. However, that does not affect my main argument that it is quite wrong for us to push through such a Bill without giving anyone outside a chance to protest about it. If the Bill is to be pushed through now, with no debate on it from the member for Semaphore or anyone else (although I do not think that what he would say is likely to affect my view), I will oppose the second reading as a protest. I suppose I will not get far, because the member for Alexandra, in his unthinking way, has already committed his Party, and his members will put Party loyalty above everything else and stick with him. I believe it is quite wrong, whatever the merits of this proposal may be, that we should push this through now, without there being any chance for any reaction outside.

Mr. OLSON (Semaphore): I should like to clarify some of the points raised by the member for Mitcham. First, it does not come as a shock to the residents of Semaphore that the line is to be taken out. The Government's intention to remove the line was reported in the paper over a month ago. For the benefit of the member for Mitcham and other members who may be somewhat hesitant about what is proposed, particularly in relation to expediency in removing the line, I point out that only one person has approached me about retaining the line, but many people in Semaphore have expressed their approval of its being taken away, because they believe that what is proposed in the reconstruction of Semaphore Road will enhance rather than detract from the environment of Semaphore.

Question—"That this Bill be now read a second time"—declared carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Removal of portion of the railway."

Mr. CHAPMAN: I express appreciation of the action of the member for Semaphore. It is the first time that I can recall a Government member supporting a member on this side on such an issue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Sir, the member for Alexandra clearly is referring to the second reading debate, and that is out of order in Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. The

honourable member for Alexandra should not refer to matters relating to the second reading debate.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Not at all. I recognise the importance of sticking to Standing Orders and of sticking to your rulings, Sir. I was paying a tribute to the member for Semaphore. After all, the Bill refers directly, in its present form, to the removal of that portion of the line where it says that the authority may remove the portion of the railway shown on the plan between points A and B; in other words, that portion referred to in clause 3. I was supported and I am still supported by the member for Semaphore, and I appreciate that. We support the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must speak to the clause, and not to the Bill as a whole.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The removal of the line has our support. Indeed, its removal was forecast by the local press. I am aware that about a month ago the Minister publicly declared on behalf of the Government that he intended to introduce legislation for this purpose. There has been plenty of time for the member for Mitcham, any constituents in the area, or anyone else interested to object or make his position known. I have had no calls on this matter, and it would have been obvious that I would speak for the Opposition on this matter. I support the clause.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether this is the railway line debated in the House on 20 July 1972, when the Public Works Committee indicated that the line should be closed because it was costing the taxpayers a tremendous sum and that the community would be advantaged by the removal of this line? The debate appears at pages 144-5 of *Hansard* of that date.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): As I imagine that the honourable member has the relevant *Hansard* in front of him, I assume that what he is saying is correct. The question of the removal or retention of the line has been the subject of debate for many years, going back before 1972. On this occasion, adequate notice has been given to the public at large of the intention for the line to be removed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: While we have been having this inconsequential chatter from the member for Alexandra and the member for Light, I have been going through Standing Orders to see what is the Standing Order with regard to the exhibition of a plan. Normally, when a plan is referred to in a Bill, the plan is exhibited on a board down at the end of the Chamber near you, Mr. Chairman, so that all members can see it. I do not know whether a plan is sitting on the table. If that is all that is happening, it is rather slapdash for it not to be on the board for members to see. This clause refers to a point marked A and a point marked B. I ask the Minister to tell us where is point A and where is point B.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member examines the plan about to be put in front of him, he will see where they are.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the plan was on display, although it may not have been as prominent as the honourable member normally expects it to be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I appreciate the action of the acting messenger, the Minister of Mines and Energy.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not exhibiting any document to the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should place the document on the bench.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The acting messenger, the Minister, has obviously had a few lessons from our esteemed messengers in the Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not now discussing the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I am.

The CHAIRMAN: The abilities of the honourable Minister as a messenger have nothing to do with the clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister was kind enough to bring the plan up to me and to explain to me what points A and B mean. Point A is at the western end of Semaphore Road at the esplanade just before the jetty, and point B is apparently at the Glanville railway station. So, the branch from the Glanville railway station to the jetty is to be closed, and that is A and B. I raise this point to show with what speed and, really, carelessness this Bill has been pushed through, because not one member gives a damn about it.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I express appreciation to members for the carriage of the legislation.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Committee without amendment.

LIFTS AND CRANES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Allison, Duncan, Groom, Klunder, and Mathwin.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 9 a.m. on Wednesday 22 November.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That Mr. Arnold be substituted as manager for the conference with the Legislative Council in place of Mr. Mathwin.

Motion carried.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 November. Page 2081.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill, the main purpose of which is to give the Treasurer power to execute the discharge of mortgages where the mortgagee is either dead or cannot be found, or is incapable or refuses to sign the particular discharge documents.

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

ADELAIDE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS AND EDUCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 November. Page 2010.)

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): The Opposition supports this Bill. I am not the lead speaker for the Opposition; I understand that the member for Mount Gambier, who is the lead speaker, has been unavoidably delayed. This Bill seeks to amalgamate the Torrens College of Advanced Education with the Adelaide College of Advanced Education under the new name of the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education. The important thing is that the merger has brought about a new college. The Torrens College of Advanced Education was originally Western Teachers College, and when this merged with the South Australian School of Arts it was given the new name of Torrens College of Advanced Education. It is a very important principle that a merged college receive a new name to the satisfaction of all concerned.

This Bill introduces the recommendations of the Anderson Committee, which inquired into post-secondary education in South Australia. It is important for the House to realise the recommendations of that report as it applies to the amalgamation of these two colleges. The Anderson Committee report at page 20 states:

> After reviewing the evidence and taking into account the views of the colleges, the committee supports the proposal that the Adelaide College and Torrens College should combine to form a new institution. The complementary resources of the institutions should enhance the quality of the education that they will be able to offer students and increase the options available to them. The Torrens campus has the potential to provide better accommodation for a number of activities which are now handicapped because of the limitations of the Kintore Avenue site.

It is a very important reason for this amalgamation. The Kintore Avenue site of the present Adelaide College of Advanced Education is very constricted. The report continues:

> As the combined college will be large and will provide for primary and secondary teacher education, it has the potential for absorbing any further reduction to enrolments.

The report further continues:

> The committee has been impressed by the willingness of the staff and students of Adelaide College to investigate various alternative futures and believes it most important that they should continue to be able to contribute significantly to the implementation of our recommendation. The detailed planning of the merger should therefore be undertaken by the two colleges under the general direction of the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia.

That is a Bill the Opposition looks forward to seeing in its entirety when it is presented in this House. The report continues:

> It is not inappropriate that the two colleges should come together, since Torrens developed from the old Western annexe of Adelaide Teachers College. The name of Adelaide Teachers College has, for over a hundred years, been associated with a high standard of teacher education. In recognition of this continuity, the name Adelaide College of Advanced Education should be retained for the combined college.

It is interesting that the Anderson Committee regarding another Bill recommends that a new name be advanced for the merger of another pair of colleges. The final recommendation of the Anderson Committee stated:

> Under the supervision of the Tertiary Education Authority, Adelaide College of Advanced Education and Torrens College of Advanced Education should plan for a merger which should be completed as early as possible;

It is interesting to note that in some respects the Minister has put the cart before the horse, as the tertiary education commission has not been incorporated by Statute. The report continues:

> The new college should be known as Adelaide College of Advanced Education;

The Minister and the working party have differed from that recommendation by calling the new college Adelaide College of the Arts and Education. The report continues:

> The University of Adelaide and Adelaide College of Advanced Education should establish a liaison committee to promote co-operation between the two institutions.

The working parties, with delegates from both colleges, have worked very hard on this the matter. I have made inquiries, and, apart from some small matters that I will take up in the Committee stage, both colleges, staff and principals are happy with the provisions of the Bill. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MURRAY PARK COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION BILL

Adjournment debate on second reading.
(Continued from 15 November. Page 2011.)

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): This Bill also gives effect to the recommendations of the Anderson Committee regarding the merger of the Kingston College of Advanced Education and the Murray Park College of Advanced Education. The history of the Kingston College goes back to 1907, as I think the Minister said in his second reading speech. It is appropriate to outline the service provided to the kindergarten and pre-school training centres of South Australia by Lillian de Lissa, because there will be, in the new college, an institute of childhood studies that will be named after her. It is appropriate to outline the services she has provided to the children and people of South Australia.

Lillian de Lissa was a world figure in early childhood education. She was born and educated in Sydney and did her pioneering work in Adelaide, opening the first kindergarten for the Kindergarten Union in Franklin Street in 1906 and becoming the first principal of the Kindergarten Training College in 1907 at the age of 21 years. Her work with children was based on regard for the developing child as an individual, and she taught her students to integrate the study of children with educational and psychological theory. This approach is widely accepted today. She also worked especially for disadvantaged children, and the influence of kindergartens in Adelaide became both educationally and socially effective. In 1910 she fought a move by the Education

Department to take over the Kindergarten Training College, and succeeded.

After she studied in Rome and gained the Montessori diploma in 1914, she brought the Montessori methods back to Adelaide kindergartens; she remained adaptable to new ideas throughout her career. She left Adelaide in 1917 to become principal of England's first teachers' college for teachers of children between two and seven years. Already well known there through her educational papers and addresses, she held the position until 1947 and taught students from Europe, Asia and the United States.

In 1943 she lectured extensively in the United States for six months on child care, under the auspices of the British Ministry of Information. She returned to Adelaide in 1955 for the Jubilee of the Kindergarten Union. Her book *Life in the Nursery School* was well known by then, and her Adelaide talks revealed how much her early experiences here had influenced her later teaching. Lillian de Lissa stressed the importance of the formative years of early childhood, and this aspect of her work was continued through the college which she founded and which flourishes today as Kingston College of Advanced Education. This merger, as I mentioned before, was recommended by the Anderson Committee. I will now quote one or two extracts from that report, because they bear greatly upon this Bill. Page 22 of the report, paragraph 48, states:

> A Diploma of Teaching (Early Childhood Education) course was established at Murray Park College of Advanced Education in 1975 as an extension of the existing teacher education courses.

I believe that is important, because earlier in the report the committee mentioned that a merger between the two colleges would, in fact, be necessary because of the projected decline in enrolments for pre-school teachers. In fact, it made play of the fact that, unless Government policies allowed the employment of pre-school teachers in primary schools as well as kindergartens and pre-schools, there would be a teacher surplus. Many of the recommendations of the Anderson Committee were based on the submission to it by the Board of Advanced Education. The report states, at page 22, paragraph 49:

> The futures of Kingston and the early childhood course at Murray Park are closely related to the demand for pre-school teachers. This, in turn, is dependent on Government policies about the provision of kindergartens and pre-school education, as well as on the extent to which graduates in pre-school education have opportunities to be employed in primary schools.

Paragraph 50 states:

> The committee believes that early childhood education in South Australia can be best served by combining both courses and that this should be effected by subsuming the Murray Park early childhood education courses into those of Kingston College.

That is an important sentence, because it says that in the initial stages the pre-school course at Murray Park should be included in the present course at Kingston College. The report continued:

> The Murray Park staff should be absorbed into suitable positions in Kingston or into other courses at Murray Park. This should allow the combined course to continue at about the present level of enrolment at Kingston, at least for the time being.

Before the last election, when I was the candidate for Torrens, this was an issue in my district, because the recommendations of the Anderson Committee were known at that time. The students, staff and board of the Kingston College were unhappy that they were to be merged with the Murray Park institution. I believe that at that stage they sent letters to most members of Parliament to ascertain members' views on the subject. An intensive campaign was waged at that time by the people at Kingston and by me on their behalf that they should take a strong line in resisting this amalgamation until the final documentation and reports of the working party were released.

Unfortunately, in my view, in about January this year the Kingston people decided that the evidence was such that they should accede to the recommendations of the Anderson Committee and the request of the Government that the colleges be merged. I believe, in retrospect, that that was a mistake, because if they had taken a stronger position at that time I do not believe they would be in the situation that they are in at present. It is my opinion, and I believe the opinion of many people involved with Kingston College, that it is facing a take-over.

A working party was set up which recommended, after much deliberation, a programme of amalgamation between Kingston and Murray Park Colleges. Generally, it seems that the work of this working party has been successful, because there has been a measure of agreement, as there was with the working party set up between the Torrens College of Advanced Education and the Adelaide College. Generally, the provisions of this Bill are not objected to be either party, but I say "generally". The question in issue at the moment is the name of the new college. In the amalgamation between the Torrens College and the Adelaide College a new name was arrived at— the Adelaide College of Arts and Education. I have mentioned before that, when Western Teachers College merged with the South Australian School of Arts, a new name was given to that institution; it became the Torrens College of Advanced Education. The precedent has been set, and there are many instances that can be shown that, where there is a merger of this magnitude that affects many people (and when one thinks of the number of students, staff and parents connected with these institutions), the merger has to be seen to be fair as well as being fair in fact.

As I understand it, the working party recommended that there should be a new name for the merged college. The Anderson Committee itself recommended that there should be a new name for the merged college. Paragraph 55 of the Anderson Committee Report reads:

> As the combination of Kingston and Murray Park will result in a new college that will be different from either of its component colleges, we believe that there would be merit in having a new name for the combined college. We recommend that consideration should be given to renaming the college.

The Government has accepted most of the other recommendations of the Anderson Report; I strongly suggest it also accepts this one. I have before me a letter to Mr. Gilding. The Minister will correct me if I am wrong, but I believe he is an executive assistant to the Minister in handling these mergers on his behalf. After Mr. Lewis, who is President of the Kingston College of Advanced Education Council, quotes in his letter the Anderson Committee recommendation, he says:

> A new name would declare to the community that the new college is indeed different from the components, and that both Kingston and Murray Park are surrendering some sovereignty in the merger. By "new", I mean a name which does not encompass any of the words "Murray", "Kingston", or "Park". If this principle is rejected by the working party, then I would like to have considered the name proposed by the Minister of Education when Dr. Pederson and I met with him and the representatives of Murray Park (Mr. Mildred and Mr. McDonald) on June 12, namely, Kingston.

From that letter it seems a rather surprising revelation that the Minister himself suggested that the name Kingston may be more applicable to the joint college. Mr. Lewis concludes as follows:

> However, I would hope that the working party and the committee is willing to declare that "a new college . . . different from either of its component colleges" is being established.

I have a copy of a letter written to all members of Parliament by the Academic Staff Association of Kingston College, which also pertains to the merger. I will not quote the whole of that letter, but in part it reads as follows:

1. Kingston C.A.E. staff have been led to believe by the Minister of Education (address to Kingston College staff 14/6/78) (terms of reference for Joint Interim Committee set up to facilitate amalgamation of the two colleges mentioned in letter from Minister of Education to President of Kingston C.A.E. Council 14/6/78) that the intention of the amalgamation was the formation of an entirely new college.
2. We consider that, by naming the College "Murray Park College of Advanced Education" without heeding the advice of the Joint Interim Committee, the Minister has misled us. The Minister stated to a meeting of all Kingston C.A.E. staff on 14/6/78 that ". . . this college and its staff should be fairly reassured by the fact that in the planning group it will be entering as an equal partner".
3. We register our protest against the name of the new college to be formed by the amalgamation of Kingston College of Advanced Education and Murray Park College of Advanced Education.
4. We point out that, at no stage, was the name "Murray Park College of Advanced Education" included in the recommendations of the working party established for the purpose of considering a name for the new college nor was it recommended by the Joint Interim Committee advising the Minister. The Minister had directed (in letter 14/6/78) that one of the functions of the Joint Interim Committee was to advise him on the naming of the new college. Kingston staff trusted in the committee system, and made no direct representation to any Minister in this State.

Since then, I have had a letter from the Kingston College of Advanced Education General Students Association, and they are very worried people. The students have told me that they feel they have been double-crossed and in fact "double-dealed".

Mr. Millhouse: I think the word is "double-dealt".

Mr. WILSON: They said double-dealed. People have told them one thing and in their opinion have done another. That letter states:

> It has been brought to our notice this morning that the proposed name of "Hartley" for the "new" amalgamated college has been replaced by the name of "Murray Park".

I should explain that one of the names recommended by the interim committee working party was Hartley. The letter continues:

> A student meeting was called immediately to discuss the proposal. The student body felt that a new college should have a new name as a symbol of equality if nothing else. To clarify an apparent misunderstanding, the Kingston students voiced no objection to the name "de Lissa" being given to the early childhood institute.

For members unfamiliar with this merger, I should explain that there is to be an institute of childhood studies within the new college, and that is to be called the de Lissa Early Childhood Institute. The letter continues:

> A compromise was reached with the Murray Park students who objected to the name de Lissa. For our support on this issue they offered support for our proposed name "*Murrabrine*" for the new college. It has been stressed by the students that it be an amalgamation, not an absorption, as originally proposed.

They then posed a few questions which are interesting in view of the Bill now before us. The questions posed are as follows:

> Was it the Government's intention for Murray Park to take over Kingston?
>
> Why was so much money spent on setting up a Joint Interim Committee and its working parties when there was no intention of implementing their recommendations?
>
> We were again misled into believing that three names, that is, Magill, Spence and Hartley, were presented to the Joint Interim Committee. Had we known that lobbying was the correct tactic we would have also engaged in this activity. We were under the misapprehension that we were working in conjunction with our counterparts at Murray Park.

They then say they were completely sold out. It is probably worth reading the last two paragraphs of the letter, because they may apply during the Committee stage:

> Has any consideration been given to the case of the first-year Kingston student who is doing the course on a part-time basis and is now unable to complete the required units?

This is very important because the Murray Park course is to be the interim course in childhood education at the new college. The letter concludes:

> What consideration has been given to the Kingston students, past and present, who have been disadvantaged in relation to the degree course?

I hope the Minister will be able to answer those questions during the Committee stage. As recently as today I have received the following very short communication from the General Students Association of Kingston:

> An issue of vital importance to us we omitted to mention is that of the 1979 intake. Both Murray Park and Kingston have informed all applicants that their respective courses will be continuing and will not be affected by the amalgamation for 1979 intake. This information was given out as a result of a media statement made by Dr. Hopgood in June this year:
>
> "Students who planned to continue their education by enrolling for courses conducted by the colleges of advanced education in 1979 should do so in the usual way"; he said.
>
> "Dr. Hopgood emphasised that the amalgamation of the colleges should have no effect on student enrolments for 1979, particularly at Kingston."
>
> As a result of this, all students applying for Kingston, all secondary school headmasters, and those responsible for course organisation to be included in the Kingston student handbook were informed. At this time no Joint Interim Committee had been set up.
>
> To this date the prospective students, who have applied for entry to do the Kingston course in 1979, are unaware that they will, in fact, be doing the Murray Park course at Kingston.

