HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 3 December 1981

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: INTEREST RATES

A petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia praying that the House request the State Government to urge the Federal Government to reduce home loan interest rates; ensure that home buyers with existing loans are not bankrupted or evicted as a result of increased interest rates; provide increased welfare housing and develop a loan programme to allow prospective home builders to obtain adequate finance was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: FIRE STATION

A petition signed by 745 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain a fire station on the LeFevre Peninsula was presented by Mr Peterson.

Petition received.

PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL OPERATING COSTS

A petition signed by 692 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs was presented by Mr Evans.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has leave to make a Ministerial statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We are unimpeded today. What a notable absence!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Please don't mention the fact that the member for Mitcham is not in the Chamber.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, we will not, but we all noticed it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has been given leave to make a Ministerial statement.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to state the progress the Government is making in relation to finalisation of an indenture agreement with Western Mining Corporation and B.P. for the Roxby Downs project. The Government and the joint venture companies have reached very substantial agreement on the matters of principle to be covered in the agreement. However, members should be aware that a great deal of complex and detailed legal drafting has to be undertaken to reflect the agreements in principle reached on various matters.

Representatives of the Government and the companies are in constant contact and negotiation over this drafting. The fact that this involves communication between offices in Adelaide, Melbourne and London inevitably means that considerable time can elapse between a negotiating point being raised by one party, and agreed by the other. However, all parties fully appreciate the importance of ensuring that the agreement finally signed is as precise as it is responsible. It has been the desire of the companies, and the intention of the Government, to bring the agreement before Parliament at an early date to allow members and the public to fully consider this very important matter before it is debated after the resumption of Parliament next February.

This remains the desire of the companies and the intention of the Government. However, the Government is determined, as are the companies, that our pre-eminent consideration must be to achieve an agreement that is workable and in the interests of all parties—the public of South Australia, the Government, this Parliament, and the companies concerned. If this means that the original timetable for finalisation of the indenture has to be somewhat deferred, then the Government will take that proper course rather than submitting to the apparent zeal of the Opposition to see the indenture. This is something that has emerged in recent days and is all the more puzzling because the Opposition had been claiming that an indenture was not necessary.

I want to emphasise, at the same time, that this does not mean there is any significant hold-up in the negotiations, and certainly no impasse as suggested by the Opposition, or by the Leader of the Opposition. Rather, it reflects the very proper approach to this matter which the Government and the companies are taking. If the agreement is not completed to allow the indenture to be brought into this House next week, the Government will take appropriate steps to allow the indenture to be examined by all members of Parliament as soon as it is signed, and to inform the public of its contents. This will allow members of Parliament and the public an opportunity to fully consider the matter before it is debated after the resumption of Parliament in February.

I refer to one other matter, namely, speculation orchestrated in recent days about the provision of electricity for the project. The General Manager of the Electricity Trust has stated publicly that the joint venture companies are not seeking absurdly cheap electricity tariffs, nor is the trust being pressured to 'cave in', to use the Leader's term, on this matter. Western Mining Corporation has also repudiated the Leader's assertions. The negotiations on this matter have proceeded quite properly between the trust and the companies, and the Government has been kept fully informed.

To suggest that the trust would be in some way responsive to any pressure in this matter is a gross insult to the manner in which the trust has discharged its responsibilities in the interests of South Australia over many years. In fact, I think that the General Manager's comment on Monday was that the allegations were nonsense. It is the Government's view that in all matters such as this power should be provided on a basis that does not in any way disadvantage any other South Australian industrial or domestic consumers. The indenture Bill presented to Parliament this week has received widespread support and commendation for the manner in which the State's interests have been secured and for the benefits that it will bring to all South Australians. The Government is determined that the Roxby Downs indenture will be finalised on exactly the same basis. In the meantime, speculation of the type which has been orchestrated this week is simply mischievous, misleading and grossly irresponsible.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: FIRE BRIGADE

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Today, His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council proclaimed 3 December 1981 as the date from which the South Australian Fire Brigades Act Amendment Act, 1981, shall come into effect. In accordance with the above Act, the South Australian Fire Brigade now becomes a corporation to be known as the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service. The corporation is constituted of the Minister, who is the Chief Secretary.

The Chief Officer, when appointed, will be the Chief Executive Officer reporting directly to the Chief Secretary. In the interim, Mr Colin Morphett has been appointed as Acting Chief Officer of the corporation. The Fire Brigades Board has been disbanded. The functional procedures of the new corporation will not differ greatly from those existing previously. The transitional period will be quite complex, but ever endeavour will be made to accept all existing commitments and to continue all interstate and local activities to at least the same extent as in the past.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. W. E. Chapman):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Forestry Act, 1950-1974, Proclamation—section 2B—Part of Forest Reserve Resumed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I indicate that any questions that normally would go to the honourable Premier will be taken this afternoon by the honourable Deputy Premier.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr BANNON: Will the Deputy Premier be personally involved in the crisis talks this weekend over the Roxby Downs indenture, which have been called in an attempt to resolve differences over the royalty formula, which has emerged as a major area of dispute, along with the provision of electricity and water? A moment ago the Deputy Premier made a Ministerial statement to the House in which, amongst other things, he said:

> If this means that the original time table for finalisation of the indenture has to be somewhat deferred, then the Government will take that proper course rather than submitting to the apparent zeal of the Opposition to see the indenture.

Further, he went on to say:

> I want to emphasise, at the same time, that this does not mean there is any significant hold-up in the negotiations, and certainly no impasse as suggested by the Opposition . . .

I have been informed that the Under Treasurer, as well as senior finance officers of the Treasury Department and Mr Kimpton, the Political Adviser to the Minister of Mines and Energy, will be working urgently throughout this weekend to try to resolve the outstanding problems relating to the proposed indenture, and discussing it with the operating partners. I understand that the urgency arises from the Government's need to have the Bill in the House before Christmas, despite the statement made by the Deputy Premier, so that it can keep to its political time table and introduce its Bill before the report of the Iron Triangle study is published, as this report significantly downgrades the economic importance of Roxby Downs, particularly in relation to employment.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: All I can do is repeat the public statement I made yesterday in relation to the fulminations of the Leader of the Opposition in his comments on the negotiations into the indenture and say that he is talking nonsense.

Mr Bannon: Why are they meeting at the weekend?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Leader of the Opposition's anonymous informant was better informed he would know that the negotiating teams of the Government have been prepared to work not only at weekends but all night on occasions. In fact, they work when people are available to negotiate. There has been no compulsion put on public servants to work out of hours, but they have willingly done so, and to their very great credit they have done it magnificently.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Deputy Leader would like to listen to me and pay a bit less attention to his anonymous informant, and if his anonymous informant was better informed, he would know, for instance, in relation to the Cooper Basin indenture that the team worked all one night until 6 a.m., and not at my behest. There was a general recognition by the State and the officers—those loyal officers of the people of this State—as well as by the proponents of the project, that it was to everybody's advantage to finalise the indenture. Many hours outside 9 to 5 have been worked. When one is negotiating with people from interstate (and, in the case of B.P., people whose headquarters are overseas), it is a matter of negotiating when people are available. I was negotiating personally with Mr Carmichael, when he was available, in relation to the excellent indenture which the House is currently considering.

Mr Bannon: That's a different case!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am pointing out that there is nothing new. The Leader of the Opposition is trying to suggest that there is something new in the fact that officers of the Government this weekend are prepared to negotiate with Roxby Downs people. There is nothing new; it has happened before and no doubt, with the officers who have been prepared to do this on other occasions as they have with the Cooper Basin indenture, it will occur again. The Leader is talking nonsense in trying to suggest that there something brand new has cropped up. That suggestion is absurd. I made a statement to the House which made the position perfectly clear. I said that an enormous amount of work is involved, and obviously the Leader has never been involved in such negotiations, or he would know that once agreement has been reached on matters of principle that is not the end of it; an enormous amount of work is involved in getting it into legalise. There is an enormous amount of checking to do on both sides, and passing over a draft from one to the other to see that what is going to become legally binding properly reflects what people understood had been agreed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If people do not understand, I am sure in my mind who those people are, and they are the people groping around in the dark, trying to present difficulties which do not exist. There are no crisis talks—that is absurd, nonsensical and, in fact, untrue. There are some discussions at the weekend, because it is the Government's and the company's desire as well as the desire of the officers, who have been working on this matter for months, to see that it is brought to a successful conclusion.

I would be interested to know who the Leader's unnamed informant is; he is obviously someone who is not very close to the scene and who has no knowledge of the history of these negotiations.

I repeat that both these negotiations and the negotiations which we brought to a conclusion a fortnight ago in relation to the Cooper Basin have been running in parallel fashion for many months now. I might say that the Roxby Downs indenture is more complicated because it encompasses a wider range of matters, including the provision of a new town to accommodate up to 9 000 people. To suggest that that can all be wrapped up in five minutes would be absurd. I will say it again for about the fourth time so that it might sink in for all members opposite: there is nothing occurring this weekend which has not occurred previously in relation to public servants working overtime of their own volition to bring this to a successful conclusion.

Let me say that Mr Carmichael, who was involved in the Santos Cooper Basin negotiations, paid a very handsome tribute—

Mr Bannon: You are talking about real assets, not a hypothetical situation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bannon: Don't try to mix the two up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Precisely the same processes have been followed in relation to both negotiations, and for the Leader, who is some sort of lawyer, to suggest that the procedures are in any way different, is patently absurd. I make the point that the Roxby Downs indenture is a more comprehensive document, simply because it covers a wider range of matters and the investment involved in a range of matters is more complicated, because, for instance, as everyone knows, we are not thinking of building a new town in relation to the Stony Point development, but we are considering the development of a whole new town at Roxby Downs, which, as some people have rightly said, will be of the dimensions of Mount Isa; so those matters must be covered.

Let me pay a tribute to those officers and public servants, some of whom have been involved in both projects. Mr Carmichael paid a very handsome tribute to our team in relation to these negotiations. He was very impressed by the fact that public servants were prepared to work overtime, to work all night in one instance, and the fact that they are prepared to work this weekend, is to their added credit. To suggest that this is something new is absolutely and patently absurd and untrue.

ESTABLISHMENT PAYMENTS SCHEME

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs tell the House whether industry is taking advantage of the Establishment Payments Scheme which is administered by the Department of Trade and Industry? The basis of my question is my belief that small business is the backbone of our community as an employment body.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The honourable member has asked whether the Establishment Payments Scheme in its revised form is effective in attracting new development to this State. I am pleased to say that, yes, it has been, and we have found within the State Government, particularly through the Department of Trade and Industry, that there has been a very marked lift in inquiries by companies wanting to expand; in their expansion they are entitled to a certain amount of assistance from the State Government if they meet certain criteria. We have found that the number of applicants has boomed quite considerably.

I would like to detail to the House the latest figures for actual approvals by the Industries Development Committee for the period of five weeks from 1 August to 10 September 1981. Approval was given for assistance to five companies during that period. The total capital investment of the five companies amounted to more than $2 500 000, and there is an estimated increase in the total number of jobs of 138. The companies expanding under that scheme are: R. W. Bowman Manufacturing Pty Ltd, of Norwood, which has established a manufacturing facility to produce microfiche readers; Delta West, which is a new company to this State, at Dudley Park, occupying land previously owned by the Health Commission, and which is establishing a facility to manufacture antiseptics and peroxides; the Marla Bore Trading Company, at Coober Pedy, which is establishing a tourist complex; Mineral Control Instrumentation Pty Ltd, of Adelaide, which is establishing a facility to manufacture mining and processing equipment; and finally, at Port Lincoln (I am sure the local member will be pleased to know this), Port Lincoln Tuna Processors are establishing a fish cannery which will employ quite a large number of people. In addition, during the same five-week period I am delighted to say that a further five applications were received by the Government and have been recommended by me, as Minister, for approval by the Industries Development Committee, although they have not yet been approved by that committee.

These further four recommendations cover a total capital investment of just over $5 000 000 and create a further 193 jobs. I think that that highlights the extent to which the Government, through its incentive scheme, is now encouraging new industrial development and expansion in this State. Considering that all of this has occurred over a five-week period for just those companies assisted by the Government, and taking into account other industrial expansion, particularly in the smaller companies, as listed here, it is obvious that there is a significant uplift in this State's economy.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Deputy Premier, representing the Premier, say whether he agrees that unemployment is a major problem in electorates such as Henley Beach, Morphett, Adelaide and, of course, others, and will the Government provide financial support for urgently needed direct job creation schemes under active consideration by the Western Regional Organisation of Councils and, if not, why not? This morning the *Advertiser* reported that the Western Regional Organisation of Councils, including the Henley and Grange, West Torrens and Glenelg councils, is looking at direct job creation schemes because of the number of people, particularly young people, facing long periods of unemployment with no work experience.

There has been no direct job creation scheme in South Australia since the Tonkin Government scrapped the SURS project. New South Wales, which, at 4.9 per cent, has the lowest unemployment rate in Australia, has a job creation scheme. The New South Wales Government is providing $5 000 000 this year on a matching basis to local councils for job creation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are commenting, Jack.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am not; I am stating facts. I would leave it to the Speaker, if I were you. He will not let me go. Extra jobs are needed more urgently than ever in South Australia. The latest information for October shows this State's highest ever share, at 13.3 per cent, of the national jobless total, since the bureau began to collect jobless figures. This State now has had the highest unem-

ployment rate in Australia for 22 consecutive months. I have no doubt that the member for Henley Beach would like to have asked that question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The answer to the question is 'No'. The reason is because the Labor Party, in Government, instituted the State version of the RED scheme, which was a signal failure in that it did not create one permanent job. It was a band-aid method of padding the unemployment figures until something in the economy turned up which would create permanent jobs. The Labor Party spent of the order of $25 000 000—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: No, $50 000 000.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The sum of $50 000 000; that makes it much more gross. The Labor Party is advocating a scheme that it tried while in Government and found to be absolutely wanting; when it left office unemployment in this State was the highest in the nation. The Opposition is asking this Government to follow a path which proved to be absolutely futile, in that it did not create one permanent job. The Opposition is suggesting spending the public money to create temporary work while we wait for something to turn up. But nothing turned up during the years of the Labor Government. The answer is 'No', the Government is interested in creating permanent jobs. The only way to create permanent jobs is to see an improvement in the economy of this State. One will not see an improvement in that economy from spending money on creating temporary jobs. If the honourable member had listened, a moment ago—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It could well be that by spending money in this fashion one could be, in the long term, denying permanent employment to the young people in this State. If the honourable member is incapable of understanding that point, I am prepared to explain it to him in more detail. The fact is that, if Government money is squandered in this fashion, it could well be that, in the long term, we could be denying permanent opportuntities for employment in South Australia.

Some funds are being used by this Government, as was outlined by the Minister of Industrial Affairs a moment ago, in the Establishment Payments Scheme, which, as the Minister pointed out, has created permanent jobs. In other words, the Government is giving incentives, by way of cash incentives and pay-roll tax relief, to enterprises in relation to the establishment of permanent jobs. It is far wiser for this Government—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It has not worked Federally and it will not work in this State.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is working in this State, and that is shown by the figures the Minister of Industrial Affairs just quoted. There has been an increase of 12 000 in the number of permanent jobs created during the life of this Government, while during the life of the Labor Government, when it had its fancy RED scheme, which was a temporary prop-up bank-aid job, there was a decline of 9 000 jobs—

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Twenty thousand.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: There was a loss of 20 000 permanent jobs during the last two years of the previous Government. Does anyone think that this Government will be stupid enough to trade off a short-term expediency to try to pad the unemployment figures by spending money which at the moment is not available to the Government anyway for a scheme which does not create one permanent job? The answer is plainly 'No'.

SHEARERS

Mr LEWIS: Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the 80-odd people who attended the weekend meeting at Naracoorte of so-called shearers, which voted to strike, were all members of the Australian Workers Union and all local shearers or did any checks made reveal that the meeting was stacked?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am unable to inform the member whether those present at the meeting at Naracoorte were members of the union or not.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Did you attend?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I was not in attendance. I certainly would have attended had I been invited but the invitation was not extended to me on that occasion. I am aware that about the number of shearers mentioned by the honourable member assembled in Naracoorte, as indeed quite large numbers from that industry assembled in other parts of the State during last weekend. The subject they were discussing, I understand, was the tactics they were to determine for this week in relation to an application by the Woolgrowing Federation of Australia to have the award allow wide combs (combs wider than 2½ inches) to be used by shearers.

The Federal pastoral award at this stage does provide for a maximum comb width of 2½ inches to be used by shearers in the industry, and I believe the reasoning behind that confinement of comb width has been well understood by the workers and the shearing industry for many years. Indeed, as a result of a carefully assessed formula the award rates for the shearing industry are determined, and it is possible, as a result of shearers having access, by option or otherwise, to wider shearing combs that they may in turn shear more sheep, and accordingly that would have some affect on the present formula for determining the award. I believe there is some merit in the argument put forward by the A.W.U. on behalf of shearers in the industry.

After the subject broke in the media recently, I was very surprised to learn of the South Australian Secretary's attitude towards this whole subject when he, Mr Alan Begg, based his opposition to the use of wider combs in the shearing industry on their effects on the wool clip and sought primarily to take the woolgrowers' part. That was a surprising step for Mr Begg to take. I do not think it did his cause or that of his members any good. Had he stuck to the basis on which the award rate is determined to sell his case on behalf of his industrial employees, it might have been more appropriate.

However, given the opportunity as I have been today, I say, as someone who has been fairly closely associated with that industry over a number of years, that I have no objection to the use of wide combs. I have never used them. In fact, to be honest, I have had great difficulty in filling the 2½ inch combs that were issued to us for use, but there are shearers in the industry across Australia and, of course, in New Zealand who believe that they are able to shear more sheep with equal effort by using wider than 2½ inch combs. In those circumstances, I have never really appreciated the merits of denying an option of using wide combs legally in shearing the Australian wool clip. I know that in at least one of our major wool producing States, wide combs, by design, or after being pulled wider by the shearer, have been extensively used by employees there.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It is illegal to do so.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is true, as the Deputy Leader says, that it is illegal under the Federal Pastoral Industry Award to use combs that are wider than 2½ inches. In this instance, I suppose representatives of the woolgrowing industry in Australia have been approached. No doubt, at their own level they have duly considered the

subject. It is also true that they have now lodged a formal application to use them. I repeat that I cannot answer the detailed request by the member for Mallee. I am informed by my colleague, the member for the Naracoorte region, that during the meeting in that town last weekend there was a bit of fur flying, even though they were there to talk about the wool industry.

Indeed, it has been alleged that a number of shearers, apparently not members of the union and apparently not formally invited to the meeting, did turn up, but their number was considerably less than those involved in the meeting, and a bit of a scrap occurred. As a result, there was a race down the main street of Naracoorte. I am not too sure who won or lost. But, it is not unusual in the shearing industry, as I indicated to my colleague and others who were discussing the subject, for a scrap to develop, particularly on such occasions. I am unable to report details of it, and really regard the story associated with the Naracoorte meeting as quite frivolous and quite divorced from the real subject of the meeting, the outcome of which has resulted in a strike throughout the country by union members, and there may be a ceasing of work by others who are associated with the industry but who are not union members. I cannot confirm this, but the situation will result in a gross loss to the wool industry of Australia. It will cause much encumbrance to the woolgrowing industry generally and to those dependent upon that industry for their incomes, which includes members of the T.W.U. in the carrying industry, and members of the Storemen and Packers Union at wool store level. There will be an undoubted upset in the wool marketing programme in this State. All the way down the line this will be an encumbrance to the wool industry over a matter that ought to be resolved at the local industry level, and not involve a strike such as that with which we are faced this week.

JOSEPH VERCO

Mr O'NEILL: Will the Minister of Marine now state what is to happen to the Department of Fisheries research vessel *Joseph Verco*, which sank last year? Why has the report into the condition of the vessel earlier this year not yet been made public, and when will that report be released to the public? On 15 September last I asked a similar question of the Minister. The Minister, in reply, said that the question of the *Joseph Verco* had been the subject of inquiry, and involved legal matters associated with this vessel. He also said:

> Whilst the lawyers are looking at the problem it would be quite improper for me to make any comment on it.

My information is that it would not be improper for the Minister to make comment to the extent of answering the question that has been put to him. I ask the Minister whether he will now tell the House what is going on with the *Joseph Verco*. It has been suggested to me that the Government is proposing pushing more money down the drain—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows full well that comments in explanation of questions are out of order. If the honourable member has further explanation, I trust that it will be explanation, and explanation only.

Mr O'NEILL: With respect, Sir, I was saying that it had been suggested to me that the Government is about to push more money down the drain after that which had already been spent.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will know that warnings have been given to members on both sides of the House that they may not comment in that manner under the guise that it is a statement made by other people, whether it be read from a newspaper cutting or from a letter. There are a number of occasions when opportunity to bring that sort of comment in is allowed because it is not directly reflecting on the competence of a Minister or of his department. It is a discretion that is given to the Chair. The Chair on this occasion believes that the manner in which the honourable member was seeking to comment, even through the mouth of someone else, was out of order. That is the basis on which I ask the member for Florey to come quickly to the explanation, without comment.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: As I understand the question, it was that he had had advice to the effect that the answer I gave relative to the legal situation regarding the *Joseph Verco* was not such that one should not comment on it. I take it that that refers to Ministers of the Crown who are responsible for departments from which those matters are beholden.

Mr O'Neill: The suggestion was that you are hiding behind lawyers.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I do not know who gave him his advice, but the advice I am waiting for has not arrived. Litigation is attached to this matter. I know that Christmas is coming and that the goose is getting fat. I am not hiding behind lawyers. No-one else would like the answer to this question more than I would, to get this matter out of my hair, and I have little of that. The answer to the honourable member is as was explained to him long ago. I still do not have the resolution from the people who are charged with making the decision in regard to the *Joseph Verco*.

FOOTBALL PARK

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say what is the present position regarding flood lighting the playing arena of Football Park? It was reported yesterday that the Football Park stadium would have $1 000 000 spent on it to improve facilities for patrons. It was also reported at the same time that the matter of the lights was unresolved. Will the Minister tell the House what the present position is?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Members will recall the answer to a question from the member for Henley Beach some weeks ago, when I told the House that, although prior to that it seemed that negotiations had reached a successful conclusion—

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable Minister please resume his seat. I ask the member for Albert Park to heed the advice that the Deputy Leader gave to the Leader earlier this afternoon when the Deputy Leader sought to put a question which he wanted the Minister to hear. On this occasion, the opportunity is being given to the Minister to answer the question he has been asked.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, it was thought that negotiations had come to a successful conclusion. However, there then occurred a disagreement about the definition of 1 000 lux. Members will recall without my going into too much detail that the league held that it should be 1 000 lux average, which means that there could be, say, 1 400 lux in the centre of the ground and, say, 750 lux on the outside (that is an oversimplification but members will know what I mean), whereas the residents and West Lakes Ltd were holding to the fact that it should be 1 000 lux only and no more than 1 000 lux at any point on the ground. At that time I said there was very little more that the Government could do other than try to facilitate further negotiations and agreement and, in fact, further discussions were held. As I

understand it, based on copies of correspondence that I received, I think early last week, West Lakes Limited and the residents have agreed to an average of 1 000 lux; that is, that the residents and West Lakes Limited have agreed to the league's proposals. I cannot add any more than that; at this stage I have had no official communication from the league as to its response.

NIGHTCLUB FIRES

Mr KENEALLY: Has police surveillance at Adelaide nightspots been increased following the recent fires at three city premises, and have arrangements been made by the Chief Secretary for the immediate reinspection of fire protection and prevention equipment at nightclubs, in order to safeguard patrons over the busy period this weekend and beyond? The Chief Secretary will be aware of the potential hazard to human life of fires such as those that have occurred in three nightclubs during the past week. I am sure he will be able to detail to the House what measures have been taken to cope with this problem.