The Opposition supports the Bill, because, as I said before, the main provisions have been agreed to by joint representatives from both colleges. The Opposition also accepts the premise that a merged college of this type should have a new name different from both of the others. In the Committee stage, the Opposition will move that the name of the new college be changed from Murray Park to the Magill college. This name does not have any political connotations.

Mr. Millhouse: What name are you suggesting?

Mr. WILSON: Magill. Four names were put up: Hartley, Spence, Magill and Playford.

The SPEAKER: Is that a foreshadowed amendment?

Mr. Millhouse: I'm sorry, but I've led him astray.

Mr. WILSON: As he has done so often. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I find this Bill rather sad for two reasons. First, it shows that, in the past 10 years when we went mad and set up colleges of advanced education all over the place, in fact we were empire building. We allowed it to happen, but I suppose it was the education politicians who did the empire building, and it just could not last. Now that the demand for various forms of tertiary education is falling because of the falling birth rate and so on, we find we have spent an appalling sum on education which could have been better spent on something else in the long run. Now, instead of setting up colleges of advanced education (I always thought that was a pompous name; they used to be called teachers colleges), we are having to merge them and to try to save money as much as we can by reducing the number of these institutions.

That is bad enough; we have this other Bill which is adjourned on motion for some reason and this one to amalgamate two of these institutions. What I find perhaps even more poignant is that this means effectively the end of what I used to know as the Kindergarten Training College. That was a wellknown body. When I knew the girls who went there it did not have too many pretensions; they were going to be kindergarten teachers. They were nice girls—

Mr. Wilson: They still are.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No doubt; they are probably the daughters of the girls I knew. We used to have beaut dances at some of these places, particularly at the Sheridan kindergarten; they were very pleasant and innocent and no doubt raised money for good causes. May I also say it was not far from my own university college, St. Marks, and that also lent some attraction to the general North Adelaide area. The Kindergarten Training College was a wellknown institution; it trained these girls and it did the job.

Then we got all this pomposity about colleges of advanced education, and the Kindergarten Training College became the Kingston College of Advanced Education. That was its death knell really because now it is to be amalgamated at Magill with the Murray Park college, which is a pleasant place. The people there are pleasant. I have been entertained there and I was impressed, so far as I could be impressed with my limited knowledge of these things. Now the Kingston college is to disappear altogether. It is not only to lose its identity but, as I understand the speech, in due course it is to lose its geographical location and everything is to go to Magill.

The member for Torrens in his speech (and I know he was filling in time for another member of his Party who was not here) spent rather too much time talking about Lillian de Lissa who, I understand, was a prominent lady in this field. I have heard the story before, and perhaps that is why I became a little impatient. But all this will go, and the de Lissa institute of childhood studies is all right, but it is not much to take the place of the Kindergarten Training College. From that point of view I find it a sad debate.

Like the member for Torrens, I have been approached about various aspects of this Bill. The first approach I had was from the Murray Park College of Advanced Education Students Association which wrote to me in September protesting vigorously against the way in which the amalgamation was being carried out, and particularly the proposed number of student representatives on the college council. I subsequently asked a few Questions on Notice about this and I received no information in a lot of words from the Minister, but maybe that was because my questions were not good enough. I notice that the number of students on the college council is still at three, as the association was afraid it would be. Personally I think we ought to increase that a bit, and at the appropriate time I will move an amendment to that effect. The association wrote to me on 27 September, saying in part:

> Dear Mr. Millhouse,
>
> We are writing to draw your attention to the contemptuous way in which students are being treated by the joint interim committee as the plans for the amalgamation of Murray Park and Kingston Colleges proceed.

I realise that this letter is not as recent as some of the letters referred to by the member for Torrens, but I think the points are still valid. The letter continues:

> This contempt is exemplified by the proposed legislation dealing with the composition of the new college council. Under the present legislation, students are represented on the college council at a ratio of one to seven with other councillors. The proposed legislation reduces the ratio to less than one student per eight other councillors. The students at Murray Park are appalled by this proposal. It not only treats the students with contempt, it is contemptuous of the very democratic nature by which Australia operates . . . As we mentioned at the beginning this legislation is but only one aspect which exemplifies the conduct of the joint interim committee.
>
> In general, approaches to this committee for increased student representation on working parties that directly affect the conditions of students have been flatly refused. Recommendations of the committee have received less than minimal debate. The majority of people affected by these decisions are even unaware of them until they are adopted. Correspondence from both the staff and students at Murray Park and Kingston has apparently failed to appear on agendas of the joint interim committee. In total both the staff and students at Murray Park have voiced and will continue to voice their dissatisfaction by the way in which the joint interim committee is operating. We, the representatives of students at Murray Park, have no confidence in this committee's membership or present procedures.

That gives the message. It is a pity that, if the amalgamation had to go on, as I accept that it did, it has been carried out with what can only be termed a minimum of goodwill and a maximum of ill will between those concerned.

I do not know how far we can make the Minister responsible for what has happened. Obviously, he cannot administer these things, although technically he is the Minister responsible. With great respect to him, I often wonder how much he is the prisoner of his own officers and suspect it is to a large extent indeed. It is fairly hard to stand up to schoolteachers and in my experience most of the administrators in the Education Department, all of whom I think have been schoolteachers at one time or another, tend to treat anyone else, when dealing with professional matters, as grown-up children. I know it is not too easy to stand up to them.

However, that is by the by. The Minister has to take responsibility for these things. I propose to support any amendment to change the name. I think it is a pity that, so obviously, one part of the amalgamation is to get the name, and the other part, which historically is far more significant, is to lose out altogether. I am sure that this was a matter of academic politics, and if we can redress it here I think we should. The other point I do not like about the Bill is the representation of students on the council, and I hope at the appropriate stage to take some action with regard to that.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): The member for Torrens has very thoroughly canvassed the background to this Bill and the preceding one, and I want to make three principal points on the legislation before us. I think it is important to look at the background and the reasons for these Bills, which might be collectively described as the "Chickens coming home to roost" Bills, because the fact that we are now being required to amalgamate colleges so comparatively soon after a vast expansion in teachers colleges in South Australia is an indication in itself of a lack of proper planning, and a lack of appreciation by this Government of the future needs of education in South Australia. The case is very well summed up in a report in the *National Times* for the week ending 14 October 1978, which states:

> The crisis for the colleges of advanced education has been building up since 1974, when the Whitlam Government took over responsibility for funding the previously State-run teachers training colleges and gave them status as autonomous C.A.E's. Overnight, the number of C.A.E's almost doubled. There are now 83, containing almost the same number of students—150 000—as Australia's 19 universities, an average of only 1 800 students per college.

The report goes on to talk about a proliferation of courses and the surplus of teachers, and states:

> At worst, Australia could have a surplus of up to 78 700 teachers by 1985, according to a report this year by a working party of the Australian Education Council, a body comprising Federal and State Education Ministers.

The report further states:

> According to one of the participants, Dr. David Armstrong, Director of the Prahran College of Advanced Education in Melbourne, the feeling at the conference among principals of teaching training institutions was one of "defensiveness, alarm, fear, despair and helplessness".

I think those emotions have now been felt in some measure, particularly by the staff and students of Kingston college, and I also believe in the early stages by the staff and students of Adelaide College of Advanced Education. The teacher education crisis was obvious even by 1974, just as the college sector was booming, and yet we accepted with open arms the money handed out by a centralist Government in Canberra that wanted to make a big fellow of itself with the States. Dr. Barry Ritchie, Principal of the Preston Institute of Technology, in Melbourne, sums it up very well, as follows:

> The real guilt lies with the Federal Government for not being prepared to monitor post-secondary education closely in the early 1970's, when the expansion was going on.

It also highlights the dangers when we ignore the principle that the Government that spends the money should be the Government responsible for raising the money. If South Australia had had to raise the capital required for the expansion of the teachers colleges, we never would have been faced with the problem we have today of amalgamating.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mrs. ADAMSON: Murray Park was built, as were Sturt and Torrens. The Anderson Report, which was quoted by the member for Torrens, refers to the proposed amalgamation of early childhood education at the Kingston and Murray Park colleges of advanced education. The Bill before us is the legislative response to the Anderson Report which, on page 21, states:

> In the 50 years since 1907, when it was founded as the Kindergarten Training College, Kingston college has trained teachers for the Kindergarten Union. From the outset it has encouraged its students to understand the complete development of the child rather than merely teaching students to appreciate cognitive aspects of growth, an approach which has become marked in other areas of teacher education only in more recent years.

I think that should go on record, because other areas of primary and secondary education are now starting to appreciate the value of the principle that has been recognised for a long time by the Kingston college. Anderson then goes on to say that the diploma of early childhood education teaching was established at Murray Park in 1975 as an extension of the existing courses, and that the future of Kingston and Murray Park is closely related in the demand for pre-school teachers. At page 23, the report states:

> We believe that in order to bring the number of graduates more nearly into balance with demand there should be a reduction in the numbers of students of early childhood education of at least the same proportion as for primary and secondary education. A reduction of this magnitude, in addition to that already put into effect, would seriously prejudice the early childhood education programme at both the Kingston and the Murray Park colleges if these were to stand alone.

So, Anderson recommends that early childhood education would be best served by combining both courses, and that this should be effected by subsuming the Murray Park early childhood education courses into those of Kingston college. That is not what is going to happen. As this is an administrative rather than a legislative matter, it is not a matter that this House can properly debate, but the point should be made that the recommendations of the Anderson Committee have been completely reversed by the administrative action in in fact subsuming the Kingston course, which has been proved to be of value over more than 70 years, into the Murray Park course.

Then, the Anderson Report goes on to make a comment which I think is very relevant to the argument put forward by the member for Torrens in relation to the desirability of having a new name. Paragraph 53 of the report at page 25 states:

> We recognise, however, that the close community of staff and students at Kingston and their common ethos are of great value and should be protected when the two institutions are joined. We are proposing, therefore, that the Kingston college should amalgamate with Murray Park college in such a way that the educational philosophy and corporate identity of the former staff and students of Kingston may be maintained. At the same time that Kingston subsumes the Murray Park course, it should itself become the School of Early Childhood Education of the new college. The committee agrees with the proposal that the name of the founding principal, Lillian de Lissa, should be commemorated and proposes that the school be known as The de Lissa School of Early Childhood Education.

Again, the member for Torrens has read into the record a tribute to Lillian de Lissa, who was not only a superb educationist but a fearless fighter. I should think her example would have been an inspiration to those of the Kingston staff who have been trying, apparently in vain, to retain their identity in the new college.

The memorandum from the Kingston students and staff has been read into *Hansard* by the member for Torrens, but I think that, in order to discover the reason for the strength of feeling on this issue, we should look briefly at the history of both colleges. The annual report of 1977 for the Kingston college states:

> In spite of the gloomy outlook—

that is, for cuts in intake quotas of students—

> there was a very strong demand for all courses offered by the college with an unprecedented number of 1 156 applications for the 110 places for the Diploma of Teaching, Early Childhood Education.

That in itself is a clear indication that the whole community of South Australia recognises the value of the Kingston course. The report continues:

> The Kingston College of Advanced Education began in February 1977, when the Kindergarten Training College opened in Franklin Street. It was the second teachers college in South Australia . . .
>
> The college began with 11 students under the young principal, Miss Lilian de Lissa, who later became world-renowned for her work on early childhood education . . . There has been a tradition of stability and staff which has strengthened the quality of teaching in the college.

I hope that the stability, which has received a severe setback as a result of the way in which the Government has implemented the Anderson Report, will not in any way impair the quality of the teaching as it continues in the amalgamated college next year. The annual report continues:

> From its foundation the college course has reflected changes in educational knowledge and understanding tempered by the needs of the community . . . Throughout its 70 years, Kingston College of Advanced Education has responded to the educational requirements of young children by providing teachers with a sound and sensitive understanding of the development and needs of individual children and of the organisation of education suited to these needs.

That is a brief and inadequate summary of the history of the Kingston college. Let us now look at the historical background of the Murray Park college, the other college involved in the Bill. The annual report states:

> Murray Park College of Advanced Education came into existence officially on 1 January 1973, preserving in its title one of the most widely known family names in South Australia's history.

The 1977 annual report for the college contains a brief historical survey about Murray Park. The survey states that the property was purchased by the South Australian Government as the site of a new tertiary college to replace the Wattle Park Teachers College, and goes on to give what I believe is a misstatement which, in itself, says something for the way in which kindergarten teacher training has been downgraded, perhaps unwittingly, by the other teachers colleges. The annual report states:

> Wattle Park, the second oldest teachers college in South Australia, had outgrown its compact site on Kensington Road. Moreover, there were national moves to integrate teacher education more fully with other forms of tertiary education.

The Adelaide Teachers College is the oldest, founded in 1876. The Kindergarten Training College, which became the Kindergarten Teachers College, later becoming Kingston College, was founded in 1907, and Wattle Park was founded in 1957.

One important aspect of Murray Park should be recognised by members in the debate, namely, its valuable function as a community centre. That has developed from the college's inception, and it has grown considerably during recent years. The college facilities are used each week by about 1 000 members of the community, thus demonstrating that it is responding to a real social need. During the year about 4 000 people enrolled for the various programmes. The community centre caters for all age groups in the eastern suburbs. It has school holiday programmes, and goes to the other end of the scale with an over-60's education group. All this goes to show that, when Kingston college becomes established on the Murray Park site, there will be enormous benefits for the students and staff of the college in the greatly expanded facilities to which they will have access.

We cannot overlook the fact that the name of the college is a matter of great contention. Although I have no strong personal feeling about the importance of names, and although I have a high regard and affection for the name of Murray Park, as such, I am strongly opposed to a Government's going against its word, the word of its Minister, against the recommendations of its own committee, and against the strongly expressed wishes of the people whose rights should be protected by law and whose feelings should be respected by the Government. There have been strong representations to members on both sides, I should think, from kindergarten directors, kindergarten committees, and former students of the college who believe that Kingston has been sold out and, with it, the traditions which are of such value to the State.

It is on these grounds, namely, that the Government has reneged on its word, and has ignored the recommendations of its committee (I would perhaps like to see the name of Murray Park retained because I know what it means to the local community), that my objection is based. An undertaking was given and it has been breached. That is wrong, and I do not support it. I support the Bill and, in doing so, express the confidence that the current difficulties and differences of feeling can be ironed out and that the interests of early childhood education can always be kept to the forefront by the amalgamated college as it continues to serve the community in South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): My contribution will be brief, because I believe that many aspects of the situation have been explained by my colleagues. First, I add my weight to that of my colleagues in saying that I believe that the name Murray Park should be deleted and another name, yet to be determined, should be inserted. I believe that, if a situation arises that the name of Murray Park continues, the hang-ups which have been associated with the name over a period will continue, and there will not be the opportunity of cleaning the slate and, in this amalgamation, allowing the new college to get on with the job with which it is charged.

The other point I make for the public record (because a number of people interested in this subject will have access only to the *Hansard* report and not necessarily in the first instance to the Bill or even subsequently the Act) is the significant change that has taken place between section 5 of the original Kingston College of Advanced Education Act (No. 33 of 1974) and the proposal in clause 5 of the Bill. So that this matter can be viewed in proper context, I will read section 5 of the Act, which provides:

> The functions of the college are—
>
> *(a)* the provision of advanced education and training in the theory and practice of education, and in such other fields as may, in the opinon of the council, be necessary for the proper education and training of those who seek to practise the profession of teaching as kindergarten, or pre-school, teachers or administrators;
>
> *(b)* the provision of advanced education and training in such other fields of knowledge and expertise as the council, after consultation with the Board of Advanced Education, may determine;
>
> *(c)* the dissemination of knowledge in the fields with which the college is concerned to the advancement of the public interest;
>
> *(d)* the provision of post-graduate, or practical courses, for the benefit of those engaged in occupations for which the college provides education and training; and
>
> *(e)* the fostering and furtherance of an active corporate life within the college.

Clause 5 in the Bill is expanded by an additional number of subclauses and provides:

The functions of the college are—

(a) the provision of advanced education, training and research in the theory and practice of education, and in such other fields of knowledge or expertise as may, in the opinion of the council, be necessary for the proper education and training for those who seek to practise the profession of teaching or any other profession related to the nurture, care or training of children;

(b) the provision of advanced education, training and research in the theory and practice of journalism and other fields of knowledge or expertise related to the communication of ideas;

(c) the provision of advanced education, training and research in such other fields of knowledge or expertise as the council may determine;

(d) the dissemination of knowledge, and the advancement of skills, in the fields with which the college is concerned for the advancement of the public interest;

(e) the provision of consultative and research services for the benefit of the community, or any part of the community;

(f) the provision of post-graduate or refresher courses for those engaged in occupations for which the college provides education and training, and such related occupations as the council may determine;

(g) the fostering and furtherance of an active corporate life within the college; and

(h) the development of educational and cultural activity for the benefit of the wider community.

In these provisions, many of the features of the Kingston college objectives are contained. The significant change to which I draw attention occurs in four of the paragraphs *(a)* to *(h)*.

Regarding funding at colleges of advanced education, does the inclusion of the word "research" (and it is quite deliberately quoted in four different subclauses) mean that other areas of funding are opened up for the benefit of the college?

The Minister, by nodding his head, might be accepting this suggestion; perhaps he is answering another question. However, I would be interested to hear the thrust that can be placed on the use of the word "research", so deliberately incorporated in the four paragraphs. If the college to be constituted (and, indeed, the other to be constituted under another Bill) allows associations to enter into competition for funds for research, will other existing colleges which have a research factor in their objectives be starved of the funds which they had enjoyed in the past? Will it happen or has it happened that new colleges take a proportion of the funds available from the Commonwealth or any other source for research and will the colleges to which we refer in the Bills currently before the House have access to a lesser sum of money than is required to sustain a proper research undertaking? It is a matter of some importance in the overall projection of the colleges of advanced education that we know just what is intended in respect of research and that we know whence the funds are going to come. Colleges which already enjoy this income for research and specific research purposes must not find themselves starved or reduced in the amount that is available to them. I trust that the Minister in replying to the second reading will comment on the insertion of the word "research" and the import of it. I consider that the new college will be best advantaged if it is established with a name other than Murray Park.