The Chief Secretary will also be aware that the former Labor Government used all its corporate affairs powers to try to block interstate criminals from gaining a foothold in the Adelaide entertainment scene. The previous Government was widely recognised as being ruthless in its efforts to legally block business interests which were known to have 'big crime' connections. There is considerable community apprehension about recent events, as to whether the fires were the work of a disturbed individual, or whether there was some other more sinister motive behind the fires involving criminal conspiracy. Many people would like to know what efforts, other than normal police inquiries are being made by the Government to scrutinise the *bona fides* of interstate business interests infiltrating the local entertainment scene.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is obvious that the honourable member has some information; he is talking about the operation of business interest of a doubtful character from across the border. If what he suggests is occurring, I would certainly be most grateful if he would tell me about those matters privately. I am sure that the police would appreciate any information that the honourable member has on this matter.

Reference was made by the Opposition earlier this week, I think, to fears that gangland tactics were being employed in the motivation of these fires and that that was the reason for them. The Commissioner of Police has detailed the Major Crime Squad to look at this matter and at the moment it is thought that the incidents are not related, but that is not to say that there is not some connection. The matter is being investigated by people in that squad who are skilled in investigating arson and all the horrific results that come from it. The member has asked me whether we have increased police activity in those areas. These matters are in the hands of the Commissioner, and I hope that the member is not suggesting that hitherto the city of Adelaide has not been correctly policed.

Mr Keneally: I am referring to protection of nightspots by the Fire Brigade.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Fire Brigade maintains a vigilance of buildings, and the brigade has been looking at the whole city of Adelaide. This matter is being canvassed. These fires are occurring in night clubs and it is for that reason that the Major Crime Squad is investigating the matter. The squad has people with specific skills and expertise and they are giving the matter their undivided attention.

I take this opportunity to refer to something unfortunate. I do not attribute this to members opposite, but I refer to the fact that the police are coming under question. I am sure members opposite will agree with me that we have one of the finest Police Forces in this country and that it can be relied on to see to it that, whatever the causes are, the matter will be receiving the undivided attention of the force and its attention to detail, so that whoever is responsible for these horrendous crimes is brought to book.

In regard to business men having improper motives, I am sure that that is a matter that will also be receiving the attention of the police. If it is so, it is something that we do not make public, but the police can be relied upon to see to it that adequate protection is given to this city.

MILTABURRA SCHOOL

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether his department is taking the necessary action to make sure that, if the proposed new school at Miltaburra is constructed, enough water will be available to supply adjoining landholders? At a public hearing of the Public Works Committee at Wirrulla recently, concern was expressed by one landholder that there may not be sufficient water if this project is completed. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether his officers will investigate this matter. I point out to the Minister by way of explanation that, when the Karcultaby school was constructed, it was necessary to build a new main to the school so that the demands of that project could be met without affecting the adjoining landholders.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The study requested by the member has already been undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. In October last year the department informed the Director-General of the Public Buildings Department that water could be supplied to the school without adversely affecting other persons who receive supply from that main. The main referred to by the member is a 100 mm main and is supplying many of the farmers in that area.

I believe that Mr Wood has made representations to the Public Works Standing Committee in relation to the effect that this development could have on his possible future supply of water. Mr Wood has a 20 mm line (a ¾-inch plastic line) running some 9½ kilometres from the 100 mm main. He is having trouble with the amount of water he is able to get at the end of the line. One must keep in mind that with some 9½ kilometres through a ¾-inch line one cannot expect to receive a great flow of water. I believe that it is Mr Wood's intention to install a 25 mm line, which will significantly upgrade the service to his property. The department has confirmed that, with a 25 mm service, and possibly with the removal of the pressure reducing valve between the meter and Mr Wood's line, a significant increase in flow could be obtained.

The department intends installing a pressure recording meter so that it can determine variations in pressure head experienced in Mr Wood's line if the pressure reducing valve is removed. Once these studies have been carried out the department will be able to make a recommendation to Mr Wood as to whether it would be safe for him to remove the pressure reducing valve. If this is done, it certainly will overcome his current problems. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has assured me that there is ample volume of water available in the 100 mm main not only to meet the requirements of the current persons served by that main but to also meet the requirements of the proposed new school at a flow rate of .38 litres a second to the school.

If the flow is of that order, no problems will be experienced by other consumers.

BEACH SAND

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Environment and Planning aware that contractors removing sand from the foreshore at Semaphore are leaving the beach in a dangerous and unsightly condition at the completion of each day's work? Will he undertake to direct the contractors to make the area safe and sightly for beach users? The Lefevre Peninsula is a major source of sand for the beach replenishment projects undertaken to provide southern metropolitan seaside districts with attractive and safe beaches. On every occasion when sand has been taken problems have developed. To overcome those problems, I arranged with the coast protection section of the Port Adelaide council to set up a Foreshore Advisory Committee, where problems are discussed and solutions found. This has not occurred. Problems are raised, but no answers are given.

Complaints to the local council about the sand removal reached the stage where the council placed a paid advertisement in the local newspaper advising people to contact the coast protection section with those complaints. Many irate residents have contacted me with their protests about the removal of sand and the condition the beaches are left in. I am asked by those people why Semaphore does not get any consideration from the Coast Protection Board, a question I cannot answer. Will the Minister please supply that answer?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will certainly investigate the allegations made by the member for Semaphore. The sand replenishment programme is an extensive one this year, with some 125 000 cubic metres of sand being moved from one end of the metropolitan coastline to the other at a total cost of about $125 000.

I am aware that the committee to which the member referred was set up to improve liaison between the council, the Coast Protection Board, and the unit which is part of my department. From what the member indicates, there has been a breakdown in communications, and I would be anxious to follow up the reasons for that breakdown and to find out what has happened. I must admit that I am not aware of having received any complaints from people living in the area. I would be happy to get a report for the member and to look at the matter, with particular reference to LeFevre Peninsula.

WUNDERLICH TILES

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs advise whether he has had his attention drawn to the fact that there may well be a difficulty in the replacement of Wunderlich roofing tiles in the event of a natural disaster, storm or tempest, where houses could be deroofed, and whether precautions will be taken to ensure that an adequate stockpile of Wunderlich tiles is kept in South Australia?

I have been advised by some builders that it has been estimated that one-eighth of all houses in South Australia have roofs tiled with Wunderlich products, and I further understand that such tiles are generally of a different measurement from that of other tiles available and manufactured in South Australia, which are thus unsuitable for use in matching existing Wunderlich tiles. It has been said that if South Australia were hit by freak winds, storms or a natural disaster, then one-eighth of South Australia's houses, mine included, would be at risk without suitable roof tiles for replacement. It has been suggested that probably owners would have to trade between themselves to get sufficient tiles of the same sort for reroofing. As the closure of the Wunderlich factory possibly could leave the State without a sufficient or adequate supply or stockpile of these tiles, I seek the Minister's answer accordingly.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am not aware of the details, so I cannot give the honourable member a detailed reply to his question. I will certainly follow it up with the company, and particularly with C.S.R., the principal which owns the Wunderlich Tile Company. I am aware that the company does have a large excess of tiles at present, and I understood that stock was sufficient to carry on for some time, particularly if there were not significant sales of this existing stock.

I will get a detailed reply for the honourable member and then inform him. I tend to agree with him that it is important that there be a residue of these tiles, particularly if they are a unique size and do not match existing tiles manufactured elsewhere in Australia. I understand that the company has manufacturing facilities in Melbourne and Sydney and it would be feasible to bring replacement tiles from interstate, but I was not aware of the problems of the size matching, and I will check on those details as well.

LAND PURCHASES

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Lands consult with his colleague, the Attorney-General, regarding the establishment of a register of foreign land ownership in South Australia so that a check can be kept on the degree to which control of land has passed out of our hands? For some time there has been concern in the real estate community about the possibility that large overseas interests, in particular Asian and Arab investors and West Germans, looking for safe investment might move into the Australian land market, because Australian land in world terms is seen as cheap.

The Farmers and Stockowners Association has suggested that legislation might be needed in this regard. That organisation was also concerned about the pressure on prices local purchasers have to pay as a result of keen overseas bidding for properties in the South-East, Mid North and Eyre Peninsula. There is some control by the Foreign Investment Review Board, although that does not apply to sales of land for less than $350 000. The latest figures available from the review board show that there have been only 20 purchases by foreign investors in five years in this State. In the Senate it was revealed recently that in the past four years over the whole nation 14 000 000 hectares, valued at $192 000 000, had passed into foreign hands. With this in mind some States have begun to take stock.

Before he replies, the Minister might like to consider the fact that Queensland has decided to act. Queensland, where there has been heavy investment by interests from the United States, Singapore, Brazil, and Japan, decided about a fortnight ago to start an official inquiry before setting up a land ownership register, and it appears as though legislation will be needed there to enforce disclosure about land holdings.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Government in South Australia is keeping this matter under constant review and, as the honourable member said, there have been few overseas purchases in South Australia. Until such time as there appears to be a problem in this State the Government is not likely to take any action. As the honourable member mentioned, any purchases have to be considered by the Foreign Investment Review Board, which refers those proposed purchases both to the Department of Agriculture and

to the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. The matter is kept under close surveillance, and until it appears that there is any need for legislation, the matter will continue to be closely watched.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Water Resources give details of when the water supply for the southern suburbs of Adelaide will be filtered?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You got that on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCHMIDT: On a number of occasions over the last two years that I have been here I have asked questions about this. At the moment, the mud is being stirred again by the Opposition candidate in my electorate who is trying to imply that Government cuts might cause delay in the programming of the filtration system.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the member for Mawson if he would approach the Chair with the question. The matter arises that it is probable that it is precisely the same as the question answered by way of reply to a Question on Notice on Tuesday of this week.

Later:

In relation to the matter raised by the honourable member for Mawson, the information is readily available as a result of a question which was answered, not in as precise terms, earlier this week. Therefore, the question must be ruled inadmissible.

GAOLING OF WOMAN

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, advise the outcome of the Department for Community Welfare's urgent inquiry into the recent gaoling of a 73-year-old Bowden woman, and what action has the Government taken to prevent this unfortunate type of incident occurring again? It was reported that this woman was put in gaol because the authorities had nowhere else to put her, and it is similar to a previous incident when the Hindmarsh council took court action and fined an invalid pensioner very heavily for not keeping his dog off the street. However, according to a report in the *Weekly Times*, the Hindmarsh Town Clerk has rapped two Government departments over the plight of the 73-year-old woman. The Town Clerk named the Highways Department and the Department for Community Welfare as being the main culprits in the situation. The woman had been living in a derelict Highways Department cottage for the past three years, and the two Government departments came out of it badly, according to the Town Clerk.

The first, he said, was the Highways Department for allowing the woman to live in such derelict, unhealthy conditions. Council had consistently argued that the Highways Department was 'incapable of looking after situations like this', and such properties should be put in the hands of the Housing Trust. The Department for Community Welfare also deserved blame because they were aware of what the situation was all the time. The D.C.W. knew about this woman in February 1980. Its charter is to help people whether it has the legislation or the courage to become involved. The Town Clerk said they could not cope with the situation and it was only after the matter had been brought to a head by council, that the D.C.W. had 'started to take action very quickly'.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I shall certainly ask the Minister of Community Welfare for a detailed report for the honourable member, but I am aware, from a brief conversation with the Minister, that the woman concerned is now in a good situation and being well looked after, and I gather, is quite happy with her circumstances. I think that the honourable member himself would recognise that there are people who literally design their own situation in order to repel the possibility of help being given or visitors being allowed entry to a property. If I recall correctly, the woman concerned kept a large number of dogs and their presence was designed to repel visitors. Any officer or person calling to try to provide assistance for the woman in question would certainly have been repelled by the number of dogs on the property. I understand that there has been a satisfactory outcome as a result of this having been brought to the Minister's notice, and I shall arrange for a report to be provided to the honourable member.