Mrs. BYRNE (Todd): I wish to confine my remarks to the de Lissa Institute of Early Childhood Studies, reference to which is contained in clause 15 (2). A petition was presented to this House today which was signed by staff and students of the Murray Park College of Advanced Education and which states:

> That the use of the name de Lissa in the Act for the establishment of the Murray Park College of Advanced Education (1978) to describe the Institute of Early Childhood Studies is totally abhorrent. We do not want the Early Childhood Institute to be identified with the personality or philosophy of any one person, and in particular to that of Lillian De Lissa. We feel that her particular philosophy is not in accord with the academic and professional aspirations of those who will be studying in the institute.

Further, the petition states:

> Your petitioners therefore pray that your Honourable House will remove the words "de Lissa" from the Murray Park College of Advanced Education Bill 1978.

I draw the attention of the Minister to the contents of this petition and I would appreciate his comments.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I find myself in a similar situation to that of the member for Light. I want to make a short contribution to this Bill, and I suppose the Minister is wondering why country members would be taking such an interest in a college of advanced education. What is proposed in relation to these colleges has been highlighted by the member for Torrens and the member for Coles. I was interested in an interjection by the Minister about colleges spending their own money. There has been some correspondence from the Kingston College of Advanced Education about this matter, and I commend the Academic Staff Association and the General Student Association for the interest they are taking in the naming of the new college of advanced education. A footnote in the letter written by the Academic Staff Association states:

> Kingston staff trusted in the committee system, and made no direct representation to any Minister of this matter.

Of course, they are speaking about the name of Murray Park. One could be excused for thinking that those involved in the matter at Kingston College had been treated in a high-handed manner. The Bill concerns the establishment of the Murray Park College.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think the Minister has deceived the people?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister probably does not worry much about the people. The people who are looking to the Minister in this instance do not come from the city; and I will refer to that later. A copy of a letter was sent to every member of Parliament over the signature of the President of the Staff Association, Mr. David D. Curtis, and the Secretary, Mr. M. A. F. Baldwin. The letter pointed out the concern of the academic staff of the Kingston college. We have also had a letter from the students, signed by Miss J. Gebhardt, President, Miss Thomson, Vice-President, and Miss Roberts who came to see members of this House last week, so concerned were they about this matter. In its letter of 15 November the students association states:

> It has been brought to our notice this morning that the proposed name of "Hartley" for the "new" amalgamated college has been replaced by the name of "Murray Park". A student meeting was called immediately to discuss the proposal. The student body feels that a new college should have a new name as a symbol of equality if nothing else.

That is the broad ambit of the move by the member for Torrens. The young ladies whose names appear on the letter are all country ladies. That should be a lesson to the Government that introduced the iniquitous redistribution that blighted the reputation of country people in this

House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the redistribution of electoral boundaries has very little, if anything, to do with the Bill under discussion.

Mr. RODDA: With the greatest respect, everything that takes place in this House emanates from that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member challenging the ruling of the Chair?

Mr. RODDA: No, Sir, just making a pertinent comment. It will do the Minister no harm to know that representations are broad on this issue. There is a downturn in the demand for teachers, but I will bet London to a brick that within the next decade this will not be so. We must keep up these amenities.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you betting London to a brick against or London to a brick on?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister knows very well what I am saying. We do not need any smart answers from you.

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are not to use the word "you". It is "the honourable Minister".

Mr. RODDA: The Minister knows what I am getting at, and that is what is upsetting him. The Minister knows that the States got $729 000 000 of untied money to spend in areas of priority; surely this is an area of priority. I do not want to canvass the financial side of the education grant, but I cannot let the opportunity pass of reminding the honourable gentleman about these matters. I commend these people who are concerned about this name. There is a lot in a name. A rose by any other name could be a thistle. I implore the Minister to pay due heed to the request that will come from this side in the Committee stage of this Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I will support the Bill through the second reading. The points I wish to make are similar to those made by my colleagues. A comment that appears in today's *News* is apt at this time. A person by the name of Mr. Williams from Queensland says that politicians bow too much to small pressure groups when spending public moneys, and quite often those small pressure groups get politicians into bother and quite often it is bureaucrats that are behind the overall scene. There is no doubt in my mind that in the late 1960s and early 1970s a pressure group demanded that money be spent on education and that politicians ran scared on that education cram, if I may use that word, for more money.

There is no doubt that we have in Australia at the moment 26 colleges of advanced education too many. Some people might want to blame that on the Federal Government of the time for making the money available to build those colleges. It did, but it also ran scared of the education lobby. I wonder whether we, as politicians, will run scared of other pressure groups when demands are made to spend money in the future.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Fraser isn't splashing it around.

Mr. EVANS: I give the man credit for the fact that the Federal Government is tightening up in some fields. Here is an example where we as a Parliament, along with other Parliaments in Australia, are trying to decide how to bring about some rationalisation of the education budget which is forcing us to amalgamate colleges of advanced education. In a society where we have become selfish and stopped having families of significant size (we do not have as many children on a progressive basis) it is fair to assess that we may need even fewer teachers in the future than can be trained at the existing colleges of advanced education (I understand they will be teaching persons for other professions).

This does not alter the fact that, if there is a static population, there will have to be rationalisation in more fields than education and teachers colleges. Turning now to names; we all remember that the Sturt college, which is situated in my district, was originally called Bedford Park. Murray Park was originally called Wattle Park. A new college was built, and people tried to align it with a particular area by calling it Murray Park. I object to the suggestion that smooth amalgamation and unity can be obtained by sticking to an existing name and forcing the other group (Kingston college) to accept that name. I think that if that is done it is harming the opportunity for a smooth amalgamation of the two colleges. Anyone with any common sense would realise that that is not acceptable to at least a significant number of those who come from the college that is to lose its name. To those who argue that there is very little in a name, the reverse can be put—why stick to the name Murray Park and not accept another name that is not tied to either of the existing colleges? For that reason I support a change of name. If my colleague moves for Magill, which is one of the four names suggested, I will accept it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I apologise; I said "If he does". Whether he will or not, I am not sure.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has already stated that he will.

Mr. EVANS: I support the general amalgamation of our colleges because of the past mistakes that have been made when many of us were in this place. We are just apologising to society at the moment because we spent its money unwisely, and we are trying to smooth the waters so that we make better use of the money in the future. I support the Bill, and I hope that we get a change in the name proposed and a smoother amalgamation of the two colleges.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill through the second reading in the hope that the Minister will see fit to accept some amendments. My main objection to this Bill is similar to the objection I made at the time of the previous battle we had with the former Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson) when he wanted to change the name of the Kindergarten Teachers Training College (which was a reasonable enough name) to the Kingston College of Advanced Education. I wonder about the reasons for doing that. It did not make the college any better; it just caused trouble at that college.

A letter regarding this Bill addressed to all members of Parliament from the Kingston College of Advanced Education states in part:

> We point out that, at no stage, was the name 'Murray Park College of Advanced Education' included in the recommendations of the working party established for the purpose of considering a name for the new college, nor was it recommended by the Joint Interim Committee advising the Minister. The Minister had directed (in letter 14-6-78) that one of the functions of the Joint Committe was to advise him on the naming of the new college.

These people are very concerned, and I do not blame them. It is the second time in a very short period that the name is to be changed. The Kingston C.A.E. Staff Association also suggested in that communication that three names be considered. The three names were Magill C.A.E., Playford C.A.E., and Spence C.A.E. I hope the Minister will see fit to have another look at this situation, because many strong objections are being raised within the community, and certainly within this college. The letter continues:

> By giving the new college a new name, any suggestion that Kingston is being 'absorbed' by Murray Park can be refuted,

and thereby the amalgamation will be facilitated.

That in itself is enough for further consideration. On 15 November 1978 a motion was passed by the Kingston C.A.E. Staff Association agreeing that these statements be endorsed and that copies be sent to all members of Parliament with a request that members of Parliament oppose the section of the Act dealing with the new name of the college.

In the very long and heated debate in this House on 27 March 1974, the then Minister of Education, (Hon. Hugh Hudson) stated that he thought Kingston was a far better name than de Lissa. He said, 'One must make up one's own mind on the matter.' Following an interjection by me that Kingston was just the name of another person, the Minister said:

> That is so, but it is the name of a person who happens to be fundamentally related to the history of this State and who was the most out-standing Premier of the last century.

The Minister went on to say how well Kingston should be received and what an appropriate name it was for a college. I then interjected and said, 'What did Kingston have to do with kindergartens?' The Minister said, 'What did Sir George Murray have to do with teacher training, or Charles Sturt with teacher training or nurse education?' The Minister could try to fix the doubt in the minds of the members of the Opposition, who were concerned at the original changing of the name of the Kindergarten Teachers Training College. I support the Bill through to the Committee stage, and I hope that the Minister will be realistic and reasonable when amendments are placed before honourable members.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): By and large, this Bill is pedestrian and non-controversial.

Mr. Goldsworthy: But important.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Important, yes, but pedestrian and non-controversial. For that reason, it has been necessary for the Opposition, in carrying out their proper function in this place, to look around for some things to say, and they have done two sorts of things. They have made some political points where they possibly could and have indulged in some cheer chasing where they possibly could. My responsibility and function in this whole exercise has been, wherever possible, to serve as the servant of the Joint Interim Councils in this matter. Where there has been clear advice based on a consensus, I have endeavoured to ensure that that advice should be incorporated in this legislation. That has happened, and we have before the House this evening the work of the Joint Interim Council where there has been agreement between the negotiating parties on that council. To suggest that the interim council has been substantially overruled in any way on the matters before us is complete nonsense, because, in effect, the interim council has drafted the Bill which is before us.

The problem which I have had and which has faced the Government has been that, in effect, on the matter about which the Opposition is making the most noise, there was no decision by the Joint Interim Council. The advice that I was given was that there was a majority vote of the Joint Interim Council that Hartley should be the name for the new college. However, there was no consensus on that, because no-one breached party lines (if I can use that term in referring to the representatives of the two negotiating colleges) in the making of that decision. It was purely a matter of the numbers present at that time.

The Chairman of the Joint Interim Council had no option but to tender to me the advice which had been received. Honourable members will agree that such a decision, involving no consensus and in effect no concession on either side, was in a sense a non-decision. The Government was left with no clear advice within the terms of the parameters that I had set myself, and therefore I had to make a hard decision.

In looking at the results of the negotiations to date, many matters which were put are not the subject of legislation. The member for Coles referred to some of these matters and admitted that they were not subject to legislation; for example, the future structure of the courses. The decision on the immediate structure of the courses was made by the Joint Interim Council. It is a decision which does not even require my approval as Minister and is certainly not something upon which we can legislate. The member for Coles did not really spell out that there was obviously some concession by the Kingston people at that point for it to happen, but it was a concession made in the knowledge that this is subject to re-accreditation in 1981. This is an interim decision on an administrative matter which comes up for review in 1981. By that time we will have a new college operating, a new college council which will embody people who have had past responsibility for both of the amalgamating institutions, and a proper decision can be made on the basis of the new construction to which we are a party in voting in this place today. It is not something which has been given away for ever and a day: it is an interim decision subject to review in 1981 when these courses come up for re-accreditation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is a decision for the college. It is not my decision and it is not a decision this House would want to speak on. It is not a decision subject to legislative action. It is a decision taken at an administrative level, which has been taken on a consensus basis at this stage and which will be taken on a proper legal basis under the new Act once that is available at the time.

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I was about to move on to those portions of the remarks which concern certain political points scoring being indulged in by members of the Opposition. I do not intend to speak for very long on this, because I do not see that there is too much to which we have to reply, but I point out, particularly to the member for Coles, and to a certain extent to the member for Mitcham, that the situation to which they are addressing themselves, however valid it might be in the Eastern States, does not have too much validity in this State. There was no wholesale proliferation of colleges of advanced education.

Mr. Millhouse: But we are amalgamating four of them into two.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I will come to that in a moment. There was no wholesale proliferation of colleges of advanced education in the 1970's. Had there been, one would imagine that there would have been more recommendations from the Anderson committee for amalgamations than there have been. As to the two specific recommendations on which we are currently acting, those capital facilities are not to be lost to education. There is no prospect in the immediate future, for example, that the Adelaide College of Advanced Education will be abandoned as one of the campuses of the Torrens college. As a matter of fact, the Adelaide College of Advanced Education site is not currently large enough to accommodate all the people who seek to use it, and the Adelaide college currently has people working in the old mechanical engineering building and in some offices on North Terrace. That point must be taken into

account.

As for the Kingston College, it is our ambition that the whole of the staff and students on the campus should be relocated at the Murray Park campus as soon as possible, so that building will be available for other purposes. It may well be used as a site for the Board of Advanced Education and eventually the Tertiary Education Authority, if certain legislation that I will be introducing in the next couple of days is passed by the Parliament. It may be that the South Australian Council for Educational Planning and Research, which is presently in rented premises, may show an interest in it, and it may be that the Childhood Services Council—

Mr. Millhouse: In other words, you're looking for a tenant.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Of course. I have no doubt that they will be readily identified by people involved in education who are currently renting premises, at some expense to them and to the State. There are no great massive capital facilities that show some suggestion that they will be lying idle in the next few years; that is not really what is behind this whole business at all.

The other point I want to make in relation to this matter is that there seems to be some confusion on the part of some people opposite as to the sorts of institution about which we are speaking. The member for Mitcham, for example, suggested that the term "colleges of advanced education" was a rather pretentious sort of title, and he betrayed by that statement his ignorance of the fact that the colleges are considerably expanding their course offerings beyond mere teacher training. It is ridiculous to consider, say, Sturt College of Advanced Education any longer as purely a teacher training college, or Torrens College of Advanced Education as a teacher training college. What point he was trying to make in relation to this matter of their having too pretentious a title, I am afraid rather escapes me.

If there was massive overbuilding in this sector in the early 1970s, that is a topic which is more germane to the situation in the Eastern States, and does not apply here. When my predecessor brought in legislation for most of these institutions he was talking about institutions already in existence, and merely set them free from the bonds of the Education Act, and from the Kindergarten Union Act in one instance. Finally in this matter, I refer members opposite to their colleague, the member for Victoria, who seemed to contradict practically everything that most of them were saying when he said that at present there was a decline in the demand for teachers, but in 10 years time the situation could well change.

If we are to take that at its face value, what he was saying was there was no massive over-provision at all in those years and that people were being farsighted as to capital provisions in this area. I will leave it to the Opposition to make its own peace with the member for Victoria, and so much for the member for Coles talking about the chickens coming home to roost.

The member for Light asked me to make comments about research, and widening the charters of the colleges to get into the research field. He was concerned as to colleges that might lose research grants as a result of increased competition from colleges such as Murray Park. I wish that he had identified the institutions about which he is concerned. If he is concerned about Roseworthy, there is no chance that this college will take research grants off Roseworthy, because there is no prospect that this college would be allowed to so diversify its course offerings so as to get into agriculture. Part of the point of the legislation I will introduce later this week is to ensure that, in diversifying course offerings of colleges of advanced education, we do not get a gross overlap and wastage of resources. The honourable member might have been talking about universities.

Dr. Eastick: I was talking about a sum of money for research distributed among institutions. Will you reduce the amount available to individual institutions?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The main point is that I am not too certain that South Australia has always done particularly well as to research grants available generally around the country. We are looking at a national picture of research grants. If the colleges have the capacity to bid for some of this, we may well get research grants flowing in the direction of this State that would not have otherwise been available. On the other hand, I do not see the colleges in the early stages going aggressively into this field, and this may be what the honourable member fears. By and large, it seems sensible that they should be allowed to take on these functions if they are able to attract the necessary finance with the expertise they have on offer. I could not see them getting into a position of going into it aggressively.

The member for Todd asked about clause 15 (2), and this brings me to the nub of the substantive matter the Opposition was raising. I discount some of this other stuff, because it is cheer chasing, being wise after the event, or political point scoring. The member for Todd raised the matter of the naming of the institute of early childhood within the overall college, and the Opposition raised the matter of the name of the overall college. I have already indicated the trouble I have had about the naming of the overall college in that there was no consensus or proper decision on the joint interim council on this matter. As for the naming of de Lissa, that is a recommendation from the Anderson committee that was adopted by the joint interim council, and I am carrying out the wishes of the council in that respect.

True, there are people in the colleges, in particular at Murray Park, who oppose this idea, and that was embodied in the petition presented to the House. Let us see how Murray Park fares in this matter. First, the campus for the new college will eventually be consolidated at Murray Park; that was inescapable, and there is a great sense in having a consolidated campus for the new institution. That was predictable, and you can say that is one up for Murray Park, if you like. Secondly, the Director designate of the new college is the Director of Murray Park College of Advanced Education; that was predictable, when the Director of Kingston did not apply to the committee, which I had set up to advise me on this matter, for appointment to the position of Director designate. That is something over which I had no control. I would have accepted whatever advice was proffered to me by that committee, but it came to me and said, "There's only one starter." If you want to run a scoreboard on the whole matter, Murray Park came out reasonably well on that, because its Director is the Director designate.

Thirdly, it has been decided that we should call the college Murray Park, which is the existing name. I say to the people who have signed the petition from Murray Park, "How much more do you want?" I understand that, if some people at Murray Park had had their way, clause 15 (2) of the Bill would not be there. Subclause (2) provides that there shall be an institute of early childhood studies at the college. I understand that there are those at Murray Park saying that that is an improper decision, that the advice which the joint council gave to the Minister was improper and that it should have been left to the new college to work out the configuration of its schools as it saw fit. Some people want the whole lot. I have been determined all along that some assurances should be give

to the Kingston people that early childhood studies would continue to be a heavy input so far as the new college was concerned, and this should best be secured by providing in legislation that there be an institute of early childhood studies.

I was minded to call it a school, as I do not see in legislation any distinction between an institute and a school. People at Kingston seem to think that, by calling it an institute, it will be a signal to the new college council that there must be a multi-disciplinary approach in relation to the new institute. I am happy to accede to that request, although in law it does not do anything. In answer to those petitioners who are bitterly opposed to the name de Lissa, I simply say that this decision was taken by the joint interim council. It is the sort of assurance which, I think, needed to be given to the Kingston college in this matter.

Finally, I turn my attention to this matter of a breach of faith on my part. I have already indicated to the House that I have tried as far as possible and wherever there was obvious consensus and agreement between negotiating parties to be the servant of the joint interim council. Where there was not this advice, it was necessary to take a decision. It is interesting that some Opposition members suggest that I am a creature of those ex-teachers, and the things about which they are arguing are those things about which I have not taken advice, since no advice was available, and a decision had to be taken by me. That is what they are arguing about, not the areas where I have been the creature of the ex-teachers because I have allowed myself to be; it is proper and fitting that I be. I have tried wherever there was consensus to embody those decisions in this legislation.