RYE GRASS TOXICITY

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Agriculture advise whether there has been an assessment of the impact of rye grass toxicity in various parts of the State, and whether stockowners will be eligible for any assistance, either direct or indirect, to control the effects of this disease? In recent years, it has been noted that several series of outbreaks of rye grass toxicity have appeared without apparent warning and it appears that no area can be considered free of potential outbreak. Many stock losses have occurred. Many farmers are facing cash-flow difficulties in restocking, treatment of pastures, and so forth, which cause considerable expense. Could the Minister advise the efforts of his department in respect of these outbreaks?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Tremendous efforts are expended by my department in this area of plant research and plant disease research in the primary industry areas of South Australia. But, as time does not permit now, I shall obtain the information and bring it back to the honourable member on Tuesday next week.

At 3.15 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1974-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: 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

This Bill is designed to correct anomalies found to exist in several provisions of the principal Act, the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1974-1981. The Bill proposes amendments relating to the component of pension that is based upon additional salary earned by a member through holding Ministerial or other prescribed office. The existing provisions relating to this matter (sections 17 and 24) do not provide for the case where a member has held simultane-

ously two or more offices that attract additional salary. The amendment is designed to make clear that it is the aggregate of the amounts of additional salary earned where two or more such offices are held simultaneously that is to be taken into account in determining the component of pension based upon additional salary.

The Bill proposes an amendment relating to the provision for calculation of the amount of pension payable to the spouse of a deceased member. Section 24 of the principal Act presently uses a factor in that calculation that is defined in terms of the pension payable to the member when he became a pensioner. This definition does not provide for the case where part of the pension has been commuted. The amendment makes proper provision for that case. The Bill proposes amendments to section 36 of the principal Act. This section provides where a person has had a previous period of service in this Parliament or in the Parliament of the Commonwealth or another State or Territory, that previous service may be taken into account for the purposes of the Act if the person, after becoming a member of this Parliament, makes a payment to the fund in respect of that previous service.

The section presently provides in relation to previous service in this Parliament that the payment to the fund must be made within three months after the member became a member or such further time as the trustees may allow. Where the trustees allow further time for the payment, they are empowered to require interest to be paid on the amount of the payment. Under the amendments, this three-month time limit and the power to require payment of interest would also apply in any case where a payment is made in respect of previous service in the Parliament of the Commonwealth or another State or Territory. The Bill also proposes amendments designed to make it clear that the references in the Act to salary and additional salary are references to the amount payable annually as salary or additional salary.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act which provides definitions of terms used in the Act. The clause amends the definitions of 'salary' and 'additional salary' so that they are expressed in terms of amounts payable annually.

Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act which provides for the calculation of the amount of pension on retirement. The clause replaces the definition of 'H.S.' in subsection (2) with a definition under which it is made clear that, where a member has held two or more prescribed offices at the same time, the aggregate additional salary is taken into account in calculating the factor designated by the symbol 'H.S.'. The clause inserts a new subsection (2b) which makes provision for the case where it is necessary to apply in a calculation under subsection (2) the rate of additional salary for a particular higher office as at the date of retirement of a member but that higher office no longer exists.

Clause 5 amends section 24 of the principal Act which provides for the calculation of the amount of pension payable to the spouse of a deceased member. The clause amends the definition of 'appropriate factor' in subsection (3) so that, where part of a pension is commuted, the appropriate factor is based upon the amount of pension payable immediately after commutation. The clause also makes amendments to the section that correspond to those made by clause 4 in relation to section 17. Clause 6 amends section 36 of the principal Act which provides that previous service in the Parliament of this State or the Parliament of the Commonwealth or another State or Territory may be counted as service for the purposes of the Act if the member makes a certain payment to the fund. The clause amends the section so that payments in respect of previous service in the Parliament of another place will be required to be made (as is presently the case with payments in respect of previous service in the Parliament of this State) within three months after the member became a member or within such further time as the trustees allow. Under the amendment, where further time is allowed, the trustees may impose conditions relating to the payment including conditions requiring the payment of interest on the amount of the payment.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: 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

As honourable members know, the present Governor, Sir Keith Seaman, proposes to retire on 29 March 1982, and it is expected that his successor will be sworn in on 23 April 1982. Sir Keith will then have completed more than 4½ years of his five-year term and will not have taken the customary six months furlough. It is not intended that Sir Keith should suffer any financial detriment by reason of his early retirement. The present Bill therefore makes it possible for a Governor who retires after completing nine-tenths or more of his term of office to receive salary on the basis that he has completed his term. Periods of furlough will not be counted for the purposes of this new provision. Thus it will provide a means by which a retiring Governor may be paid salary in lieu of furlough.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that, where a Governor retires after completing nine-tenths or more of the term for which he was appointed, his entitlement to salary shall be determined as if he had completed his term. For the purposes of the new provision periods of furlough (i.e. extended recreation leave) shall not be counted as part of the Governor's period of service.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Explosives Act, 1936-1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: 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 purpose of this Bill is to give the Governor power to make regulations under the Explosives Act, 1936-1974, to control the use of fireworks and other explosives for the

purposes of entertainment. At the moment, the Government has no power to control the use of fireworks. A person purchasing fireworks must hold a permit and it has been the practice to issue safety guidelines to applicants for permits. However, these are guidelines only and are not enforceable. Fireworks displays, by their nature, attract large numbers of children and the Government feels there is a need to control the use of fireworks in these situations. The Government hopes that incidents such as the injury recently of a boy at Loxton and a fire at Glenelg following fireworks displays will be avoided by the implementation of safety regulations.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 52 of the principal Act. Subclause *(a)* makes consequential amendments to a number of paragraphs of the section to provide uniformity of expression. Subclause *(b)* inserts a new paragraph giving the Governor power to make the desired regulations.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FURTHER EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Further Education Act, 1975-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: 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

This Bill repeals Part V of the principal Act, which requires the licensing of institutions that provide prescribed courses of academic, vocational or practical instruction or training. Currently, there are only 37 licensed colleges pursuant to the Act. These colleges have complied with Part V of the Act, by advising this department of changes in course structure and fees or introduction of new courses. This has become a standard exercise with all variations being approved. The licensed colleges appear to be using the licence number purely as a status symbol when advertising.

The Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment via the Industrial and Commercial Training Act, 1981, accredits courses that would also be subject to Part V of the Further Education Act. Therefore, Part V is largely a duplication. Consumer protection legislation is also available where malpractice occurs. Currently, Part V is not being policed or enforced. Only those schools approaching the department for a licence are considered; the number of institutions operating without a licence is not known. It may be considered unreasonable to force 37 schools to abide by set standards to be licensed when others are not so constrained. The licensing system is a financial loss for the department as income from the fees is minimal. Deregulation would also ease the administration load within the department.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 repeals Part V of the principal Act. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEA TREE GULLY (GOLDEN GROVE) DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act, 1978-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: 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

This amendment to the Tea Tree Gully (Golden Grove) Development Act will enable the Development Committee to require developers to contribute, in lieu of public open space, an amount of $100 per allotment into a trust fund which will be used towards the costs of developing reserves, community facilities and other projects which will be of direct benefit to the future residents of Golden Grove.

The special legislation for Golden Grove enables the Development Committee to administer a flexible and streamlined planning process for the area. In particular, the committee can support the private sector development industry by introducing initiatives of the type proposed.

The committee believes that this proposal will enable a rationalisation of the requirements traditionally placed on a developer for 12½ per cent of land in a subdivision scheme to be dedicated as open space. This is easily achieved because the land is currently held in public ownership.

The concept requires that all public recreation reserve land in Golden Grove will be identified prior to sale of the land by the Land Commission (Urban Land Trust) to developers. This reserve land (representing about 25 per cent of total development area) will then be transferred direct from the trust to the council. Accordingly, there will be no requirement on developers in Golden Grove for land under the ownership of the developers to be set aside for public open space purposes. In lieu of this requirement the committee proposes that all developers should contribute an amount of $100 per allotment into a trust fund and that this money should be used to develop within Golden Grove reserves, facilities and projects to meet the needs of the area's future population. The Development Committee, in close liaison with the Tea Tree Gully council, will be responsible for ensuring that the funds are allocated accordingly.

The principle of a fee being payable by developers into a fund in lieu of open space contributions is consistent with proposals under the new planning legislation for councils to require developers to pay to the council an amount prescribed by regulation.

The prescribed amount under the new planning legislation will of course need to be greater than the $100 lot proposed for Golden Grove as the new legislation will apply in areas where public open space areas have not been previously divided out and vested in the council.

Discussions on this proposal have been held between the Development Committee and representatives of the private sector development industry and this proposal is submitted with the knowledge and acceptance of those representatives, subject to there being reasonable control on any movement in the level of the fee.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 empowers the Governor to provide, by regulation, for the establishment and administration of a fund to be applied for the benefit of the

development area. The regulations will provide for contributions to be paid by developers upon submission of subdivision plans to the committee for approval.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Highways Act, 1926-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: 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

This short Bill has two objects. Under section 32 (1) *(m)* of the Highways Act, 7.5 per cent of the fees received by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles by way of motor vehicle registration fees are allocated to the Police Department for the purpose of defraying the expenses of providing road safety services. This provision presently results in the application of about $3 266 000 towards the cost of those services. The Government has recently reviewed the cost of providing road safety services and concluded that a further $1 000 000 should be applied from the Highways Fund towards defraying that cost. The Bill therefore increases the proportion of registration fees that is to be applied towards road safety services from 7.5 per cent to 9.8 per cent.

The second object of the Bill is to remove the present onerous obligation upon the State Transport Authority to contribute to the Highways Fund for the maintenance of roads, as well as paying fuel tax for the same purpose. The road maintenance contribution is calculated on the basis of 0.95 of one cent for each kilometre travelled on roads by State Transport Authority buses, and amounts to approximately $350 000 per year. The additional burden of fuel tax, imposed in 1979 when the road maintenance charges legislation was repealed, amounts to approximately $270 000 per year. The Government believes that this double liability is an unwarranted imposition. Under the new State Transport Authority Act provisions, the Minister can require special contributions from the authority for road maintenance, where appropriate.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendment is to operate from the commencement of the present financial year. Clause 3 strikes out from the list of moneys that must be paid into the Highways Fund, the reference to State Transport Authority road maintenance contributions. Clause 4 increases the percentage of registration fees that is to be applied towards the maintenance of road safety services from 7.5 per cent to 9.8 per cent. Clause 5 repeals the section that presently obliges the State Transport Authority to pay to the Highways Commissioner a monthly road maintenance contribution.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 6)

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill deals with a number of miscellaneous matters. Firstly, it brings tow trucks within those provisions of the principal Act under which annual certificates of inspection are issued. This amendment is designed to ensure that tow trucks are kept in a safe and roadworthy condition. The definition of 'alcotest equipment' is amended so as to enable new, much improved equipment to be introduced by the police. It is envisaged that the new equipment will result in a significant saving in costs. The Bill also deals with the powers of authorised persons at ferries. It enables an authorised person to give directions to pedestrians in relation to the position that they should take up on the ferry. This amendment follows a number of problems that have been experienced in this respect. The Act as it now stands contains many repetitive provisions relating to the power to grant exemptions from the Act. These provisions are repealed and replaced by one single provision.

A regulation power providing for the payment and recovery of fees is included in the Bill. This is principally directed at recovering fees for inspection of vehicles that are subject to a defect notice. The Bill also removes from the Act the evidentiary provision that states that the failure to wear seat belts does not establish negligence or contributory negligence. The State Government Insurance Commission and the Road Traffic Board both believe that it is now well-established that the wearing of seat belts contributes to road safety, and that it ought therefore to be open to the courts to take this factor into account in any particular case. Sundry other minor amendments to the Act are included.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act. The amendment made to the definition of 'driver's licence' makes it clear that disqualification from holding or obtaining a driver's licence includes disqualification from holding or obtaining a learner's permit. A definition of 'tow truck' is inserted. This definition is required for the purposes of later provisions under which a certificate of inspection is to be required in respect of tow trucks. New subsection (3) provides that a vehicle shall be deemed to be attached to another vehicle if it is drawn by that other vehicle, notwithstanding that the vehicles are not directly attached to each other.

Clause 4 amends the definition of 'alcotest' so as to enable the police to introduce a new, more accurate, piece of equipment that works electrically, and not on a discolouration basis, and that also has hygienic, disposable mouthpieces. Clause 5 deals with the powers of authorised persons at ferries. At present an authorised person may give directions to the driver of a vehicle as to how the vehicle is to be positioned on the ferry. This power is extended to enable him to give directions to pedestrians as to the position they are to occupy on or in the vicinity of the ferry. Clauses 6, 7, 8 and 9 repeal provisions that provide for the granting of exemptions.

Clause 10 deals with the towing of motor vehicles. It provides that a person may not tow another motor vehicle unless he complies with the relevant regulations relating to the towing of vehicles. Clause 11 repeals the provision that states that contravention of the seat belt provisions does not establish or tend to establish negligence or contributory negligence. Clause 12 amends the section that sets out the information to be marked on certain vehicles. As the section

now stands, if a vehicle comes within the ambit of the section, all the information specified in the section must be marked on the vehicle. It is desirable that, for some vehicles, only some of that information should have to be marked on them. The amendment enables the regulations to prescribe different requirements for different classes of vehicle.

Clause 13 inserts a general power of exemption in relation to the provisions of Part III of the principal Act. Clause 14 brings tow trucks within the provisions of the principal Act requiring annual certificates of inspection. Clauses 15 and 16 make it clear that the Central Inspection Authority must decline to issue an inspection certificate where a vehicle is unsafe, whether or not it is 'unsafe for the carriage of passengers'. Clause 17 inserts a new section that makes it clear that where a person contravenes a permit or exemption, he is guilty of both that offence, and the offence of contravening the provision of the Act from which he was exempted by the permit or exemption, and so can be prosecuted for either offence (but of course not both). Clauses 18 to 22 are drafting amendments that make the expression 'disqualification from holding or obtaining a driver's licence' uniform throughout the Act, and in accordance with the terminology used in the Motor Vehicles Act. Clause 23 inserts a regulation-making power providing for the fixing and recovery of fees (not to exceed twenty dollars) in respect of specified matters. A new regulation-making power is also inserted providing for the granting by the Road Traffic Board of exemptions from any provision of the regulations.

Mr HEMMINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 December. Page .)

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I continue from where I left off last night. We were discussing the matter of the proposal to make non-compulsory student union fees as in the Bill and the consequent amendment would seek to add even more dramatic powers still. I have been considering this matter further overnight and been considering the consequences that this may have on the amalgamated college in this State. There are a number of serious ones that I believe the Minister cannot have taken into account if he is at all serious about what he is now proposing to do.

In achieving the very wide variety of purposes that they seek to achieve, student bodies rely on a significant proportion of volunteer assistance. The contribution by paid officials of student bodies is very valuable, but it is certainly not the most significant, nor the majority, contribution of the work that those bodies do. Most of the work is undertaken by volunteers. There was a time 10 or 15 years ago when it was almost entirely done by volunteers.

Now, it is being proposed to this House that, when moneys are collected by the college they cannot be distributed to any other body within the college. Any moneys collected by the council must be spent by the council. Of course that means that, if any money has been collected for the purposes of amenities or services within that college, that money must be spent by the college and must be spent on the terms in which its other activities are also undertaken, namely, it will have to rely on paid assistance. It will no longer be able to depend so much on volunteer help.

Of course, the implication of that is that the imposts or charges that will be levied against the student body will be very much greater in order to meet the costs of those services than is presently the case. I am sure that, when students finally see the outcome of that, they will not think that the Minister has operated in their best interests across the board. The other feature to which attention should be paid is that there is some suggestion that the proposal to amend that has been put would be contrary to the spirit of Federal-States grants legislation (I am advised that the section affected would be section 14 (10)) that would preclude the use of any facilities funded by the council of the college being open to any other than students of the college, automatically precluding staff of the college and graduate members of the college.

You will know, Sir, that at the moment a great many of the facilities of the college are used by members of staff and by graduate members, and they make contributions towards the running of those facilities, so they are not getting them entirely free. That maximises the use of those facilities. It is more efficient that that should be the case, but now it is proposed that that possibility be precluded.

I understand that the Minister, in a press release on this matter, advised that he was seeking to introduce the concept of use-pays so that those services that were being used on multi-campus would be paid for by those who use them, and those who did not want to use them would not have to pay. A number of the facilities that are being used are in that general category of facilities that are provided in a number of areas of life, and naturally become quite expensive when just related to any particular point of time to those who may be using them. This can only, therefore, restrict the services being offered.

Certain clubs and organisations, I imagine, must go out of existence, because, by definition, they are more expensive clubs to operate than others and more expensive to operate than can be returned in the payment of fees by the immediate users. That may well result in a limitation of activities, a restriction of activities, that will not add to the general life of the college.

The college is a tertiary institution, that, like all other tertiary institutions, relies for a vital student life upon a variety of activities to foster that vital student life that adds to the general educational goals of that institution as well as to the actual education of the individual student in non-academic ways. Education that is achieved by students of tertiary institutions is not merely that which is obtained within the tutorial room, the lecture room, or the laboratory. It is also that which is gained informally by the interrelationship of students in their careers at the tertiary institution. If the student services and facilities are to be so undermined, naturally that informal education must suffer as a result.

Last night I quoted from a paper that had been circulated to all members of student organisations in South Australian tertiary institutions. I would like to quote from another section of that paper, labelled 'Student unionism legislation', which makes some brief comments on attempts to do the same sorts of activities in other States. It states:

> Student unionism legislation currently exists in Western Australia, the Australian Capital Territory, and at Melbourne University. The development and implementation of such legislation has been obstructed by massive problems in terms of defining services and amenities, the reticence of the institutions' councils/senates—

I draw attention to the loudly expressed opinions of councils of most of the constituent colleges or other tertiary institutions in this State in that regard. They have certainly indicated their reticence regarding that aspect. The paper continues:

> —to interfere with their student organisations and the complexity of developing legislation appropriate to the variety of student organisations in each State.

Notwithstanding such pragmatic considerations, legislation enforcing voluntary individual membership of student organisations can be seen as a blatant act of unnecessary outside interference in student affairs. This would only serve to destroy the democratic characteristics of student organisations which has worked well throughout Australia for over 70 years in servicing the interests, expressing the concerns and confronting the problems that students have and which are best understood and can be best dealt with by students free from external interference.

Just closing on that section, I have some figures, being the percentage breakdown of expenditure in South Australian student organisations for the 1980 financial year, covering the campuses that are proposed to be amalgamated in the South Australian college, as well as Flinders University, the South Australian Institute of Technology, and the University of Adelaide.

The table is purely statistical and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

PERCENTAGE BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURE IN S.A. STUDENT ORGANISATIONS FOR THE 1980 FINANCIAL YEAR

Budget line	Adelaide C.A.E.	Adelaide University	Flinders University	Hartley C.A.E.	Salisbury C.A.E.	S.A.I.T.	Sturt C.A.E.
Welfare and Educational Services[1]	24.7	10.2	12.1	10.7	16	9.7	−30
Amenities and Services maintenance and co-ordination	7.3	32.4	22.55	17.1	29	5.5	21.5
Extra-curricular activities	24	18.5	30.25	22.4	7	45.4	15.6
Clubs and societies							
Sporting							
Activities							
Administration and Miscellaneous[2]	44	38.9	35.1	49.8	48	39.4	32.9

1. Includes expenditure in running employment services, accommodation services, orientation programmes, conference expenditure, publications, student insurance, affiliation fees for AUS, costs relating to representative functions, and emergency loans services.
2. Includes salaries for staff employed to service all areas of the organisations' operations, office expenses, auditing and legal fees.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the House for its concurrence. The figures show quite clearly that there is a wide range of activities undertaken by tertiary institutions in this State, and they also show that there are varying priorities at each of the campuses, and that it is very difficult to make hard and fast guidelines that will apply to all of the campuses, because there is no common denominator in some instances. It isolates the welfare and education services component, the amenities and services component, and the extra-curricular activities, part of which component is the matter that is driving the Minister to distraction. I earnestly hope that the Minister has only been playing a private joke on this House by introducing the clause in question, capped off by another little joke of his in the form of the amendment. I hope that when it comes to the serious debate in Committee we will have had our little joke and we can get on with the serious business of creating a Bill that is workable and desirable.

The other major area of concern is that dealing with Ministerial control over the college. The clause presently proposed is a derivation of one that exists in other legislation but it takes the scope of that much further. The Minister himself has acknowledged in his second reading explanation that it takes that control much further; in fact, the Minister is not being entirely honest with the House: while he acknowledges that it extends it, he says:

> This latter provision extends a power in all constituent college Acts presently referring to the admission of students to courses for the training of teachers. The extension is related to the new college's substantial interest in fields outside teacher education.

If that is all he is worried about, he will have no problem at all in accepting the amendment that we are proposing to that clause because, indeed, our proposal covers entirely that area and no more. It does not seek to give the blank cheque to the Minister that could enable him, or a committee constituted by him, to dabble its fingers in the affairs of this new college. I remind members that there is a great deal of concern among those who know about the operations of tertiary institutions that it could lead to the dabbling of fingers. I also remind members of the letters that I quoted last night from the councils of various colleges. It is true that a tertiary institution is in receipt of Government moneys and that it has a public interest to serve.

It is true that it is responsible to the community at large. Nobody can disagree with that, and the very fact that we are debating a Bill in this House is a recognition of that community link, of that public obligation, because it is responsible to an Act of Parliament and by definition, therefore, to Parliament itself. Indeed, in the Bill there is provision for many of the Statutes and regulations to be tabled in this House for possible disallowance. There is also the capacity for the council to consult with and hear the opinions of not only the Minister but any interested persons in the community at large, as contained in the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australian legislation, which enables councils to be responsive to the wider communitty interests.

As I mentioned yesterday, the proposed council has 14 Ministerial nominees—a majority. If that is not a means of giving the Minister control over that council, I do not know what is. But no, it is not sufficient; he has to go wider and write himself this blank cheque. That will seriously endanger the spirit of institutional autonomy which tertiary institutions in this country and throughout the Western world have been used to and seek after. If there are problems arising from that autonomy and that independence, they should be tackled individually with regard to the particular nature of the problem rather than implementing some ambit clause which seeks to ride roughshod over the whole principle and which can only reduce the governing body to a rubber stamp.

I know that some problems have been mentioned earlier this year with regard to promotions in tertiary institutions and appeals against unfair rejection of promotion by a tertiary institution. One might say that this clause may permit that matter to be solved. From the feedback that I have had from tertiary institutions, a much more logical proposal would be to enable the Ombudsman's Act to be amended to enable the Ombudsman to investigate grievances in that regard. That would be a solution that would address itself to the particular problem and not seem to be a blank cheque that could have a great many other dangerous implications. Concerning the Ombudsman, I feel that usefully this Parliament could at some stage consider an amendment to the Ombudsman's Act to entail grievances against discrimination by tertiary institutions, with regard to not just promotions but admission and other aspects of treatment by an institution.

Mr Abbott: Natural justice.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. I put that forward to the Minister in the hope that another time he will give it serious consideration, because we on this side certainly propose to do that. Ministerial control has frightened the tertiary sector in this State. They are very worried not only because of the South Australian college amalgamation but also because of the other tertiary institutions that may likewise be brought under this same sledgehammer. The Minister could very quickly ease those doubts and allay those fears by indicating to us that what he said in his second reading explanation was, in fact, what he meant and, if it was what he meant, by accepting the proposition that we are putting which would tighten up that clause, reduce its ambit and return to the council of that college real governing authority and autonomy.