True, I had a meeting with Kingston college and that I told it that I would try as far as possible to ensure that it was entering these negotiations as an equal partner. I believe it still does. I believe that the machinery of the joint interim council still enables the Kingston college to have an equal input into the ongoing administrative decisions at the new college, and I will certainly be ensuring that, in the new appointments which the Governor-in-Council makes to the council of the new college which the new legislation sets up, the viewpoint of early childhood studies is given a large say indeed. Names are a minor consideration compared to the important matters as to who will be taking decisions, who will be occupying positions, and the sort of curriculum that will be offered to whom. In these matters, Kingston will continue to have a big input. I guess that, on a strict one vote one value basis on the basis of the size of the two institutions, you could say that they have an over-large input, but I have not seen it in that way. I have seen it as two equal bodies entering into a delicate negotiation with this Parliament having finally to ratify those decisions and my giving whatever advice to Parliament I can to ensure a reasonably smooth passage of the Bill and the embodiment of those principles in legislation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short title."

Mr. WILSON: I move:

Page 1, line 3—Leave out "Murray Park" and insert "Magill".

This amendment alters the name of the college from Murray Park to Magill. I have already canvassed the reasons why I believe the name should be changed, as have other members on this side. The Minister mentioned that the name is a minor consideration. Administratively, that may well be so, but there has been a merger to which all parties have come equally. The Minister asked, "How much more do the Murray Park people want?" That is the very nub of the matter (and I do not want to criticise the people involved: I have the greatest respect for the institution and the people). We believe that is the least that should be applied in a mutual name.

I am not over-entranced with the name "Magill". I am happy to accept Hartley, Spence or Playford, although there could be an accusation of political connotations. I believe Sir Thomas Playford is so well respected, as statements made by the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate, that his name would be above political consideration. It was thought that a name such as Magill would be best. According to a volume I have obtained from the Parliamentary Library entitled "Campbelltown" by John T. Leaney, the name Magill goes back to 1838. It has undergone several differences in spelling but nevertheless it is a very old name in our history; it was a very respected area indeed in the history of the State. I will not canvass again all the reasons for a change in name, because we have provided in the second reading debate letters from various organisations that feel that the merger would appear to be a merger in name as well as in fact if the name of the college was changed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the amendment, although I do not think much of the name that the Liberals have chosen to substitute for Murray Park. I think Magill is perhaps a bit dull. I would have preferred Hartley or Spence, and I understand that the joint interim committee recommended the name of Hartley. I suspect this name was rejected because there is a Labor member here and there might be some political connotation, forgetting that the electoral district was named Hartley because it was a well known and respected name. The use of the name would not be political at all. However, the Liberals have chosen Magill and I support it because the real point is that there should be a new name, whatever it is, as that would be better from the point of view of the Kingston college people.

In the second reading debate I suggested that there had been some academic politics played and that was why the name Murray Park was to be used. I certainly wish no ill, quite the contrary, to the people at Murray Park and no doubt they are delighted by this. However, the new name rubs salt into the wound of the Kingston people. They feel that they have been swallowed up by Murray Park, and they do not like it. They have protested about the development, and I think they are justified. A few days ago I had a message from a woman who is on the staff of Kingston college, part of which states:

> A joint interim committee was formed to make recommendations to Cabinet about the new college and they were asked to recommend an entirely new name not associated with Murray or Kingston. Names suggested were Hartley, Magill and Spence.

However, Cabinet has not accepted these and she thinks it is to be "Murray Park". She was quite right. The situation is quite unfair. Kingston is the kindergarten college and is going out of existence physically and in every other way. It makes the situation worse for those concerned, who see the college disappearing, to be saddled with the name of a rival with whom they have had to amalgamate. I do not know why Cabinet chose the name Murray Park; there may be some important principle at stake. I hope the Government can change its mind and have the generosity to listen to those from Kingston.

Dr. EASTICK: I attack the problem in a different way. I certainly support the amendment. I would support any other name than that of Murray Park. I would prefer a name with an on-going and advantageous association. I am quite happy to accept "Magill", on the explanation given by my colleague but, if the Minister wants to suggest an

alternative, I am sure members on this side would be willing to accommodate him. The name "Murray Park" has some unfortunate connotations in respect of difficulties which have existed over a period of time. I believe we need, in the best interests of the organisation which will come from this amalgamation, to clean the slate and give the institution the opportunity to move on as soon as this Bill becomes an Act. The new institution can develop an entirely new approach, with its own history and vision. This can be best done by moving away from the Government's insistence on maintaining a name which is common to only one of the two institutions involved, a name which has been in the public eye in unfortunate ways.

I believe that there is a distinct advantage for the college of advanced education based on the old Murray Park campus site to obtain a new name. Therefore I support the amendment.

Mr. WILSON: The member for Light speaks for all of us when he says that we are not set on the one name. It could be argued that the name "Magill" has unpleasant connotations if one goes back to the days of the reformatory.

Mr. Millhouse: For heaven's sake, don't be so silly.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the honourable member for Mitcham wishes to contribute further he will get the call.

Mr. WILSON: The Anderson Committee recommended a change of name. The precedent was set by the merging of Torrens and Adelaide under a different name. When Western Teachers College amalgamated with the South Australian School of Art a new name was found for the new college. I believe the precedent shows that the case should be agreed to by the Government.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): The effect of this amendment, if accepted, will be to substitute a name which some people do not like for a name that nobody is happy with. I am certainly not. The Kingston people would be a little happier than they are with the situation which faces them in this Bill, but I do not see that they would be particularly enamoured of the name proposed, and there is no reason that they should be. Certainly, Murray Park people would be less happy with the situation than at present. The Government does not see Magill as being a particularly attractive name for the new institution.

I will give the Committee an undertaking that if, following the proclamation of this Act and the setting up of a new council at the new college, the new council comes forward to me which a recommendation as to a name, I will come into the House and amend this Act in conformity with the decision of that council. The point of the matter is that currently we simply do not have a decision—we have no consensus. This Act provides for a legal framework, namely, the new college, through which a decision can be taken.

There will no longer be talk of people representing Murray Park's point of view or the Kingston point of view; there will be a new institution and the students and staff will be part of that new institution. If, a result of that, advice is tendered to me by the new council that it favours Hartley, Spence or (heaven preserve us) Magill, I am prepared to tender appropriate advice to Parliament in the form of an amending Bill. I urge the Committee to reject this amendment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. I am disappointed about the way in which the Minister has put this matter. What he has said is that he is bound to the numbers of Murray Park.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Oh, come on.

Mr. MATHWIN: Of course he is. It means that the Minister has given in. Fewer people involved with the Kindergarten Union will be hurt, so he will go along with the Murray Park clause in the Bill. I received a letter from the Kingston College Academic Staff Association as follows:

> We point out that, at no stage, was the name 'Murray Park College of Advanced Education' included in the recommendations of the working party established for the purpose of considering a name for the new college, nor was it recommended by the Joint Interim Committee advising the Minister.

It is obvious that the only thing the Minister can come up with is some idea that, if we receive a recommendation about a name, he will come back with a further amendment, or a further Bill to start all over again. We have had arguments over the years about this, one from the Kindergarten Teachers Training College with the then Minister of Education (Hon. Hugh Hudson), who said that Kingston was the name for this organisation, that it was so important, because Kingston was such a great man, the greatest Premier ever in this State.

Mr. Millhouse: He wanted to call Flinders University "Kingston".

Mr. MATHWIN: Of course he did. He made his maiden speech in this House based on Kingston. It was said that if he had not mentioned Kingston there would have been nothing in his maiden speech at all. Despite this, the present Minister is willing to wash his hands in a Judas like fashion and say, "Let them go to the wall; they are only a small show anyway, so it does not really matter. We will let Murray Park engulf them and absorb them in this area."

He will not win friends by doing this, and he will upset the Kingston college people. The Minister said there were no names fitting for a new college. The member for Light said that he was quite willing for the Minister to suggest a name other than the one suggested in the amendment. I would be happy to go along with the Minister's suggesting another name. I think it is of paramount importance that he do this for the benefit of all concerned. I ask him to reconsider the situation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The mystery still remains as to why the Government chose the name Murray Park. The Minister said that there was no recommendation at all for any particular name.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I did not say that. There was a recommendation, but it was from a hung jury.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know that it was from a hung jury. According to my information, which is the same as that of members of the Liberal Party, the recommendation of the Joint Interim Committee was for "Hartley". I do not know whether they were hung or not. That, as I understand, was the recommendation that the Government got. Even if it were a hung jury, why Murray Park?

Mr. Mathwin: The easy way out.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it must have been. The Government, nevertheless, must have realised that it would antagonise and make more difficult the position of the Kingston C.A.E. people, so why do it? We heard not one word of explanation from the Minister as to why the name Murray Park was chosen. We have this rather silly suggestion that he will reopen the Act, as it will be, to change the name if that is the recommendation of the new council. I would have thought that he had been a Minister for long enough to realise that it is not altogether easy sometimes to get a Bill drafted and into the House when there is much work to be done.

This Government says it has much work to be done, and in volume there is quite a bit here. I would have thought

most Cabinets would be a bit unwilling to introduce a Bill simply to change a name, so that is an easy undertaking to give, but it might be more difficult to honour later, if ever the occasion arises, than the Minister would like the Committee to believe now.

The chances of a recommendation for another name being given are not good, I think. It depends who are the 14 or 16 people that the Minister puts on the council, apart from those who are there by election or *ex officio*, so that really has not much substance. I would like to know why the Government chose the name Murray Park rather than anything else. I would also like to know why (unless I am wrong in this assumption and I have been misled by this letter from the staff association at Kingston) the name Hartley, which was apparently recommended, has been rejected.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I support the amendment. I am amazed that the Minister should give an undertaking that is nothing more than an evasion of his responsibility. To use the vernacular, the Minister is a piker and is passing the buck. The Minister should be accepting the responsibility here and now in this Chamber and not passing it on to a group of people who are supposed to be administering a college, not setting out to select a new name as their first function in their newly constituted form.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You said the same thing about the Joint Interim Council.

Mrs. ADAMSON: No, the Joint Interim Council was set up for this purpose. The Minister, and some of his colleagues (because I wonder if the Minister alone is responsible for this), have disregarded the recommendations of the Joint Interim Committee. The Minister has said that the name Magill is boring.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: No, your colleague said that.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I think the Minister said it, too. The Minister said, "Heaven preserve us from the name Magill".

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That doesn't mean boring.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Anyway, the Minister indicated he did not like the name Magill. I strongly suspect that if the member for Torrens had put up the name Playford he would have been accused of politicking. If he had put up the name Hartley it would have been said it was inappropriate because the college was not in the electorate of Hartley, but in the electorate of Coles. If the member for Torrens had put up the name Spence it would have been said that it would have been confused with the electorate of Spence on the other side of the city. In other words, the Minister would have had an argument against any name that was put up. However, the name in the amendment is not so much at question as is the Government's obligation under this Bill to name a new college in accordance with its undertakings. As for passing the buck to the council and saying it can determine the name, what kind of Pandora's box would the Minister open up by giving this to the newly constituted council? What is done in this Parliament is done and is unlikely to be undone, and I suggest that the Minister knows it. If the Minister's undertaking is accepted by members on this side, it would mean that the new council, instead of getting on with the job, would spend hours debating a new name. Members should face up to the function of Parliament, and in particular the Minister should face up to it and accept the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment if the Minister offers no alternative. Is the Minister prepared to work on other names, even by negotiations with the authorities concerned, before the Bill goes through the other place, and to accept a change of name before the Bill leaves the Parliament?

Mr. MATHWIN: Does the Minister intend to answer some of the questions asked of him? He was asked why he selected the name Murray Park. The member for Fisher asked the Minister whether he would consider names while this Bill was in another place. If he can find a better name than Magill, well and good. There are a number of names of people or places in this State that would be quite appropriate for this type of college.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not wish unduly to lengthen this process. The answers to the member for Mitcham, reiterated by the member for Glenelg, is that I refer him to the second reading speech. The answer to the member for Fisher is, "No".

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Millhouse, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Tonkin. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. WILSON: The definition of "general staff" seems to have been included twice in this clause, but is not mentioned again in the remainder of the Bill, whereas the term "ancillary staff" is used. There seems to have been general agreement amongst non-academic staff groups in colleges of advanced education to be referred to as general rather than ancillary or support staff.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Where the term "ancillary staff" is used, it is used because it has to be used; it refers to the elections I will cause to be undertaken in the first instance from the staffs of the existing colleges. The term "ancillary staff" is used in the present legislation, but we are substituting the term "general staff" in the new legislation, and that applies to the same people who will be employed in the new college set-up under the Bill.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Constitution of the Council."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before I come to the amendments I have on file, I have a point to raise about clause 8 (2) *(b)* which provides;

> A member of the senior academic staff of the College elected by the senior academic staff (but the Head of the de Lissa Institute of Early Childhood Studies shall be deemed to have been elected, upon the commencement of this Act, to membership of the Council under this paragraph);

I wonder whether that is meant to be only the first head of the institute or whether the Head of the de Lissa Institute will always be deemed to have been elected. I think the strict interpretation of this provision may well be that, in which case it would be easier to say that the Head of the de Lissa Institute of Early Childhood Studies will be on the council. It reminds me of what I believe to be a true story—

The CHAIRMAN: And relevant, no doubt.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Absolutely relevant, Sir. In England, before the first Matrimonial Causes Act was brought in, in about 1860, the only way in which you could get a divorce was by private Act of Parliament. A town clerk, an enterprising man who did not like his wife, was

drafting a Bill which was to be presented to Parliament on some completely different topic, and he inserted in the middle of it a clause stating "The town clerk of X is hereby divorced." When it got to the House of Commons or the House of Lords, no-one read it and it went through. He was then divorced. Afterwards, however, it caused enormous trouble, because no-one was sure whether every town clerk thereafter was, immediately upon appointment, divorced or not. Parliaments have not changed: members did not do their homework in those days, either.

Here there is an ambiguity at least of interpretation. I suspect that it is a delicately balanced thing, even though they have been brushed aside on the name, to try to get some soothing of feelings; perhaps in the way in which it is drafted it means that the Head of the de Lissa Institute will always be the senior academic staff member of the college on the council. What was the intention?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The intention clearly is that Dr. Pederson shall be on the council of the new college. If the honourable member turns his attention to the Bill dealing with the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, he will find a similar provision. In the first instance, Dr. Pederson, as the Head of the de Lissa school, would be on the college, but that is what is intended. In the fullness of time, this position would be available to a member of the senior academic staff of the college elected by the senior academic staff.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the Minister should look at it. Although the draftsman is laughing in disbelief, I am not certain that he is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know I must not refer to the draftsman. Even the Labor Party will be glad to do something about that upstairs. I have my amendments to move.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Committee wish to debate any matters on clause 8 before the member for Mitcham puts his amendments?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The important words are that the Head of the de Lissa Institute shall be deemed to have been elected, but that election, as with all other elections under this clause, is in force for two years. At the end of two years, the substantive wording of the subclause applies. It will be a position open to election from the senior academic staff.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the Minister had a little more experience in the law and understanding of it, he would not speak with such confidence. It is by no means as clear as that. In 10 years time, the head of the institute may well say, "I was deemed to have been elected to membership of the council."

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Upon the commencement of the Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is not how it is worded. A person appointed in 10 years time may say, "I was deemed to have been appointed to the council at the commencement of the Act, and I am still on it." It is a small point and probably will not be tested, but it is an imperfection of drafting.

I turn now to my first amendment. There was only one, but then, thanks to the member for Torrens, I realised that I needed a consequential amendment. I move:

> Page 4, line 14—Leave out "three" and insert in lieu thereof "four".

The council will be enormous, with about 25 to 30 people, but perhaps that is all right, and I say nothing more about its overall size.

Mr. Chapman: Are they honorary or paid?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope they are honorary. Paragraph *(e)* provides that there shall be three students of the college on the council elected by the students. I had a letter in late September from the Students Association of Murray Park. I used part of it in the second reading. They protested most bitterly about what they said was the reduction in the ratio of students to other members on the council. A paragraph I did not read previously from the letter of 27 September states:

> While the new college operates on a split campus, the problems of this reduced representation will be further accentuated. If one student from the North Adelaide campus—

the old Kingston—

> is a member, only two from the Magill campus will be able to become members of this body. That is one less than is at present the case. As is widely known, the work loads of students are often quite considerable, hence, the greater the student representation, the less the additional pressure on council membership may be for individuals. It is most important that students have an opportunity to contribute to the college life without adversely affecting their studies. In the case of illness, student representation can be severely affected for both campuses, especially the North Adelaide one. It is imperative that student representation is able to maintain continuity on this body throughout the year. To make this more readily attainable, greater student representation is necessary.

That is the gist of the reasons why I have moved this amendment. I found that there were still only three students on the council. Although that letter was dated 27 September, I was prepared to think that perhaps the Government had increased the number, but it has not. My amendment would allow of four student representatives. Although they do not say how many they want, and I do not know, at least it is one more than they had previously.

We really cannot look at subclause (2), which I am amending, without looking also at subclause (8), and this is where the second amendment is. It is absolutely necessary, to make sense of the thing, that I at least refer to it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will allow the honourable member to speak to both amendments, but they must be put separately, because the Minister has an amendment on file that comes between them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Subclause (8) deals with the way in which the student members will be appointed. As it stands, again it looks as though a delicate compromise has been worked out by the academics, because it is infernally complex. There is one elected from Murray Park, one elected from Kingston, and then one elected by the combination of the students at both places. It is very likely, because of the 1 100 at the Magill campus compared to the 300 at the North Adelaide campus, that the one will be a Murray Park student; but that would still give Murray Park only two and Kingston one, and that is what students at Murray Park complain about. What I would like to do is to increase the number to four and, in my second amendment, in subclause (8)(c), make "one of their number" "two of their number". It is likely that both of the student representatives elected on the combined franchise will come from Murray Park, but not necessarily. If that happened, it would give Murray Park three to one or, if Kingston got two, two all, thus meeting the problem that has been raised. This seems to be sensible. I cannot see how it will affect the work of the council very much. It will be a large council, between 25 and 30, and one more here or there would not make any difference.

Mr. WILSON: I oppose the amendment. As regards the ratio of student members to the council, I would not be unhappy to see four there. My experience is of a university council where they have four student representatives and a

council of 36 or more members. This would maintain a ratio of three to 25 or 30, or about the same ratio. I think there would have to be three Murray Park representatives to one Kingston, considering the relevant numbers contained in the combined electorate. The point of the clause has been to provide a guarantee (the only guarantee contained in the Bill) that the Kingston people will be protected in any transfer of the North Adelaide campus out to Magill. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I, too, oppose the amendment. The arguments of the member for Mitcham lacked substance. I also received a letter, identical to the one received by the member for Mitcham, from the student body at Murray Park. The letter stated that they had been treated with contempt, and were not properly represented. I made careful inquiries as to how they had been treated, and it was an overstatement on their part to say that they had been treated with contempt. They have been treated throughout with consideration, and certainly they had representaton on the subcommittees of the joint interim committee, and everyone had access to all correspondence and agendas.