We have an agreement that we should try to finish this legislation before this House in the next couple of hours, and I am eager for that to be done, because certainly we on this side of the House know how important it is that the college amalgamation go ahead and that legislation be there for it to operate under. I will shortly conclude my second reading remarks (my colleague the member for Norwood wishes to make some comments), so that in Committee we can debate at greater length the amendments that we propose to move. Those amendments have already been circulated in this Chamber.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I wish to comment briefly on this matter, because it is a very important one indeed. It has been the subject of substantial representations to me from persons involved in the administration of the non-university tertiary institutions in this State, from staff and students and, indeed, from parents of students attending such institutions. It never fails to amaze me how the Minister of Education can cause such havoc in our education institutions in this State.

Mr Lynn Arnold: He has a unique capacity.

Mr CRAFTER: Yes, his capacity to do that is unparalleled. Whether it is in the area of kindergartens or pre-school education, in primary schools or high schools, whether in the provision for the proper maintenance of school buildings, or whether it is in the proper staffing of buildings, in every area of education and now in the tertiary sector we have havoc and chaos and substantial distrust of the Government's motives in providing what is a fundamental service to the community, that is, a proper education system.

The Government continually talks about non-intervention in the marketplace, of getting out of the way of business, of being a Government that facilitates private enterprise, and yet we have the absolute contrast to that with respect to the provision of education in the community. I would have thought that, if those principles were to be applied in the marketplace, then of all places they ought to be applied to educational institutions in this State, but no, here we have the heavy hand of the Minister getting right into the focal point of tertiary institutions and bringing his political influence right into the decision-making bodies by way of this legislation in an unprecedented way, destroying the fundamental independence, the objectivity of tertiary education in this State.

That is the point that has upset so many people in this area, namely, the Minister's having that opportunity for direct political influence in the policy-making forums of the non-university tertiary sector in this State. It is an area that is fundamental to the training of persons who will have skills in the service areas that will inextricably affect the quality of life in this State. I refer to education, the training of teachers, health care workers, and welfare workers in particular, and also to those many people whose skills are essential for the proper functioning of industry in this State who rely very much on the tertiary sector for their training.

The Bill refers to the promotion of research in these tertiary institutions, and that, indeed, is a welcome sign, because for many years some doubt has been cast over the degree of research that should be undertaken in these institutions. However, there is little point in this research being undertaken and promoted by legislation if there is to be political direction over the functioning of these institutions. Therefore, it can be seen that the Minister is embarking on a very nasty political exercise, and it has rightly drawn the indignation of all those people, whether directly or indirectly affected in the delivery of education services, and that indignation is rightly directed at the Minister himself, because it is very clear from the representations that have been made to all members of Parliament that those who advise the Minister and those who are affected in the delivery of these services are not in agreement with this Bill.

One need look only at the advertisement in the *Advertiser* today. It is an open letter to the Minister of Education concerning the legislation for the South Australian College of Advanced Education. I refer to that aspect of the advertisement relating to student organisations; we are seeing the Young Liberal style intervention by the Minister in the matter of student fees and the whole structure of student organisations and I refer to his banal comments in the second reading explanation with respect to the socio-political activities of such student organisations, yet he chose to ignore those very fundamental services given to students in tertiary institutions by such student organisations.

The services are given with great dedication by many young people who are concerned for their fellows who are struggling to find their way through tertiary institutions, particularly those who are in the non-university sector and who, with their families, have made great sacrifices so that they can achieve some professional expertise, some qualification, so that they can take their place in the work force alongside those privileged members, like the member for Mallee, who have achieved academic qualifications. I refer to some of the services referred to in the advertisement, namely:

Financial assistance for students in need
Sponsorship of sporting clubs and societies
Funding of child care facilities
Accommodation and employment assistance
Recreation and social activities
Welfare and counselling services

Is the Minister telling us in this legislation, and is he telling the students in tertiary institutions that will be amalgamated under this legislation, that those who do not pay fees will be denied financial assistance if they are in need, that they will not be allowed to use the sporting clubs and societies that are sponsored in that way, that they will not have access to child care facilities or to accommodation and employment assistance, that they will be denied recreational and social activities, access to the clubs and bars and the other facilities that are available through the student unions, and that they will be denied access to the welfare and counselling services that are funded by student fees?

Is the Minister saying that he wants to deny a certain sector of those students, I would suggest a minority group? Over the years we have heard the opposition of those very right wing and Young Liberal groups to the payment of these fees, substantially dominated by political thoughts and eliminating any consideration of the basic and fundamental delivery of welfare services to those most in need in those tertiary institutions.

Mr Lewis: Are you implying that that is not a political thought?

Mr CRAFTER: I am saying that one must have a balanced view in these cases and I am suggesting that the Minister's view is anything but balanced.

Mr Lewis: You had better run flat out for the centre; you are way out left now.

Mr CRAFTER: I suggest that the member for Mallee talk to people in these institutions and explain to them the access that they will have in future to these services and tell them about the cutbacks that will occur in services if the Minister has his way. I refer to the area of funding of child care facilities. My wife has been a member of the board of one of the child care facilities in a tertiary institution affected by this Bill since its inception, and my children have attended that child care facility, and I know of some of the struggles that have been evident in the establishment of that facility and of the great support that has been given to its establishment and its broad base; that is it has been made a facility that is open to those most in need of it in tertiary institutions.

That is very much under threat, not simply by this legislation but also by a similar political philosophy to be implemented by the Minister's Federal colleagues, particularly with respect to the Spender Report. Here we have what I would have thought was a facility that is essential particularly to those supporting mothers or supporting fathers who want to regain access to tertiary institutions to get qualifications so that they can re-enter the work force and once again play a useful role in society, yet they will be the very people who will be denied access to those facilities because it will simply cost too much to gain access.

I am a member of the Department of Further Education College Council, and at the last meeting a direction was received from the Minister indicating that those on that college council could not even establish a voluntary child care centre. Such is the intent of the political philosophy of this Government and the Federal Government to deny the establishment of such facilities in educational facilities in this State. Why is this? It is because they are to be handed over to private enterprise where they are profitable. That is the be all and end all of this philosophy, appalling as it is. Students are subsidising each other so that they can share their needs and benefit from each other's support so that they can find their way through these institutions, gain qualifications, and take their place in society, yet the Minister, by way of these fees, small as they may be, is striking at the very heart of that co-operation and that fundamental brotherhood.

That is part of the reason, no doubt, why the Minister wants this strong power to intervene in policy-making, despite, as the member for Salisbury has said, his having the numbers on council. The Minister does not trust his numbers on the council; indeed, he wants direct political intervention, and that is why he is fighting for this, and prepared to overthrow the autonomy of these colleges in the process.

The other matter that the member for Salisbury referred to in great detail is the elimination by this Bill, of the anti-discrimination clause. The ability of equal access to education, I would have thought, was fundamental in our community; in this, the Year of the Disabled Person, one would have thought even more so, but the Minister is prepared to cast aside such a provision. One can only reflect on why he wants to do that. It is a matter that cannot be left unattended by those on this side of the House. As the member for Salisbury has indicated, we will take every step to make sure that this is provided for in any legislation that leaves this Parliament. I am disappointed, in expressing the views of the many people who have made representation to me, that legislation has come to us in the form it has, with the fundamental deficiencies it has in it.

One can only see the lot of students and administrators of this new institution, instead of embarking on a programme with a great deal of idealism and the support of Government, being one of a great deal of frustration with the Government intervening at the political level and they will be hindered in many ways in its establishment. That is a distressing factor, and indictment of the Government's attitude to education, however consistent it is with the many other decisions this Government has taken with respect to the diminishing importance it places on all levels of education in this State.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I am somewhat surprised that there are allegations that this Bill is deficient or, to some extent, Draconian in its approach. After all, I believe there have been only three major objections to it lodged. I believe that the Minister's and the Government's intention behind those clauses is being misinterpreted and misrepresented in speeches made in this House.

I first address myself to the point of the relatively late introduction of this legislation. I point out to members that the last piece of legislation on a similar issue, the amalgamation of the Hartley College of Advanced Education with Kingston College of Advanced Education, and associated matters, was introduced as the very last piece of legislation in December 1978 and was assented—

Mr Lynn Arnold: And that excuses your episode here, does it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I simply point out to members that the introduction of this legislation, with the sinister implications behind the member's remarks, must, therefore, be translated directly to the almost identical motives related to the introduction of the Hartley and Kingston legislation and I am sure that the member would not accept that any more than I accept the allegations he has made against the present Government. The fact is that this legislation has been debated, considered and reconsidered at great length, just as the previous Bill was.

It also concerns me that the member expressed some surprise that the matter should have gone through, despite that relatively late introduction into the House, with its otherwise apparent smoothness and lack of opposition. A lot of people have been behind this legislation. I expressed that view to the Executive Committee under Chairman David Pank and members Mr Carlier, Mr Gilding, Mr Ramsay, and Mr Bowes, who have carried the show along as the Executive Committee overseeing the activities of a number of other subcommittees which have been ensuing over the past several months that the amalgamation and intergration of four separate and geographically remote campuses proceed as smoothly as it has done.

I also thank the professional staff, academic staff, general staff and the students for a sensible and constructive approach, particularly over the past 12 months, after an initial period during which there was some suggestion of closure of at least one of the colleges. I also point out to the House the present Government's wisdom two years ago in looking around the Commonwealth and noting that there were some 80 or more colleges of advanced education, the majority involved in teacher education, and its wisdom in realising, in the then climate, where the reduction in student population has already been well established, that that climate portended rather badly for teacher training if the then numbers continued to be trained.

I am quite sure that the House will recall that as late as 1979-80 over 5 500 teacher trainees were still going through with no apparent brake being put on the numbers, this

despite the fact that the Education Department had, in its wisdom, become, I think, the first of the former Government's departments to acknowledge that the student and teacher training situation was becoming grim. What did those concerned do? They decided to remove the bonded teacher from the system because there was no guarantee that teachers could be employed. That was one of the early realisations in the Education Department. At the same time, Monarto and other projects were still being proceeded with in this somewhat forlorn expectation of expanding population, so I think that the Education Department deserves congratulations for its recognition of the facts as they were. It did not have an ostrich approach.

It did mean that the present Government, and certainly I, as Minister, were faced with the problem of immediately deciding what to do in this tertiary scene, particularly to protect the young people who were going through the system as teacher trainees and who would be faced, in any case, with some difficulty in obtaining employment. So we approached the matter on a State basis and our example has been emulated interstate. We were told by the Federal Government during the last Budget debate that two South Australian teacher-training colleges would be recommended for closure, not the one that the Tertiary Education Authority had originally considered but two, namely, Salisbury C.A.E. and Hartley C.A.E.

We were assured that because we had already said that we were going to introduce legislation and were already well on the way towards the amalgamation of the colleges, that that was little more than a threat and that South Australia's funding was in no way to be affected. That was fortunate, because South Australia is, I think, leading the rest of Australia in this legislation. I thank everyone who has been involved for their constructive and co-operative approach. That is not to say, however, that we are going to accept all of the proposed amendments. I will explain the Government's position, if not during this second reading closure, during the Committee stages.

There are one or two issues to which I will now refer. The member for Salisbury said that this Bill was introduced belatedly, for a number of reasons. He said that one was that great difficulty would be experienced at college level as a result of that lateness. The same provisions as were made when the previous amalgamation Bill (the Hartley Bill) was introduced were made during the past few months. We have made provision for elections to be held while the debate proceeds in the event of there being difficulties at student level.

We have made provision for candidates to be preselected and voted for on a differential basis. The Minister's council members have been approached and their appointments will be automatic. We have a great number of responsible competent people who are eligible and who have expressed that they are available for membership of that council. In other words, they have not seen the allegedly Draconian restrictions placed on the college council operations as being sufficiently strong to prevent them from accepting the offered places. We have more people willing to accept office than we are able to choose, and they are very competent people.

The question of sex discrimination was addressed in the Hartley and Salisbury C.A.E. drafting. Although there was an inclusion in the Bill of a discrimination clause, which I have chosen to exclude, I point out that in the previous Bill the Minister of the day was asked to consider not simply sexual discrimination but matters of sexual preference and political and religious beliefs.

We have excluded that legislation and I will speak at greater length on that when the amendments are moved. In relation to the De Lissa Institute and the South Australian School of Arts, the De Lissa Institute was included in this legislation by choice; it was not an *ad hoc* decision. I recognise that the De Lissa Institute was included in the Hartley Bill and the South Australian School of Arts was included in the Adelaide College of Advanced Education Bill. Although the De Lissa Institute was still struggling, it had been moved from the Kingston campus, and inadequate accommodation had been provided in crowded circumstances on the Hartley campus, whereas the South Australian School of Arts is strongly entrenched within the Underdale campus and already has a strong reputation for the work it does. I did not see it is under any threat. I cannot see that that is a point of contention; it will not be a major issue.

In relation to the question of Ministerial control over the college council, I think that the key phrase in that clause is that collaboration is requested. I certainly do not see that collaboration implies Ministerial or Cabinet control at all times. I regard that more as an emergency measure. I certainly do not intend to be involved at all times and at all levels of council policy and other decision-making, and I think that the implications behind that are more implied and feared than they are factual. Certainly, there is no intention of there being strong Ministerial control.

That is not to say that the Government would be acting improperly if it were to exercise more control than was intended. It has been pointed out by proponents of this legislation, or at least of this clause, that the Governments of the day, particularly Federal Governments, are spending in South Australia's case tens of millions of dollars on colleges where the courses are essentially free, where the staff have been guaranteed rights under the amalgamation legislation, and where the State Government has undertaken in writing a certain number of responsibilities.

These commitments were given to the various staffs when we put forward the draft Bill several months ago and apart from that, State and Federal Governments have assumed responsibility for the quite massive superannuation deficits which are evident in all tertiary sectors across Australia and where in South Australia that superannuation deficit amounts to tens of millions of dollars. So to suggest that Governments should simply be magnanimous and open-handed but exercise no control or accountability is flying in the face of contemporary realities. The public is expecting that institutes, whether they be autonomous tertiary bodies or any other under Government or statutory control, should be accountable. I am not suggesting that this clause will enable the Minister to do any of that. I am simply pointing out that autonomy and statutory authority do carry with them heavy responsibilities and, if the Minister has a clause somewhere in the Bill which enables him to exercise some emergency control or to make emergency recommendations in the expectation that they will be listened to, then I do not think that is necessarily a bad thing. I would ask the House to look at that clause in that light, rather than to say that the Minister wants to intrude into every aspect of council and college life. That is not so.

Incidentally, we already have a degree of control over financial matters in another clause in the Bill, over mortgages, buildings and loans, and to some extent, although I believe in a more limited manner, the Tertiary Education Authority does exercise some control, particularly with regard to accreditation and consideration of college courses, but I believe any close perusal of Tertiary College Authority legislation would reveal that in general the clauses indicate that the authority is advisory, recommendatory, and so on. They are not really clauses that contain much executive power.

I am quite sure that the matter of student unions will be debated at greater length in committee. Since I have quite

a bit to say about that, I will reserve my comments until that clause is brought before the committee. With those remarks, I conclude the second reading debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Functions of the college.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Opposition is pleased to see the provision in 5 *(c)* for consultative and research services for the benefit of the community, or any part of the community. It is refreshing indeed to see embodied in this legislation that research component and that research component being directed towards community interests. Tertiary institutions, of course, have played a valuable part in research capacity for the wider benefit of the community for many years, and often it has had to be somewhat *ad hoc*, by virtue of the nature of things. I indicate at this stage that the Opposition is pleased to see that the Bill contains that specific legislative provision.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

New clause 6a—'Discrimination.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I move to insert the following new clause:

1. The college shall not discriminate against or in favour of any person on grounds of sex, sexual preference, marital status, race, religious or political belief, or physical impairment.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) the college may, with the approval of the Minister make special provision for any student, or class of students, where it is, in the opinion of the council necessary to do so to enable those students, or students of that class, to overcome any cultural or educational disadvantage to which they may be subject.

This relates to the reinsertion in the legislation of an anti-discrimination clause and a second provision that would permit the council of the college to enable certain groups of people to have access to the college if they were otherwise not able to get that access because of some impediment. I know that similar provisions already exist in the Hartley and Adelaide Colleges of Education legislation and in fact it has been a been a benefit to that legislation and indeed I believe a benefit to the operations of those colleges.

I have had no evidence that these inclusions in those other two pieces of legislation have hindered the way in which those colleges could operate. No-one has given me such evidence. If the Minister has had it, I hope he tables it in the House on this occasion. We also know that this clause, or a similar one, was contained in the draft Bill that went before Cabinet for the amalgamation of the colleges. That proposal was there, and Cabinet withdrew it. Its members determined, as the Minister acknowledged in his second reading speech, that it was not deemed necessary or important. There has been enough evidence in years past to indicate that discrimination is a regrettable, unfortunate, but actual fact of life—discrimination on a number of grounds: on grounds other than those relevant to the factor, style or parameters of the institution concerned. We seek to reintroduce this discrimination clause to make sure that no-one is thereby prejudiced.

The Minister made some rather obtuse reference to the inclusion of the term 'sexual preference'. That refers to a variety of behaviour patters that certain people in society feel they wish to practise. I do not wish to comment on the morality or the correctness of those practices. Many of the practices that might be implicit there are not those in which I would wish to engage, but I do not believe it is our responsibility, obligation or entitlement to make a decision in this Parliament about that. In other words, we cannot say that we should not include in legislation a clause preventing such people from being discriminated against. Those practices or behaviours have absolutely nothing at all to do with the functioning of a tertiary institution.

Tutorial classes will operate none the worse, as will lecture rooms, and laboratories, and the achievement of education in all its complexities will be attained none the worse for the participation in that institution of people whose sexual preferences are somehow different from those of the mainstream of society. But, that is only one of the inclusions there. Other areas include discrimination on the grounds of sex, and we know that the International Women's Year in 1975, which led to the Decade of Women 1975-1985, found that ample evidence exists that women are discriminated against in all aspects of life. If the Minister is now saying that that no longer happens, that it apparently stopped happening when the draft Bill was presented to the Cabinet, that was a wondrous day which most of us have missed, because a great many people in society, not the least of whom are women, would say that evidence is still there that discrimination is taking place on sexual grounds.

Likewise, there is no evidence to suggest that discrimination on marital status has stopped. Racial discrimination certainly still exists, as with all those areas of discrimination. Regarding religious and political discrimination, in an enlighted society it, like all the others, should not happen, and perhaps it is not so significant in our society as it may have been in the past, and not so significant in our State as in other States.

Mr Keneally: Such as in Queensland.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, such as in Queensland, but nevertheless we must make sure that we close the door to its entry at any time.

Mr Crafter: It is the only enlightened body—

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is right. Why do we not tell the States of Queensland and Western Australia that? Lastly, going to physical impairment, I am amazed that in the International Year of the Disabled Person the Minister should choose in the original legislation not to have that aspect contained therein, because it is timely to include such a provision. The disabled have been discriminated against in the past, on a number of bases. Here is an opportunity to reaffirm that we hope that discrimination will end in the not too distant future.

The second subclause refers to the capacity of the college to provide for positive discrimination if the council feels that that should exist. That says that there are some circumstances where some individuals or categories of individuals may, by virtue of impediment beyond their own control, not be able to achieve their own full educational opportunities, if required to meet the existing entry standards or, if required, to meet all the existing conditions of a tertiary institution. That gives the council the opportunity to say, 'Yes, we will bend those rules on occasion for such individuals or for such classes of individuals to enable those people to get further education.' It is not the sort of thing that would become widespread in its use. Previous councils have not done that. Nevertheless, it is a right that the council could, therefore, exercise on behalf of such people in this State which we believe should be embodied there. I hope that the Minister will see the wisdom and virtue of this amendment and agree to its acceptance.

Mr CRAFTER: I seek information from the Minister with respect to the omission of such provisions from this measure. Did the Minister receive advice from the Crown Law Department, and if not, why not, with respect to provisions of the United Nations covenants regarding discrimination? As I indicated in my second reading speech, there has been much play on these fundamental rights and on the signing of such international covenants by Australia, particularly in the last year. I would think it would offend the spirit and letter of those covenants if this State did not

embrace such fundamental rights as those accorded in this amendment by including them in its own measure. I would be very interested to see the Minister table the advice he received on this matter from the law officers of the State. This is not a matter that can be lightly passed off. Of course, I presume that such advice would have been received before eliminating this provision from the Bill.

It would be in the interests of all those people struggling for equality in our society, which is a fight that this Government and all people of good will have joined in in recent years, in support of those who suffer inequality, injustice and who are discriminated against, who suffer hatred because of their sex or sexual preference, marital status, race, religious or political beliefs, or their physical impairment. To eliminate this aspect from the legislation must surely must have been done on some legal advice, so that it would not offend those international covenants to which the Federal Government was a signatory, and which would be embraced in the community as part of the spirit of equality that this country enjoys. People in many other parts of the world cannot embrace such enjoyment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I intend to oppose this clause. We considered a number of issues. Sex and marital status (not sexual preference) are covered by the Sex Discrimination Act. Race is covered by the Racial Discrimination Act.

Mr Crafter: No, it's not.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is true. The honourable member said that there is some provision in the Commonwealth Constitution, under section 116.

Mr Keneally: You could include them all and not act contrary to your policy.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member would stop interjecting, it would help. My reference to the Commonwealth clause was on the grounds of religion in respect of any office or public trust under the Commonwealth.

We do have the Handicapped Persons Equal Opportunity Act that was introduced by this Government in 1981, and we believe that the provisions of those Acts are adequate to the needs of the tertiary institutions in South Australia. As to the reference that we should specifically include religious freedoms in a State such as South Australia that has been traditionally, since the middle of the last century, one of the refuge places for people who were being religiously persecuted, I think that that is taking it too far. I have not actually come across any discrimination against people on religious grounds, and it would be legislating for something that I have no evidence is really happening.

An honourable member: You should speak to the Minister of Housing about this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am very disappointed that the Minister chooses not to accept the amendment. Perhaps I should remind him of the opinions expressed by certain bodies that have lobbied all members of Parliament. The Minister said he thanked the staff and students for their help through the drafting of this Bill. They have worked very hard, and I think that they should be acknowledged further participation in the working parties and committees, and so on. Now, suddenly, he rejects their opinions in this regard. Let us read out some of those opinions. The Salisbury College of Advanced Education Council wrote as follows:

> Council considers that the omission of effective clauses relating to discrimination is inconsistent with generally accepted societal expectations. Council is aware that the Constitution and certain other Acts provide protection, in some areas, against arbitrary or considered discrimination. However, it is council's belief that discrimination in the areas of religious or political belief and physical impairment are not otherwise covered and should therefore be the subject of appropriate provision in the legislation.

Of course, one can extend that to the sexual preference clause as well. Then it carried a resolution to that effect. Likewise, the University of Adelaide Council resolved that:

> Council restates its belief that any Statute establishing or regulating tertiary institutions should contain specific provision that there be no discrimination against or in favour of any person upon grounds of sex, race, religion or political belief.

Likewise, the President designate and the Directors of the South Australian college, who naturally will play a very important part in the way in which that college will operate, said in their press release that they were concerned that there was no anti-discrimination clause included in the Bill. They will be operating the day-to-day functions. They, the people who may be constricted by such a legislative provision, are seeking that legislative provision. They are the people who are closer to the field than the Minister is, and I would have thought that, accordingly, their opinions could have been given some more weight than that. It is a pity that the Minister has chosen not to do this. He made a few comments on the sexual preference clause in the second reading stage that, as I said at the time, were somewhat obtuse. He has chosen not to elaborate on these. I appeal to the Minister once again that he reconsider and support this amendment.

Mr CRAFTER: I strongly support those words of the member for Salisbury on this important matter. I join issue with the Minister in the fact that there is piecemeal legislation that does not cover the field sufficiently, as is embraced in this amendment, in other Acts passed through this and other Parliaments of this country. I would have thought that it would have been in the interests of those people who would enjoy the benefits of such protections to include anti-discrimination clauses in every piece of legislation which passed through this Parliament and which affected the delivery of such fundamental services as this area of tertiary education that is provided for by this Bill. I can see no reason why we should not include a broad-based expression of support for non-discrimination in the delivery and in the administration of education in this State.