An extra member on the council certainly makes a difference not only in terms of the aggregate number but also in terms of the relationship between students, academic staff, and general staff representation on the council, and between that proportionate representation and those outside people who will be appointed by the Minister. Surely we should be looking at what is the function of a college council. Is it to be representative of the students or is to administer the affairs of the college? Should administration be done by people with experience and wisdom?

Mr. Millhouse: You'd cut out student representatives altogether.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting that the present balance of three members of the academic staff, three members of the general staff, and three students is a fair balance in favour of the students. As the student population moves continually through the college, there is not the stability and continuity that can be achieved through representation of members of the academic and general staff and the outside community. The work load is heavy, and therefore the students need to spread it among a number. Student councillors from both colleges have approached their task diligently. As we need good administration from the council, and as that will be more likely achieved by a smaller well-balanced group, I oppose the amendment.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: First, it is important that we retain parity as between academic staff, general staff, and students. Secondly, we should retain *de facto* parity between people internal to the college and those external. The member for Coles has raised the matter of students sometimes having problems about being able to maintain a presence in the council, because of studies for exams, etc., but outside people appointed to the council have similar sorts of difficulty for other reasons. Formally in the Bill, they outnumber the people who are internal to the college, but that is done in the expectation that there will not be a full muster of those people at all times. In practice, people sitting around the table on most occasions will roughly be equal as between those internal to the college as academic staff, general staff, and students on the one hand, and those appointed by the Governor-in-Council. If we were to accept the amendment, I would be pressing further amendments as regards the council that would have the effect of four academic staff and four general staff, and we would have to look at the whole question of the people appointed under paragraph (f). I urge the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As so often happens in this place, it seems as though the Labor and the Liberal Parties have ganged up on me. I am undaunted because the arguments they present are pitifully weak. During the course of a patronising speech, the member for Coles, in whose electorate the college is situated and for whose benefit the amendment is moved, said, "Students do not have the ability or the experience to serve on councils effectively; older people who have that ability and experience should be put in their place." That is typical of Liberal Party outlook, but it is not my outlook.

The argument advanced by the Minister was equally pitiful. He said that the balance would be upset, since some of his 14 to 16 nominees will stay away from meetings. He suggested that, if one more student was added to the council, the balance would be upset. That is absurd because the balance will depend on whether 14, 15 or 16 representatives are appointed, and this is entirely up to the Minister. How can the balance be upset in a group of 30 or 35 people by adding one more student? This argument has been used only because the Minister had to say something in opposition to the amendment.

The member for Coles suggested that the amendment would upset the balance between students. Students do not make up the council on their own. Whether three or four students are appointed, it is a very small proportion of the total number of representatives on the council. To say that it would be unfair to one or other college is unreasonable.

Question—"That the amendment be agreed to"—declared negatived.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: There being only one member on the side of the Ayes, I declare that the Noes have it.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I move:

Page 4, lines 28 and 29—Leave out paragraph *(b)*.

Under the present Bill a member of the staff of the college is ineligible by appointment of the Governor to be a member of the council. That would not be something that would happen often, but it seems unreasonable to place a limitation such as this in the legislation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Even I sometimes get discouraged, and I do not propose to proceed with my amendment.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Council to collaborate with certain bodies."

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I direct attention to clause 14 (2). This provision is contained in all of the existing college Acts, and I was lobbied by students to have the words "or the right of students to continue in any such course of training" withdrawn from the clause. The students said that this was a survival of the days when the Government offered unbonded and bonded scholarships and may have wanted to have a say in such decisions. Students feared the possibility of a malevolent Minister using this provision in a Draconian way. The wording of the clause makes clear that the Minister has no right of initiation. The council of the college is the initiating body.

This clause really gives the students certain rights. The council could, if it wished, bring down statutes about the rights of students continuing in their course of training, if these students were of a radical opinion, did not wash, or something of that nature. In that situation, the Minister's role would be to protect the students. The college council is obligated, in the public interest, to collaborate with the Minister in matters such as this. I think I have been able to

persuade the people who feared the insertion of this provision that striking out the words they wanted struck out would not bring about the situation they wanted to achieve. I commend the clause to honourable members.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—"Internal organisation of the college."

Mr. WILSON: This clause has particular application to the petition received in the House today. It was my understanding that this clause might be omitted from the Bill. I understand that the Kingston people were worried that the naming of the institute the de Lissa Institute of Childhood Studies could not be incorporated in the Bill. I express the appreciation of the Kingston people that it is in fact included in the Bill. Members will realise that the petition we received today was directly contrary to having this provision included in the clause.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Student bodies."

Mr. WILSON: Is provision made in the Act for academic or general staff associations to be formed without the involvement of students?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is no intention that this should not take place. I see the point the honourable member is making. We intend that there be no obstacle to the formation of such bodies. I cannot put my finger on the provision that makes clear that this can happen.

Mr. WILSON: Will the Minister give an undertaking that he will look at this matter before the Bill passes through the Parliament?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 19 to 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Exemption from certain charges."

Mr. WILSON: Is the exemption from sales tax enjoyed by these institutions covered under Commonwealth legislation which overrides State legislation? I notice that sales tax is not mentioned in the new clause.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is the case. The State Government cannot legislate in respect of that.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (28 and 29) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW (PROHIBITION OF CHILD PORNOGRAPHY) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADELAIDE COLLEGE OF THE ARTS AND EDUCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 2164.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): There is no doubt that many colleges surplus to need have been built in Australia over the past 10 years. There has, in fact, been considerable proliferation, not only in South Australia but elsewhere, and more particularly in the Eastern States, where about 10 years ago there was the idea that Australia's economy was burgeoning, and that the population would increase rapidly because of migration and a steady birth rate. Perhaps the member for Victoria was being far-sighted when he said that we could not predict school student numbers and therefore teacher requirements with any certainty. Perhaps he read the Anderson Report, because I believe Prof. Anderson made the same comment.

There are several variables that we cannot predict. Among them is migration. If migration increases rapidly a large number of students will immediately come on to the market and we will need more teachers. There is a report on its way to the House about the possibility of matriculation colleges being established to attract more adults back into the secondary education field. There is also the question whether the birth rate might not increase. At the moment there is an extremely high abortion rate in Australia. It is interesting that there are literally billions of dollars in savings accounts and I am optimistic enough to think that much of that money may have been put into savings accounts by young people wishing to build their first home, marry, settle down, and have children. There could be a baby boom again; we do not know.

Professor Anderson pointed out that if we increased the retention rate in matriculation in secondary schools from the present 35 per cent to 50 per cent, that would require an additional 5 500 students being brought into education at that upper level with the necessity to provide more teachers. All these variables make it extremely difficult to predict the future particularly if one considers that the impact of technology on education is not nearly as drastic as it is in industry and commerce. There technology means, generally, massive reductions in staffing. In teaching we have to aim for a steady reduction of the staff-student ratio, so the impact of technology has not been so dramatic and is unlikely to be because teachers are clearly the most important component in education. Of course, we had many colleges at tertiary level anxious to step on to the then bandwagon to obtain tertiary funding. This, too added to the number of colleges of advanced education which were declared surplus about 1975.

It is also interesting to note that South Australia has quite a strange contradiction in that the Government was strenuously defending the construction of Monarto in 1975, while at the same time the Minister is claiming that that was the same year that it was evident that we had a declining population and therefore a declining student population and the surplus of teachers colleges was quite evident. Apparently, the two Government departments involved were not working as closely as they might have done, otherwise some quite heartrending debates might have been avoided in this House.

Be that as it may, the Federal Borrie Report, which predicted a stabilising of population proved to be only too true, so we did have too many colleges constructed, including those in South Australia. Therefore, this amalgamation is a quite logical and rational move towards resolving that surplus. Whether it will be successful in reducing costs, as many people in the community believe, is to be questioned, because Professor Anderson on page 3 of his report pointed out the following:

> Evidence from studies in Australia and the United States does not indicate that colleges as small as the smallest in South Australia are necessarily more expensive to operate than larger institutions, although they may have difficulties in adequately providing some expensive services such as libraries.

Kingston college is an example we have just dealt with in the last debate, where there was an inexpensively run college being amalgamated with a more expensively run college, with the corollary that we assume costs for the Kingston college will increase. There is no guarantee that costs will reduce when we move into the super college situation, particularly since there has been a strong move by all of the various components to be amalgamated to retain the *status quo* as regards staffing, to ensure that they still have adequate student numbers going through. Therefore, on the surface what may seem a reduction of cost may not be realised for some considerable time, if at all. Perhaps it would be fair to quote Professor Anderson when he says that that should not be the primary consideration. What should be the primary consideration is that we should look into educational advantages for the students and not the assumption that the cost per student will be lowered.

I did not hear the various points of view put forward by my colleagues, so I will not make any comment other than to say that I did hear the Minister referring to the statement made by the member for Victoria. Perhaps it would be in order to congratulate the Directors and the councils of Torrens and Adelaide colleges. At first they had extremely divergent points of view. We should all recall the initial board of education submission to the Anderson Committee when it was released in the House. I said it was quite plain and certainly set the cat among the pigeons, because members on this side and the Minister himself were lobbied by both parties, each anxious to retain its identity on its own campus; something which could not happen, of course.

We therefore have the situation that Torrens college and Adelaide college both made immediate press releases stating their cases quite strongly for the retention of their own identities on their own campuses. Torrens college probably appeared the more willing to amalgamate, and certainly it put forward a substantial submission to the Minister. I will refer to a few of the points made in that submission, because, coupled with the joint press release from Adelaide and Torrens colleges of advanced education, they do seem to represent largely the basis of the Minister's preamble to this Bill.

One or two of the points of view are divergent. The Torrens college initially said that after much discussion its council had favoured retention of the present Torrens College of Advanced Education as a separate institution, but that if the Minister did not agree to that it was quite agreeable to amalgamating with the Adelaide College of Advanced Education. The council was also good enough to point out that the Torrens College of Advanced Education Act, 1972, had provided for the maintenance of the South Australian School of Art as a school within the college and that therefore any amalgamation should include the retention of that school as a separate identity within the amalgamated group.

In the initial submission to the Anderson Committee, they also considered that a dual campus organisation of the college was undesirable because it would make things more difficult for students to obtain some of the advantages of amalgamation which were argued quite strongly in the Anderson Report. Apart from that, the college had had considerable difficulty in the isolation of different parts of the student body prior to its own establishment as the Torrens College. We all remember the old Western Teachers College and the South Australian School of Art, which presented quite mammoth problems for students. The college council was talking from a considerable body of experience in this when it recommended no dual campus. It said that separate sites would perpetuate the problems which Torrens college as a multi-campus institution, had experienced for some years. Some of the problems it saw were communication of students between campuses and certainly time-tabling difficulties. With the duplication of some facilities and amenities obviously being necessary, and this at a time when we are obviously trying to establish a new college identity, which is difficult if you have scattered campuses, it made recommendations to the Anderson Committee. I was interested to note, therefore, in the joint press release released some considerable time after that the Directors had entered into quite a different attitude when they stated they were pleased with the recommendations that the Kintore Avenue campus was to be retained for the new college.

They said it would play a very special part in the college's teaching programme because it would provide an important central city venue for courses in performing arts, ethnic and language studies, post-graduate work, and in-service courses for teachers. They then referred to the excellent facilities nearing completion at Underdale. Apart from any need for initial educational facilities, they said the merger would not require significant capital expenditure. That is a happy resolution because on the face of it it seems, that if we were going to do away with a dual campus situation, we would be faced with considerable expenditure on new facilities at Underdale to provide for the absorption of the Adelaide college should it move holus bolus to the new site. That seems to be a rational compromise in the light of the funding available. If the two college councils are in agreement, it would hardly behove this House to disagree with them and make any major issues.

I should have said at the outset that the Opposition is supporting this legislation. We do not propose to move any amendments, because it is a rational move, albeit some people have been disadvantaged and upset, and at present there is some reduction of morale while the staffs of the two colleges are waiting to see when and whether this Bill goes through the two Houses. With that reassurance, we are not opposing the Bill, and we would like to see things put into motion as soon as possible.

The timing of this Bill is a little late rather than a little early and the drafting may have been a little hasty, because there is the question of what to do with two Directors. I questioned the Minister on this some months ago and I was assured of the appointment of Kevin Gilding, the Director of the Adelaide College of Advanced Education, to the Torrens college as an Associate Director, with what we would consider to be equal status at that time with the then Director, Greg Ramsay, who is now the new Director of the new college. That presented problems.

Within the Bill, we notice that the Associate Director's position will take effect upon the commencement of the

Act, and we had an assurance from the Minister that the appointment had been made. I should like the Minister to be thinking about a few questions whilst I continue debating other issues. By whom was Mr. Gilding appointed to the position at Torrens college at equivalent to Deputy Director status? What consultation was there with either Torrens or Adelaide College of Advanced Education before the Minister approved that appointment? On what date actually did the appointment take effect, or on what date will it take effect? It seems ambiguous, in the light of a previous answer to a question and the statement in clause 17 (2) of the Bill. Were the views of the councils at Torrens and Adelaide colleges of advanced education sought on the question of Mr. Gilding's subsequent secondment?

We realise that the work he has been doing is extremely important. He has done sterling work in helping the Minister with the drafting, but can the Minister say whether some consultation took place with the two councils regarding the secondment of Mr. Gilding as adviser to the Minister prior to his commencing duties in that capacity? Very relevant to this is that colleges at the moment are looking for staff appointments. They are anxious to move into different fields with the decline in numbers of students going through for teacher education. With an associate director or a deputy director being paid by the college, this may mean that the funding could be used for two additional staff members to start branching out into something new. I do not know precisely what the Minister has in mind, but it appears to be a question that needs to be resolved. Probably there is also a point as to whether the tertiary funding from the Federal Government is legitimately being used if the Associate Director is being seconded for Ministerial work. I would appreciate the Minister's comments on these points.

To return to some of the submissions from the Torrens college council, initially I think they would have concluded that this was certainly not a cost cutting exercise, because they envisaged plans that would mean essential buildings at Underdale, the construction of new buildings after the amalgamation took place, and if it were to be successful, and they foresaw the problems of capital funding if such proposals came to fruition for renovations, additions to existing buildings, and the construction of new buildings for the new campus. They sought Ministerial support should the amalgamation go through on that basis.

The council did not favour the recommendations regarding the name Adelaide College of Advanced Education. I am pleased to see that "Adelaide" has been retained as part of the new title, although it has been changed only slightly from Adelaide College of Advanced Education to Adelaide College of the Arts and Education. The retention of the name "Adelaide" gives some status to the college, this being, of course, that the Adelaide College of Advanced Education is one of the oldest tertiary education institutions in South Australia, and it is fitting and proper for the name to be perpetuated. I do not see much cause for concern there. Torrens has won the campus battle, since most of the work will be on the Torrens site, and Adelaide has retained at least part of the original name, and a prestigious title, too.

The council also said that it was worried about the problems regarding the changing nature of staffing within the new council: what precisely do you do when you are asked by the staff that they be retained on the same basis, on the same salary (or not a lesser salary; I do not suppose they would oppose an increase in salary)? If you are going to maintain the staff and have a reduction in student numbers, something has to change, and the whole question seems to have been ignored by the Anderson Report as to what to do with those people if the nature of the college is changed. What will be done in the way of courses keeping these staff gainfully employed? Where will you get new staff? How quickly will you start to employ new staff so that you can have a transitional period as soon as possible, especially in view of the impact of technology on the employment situation? We have to retrain people and train people into new technological jobs, because there is a dearth of apprenticeship appointments throughout the whole of industry. Therefore, people with technological skills have to be found.

I have pointed out several times in this House that we have a ratio of about 8:1 in arrears compared to the rest of the Western world in the provision of technological staff to degree staff. We have about 1:1, whereas most of the Western world has about eight technologists to each person with a degree—a big backlog to catch up.

The council said that it was not considered that teaching and non-teaching staff would be absorbed into other vacancies because of the declining employment position in tertiary institutions throughout Australia. Generally, the submission put forward by the Torrens council was a considerate one—considerate of the existing position in relation to staff, the declining student population, and many other factors. No doubt much of what was said has been embodied in the Bill.

The press release issued jointly by the Adelaide college and the Torrens college when they finally came to some agreement was quite a pleasant surprise in view of the conflict existing between Kingston and Murray Park colleges at the same time. This was one of the alternatives that the Anderson Committee suggested. The committee also envisaged that there would be dialogue with the Adelaide University and the South Australian Institute of Technology to have two colleges, so that their proper future was in amalgamation, and so they entered into this quite fruitful discussion. I will not read from the press release, but much of what was said represents what the Minister has given as preamble to the Bill before us.

Most of what the Directors of the two colleges said pointed out that there were tremendous benefits to be obtained for the students, and that is precisely what Professor Anderson pointed out: education first, costs second. We hope that the passing of this Bill will lead, over the years, to a fruitful and constructive period for the new college. I cannot see that staffing problems will be reduced in the near future, and I can certainly see that there will be continuing problems in relation to general accommodation.

The problems that the Torrens council foresaw regarding scattering of the students to some extent is still there. How soon we will have the integration of these two colleges on the one site remains to be seen. The problems envisaged by the Torrens college and the Adelaide college are still there, and the essential thing is that amalgamation has to occur and that the passing of this Bill as soon as possible will help boost the morale of the staff, helping them to get off to a good start towards making their colleges function as a very effective unit. We support the legislation.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I thank the honourable member and the Opposition for their support in general for the Bill. The honourable member asked me some specific questions about Mr. Gilding's appointment. I think I should bring down a considered reply for him. The honourable member asked about the date, but I cannot remember the exact date. I discussed this matter fully with the then Chairman of the Adelaide college council and the Acting Chairman of the

Torrens college council. As I recall, special meetings of the college councils were called to consider the matter. The appointment would have been by resolution of the Torrens council, but, as to when it happened, I will have to obtain information for the honourable member.

The other point about Mr. Gilding's position as Associate Director is that it was conceded that his secondment to me to do the valuable work to which the honourable member has referred was something which had a finite life, and it was necessary, by virtue of the general assurances that had been given to people at all colleges, about tenure, that there should be something to which he could return, and this seemed to be the best way in which to bring that about. I commend the Bill to the House. I move:

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

Motion carried.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Constitution of the Council."

Mr. ALLISON: Are we to assume that subclause (2) *(e)* automatically excludes those who hold awards from the former South Australian School of Art, the Western Teachers College, or the Adelaide Teachers College?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): No, because the legislation setting up the Torrens college takes those matters on board. I move:

Page 4, lines 27 and 28—Leave out paragraph *(b)*.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 9 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—"Council to collaborate with certain bodies, etc."

Mr. ALLISON: One question of interest is the definition of Kindergarten Union, referred to in paragraph *(c)*, but kindergarten training is not specifically mentioned in this part of the Torrens-Adelaide amalgamation. Does this mean that we may expect some movement of this college into the kindergarten field, or is it there for some other specific reason?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is there because it was in the old Act. There are no ambitions of which I am aware of the new college to move into that field.

Mr. ALLISON: Why was teacher training singled out, and will subclause (2) affect in-service training in any way?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It could. The Minister of Education has a particular interest in teacher training and in ensuring that in their course offerings and in the number of places available at the college there is an adequate supply of teachers to staff the schools. The honourable member would be aware that it is not our problem right now, but we cannot altogether rule out the possibility that at some time in the future that may well be a problem. What is required of the colleges here is that they collaborate with the Minister of the day in ensuring that this particular public interest as to teacher training is met. Certainly, in-service training may well be an aspect of that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Transfer of staff."

Mr. ALLISON: My questions about Mr. Gilding are relevant to subclause (2). Why are no specific duties outlined for the Associate Director, whereas they are mentioned specifically in clause 16?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That is a matter which will have to be developed should Mr. Gilding take up the position of Associate Director of the college. He has been seconded to me for a period up to the end of the 1979 calendar year, and it seems premature now to spell out specifically the role that people will play in the new college. The honourable member raised the matter of the use of Commonwealth funds. This matter was carefully checked with the Board of Advanced Education, which has a specific role in this area. It is necessary that this position be spelled out in furtherance of the general undertaking I made to all involved in these amalgamations. It is conceded that, when you have two Directors of two colleges and they become one college, you cannot still have two Directors. Some loss of status is involved, and that is in the very nature of the position. To the extent that we have done whatever we possibly could, we have held to our commitment, as a Government, in this matter.

Mr. WILSON: A position has been specifically created for Mr. Gilding on which there seems to be no time limit. If Mr. Gilding resigned from the position in the future to take up a position in another place, I assume the position of Associate Director would lapse.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Clause 17 (2) provides:

The person who, immediately before the commencement of this Act, held the position of Director of the Adelaide College of Advanced Education . . .

Mr. WILSON: I assume there will be no Associate Director in the structure of the college. I realise that this was specifically for him, but there will be no such position.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's right.

Mr. ALLISON: Is there some ambiguity about the appointment of Mr. Gilding as Associate Director? The wording is "if he so elects", but from the Minister's reply it seems there may be some doubt about Mr. Gilding's electing to follow this course.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Other positions could become available under legislation to be introduced into the Chamber. Mr. Gilding has been given no assurance that he will be appointed to such positions, but he will certainly be eligible to apply. Although generally appointments in the academic community occur much less frequently than was once the case, a person of Mr. Gilding's qualities may well secure an appointment to an academic institution, either in this State or in another State, during the period in which he is seconded (that is to the end of 1979). No prediction can be made about Mr. Gilding's filling this position, but, if he chooses to do so, the position is available.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 29) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November. Page 2082.)

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): The Opposition supports this Bill; however, an amendment will be moved regarding the establishing of the Reserves Advisory Committee. I have been concerned for some time about the establishment of this committee and the purpose for which it is to be set up, particularly regarding the formation of management plans, which are very important to the management of South Australian reserves. I have previously asked questions of the Minister, which have not been answered, as follows:

1. What is the reason for the delay in the completion of final management plans for Innes National Park and Flinders Ranges National Park?

2. Was the recently disbanded National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council required to approve management plans for parks (pursuant to section 38 (7) and (8) of the National Parks and Wildlife Act) before they could be gazetted and if

so—

(a) will there be indefinite delay in the gazetting of these recently prepared management plans; and

(b) what will be the extent of this delay?

3. Will the proposed "smaller committee" to "advise on conservation and scientific matters" to be established by the Minister, be authorised to approve management plans for parks and reserves?

4. When will this committee be established?

5. What progress will be made in formalising—

(a) already prepared; and

(b) currently being prepared, management plans in the interim?

I have not received answers to all of these questions, although I appreciate that some answers are supplied with the introduction of this legislation. Many questions on the Notice Paper are awaiting reply.

I would like to express the appreciation of South Australians for the very valuable work that was carried out by the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. Before that body was formed, the work was carried out by the commissioners. I personally know many members of the advisory council and I know how dedicated they are to the cause of conservation in this State. They have served the State well in this way. I am disappointed that the number of members of the council has been reduced so drastically. I realise that smaller committees are probably easier to organise and in many cases are more fruitful, but the difference between a membership of 17 and five is quite extensive. I would prefer the committee to have more than five members. However, the Minister has made that decision, and the Opposition accepts it.

With a larger membership it is more likely to be a scientifically based body, as was the council previously. Members had various opinions and represented different aspects of sciences; botanists were represented, as were those involved with land management, game life and the pastoral industry. A membership of 17 demonstrated democracy because the public had an opportunity to provide advice, and thus lead to recommendations to the Minister. The best arrangement was under the direction of the commissioners, who had a great deal of expertise to offer, as they did, on a voluntary basis. Those people were completely dedicated, serving this area well indeed.

I suggest that perhaps the present Minister was not happy with the previous advisory council and wished to change it. I suppose all Ministers like to know their committee members and like to be close to their committees. I believe that the reduction in the size from 17 to five is too drastic. I suggest that if it can be reduced from 17 to five it can be reduced from five to nil. I hope that that will not be the case and that the present Minister and future Ministers will always rely on public advisory participation.

I am concerned that no guidelines are set down in the Bill about the five persons to be selected for the new committee. We see in the Minister's second reading explanation that the Government believes these matters could be handled more expeditiously by a smaller, scientifically based group. I accept that, but I am concerned that no guidelines are to be found in the Bill to suggest the areas that these people will represent. I have previously expressed my concern about people having suitable qualifications in the department and particularly in the Minister's pet division of co-ordination and policy. It is extremely important that the work of that division should be such as to enable that division to advise the Minister and Government departments adequately.

It appears that the qualifications of those in the division lean more towards the social sciences and economics than to any expertise in environmental matters particularly. It is important that these people be able to advise the Minister and the Government about policies and programmes of an environmental nature as well as being able to foresee long-term environmental problems in Government and other proposals that they are asked to evaluate.

I ask how it is possible for them to advise on these matters if they do not have a strong environmental background. I hope that the five members of this committee will not be "yes" men to the Minister. I believe this committee has an important role to play if it is to advise the Minister properly. I suggest that rather than these five people being an extension of the department, particulary of the division of co-ordination and policy, that they should be from outside the department. I believe that the public should be able to express its views through this committee. It is to be expected that the Minister will not always be prepared to accept the advice that comes from that committee.

I appreciate that the Minister present at the moment is not the Minister for the Environment, but I am particularly concerned about the situation involving the Wildlife Conservation Fund. The Bill sets out the functions of the committee as follows:

(a) to make recommendations to the Minister relating to the expenditure of moneys from the Wildlife Conservation Fund.

The principal Act provides:

The fund shall consist of:

(a) any moneys derived by the Minister from any donation or grant made for the purposes of the fund;

(b) any moneys provided by Parliament for the purposes of the fund;

I do not know how much money is in that fund, but I suppose we can find out by questioning the Minister. I do not see that that is particularly relevant, although I assume that there is much money in that fund. If so, it is important, since the source of that fund is donations from organisations and individuals, that that money be spent wisely. I hope that the committee will look at that matter closely and that that money will not be spent on a pet project of the Minister. In his second reading explanation, the Minister stated:

> More recently the emphasis on policy development in the department and the proposed formation of trust means that the Minister has other opportunities for advice on parks and wildlife issues, and the role of the National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council has been re-examined.

I am interested to know what that means. I was particularly interested over the weekend to see an advertisement for the Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Division. I was interested to see that applications have been called again. I was under the impression that applications had already been called. I learned today in an answer about the applications that no applications for the Director came within the division of the National Parks and Wildlife Service; two applications came from within the department; 14 came from within the State; 10 came from elsewhere in Australia; and one came from overseas. Thus, there are several applications to choose from. As I understand the situation, the Minister was about to make a decision about the matter, so it is interesting to see that applications have been called again for a Director. The advertisement for the Director states:

> The service is to embark upon a number of changes in both organisational structure and to funding. Proposals for the establishment of regional control are in hand, and the formation of trusts will allow greater attention to be given to the development of high visitor usage parks, primarily near

metropolitan Adelaide.

I will go into that later. The advertisement continues:

> There is a requirement for a person with considerable management experience to assume responsibility for all activities of the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

The interesting part states:

> While previous experience in park management is desirable, a person with proven management experience in another field should consider the position. It is essential that applicants have proven ability to assume a management role and to relate effectively to the public, community groups and other governmental agencies.

In the advertisement, the second reading explanation and the Bill before us much emphasis is placed on these trusts which are to be set up. It is not only in this department that the Government is having a ball with these trusts, which are springing up all over the place.

I am very concerned about this matter. I do not believe that trusts will make management any easier, because they have many pitfalls and they will only complicate matters. I have checked on the situation in New South Wales and Victoria and I found that the trust system was rejected some years ago by New South Wales, and largely by Victoria as well. The trust system might be all right for parks which are used by many people and which therefore need close management, but I believe they can have a detrimental effect on more remote parks selected to protect, and I would suggest, maintain fragile ecological environment. The problem arises when a localised system of management tends to disregard true overall conservation principles; this can happen with an individual trust. I am not happy about the importance that the Government, this department, and in particular the Minister, is placing on the formation of these trusts.

I would like somebody on the Government side to explain to me who will service these loans of up to $1 000 000. Will the Treasury, with taxpayers' money, pay off the loans in the end? That is important. We are told that this is only a temporary measure to be able to obtain a lot of easy finance quickly. Who will pay off these loans in the long run?

As I mentioned earlier, I am particularly interested in the formation of the management plans. The second function of the committee is to give advice to the Minister in the preparation or amendment of plans of management under Division V Part III of the principal Act. Naturally I am pleased (and this was part of the question which I asked and to which I have not received an answer) to see that this committee is going to advise the Minister, and I would hope help the Minister, in setting up these management plans. There is a great need to speed up this process. I am sure we would all agree that improved park management is vitally important. We have a continuing problem, not only with the parks near the metropolitan area, but also those larger areas of land in the rural and pastoral areas where there is still a great deal of conflict between the pastoralists and the national park officers.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will come back to the Bill.

Mr. WOTTON: With respect, I do not believe that I am going away from the Bill, Mr. Speaker, because it does concentrate rather extensively on the setting up of the management plans in the national parks and reserves, and this is an important part of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member relate his remarks to a clause in the Bill?

Mr. WOTTON: I refer to clause 6, which inserts new section 19 *(b)*, relating to giving advice to the Minister in relation to the preparation or amendment of plans of management. As I said earlier, the situation, particularly in the pastoral areas, is quite critical. It is vitally important that we have a good understanding between the pastoralists and the people who are working hard in these reserves. The management plans can only help to provide a better understanding and will provide better management, which is very much needed in many of our parks and reserves in this State. The Government has made it its policy to buy up large tracts of land throughout the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now moving away from the Bill. It is a very short Bill and concerns reducing the number of members on the committee from 17 to five. He is now moving onto another angle that is not in the Bill.

Mr. WOTTON: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, although I do not agree with it. I am pleased to see that the committee is going to advise the Minister about the plans, because at this stage we have only two completed plans and South Australia has 193 parks and reserves, so we are looking forward to seeing some of the other management plans coming to hand.

As you say, Mr. Speaker, this is only a short Bill but I believe it is an extremely important Bill. I commend the work of those who have carried out their job so adequately and in a dedicated fashion on the previous advisory council. There is a very great need for this new advisory committee to have the necessary expertise if it is to work properly and do its job in advising the Minister. I would have preferred more members than five but, if the Minister is satisfied that five is the right number, that is his prerogative. I question the guidelines to be set down in the selection of the committee and I will be moving an amendment accordingly.

I question the fund itself and I sincerely question the committee's responsibility in the distribution of this money. I am sure the Minister and this government would appreciate that that money particularly does not belong to this Government or to any other Government. It has been presented by individuals and organisations who are dedicated and who believe in the need to conserve this State's resources. Therefore, I hope the Government will respect that money. I am concerned about the national trusts and the economics involved in establishing the trusts, and I am again concerned that the committee does its job in speeding up the release of further management plans to assist with the management of reserves in this State. I support the second reading.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Minister's second reading explanation, which was given in the Minister's absence by the new Minister of Community Development, states:

> In a Ministerial statement given to this House on 13 July 1978, the Minister for the Environment foreshadowed these amendments to the National Parks and Wildlife Act to enable a smaller, scientifically based committee to be established in lieu of the large 17-member National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council which operated until 30 June 1978.

Scientifically based committees may be all right in certain fields, but a committee of this type should consist of people who have practical understanding and experience in land management and land control. One of the problems with the National Parks and Wildlife Service when it was set up was that unfortunately some of the officers did not have experience in the management of large areas of land. The previous council was very large and probably unwieldy, but it did have some people on it who had some experience. However, I do not believe that the right type of people were on that council.

It is no good beating around the bush in these matters. If the National Parks and Wildlife Division and its management of the large tracts of land in this State are to

be improved, we must have people who know what they are talking about, people with experience in the control of vermin, kangaroos, emus, and so on, and with experience in burning-off operations. They are the types of people who should be on the committee. In his second reading explanation (*Hansard*, page 2082) the Minister stated:

> The advisory council has at present three principal functions: it advises the Minister on the disbursement of money from the Wildlife Conservation Fund; it tenders advice and recommendations in relation to management plans prepared in relation to reserves constituted under the principal Act; and it investigates and reports upon matters referred to the council for investigation. The Government believes that these matters could be more expeditiously handled by a smaller, scientifically based group.

I have my doubts about this scientifically based group. The Government Whip, the member for Henley Beach, as Minister for the Environment, was responsible for the original legislation. On the passing of that legislation, the department set out to purchase large areas of land in South Australia. Some of those areas were in my former district, and many of them are in my present district. I have some knowledge of land management, and I believe everyone should be concerned because, when the legislation was passed and the new department was set up, most people thought we would be taking positive action to set aside land that should not be developed for agricultural and pastoral purposes but should be set aside for the benefit of the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member can relate his remarks to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I was about to link up my remarks, if I may be permitted to continue.

The SPEAKER: I hope the honourable member will do that.

Mr. GUNN: I will endeavour to do that. I do not know what sort of advice the 17-man committee which operated in the past tendered to the Government, but the only evidence that members of the House have is that there has been a great deal of disquiet from adjoining landholders and rural organisations. If the Minister wants to take action that will improve the standing of the National Parks and Wildlife Division, action that will be to the benefit to the people of South Australia, he should make sure that one or two people on the committee have had considerable experience in pastoral or agricultural management, have had experience in thinning out kangaroos, and are fully aware of the practical problems that can be caused to adjoining landholders. If the committee is based in that manner, I believe it will be successful and that the National Parks and Wildlife Division will improve and will play a significant part in providing recreation areas for the people of this State, preserving areas which should be set aside.

In the past, I have been very critical of the department, and I make no apology for that. I have tried to be constructive. I do not want to get up in this House every time the Act is to be amended and whinge and belly-ache about the department, and I do not want to be at personal variance with the Minister or his officers.

Mr. Keneally: I didn't think the Minister had noticed.

Mr. GUNN: Well, I say the Minister is overloaded already, and he would find it difficult to devote the necessary time to this branch. I have strong views that the branch should be under the control of the Minister of Lands, because the problems are basically problems of land management. The Lands Department is the only department with the experience necessary to make sure that the service operates effectively and efficiently. The Minister of Works controls water distribution, and the Minister of Education looks after education. We do not have the Minister of Agriculture looking after education. It is only common sense that this division should be under the control—

Mr. Wotton: Just make the point that it's your view.

Mr GUNN: It is my view. I have said it publicly on occasions and in this House. Let us look at some of the problems associated with the service in pastoral areas of the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is moving away from the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: We have had a 17-man committee since 1972. I do not know what advice it has tendered, but since that time there has been a great deal of dissatisfaction. There have been problems within the service. I do not know whether the committee has been advising the Minister about the operation of the service, the appointment of Directors, the golden handshake, the pushing aside of Directors, or whether—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has moved right away from the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill about Directors. The Bill reduces the number of committee members from 17 to five. I have been very lenient with the honourable member.

Mr. GUNN: I suggest most respectfully, Sir, that you should study his second reading explanation, where the Minister clearly indicated that the 17-man committee was advising the Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member moved away from the provisions of the Bill to matters concerning Directors, in another field. I hope he will get back to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I have made the point about that matter. When the Minister replies, I should like to know whether the new committee to be appointed will be asked to advise the Government on the appointment of a new Director. That is a function that perhaps it could look at, and I should be interested to hear from the Minister whether the new committee will be called on to make such recommendations.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about a Director. The Bill deals with the committee. I hope the honourable member will not continue in this vein.

Mr. GUNN: It concerns a committee, and also the matters on which the committee will be asked to advise the Minister. I would say that it is in order to make at least passing reference to these matters. I sincerely hope that the committee can operate successfully and that it lives up to the Minister's expectations, that its advice will be such as to improve the standing of the division, and that we will see positive action to improve the management of national parks. The areas the committee should look at as soon as it is constituted include fire prevention in large national parks, control of burning, and so on. It should enter immediately into discussions with adjoining landholders.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill concerning fire protection. I have spoken to the honourable member on several occasions. The Bill relates to the reduction of a committee from 17 members to five, and also deals with funding. The honourable member is right off the path, and I hope he will not continue in that vein.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's doing a good job.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make the decision.

Mr. GUNN: I am confused.

Mr. Keneally: That's what Greg Kelton said.

Mr. GUNN: He would not know. He is like the member for Stuart.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will not interject. He is out of order.

Mr. GUNN: He is only a rat.

The SPEAKER: There is nothing concerning a reporter in the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I sincerely hope not. This is a matter far more worthy of discussion. Rats are vermin. I shall await with interest the operations of the committee.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I express my real concern at the reduction of the 17-member National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council to a five-member advisory committee. The persons who made up the original 17-member National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council were some of the most competent people in South Australia, who gave their services for the benefit of this State.

Unfortunately, the Government saw fit not to make the maximum use of the time and expertise of these people. To me, that was a disaster for South Australia. What is more, many of the people involved in the old National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council had reached the point of complete and utter frustration. The time and effort they devoted to this work provided little result from their efforts. It might be said that an advisory council of 17 might be unwieldy but, with the expertise available in the council of 17, divided up into their various areas of expertise, by means of working committees, it provided an enormous potential of knowledge that could be put to valuable service in South Australia. Now, much of that knowledge has been lost to the Government and to the benefit of the State. It is a sorry day, purely because the Government did not want to accept the recommendations, advice, and direction offered by the competent members of the old advisory council.

It is interesting to note that the United States of America and Great Britain are moving in exactly the opposite direction to that being taken by this Government: they are giving greater control to volunteers, to the benefit of the country. Greater consideration is being given to their knowledge and expertise, particularly in the field of nature conservation and wildlife management generally.

I had the opportunity of discussing in England with members of the Nature Conservancy Council the work in which it is involved, and I also spent two or three days with the Countryside Commission. I believe that this is the direction in which we in South Australia should be going, but we are tending to go backwards, not forwards, and that is disastrous. The Countryside Commission is a development of the role presently played by the National Parks and Wildlife Division, but it is more broadly based, and, I believe, it is a development of the type of department we have in South Australia. The commission largely revolves around the advisory committee, or whatever it is called, and co-operates with the Countryside Commission. A document that I have states:

> The Countryside Commission is an independent statutory body with a wide sphere of activity. Its job is to keep under review matters relating to the conservation and enhancement of landscape beauty in England and Wales, and to the provision and improvement of facilities of the countryside for enjoyment, including the need to secure access for open-air recreation.

This is fundamentally what we are looking at in the National Parks and Wildlife Division and the area of expertise of the advisory council. The document continues:

> When the Countryside Act became law on 3 August 1968, the Countryside Commission replaced and assumed the functions of the National Parks Commission. Their powers and responsibilities are defined under that Act and two others, the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act, 1949, and the Local Government Act, 1974.
>
> The change was much more than one of title. It has affected everybody who finds enjoyment by going to the countryside in leisure time, when to be alone, or in a family party, or to join in active recreation.
>
> The National Parks Commission were bound to confine their attention to areas of countryside specially designated, with the Government taking little account of schemes for recreation or landscape conservation elsewhere. But the 1968 Act recognised the urgency of considering and catering for such demand on a countrywide scale, and charged the new commission with the task. Members of the commission, numbering about 15, . . .

This is the point I am trying to make: the United States of America and Great Britain are expanding their advisory committees and drawing in more expertise from a broad cross-section of the people. Their Governments are becoming more dependent and are placing great emphasis on people in the community who have something to contribute to their country. The document continues:

> Members of the commission, numbering about 15, are appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment and the Secretary of State for Wales acting jointly. Their staff are civil servants. In matters affecting Wales they are assisted by a committee appointed by them in consultation with the Secretary of State, with an office at Newtown, Powys. Scotland has a separate Countryside Commission set up under the Countryside Act (Scotland), 1967.
>
> A major part of the commission's work concerns the national parks. The commission can designate exceptionally fine stretches of relatively wild countryside, such as the larger unspoilt areas of mountain, moor, heath, and some of the coast. So far there are seven national parks in England and three in Wales. The 13 620 square kilometres they cover is nearly one-tenth of the area of England and Wales, the proportion of the coastline included in them being about the same.

We are looking at one-tenth of the whole area of Great Britain being included virtually in national parks.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is doing well, but I hope that he will confine his remarks to the size of the committee.

Mr. ARNOLD: I might be expanding on the Bill a little. I was trying to indicate to members the magnitude of the work being covered by the enlarged committee being used under the Countryside Commission Act. Unfortunately, we are reducing our body in size, and only South Australia can suffer as a result of such action. No way can any Government or department afford to hire permanently the expertise that was available under the old National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council. The 17 members had an enormous amount to contribute, and in no way could they be fully involved full time with the National Parks and Wildlife Division. Their knowledge and expertise were available to the Government whenever it required it. It is indeed a sorry day for South Australia that we have now lost the services of many of these people to the State.

Although I could say more about the Countryside Commission, I believe that it is a subject for another day, when I would like to enlarge on it and give a complete history of the commission in England, how it operates, and the benefits being derived from it. The operation of the commission, in conjunction with the Nature Conservancy Council, is making England into very much a complete national park.

While South Australia is hell bent on bringing more land under the control of national parks, the reverse is happening overseas. Regarding the Countryside Commis-

sion, although the greater part of land in national parks remains in private ownership, some portions have been acquired by the park authority under various powers. Many properties have passed to the control of the nation, either by purchase by the national trust as forest parks owned or leased by the Forestry Commission, or as the national nature reserves owned and managed by the National Conservation Council. However, the vast proportion of national parks in Great Britain remains under private ownership, and any future advisory council in South Australia should examine that approach. This procedure has benefited a small country like Great Britain, where there is a small land mass and a large population. Land has remained in private ownership, but under a management agreement with the Government and the department concerned. This procedure should be adopted in a large country like Australia, particularly in South Australia where there is a small population.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is straying from the Bill once again.

Mr. ARNOLD: If the council is to support a philosophy of acquisition of land, the Government can not afford to continue in this way. Many members of the previous National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council believed in the philosophy that I have outlined, and that is one of the reasons why those members are not on the council today, because the Government is determined to obtain as much land in South Australia as it can, whereas the previous National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council—

The SPEAKER: I have been very lenient with the honourable member, who must now relate to the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: The National Parks and Wildlife Advisory Council, which has been disposed of and the members of which have been sacked, believed that much of the land that the Government wants to control as national parks should remain in private ownership. That is why those members are not still there. There is no other efficient and effective way for South Australia to go if there is to be effective management of the national parks and resources of South Australia.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): I will deal briefly with the points that have been raised by honourable members during the debate, although obviously not with the same depth of knowledge as the Minister would display, nor with the same emphasis. I appreciate the support given to this measure by the member for Murray, as spokesman for the Opposition on environmental matters. With the exception of the member for Chaffey, who is not enthusiastic about the reduction of the number of members of the council, it would seem the Opposition supports this move as one that will make the Council more workable and effective. The member for Murray raised a number of points, including the delay in answering questions. I assure the honourable member that those questions are being processed but, because the Minister is temporarily absent, there is some delay in approving answers based on material prepared by his department. If answers are to be given, the Minister must give them, and he is not available.

Regarding the work done by the advisory council, the member for Murray expressed his appreciation, and the Minister also expressed appreciation, of that work which has contributed to the development of parks and nature conservation in South Australia. The time has come to substitute for that body one which can move more effectively in new directions, particularly in the light of the establishment of the various trusts and the management structure within the department. Members of the Opposition generally recognise this fact.

The member for Murray was disappointed about the reduction of the membership, but, if the committee is smaller, it will be more effective as an advisory body. A smaller committee can be convened easily and can travel around to inspect more readily than a committee with a membership of 17. The member for Murray has expressed concern that no guidelines have been laid down in the Bill as to the membership of the body. The Minister has said that emphasis will be placed on a scientific background, although this is not spelt out in the Bill.

Regarding the wildlife fund, the Auditor-General's Report stated that as at 30 June 1978 the fund had a total of $287 242. Under this Bill there is no change in the role of the advisory committee from the role of the previous advisory committee. The member for Murray said that the fund is made up of donations from people who are actively concerned with conservation. The fund does accept contributions, but the vast majority of funds is made up from hunting permit income. I think it is stretching the long bow a bit to suggest that the fund is comprised solely of donations by people interested in conservation. However, that is not a major issue.

The honourable member commented on the position of the Director of Parks. This is not relevant to the Bill (which was stated by other members). The member for Eyre asked whether the committee would have a role in appointing the Director, but the committee has no executive function and will not appointment management. The committee will be concerned with policy and not personnel. It would therefore be inappropriate for the body to appoint a Director of Parks. Regarding general criticisms of the trust, I will not deal with these in any great detail.

The member for Eyre rejected the scientifically based approach in favour of land management—land control approach. That comment, and his other comments, will be noted by the Minister, but they do not call for any specific response now. Regarding his suggestion that this area should be controlled by the Lands Department, the Government and some members opposite, particularly the member for Murray, would not accept such a backward step.

Mr. Gunn: That's a reflection on people who were involved in this matter before you were born.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: That is no reflection on how it was administered in the past. The important thing is that by making it into a separate department it has got some sort of priority. Perhaps the honourable member should consult with his colleagues to ascertain whether they will support that proposition. Ask the member for Murray. The member for Chaffey is the only member opposite who is concerned about the reduction in size and the basic principle of the Bill, which he does not like. He says we will lose the benefit of the experience of those members who have been on the existing committee completely from this State. That is not true. Many of them are involved in organisations which continue to have a direct and important role in environmental matters.

I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the Minister has announced that he will be establishing a number of trusts and, in a sense, breaking down into smaller portions some areas of the National Parks and Wildlife Division jurisdiction. Those trusts obviously have to have people on them with background and expertise in this area. In considering whom to appoint to those trusts the Minister will probably bear in mind the people who have been on the previous council and, in appropriate cases, their experience may not be lost over in that area. That is something for the Minister to decide and no doubt he will make appropriate announcements in the

future.

As to the suggestion that greater control is being given elsewhere, I do not know that that is true. I think the general tendency in areas such as this is to swing away from large, broadly representative advisory councils, which find it difficult to reach a consensus on what are essentially complex environmental matters and to bring it down to a smaller, more detailed, expert advisory group. That can be seen to be quite effective.

Mr. Arnold: Have you made a study of the British Countryside Commission?

The Hon. J. C. BANNON: I am glad the honourable member by interjection refers again to the British Countryside Commission. That is not a real analogy. Whatever the specific merits of the United Kingdom Countryside Commission may be it is dealing with an entirely different environment and climate than the National Parks and Wildlife Division here. For a start, as he said himself, one of its main aims is to provide access to open area recreation. The question of access is not a problem in Australia where we have plenty of space. Britain is closely settled and intensively cultivated, with a man-made landscape. Just about anywhere one looks in Britain there is the impact of man and settlement somewhere, but in Australia the open space and the outback do not have that influence to the same extent. We are really dealing, in terms of size, nature of terrain, climate and so on with a different situation and analogies drawn with the United Kingdom Countryside Commission are not relevant. They are the only comments I wish to make. I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Repeal of Division II of Part II of the principal Act and enactment of Division in its place."

Mr. WOTTON: I move:

Page 2, line 10—After "the Governor" insert "of whom—

(a) at least one must be a person with wide knowledge of, and experience in, biology;

(b) at least one must be a person with wide knowledge of, and experience in, land management, and

(c) at least one must be a person with wide knowledge of, and experience in, the management of reserves.

Earlier, I emphasised the need for guidelines to be set down for representation on this committee. I think comments made on this side suggest that there is a real need to look closely at the management of the reserves that we have in this State. Land management is an important part of any reserve. For that reason I have suggested that two people should have previous experience in land management—one in land management and the other in land management of reserves. The need to have somebody who has real understanding and regard to matters relating to biology is self-explanatory, because plants and animals are an important part of these reserves. Animals rely on plant life and biology is the most important scientific area concerned in these reserves. If the Minister at the table is not able, because of the absence of the Minister for the Environment, to support this amendment I hope that when this legislation goes to another place consideration will be given in that place to supporting this amendment. It is not restrictive. I am suggesting that only three people out of the five should be detailed in their representation.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. As an instance of the need for practical knowledge in the field, I refer to the Belair Recreation Park Golf Club, which looks like being a total loss because there was not enough expertise used when installing the watering system, and a $500 000 project looks like going down the drain. I have written to the Minister about that.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development): I cannot accept the amendment. I think that the objection is that, when we have a small body of five, to start categorising the skills or qualifications of any particular member would be unnecessarily restrictive and could be quite impractical if somebody of the requisite experience at the right level was not available. This would severely inhibit who the Minister could appoint to the committee. Although that might not matter with a larger body, it would matter a lot here.

I think what the Minister will be looking for when he looks at who should be on the committee will be the overall composition of the committee and the range of skills members should possess. Practical knowledge is something the current Minister for the Environment values highly. He will obviously be looking for those sorts of qualities in the people he appoints to such a committee. I think the restrictions as they stand cannot be accepted. For instance, in paragraph *(a)* the term "biology" is used. One could argue that one should say "zoology", "botany" or something of that nature. There are arguments about terminology.

What constitutes experience in land management? Do we have people with the requisite wide knowledge and experience in the management of reserves, particularly bearing in mind the problems so far experienced in find a suitable Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Division? These sorts of practical difficulties will have to be grappled with by the Minister. However, he should be able to grapple with them in forming his committee without being constricted by the Act's rigidly laying down certain categories which he must fill. I do not think the Minister should be saddled with this, and accordingly I oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOTTON: I am disappointed that the Minister responsible is not able to accept this amendment. This amendment is in no way restrictive. The Minister has decided, against the wish of a lot of members of the Opposition and many people in the public that this committee will be reduced from 17 members to five members. As has been pointed out on this side, we believe this is a retrograde step. The Minister should be prepared to accept that there are areas vitally important in relation to adequate representation in this committee.

The Minister has said that the provision relating to biology could be restrictive. I would have liked to see one person with practical experience in zoology and another with practical experience in botany on the the committee, because they are two important areas. I decided against that and selected only one person, a biologist, because he will cover both of those fields. It is vitally important that the Minister accept that situation, because we have tried to emphasise the importance of this point. If the Minister cannot see that I suggest that is why we have as many problems with management as we have with our parks and reserves at the present time.

I hope that this will not be a "job for the boys" situation. If it is open, it is quite likely it could be filled with people who are "yes" men to the Minister. This would be an extremely dangerous situation. I hope that the Minister for Environment will give this matter further consideration and that he, or his colleagues in another place, will accept this amendment when it reaches that place, and that the Minister will see the importance of presenting guidelines or criteria for representation on this committee.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, Wilson, and Wotton (teller).

Noes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon (teller), Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Langley, McRae, Olson, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Tonkin. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

The Hon. J. C. BANNON (Minister of Community Development) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. WOTTON (Murray): I regret that the Government was not prepared to accept the amendment. Because of the absence of the Minister, I hope that many of the questions we have placed on notice, particularly those relating to this legislation, will be answered during the break between now and resumption of the sittings in February, and as soon as possible.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November. Page 2012.)

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I oppose this Bill, the purpose of which is to enable the Government, by regulation, to ban dangerous articles. The articles in question mentioned in the Minister's second reading explanation are imitation firearms, self-protecting aerosol sprays, and hand-held catapults. Clause 2 of the Bill makes it an offence to manufacture, distribute, supply, possess, or use a dangerous article. The provision excludes a person who has a lawful excuse for doing any of these things. The clause also enables the forfeiture of dangerous articles to the Crown, and redefines "prescribed drug" to mean one declared by regulation instead of by proclamation.

I accept that there could be arguments in favour of this Bill, and I acknowledge that the Police Force and the Police Association have expressed the wish that there should be such legislation. However, their arguments are based on fear that there will be widespread promotion of these dangerous weapons, and that this widespread promotion would increase the risk of their being used for offensive rather than defensive purposes. I acknowledge that the Commonwealth will not legislate to prohibit imports unless there is complementary legislation in the States, and the three products I have mentioned are imported items. But I believe that the arguments against the Bill far outweigh those in favour of it. The principal argument against the Bill is that it imposes further restrictions on the freedom of law-abiding individuals.

Mr. Groom: What about the safety of the public?

Mrs. ADAMSON: I will come to the safety of the public that the member for Morphett is so concerned about. If the problems were approached in a logical way there would be some benefit, but I see no benefit to anyone in this Bill. Let us look, for instance, at guns. The quality of the replica in the case of a gun is scarcely material if it is used in a violent situation or in a hold-up. For example, if I were a teller in a bank and I had my son's water pistol aimed at me, I would not know the difference and I would react as if it were the genuine article. To all intents and purposes, the person committing that crime would be as guilty as if he were using the genuine article. The hold-up situation highlights the sheer stupidity of attempting to ban replicas. Where do we draw the line? What is an exact replica? Is it something that cannot be distinguished from the original except by an expert, or something that people believe is the same at a cursory glance, and who will make the decision?

The difficulties involved were recognised by the Consultative Document on the Control of Firearms in Great Britain, prepared in May 1973 and presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Secretary of State for Scotland, by command of Her Majesty. The report states:

> In considering the possibility of a ban, therefore, three difficulties arise. The first concerns the design of children's toys. If realistic toy firearms were prohibited manufacturers and importers would have to take special care that their toy firearms were not likely to be mistaken for the real thing, and the age-old children's tradition of playing with realistic toy weapons would, in relation to firearms, be much affected. Second, it would not be practicable to ban the possession, as well as the manufacture, import or sale, of realistic imitations. There are many thousands of these imitations and replicas in circulation, and a legal requirement to hand them in or destroy them would be unenforceable.

I shall be interested to hear, in Committee, how the Minister proposes to enforce this legislation, if it passes the House. I foresee a situation where we create hundreds of instant criminals in South Australia. The report continues:

> Third, air weapons and starting pistols are not imitations, and they have legitimate uses.

This Bill does not deal with that. The report goes on to elaborate on the further difficulty as to who would decide what is a realistic imitation firearm, and if this legislation is to be implemented by regulation we will be continually faced with the problem of who are the omniscient people behind the scenes to advise the Government as to what is a dangerous weapon. I foresee a situation developing in which, if we carry this Bill to its logical absurdity, we eventually ban knives and forks because they have a potential for danger. That is principally the reason why we oppose the Bill. Not only does it impose unrealistic restrictions, but I believe it is unworkable.

If there were a Bill before the House asking me to support more severe penalties for the illegal possession and use of firearms, I would support it. If there were a Bill before the House asking me to support a provision for the Crown to appeal against sentences which, in the belief of the Crown, were too light, I would support it. If there were a provision to have a review of the Parole Board and its activities in ensuring the release of prisoners who had not served their set terms, I would support it, but I will not support a Bill that I cannot see is going to have the effect—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now straying from the Bill. There is nothing concerning custody in the Bill.

Mrs. ADAMSON: With respect, I am trying to demonstrate that the intent of this Bill will not be realised in the way the Government has gone about trying to achieve it. I think there are other means by which the public can be satisfactorily protected, rather than by trying to ban "dangerous weapons". A report in the *Advertiser* on Thursday 16 November, the day after the Bill was introduced, quotes the Minister, as follows:

> I thought it was a good idea to ban them, and so I put it up, and here we are.

That's nice. No more thought than that. No statistics were given that support the contention that these dangerous

weapons should be banned—"I thought it was a good idea, and here we are". It seems a pretty casual approach.

Mr. Mathwin: Thought it up in the bar.

Mrs. ADAMSON: One wonders whether he thought it up in the bar and whether that might have coloured his thinking. It is a pretty flimsy basis on which to introduce a Bill which will impose very severe restrictions, and restrictions that have no foreseeable limits. In other words, this is just the beginning; the three substances mentioned in the Bill are the beginning, and further substances can be banned by regulation. The newspaper report also contains the following comment:

> A spokesman for the Rape Crisis Service said last night it would not lobby against the ban of self-protection aerosol sprays. Although there might be times when the sprays were effective, they posed a threat . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the honourable member relate this to a clause in the Bill?

Mrs. ADAMSON: Certainly. Clause 2 does not refer specifically to aerosol sprays, although the Minister's second reading explanation referred to the sprays which are to be defined as dangerous articles. It is a specific provision of the Bill, and was mentioned in the second reading explanation. The fact that these aerosol sprays, one of the products to be banned in the legislation, are regarded as a clumsy form of protection highlights the futility of the Bill.

If we are going to ban aerosol sprays that have been specifically designed for defensive purposes, where will we stop? Will we ban ordinary insect repellent sprays? It seems to me that, if you want to disable or disarm an attacker, a good squirt in the face with fly spray or shaving cream would have much the same effect.

Mr. Mathwin: Or a pinch of mustard?

Mrs. ADAMSON: Yes, or a pinch of pepper. Where do we stop? Where does the logic of this proposal lead us? Into a completely untenable situation, where we ban practically anything that is useful. When I was considering this Bill yesterday, I read the letters to the Editor in the *Advertiser*, and I noted one headed "Packing in pistols". The writer of the letter, Mr. Trevor Gurr, of Hawthorndene (whom I do not know), I think expressed the reaction of most ordinary people to the Bill so well that I think it is worth reading his letter into the record, as follows:

> If ever a prize were to be awarded for the most ridiculous Bill to come before State Parliament, then the proposed proscription of replica firearms must be a strong contender.
>
> Unless used as a cudgel, these replicas cannot hurt anyone, and readily available steel bars are more suitable for this anyway. Without doubt robberies can be perpetuated with them, but in such circumstances the average person could not distinguish between a replica, a real pistol, or some kid's cap guns I have seen.

I certainly endorse that view. The letter continues:

> Perhaps the next phase will be to confiscate every toy gun owned by the State's eight-year-olds?
>
> It is incredible that anyone could be so naive to think that confiscation of a heap of den wall decorations will improve public safety.
>
> Legislation like this only makes an ass of the law and causes it to be held in contempt.

Mr. Gurr certainly summed up the arguments against this Bill in his letter. The Minister has said that the only people who will be disadvantaged will be those who want a collection of fancy guns, but I disagree with him. I think that the people who will be disadvantaged will be the people of South Australia, who are being subjected day after day and week after week in this session to legislation which puts greater and greater restriction on their freedom to do as they choose, within the limits of the law. The Bill, I suggest, will not do anything to reduce the incidence of law-breaking. What it will do will be to put a still tighter net around all of us who live in this State, and who value our freedom, to do as we please within the law. On those grounds, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I too, oppose the Bill and support the comments made by the member for Coles. I shudder at times when we think of saying, because law-breakers use a particular article in their act of breaking the law, that others should not be able lawfully to own the same object. If we are going to do that, we will get down to knives and all sorts of articles that we will say that people should not be allowed to own.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Flick-knives and knuckle-dusters?

Mr. EVANS: The Minister talked about children losing their eyesight. I know that that will occur, whether or not we ban these weapons. People who illegally use the articles mentioned by the Minister have the law to contend with. The Government is reluctant to take action against some law breakers who affect other people's lives and who sometimes destroy people by other means in the long term. I reflect on those who encourage others to move into the drug field.

Mr. Keneally: What's an illegal purpose?

Mr. EVANS: I have seen the Premier wearing a ring on his finger that he would call a dress ring but, put in the hands of a person who wanted to use it as a knuckle duster, it could be used as one. The Premier should be proud of it, because it is a valuable item. I have seen many men wearing dress rings that could, in certain circumstances, be used as knuckle dusters, thereby damaging a person's face. How far do we go with the law in passing this sort of legislation? We talk about using any weapon or device that can project a missle at more than 200 feet a second. Undoubtedly many members used shanghais when they were boys, and many were proud to use them, but I know that their parents would have been frightened at times by their sons using them, but surely it was part of the growing-up process. Should we put ourselves in cotton wool so that we are not endangered, thereby creating a race of people who might get into more strife in the long term? The Bill takes the law too far. I do not believe it necessary to do what the Government is trying to do: intrude into the lives of people as much as it is trying to do by this type of measure.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, oppose the Bill. It is a poor Bill; indeed, the more I look at the Minister's second reading explanation, the more ridiculous the Bill appears to be. I cannot see how on earth the Bill will prevent or even reduce law breaking in any shape or form. In his second reading explantion, the Minister said:

> The purpose of this Bill is to enable the Government, by regulation, to ban dangerous articles. The three groups of articles that have inspired the amendment are imitation firearms, self-protecting aerosol sprays, and hand-held catapults.

He obviously was inspired by the fact that they should be the first to come under Government control. The Minister continued:

> The amendment, however, is drawn in a general form so that the Government will from time to time in the future be able to ban other dangerous articles as the need arises without incurring the delays involved in passing amending legislation on each occasion.

I see the situation where the Government will look around to see all things large and small that are dangerous, and it

will pick them off one by one until, eventually, all that the kids have left to play with will be a balloon and perhaps a woollen ball or something of that nature. One can imagine the Minister going along King William Street and seeing an old man with a walking stick and saying, "That's a dangerous weapon. We must ban this by regulation."

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If they see you walking along, they'll ban you by regulation.

Mr. MATHWIN: Many people have tried to ban me, but they have not succeeded.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: Indeed, the Minister is out of order, and he would be out of order if he tried to ban me. How ridiculous can one get? We are going to ban anything that looks dangerous. A lady with a knitting needle might be dangerous. Ammonia squirted in the face would be more dangerous than an aerosol can. The Bill is one of the few Bills the Minister has introduced in the House.

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was time he showed his face.

Mr. MATHWIN: Caucus had a debate, at which it was said, "Now, whose turn is it to run?", and the Chief Secretary's name was picked out of a hat. This Bill was the best he could come up with. The Chief Secretary, regarding aerosol sprays, said:

> If these sprays remain available, it is impossible to ensure that they will not be used with aggression, instead of defence.

Anything can be used in an aggressive way; this includes fly sprays, and even eau de cologne spray, which could be squirted into the eyes. This Bill is ridiculous, because anything used in an aggressive manner, even a surf board, can be dangerous.

Mr. Evans: What about a no deposit beer bottle?

Mr. MATHWIN: There is no deposit on beer bottles, and the Government is not brave enough to introduce such a measure.

The SPEAKER: The Bill does not refer to beer bottle deposits.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pointing out that beer bottles can be dangerous, especially broken. The time is approaching when beer bottles might be banned. The only thing that could not be banned would be a balloon, and even that could go bang and give somebody a heart attack or it could fly into somebody's face. The Bill is ridiculous. If the Minister can suggest no better measure than this Bill, he should consult his own department. Firearms have been about for years, even when the Minister was a boy. Blank cartridges, guns or imitation guns, were available and I am sure that the Minister was never tempted to stage an armed hold-up with his imitation cap gun. How would the Minister have felt when he was a small child if the Government of the day had tried to ban his toys? I cannot support a Bill of this nature, and I oppose it.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I never cease to be amazed at members of the Opposition, who so proudly proclaim their defence of law and order. However, when something is recommended by the police and the Australian Bankers Association, the Opposition talks about restrictions on the rights of individuals, even though this measure has been adopted by other States. It does not surprise me, because recently I received a copy of a document written by opponents of this legislation, which states:

> Dear Mr. . . .
>
> Attached to this letter is a document that I believe would be of great interest to you. Would you accept this with the compliments of the Workers Party and the National Firearms Council? A submission to the Queensland Government was prepared by the Progress Party, Queensland Branch—

I have a fair idea how progressive that would be—

> Both the Workers Party and the Progress Party are strongly opposed to firearms controls on philosophical grounds—

like the member for Coles. The document continues:

> The National Firearms Council is spreading around Australia as a converging and rallying point for those who object to continuing efforts by most of Australia's Governments to disarm the citizens. We believe that steps must be taken now in South Australia to alert the public to the dangerous course being considered by the South Australian Government.
>
> I hope you will study the attached submission carefully for it makes an irrefutable case to show that firearms controls just don't work. You are welcome to circulate the submission where you see fit and you can obtain further copies from me at a small charge to cover copying. I will contact you soon to ask for your reaction to this material. Until then,
>
> Yours faithfully,
>
> Ewan Hutchinson,
>
> For the Workers Party and the
>
> National Firearms Council

Opinions expressed tonight by members of the Opposition can be found in this document when it is examined carefully. It is pathetic that the member for Coles made a statement implying that, because the *Advertiser* quoted a small part of what I had commented, this Bill was brought in merely because I thought it was a good idea. A very comprehensive document has been prepared by the Command Planning Unit of the Crime Services Section of the Police Department. I say this in answer to a suggestion made by the member for Glenelg that I should consult with the Police Department. I read that document very thoroughly before I decided that it was worthy of implementation. The Police Department asked for this to be done.

I give credit to the member for Hanson regarding this matter. I thought he would support this legislation, but at least he has not opposed it. That does not surprise me, because a comment referring to the Australian Bankers Association (and the opinion is held by bankers and bank employees, who, are concerned about the increase in bank hold-ups) states:

> In March 1977 the Australian Bankers Association forwarded a letter to the Commonwealth Minister responsible for customs, expressing their concern in relation to replica firearms. The letter requested the Minister to give consideration to prohibiting the import of replica imitation hand guns and similar weapons, including handcuffs. It stated that all are currently available without restriction throughout Australia, and are being used in increasing numbers by the criminal element. The association makes reference to a National Standing Committee on Bank Security which has been in operation since 1972. Members are senior bank executives, specialising in security and representing the complete banking industry, representatives from every Police Force throughout Australia, Commonwealth and State, and representatives from the two bank officers unions. At recent meetings of the Standing Committee, concern has been expressed at the present incidence of armed holdups of banks where criminals have been using replica firearms that are extremely realistic as to appearance, weight and apparent mechanics and which are generally available through normal retail outlets for sporting goods.

That comment was made by the Australian Bankers Association, which is concerned about the increase in armed hold-ups, particularly in the Eastern States. There has been a request by the police because of a decision at Police Commissioners' conferences which considered that these items should be banned. Regarding other articles like aerosol sprays, I have a letter from the Minister for

Customs who has asked about the attitude of the South AustralianGovernment because the Commonwealth Customs will not ban the importation of an article that the States permit to be sold and used freely.

They want to know what the attitude of this State is and to ascertain whether we are coming into line with some of the other States where steps have already been taken in respect of certain aerosol sprays. We are not talking about shaving cream, or fly sprays, because they have some value. The aerosol sprays in question are those being advertised and sold for women to carry in their handbags to protect themsleves against rapists. If a woman is attacked by a would-be rapist is she going to say, "Excuse me, I want to open my handbag so that I can get something to squirt in your eyes". How ridiculous that is.

These articles give a false sense of security. When I referred this matter to the police some months ago, they told me that as far as they are concerned these things do far more harm than good, and that they create a false sense of security for the women who buy them; in fact, the women are much worse off, because the spray can be used much more easily by a rapist to incapacitate a woman than by a woman to protect herself against a would-be rapist. That is the sort of article provided for in this legislation and, being subject to regulation, it means that Parliament has an opportunity to examine the things that are going to be prohibited. It can be disallowed by either House of Parliament, as members well know. I think it is criminal of members opposite to put up this spurious argument about protecting the rights of the individual and prevent the police from having power to protect the public. I urge the House to support the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Drury, Duncan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, Klunder, McRae, Olson, Simmons (teller), Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Whitten.

Noes (14)—Mrs. Adamson (teller), Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Blacker, Dean Brown, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, Rodda, Russack, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr Corcoran. No—Mr. Tonkin.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Offensive weapons, drugs and articles of disguise."

Mrs. ADAMSON: Paragraph *(c)* provides:

> "dangerous article" means any article or thing declared by regulation to be a dangerous article for the purposes of this section:

The Minister, in his second reading explanation referred to replicas of guns, aerosol sprays and hand-held catapults. What does he have in mind as likely to be defined as a dangerous article in the future, and how does he relate the use of these things to the dangers involved in the use of genuine firearms? I stress that no member on this side, myself included, would want to see any lessening of the stringent regulations that cover the use of firearms. Speaking for myself, I would want to see even stricter laws covering firearms. A firearm is a different thing from what is designated by these omniscient people, whose views we do not as yet know as dangerous articles. What else does the Minister consider might constitute a dangerous article in addition to the three products to which he referred in his second reading explanation?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): This Government does not believe in unnecessary restriction of the rights of the individual and, therefore, the things that are going to be banned under this legislation will be set out specifically in the regulations. I will give the honourable member one example. The easiest way to cover, for example, aerosol sprays is to name the particular type. There are two or three types of spray which are available that can be named specifically. The slingshots which have been on sale in South Australia are the Saunders Falcon II, and it is sufficient to define that slingshot specifically so that people buying it will know that it is a prescribed article.

It may well be that another article will come on the market and for that reason that will be named by brand. Rather than mention in the Bill, for example, a Saunders Falcon II, which may be supplanted next month by a similar product, we will name the particular article involved in regulations.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I would like further information from the Minister about my contention that these dangerous articles (and I am referring to the replicas of firearms) are being used on a wide-scale basis. Is there any evidence that the courts are imposing different sentences for offences where a replica firearm is used from those offences where the real thing is used? In other words, does the court distinguish between a dangerous weapon as described in this Bill and an actual firearm, and, if so, why?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I cannot say whether the courts differentiate. There is a very good argument in favour of not differentiating, because a bank teller faced with something that for all practical purposes looks like a Luger pistol (whether it is can only be determined in most cases by an expert actually handling it) believes he is being held up by a real gun. Although the criminal might try to claim that he could not shoot anyone because the gun was not capable of firing a bullet, that is a poor excuse to put forward in what is really an armed hold-up.

I do not have the exact answer for the honourable member but I would be surprised if the courts took much notice of an argument that it was not a real armed hold-up because the gun was not real and could not shoot anyone. As far as the parties involved in the hold-up are concerned it would be a real firearm. The person used it in the knowledge that it would be taken as a real gun, and therefore I do not think there is a very good case in favour of a lesser sentence for using an imitation article.

Mrs. ADAMSON: The Minister has substantially supported the point that I made, namely, that court sentences should be identical, irrespective of whether the weapon is real or is a replica. Very few people can tell, when a gun is pointed at them, whether it is real or an exact replica. How far does the Minister intend to go with this clause? Does the Minister intend to carry it through to a plastic toy, which, to the untrained eye, can look just as dangerous as a real gun? Who will determine what looks dangerous and what does not look dangerous? We could end up with a completely untenable situation.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: The courts will be best able to determine what will be regarded as offensive weapons. I accept that in some cases some articles can be fairly innocent in themselves, but nevertheless become offensive when used in a particular way. This argument could apply to an axe. A constituent of mine at Welland was prone to solve a lot of his problems with an axe. On one occasion he chased his wife down the street with an axe and on another occasion he hit a couple of holes through a dividing fence which, as far as he was concerned, was in the wrong position. Quite obviously that man brandishing an axe, and running down the street after his wife was using an offensive weapon. However, no-one would say that axes must be prescribed as offensive weapons or that they are

dangerous articles.

The position with replica firearms is that they would be placed in the same category as flick knives and knuckle dusters. If you are innocently walking around this House or down King William Street carrying a knuckle duster or a flick knife and the police find that out, according to the law as it stands at the present time you are liable. That position will also apply if you are walking down King William Street carrying an imitation firearm, because the inference is that you are about to use if for a nefarious purpose and the police will take action against you. That is the difference between an article which can be quite harmless in its place and one which, according to the balance of probabilities, will be used for an illegal purpose.

Mr. EVANS: The Minister has mentioned the Saunders Falcon II brand of catapult, and he referred to catapults capable of projecting a ball bearing or some other missile over a distance of over 200 feet a second or greater. It is very difficult to define the particular article. It is possible to make a catapult using heavy duty tractor inner tubing that can project a missile at a greater speed than the Saunders Falcon II, and I have seen one of those articles. As a boy I used a catapult made with heavy duty tractor inner tubing. Tractor inner tubing is even heavier today, and I am sure that boys can construct deadly and accurate catapults in this way. Persons using a catapult of this type can be just as accurate as those using the manufactured type.

If a person stopped me in a fairly lonely street and they had their hand in their pocket, using their forefinger by tipping their coat pocket up and told me to hand over my money or else, I would hand the money over and take a chance that that was all that was going to happen. If he told me he had a gun I would not try to argue that he did not have one. He would not get very much money, anyway. There is great difficulty in trying to describe these catapults under the legislation. Once you start trying to ban some, slowly but surely you move down until you ban them altogether, and that would be a sad situation. I had a lot of fun with them.

Mr. BECKER: Clause 2 *(a) (a)* refers to a person who manufactures, sells, distributes, supplies or otherwise deals in dangerous articles. Does that provision mean that the Minister proposes to outlaw the sale of replica guns and pistols by mail order? The Minister will recall that on 24 August 1978 (page 728 of *Hansard*) I asked a question on this subject regarding an advertisement that appeared in the *Australasian Post* where a firm in Queensland was selling replica guns and pistols by mail order. That advertisement carried the following notice:

> We regret under the New South Wales Firearms and Dangerous Weapons Regulations, purchase of these items is prohibited in New South Wales.

Does this Bill cover that situation?

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: This Bill will bring the situation in South Australia into line with that obtaining in New South Wales. When all the States have banned these articles—and they are moving towards that—the Commonwealth Government will then act through the Customs Department to ban their importation from the United States of America. We are doing our part towards the Australia-wide effort which is necessary before the Commonwealth Government will ban importation, so the mail order aspect is not relevant.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 22 November at 2 p.m.