There is no extra cost in including those words. I would have thought that one of the lessons of the involvement of two groups in recent years that have suffered a great deal of discrimination in our community, that is, women and handicapped persons, is that they have asked continually that they be provided for in legislation. Continually, they ask that legislation set the pace, that it be educational as well as legislative. Those who look to what will become the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act and want to see on what basis this college is established will see there in black and white an anti-discrimination clause. But, no, the Minister says that that is not necessary. People should presume that there are pieces of protection in other Acts scattered around the enactments of this State. That, to me, is a very weak argument. If the Minister believes that that legislation adequately provides for it, then in logic there is no reason why it should not be included also in this legislation, which is the first point of reference for those who seek the protections of this Bill and will do so for many years to come.

I am disappointed that those members on the back bench in the Government who sit on the councils of some of these tertiary institutions that will be affected by this Bill and those other tertiary institutions in this State that have made some very strong representations to us, as Parliamentarians, about the exclusion of anti-discrimination provisions in this Bill, did not support the inclusion of such measures in this Bill, but no, they have—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CRAFTER: Precisely. They have acquiesced in this matter. They have joined with the Minister, and no doubt

by their silence agreed to the exclusion of these fundamental rights from this piece of legislation. It is not comprehensive and it does not provide that educative, fundamental statement of principles that one would expect in a piece of legislation that will establish this new and comprehensive institution in this State in the non-university sector of tertiary education that will provide all those fundamental services to which I have referred earlier in this debate, so essential for the growth and stability of this State.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I fail to see that the omission of such a provision is going to adversely affect the running of the college. I am particularly reassured—

An honourable member: Tell that to the Principal designate.

The Hon. H. ALLISON:—after having heard the Principal designate's comments and having had them from him personally. After all, anyone with that sort of concept in mind (the fact that any form of discrimination is bad) must surely be an ideal person to ensure that there will be no discrimination in a college under his leadership.

Mr Lynn Arnold: What about his successors? He will not be there for ever.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I suggest that if there are weaknesses in the sex discrimination legislation that was introduced in the mid-term of a previous Government in 1975, then the weaknesses should be critically addressed to the former Government rather than to the Minister who at present chooses to believe that the Sex Discrimination Act, the Handicapped Persons Act and the Racial Discrimination Act, and even homosexual legislation that has been passed, will cover the circumstances which are likely to arise under the present legislation. After all, it is the previous Government's legislation in the main that the honourable member is criticising so readily as being inadequate. It was this Government's handicapped persons legislation in 1981 which, I believe, has rendered this legislation, or at least the additional clause, unnecessary. I am reassured by the fact that the existing councils and the existing Director designate are strongly against any form of discrimination. They are, as the honourable member said, the people who will be putting the Bill into practice, and the pieces of legislation which are not included I am already assured they are quite ready to follow in any case.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran and McRae. Noes—Messrs Evans and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 7—'Constitution of the council.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I shall be referring to a later clause to be considered, but I remind members that the Minister has Ministerial control under clause 7. The clause provides that there shall be a council which will consist of the Principal *ex officio*, a member of the senior staff, three members of the academic staff, three members of the general staff, and three members of the college elected by the students. It also provides for 14 other persons appointed by the Governor on the nomination of the Minister. Clearly, that provides for the Minister to have a degree of control over the operations of that council. I remind members of that, given the fact that we will later on be voting on another clause that seeks to strengthen control by the Minister.

We received a submission, as other members did, from the Faculty of Arts of the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, making a number of proposals and one of them was that there should be a senior member of the academic staff in the arts as an *ex officio* member of the council of the new college. We considered that proposal but felt that it was not the most appropriate way of recognising the valuable role of the School of Arts within the South Australian college. Rather, we feel that it is recognised by an amendment we are proposing later, and it would also cause complications in that, while that particular school would be embodied or represented on the council, not all the present directors of the constituent campuses would automatically have access to that college council.

Clause 7 (2) (b) provides for only one member of the senior staff of that college to be elected. Three of the directors, maybe the entire four (depending on who that senior staff member is), will not be appointed. In those circumstances we do not feel that we can support a proposal for an *ex officio* senior member of the Arts Faculty.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I would like to speak in response to the last speaker's allegations. There was some very strong implication that there would be Ministerial control over the college council simply by virtue of the fact that 14 of the 25 members were Ministerial appointees. I think that would have to be a direct insult to the people who are to be appointed, and the member is not even aware of their names, at this stage. I can assure him that the majority of them have already served very well as appointees of the previous Government on college councils.

To suggest that these appointees will be mindless followers of the present Minister of Education would be totally improper. I simply have to defend both my own choice of membership and also the people themselves. The simple fact is that, irrespective of who appointed the members of the existing council, I do not believe it has been my practice to contact any of them over the past 12 to 18 months other than, I believe, the Chairman of the council over the question of amalgamation. Certainly there would have been no attempt at any level to influence members of colleges, or even to obtain from them any opinions about how the affairs of the colleges are to be run.

Ministers generally are simply in receipt of the council minutes and that is as far as it goes. I simply wish to reassert that the 14 members who will be appointed will be intelligent and competent people, essentially free thinkers who will contribute towards the well-being and good conduct of the college, and certainly free from Ministerial contact and interference.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Conduct of business by the Council.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I want to ask some questions relating to a submission from the President of the Sturt College of Advanced Education, who raised some doubts about clause 10 (2), which relates to a quorum of the council. His letter, addressed to the Principal designate of the college, states:

Section 10 (2), which provides for quorum of 13. This is in effect the same as the present provision of the Colleges of Advanced Education Act, 1972, if (but only if) all 25 Council positions are filled at the relevant time. But vacancies will occur, e.g. by virtue of Section 9 (6) and (7); and it is possible that retiring members

appointed by the Minister will not be re-appointed or replaced immediately their terms have expired.

This may make it even more difficult than it is now for existing Colleges, to constitute a meeting of Council during the early part of the year. The problem at Sturt has proved almost insoluble on occasions. It might perhaps be dealt with:

(a) by a provision that retiring members of Council continue to hold office, or be deemed to hold office, for the purpose of Council meetings until re-appointment, re-election or replacement actually occurs;

(b) by giving members who are likely to be away from the State, or who for other reasons are unable to attend a meeting, the right to appoint a proxy. This might be subject to the proviso that the proxy be approved by the body which appointed or elected the Council member;

(c) by the appointment of an Executive Committee to deal with current matters between Council meetings.

I wonder whether consideration has been given to that particular issue raised by Justice Hogarth.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Some consideration to that was given. That was the only comment of its kind that I could find from any of the colleges, and in view of that we thought that the present conditions in the Act should remain, and should any major problem arise at a subsequent date we can then re-examine the matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Powers of the Council.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I refer again to the submission from the Sturt College of Advanced Education Council. In regard to clause 12 (2), mention is made of the fact that an executive committee is appointed at that college and that that has the capacity to act between meetings. The letter states:

Section 12 (2) is probably expressed in terms which authorise some such body being established in the new College [namely, an executive committee] but to avoid the possibility of legal challenge, it might be as well for express provision to be made.

The prospect of legal challenge is significant, because between council meetings, particularly over the vacation period, some major decisions could be made affecting the spending of money, the design of courses, the admission of students, and the like, and there could well be the prospect of legal challenge to that. Clause 12 (2) at present does not specifically nominate any such executive committee. I think the suggestion is at least worth consideration by the Minister.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Cabinet's belief (and certainly my belief) when the legislation was drafted was that the provisions of clause 12 (2) adequately covered the situation. I think one of the major concerns in regard to the question of delegation, which was considered in relation to a number of areas, was that ultimately the college council is, after all, the appointed and controlling body, and for the same reason we even declined to allow a delegation in so far as additional college council members might be appointed at the college's initiation rather than under the statutory requirements. Therefore, it was a considered decision that we have a very responsible body, and that, rather than over-delegate, we would restrict.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—'Council to collaborate with certain bodies, etc.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 6, lines 5 to 8—Leave out subclause (2) and insert—

(2) In formulating any statutes or policies affecting the admission of students, or the right of students to continue in any course, the council shall collaborate with the Minister, or any committee established for the purpose by the Minister, with a view to ensuring that the public interest, as assessed and determined by the Minister is safeguarded.

This amendment seeks to reword subclause (2) by reinserting the spirit or the intent of clauses that exist in the present Adelaide and Hartley Acts and a variety of other Acts. I must say that the submission was made to all members of the House that clause 13 (2) should be deleted in its entirety. Indeed, one of the arguments in favour of deleting it in its entirety was the proposition that that power was already contained in the TEASA Act. I have studied that Act and in fact the relevant part of the Act is section 15b. However, we do not agree that the powers contained in the spirit of the Adelaide and Hartley legislation appears in the TEASA Act. For a start, the TEASA Act provides for the initiative for that consultation (that is the term that is used in the TEASA Act, namely, 'consultation', not 'collaboration'). The initiative rests with the council; there is no capacity for initiative to rest with the Minister. Secondly, the obligation on the councils is specified by the word 'may', not 'shall'.

In fact, the Minister is not in particular identified in that subsection. The Minister could only be taken to be incorporated as one of the other bodies that may have a purpose to make some comment. We do not feel that that is strong enough. We feel that something stronger is needed and that is why we are not moving to delete clause 13 (2) and are moving to amend it. The spirit of clause 13 (2) in the earlier legislation, in fact, related to the capacity of the Minister to collaborate with the council with a view to determining the admissions for teaching.

Clearly, we acknowledge that the new college that will represent the present four colleges is not, in fact, primarily a teacher training institution. It now has a great many other course offerings that result in a great number of types of graduate other than teachers, so it is quite illogical, therefore, to have a clause that relates to only one of those.

We have sought to delete the teaching reference, but still limit it to dealing with the admission of students or right of students to continue with any course but, again, acknowledging the Minister's right to entertain the public interest in so considering the right of admission to courses or to continue any course. I believe it is what the Minister intended in his second reading explanation, and I quote from that where he said:

This latter provision extends a power in all constituent college Acts presently referring to the admission of students to courses for the training of teachers. The extension is related to the new college's substantial interest in fields outside teacher education.

No more is said on that clause, so, in his second reading explanation, the Minister was referring only to admissions, the right to continue in courses, and taking account of the broader coverage of the college and nothing else. Therefore, we believe that our amendment adequately covers all that he intended in his second reading explanation.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I recognise the concern which has been expressed by members of the Opposition and which has also been expressed in correspondence from various sections of the tertiary community. However, as I said when concluding my second reading address, the intention is not that the Minister should intrude on a day-to-day business in the administrative and council affairs of this new South Australian College of Advanced Education. We believe that the wording of clause 13 (2) is such that the requirement that council shall collaborate with the Minister or with any committee established by the Minister, with a view to ensuring that the public interest as assessed and determined by the Minister is safeguarded, is in itself the type of clause that is fairly specific. After all, it has to be clearly demonstrated that the public interest is being protected. I suggest that very few things that a college council may care to consider or to enact would be against the general public interest.

I earlier gave reassurance to the House that there is certainly no intention on the part of the present Minister

to intrude unless exceptional circumstances arise. I believe that over the past couple of years there has been only one case where I probably intruded and had to search through the existing Act relevant to that college to find a clause that would enable me to take some restrictive action. In that case, the necessary clause was found and the Minister's action was under question at the time, but only in correspondence and telephone calls. Subsequently, the matter was satisfactorily resolved. This is by way of an emergency power to cover circumstances that may possibly arise.

I recognise that the previous college Acts, the Hartley College Act, for example, and the Adelaide College of Advanced Education Act, did include the clause that gave the Minister the right to seek collaboration on the question of certain matters relating to teacher training. The fact that the very nature of the South Australian Colleges of Advanced Education is changing is probably the fact that encouraged the Opposition to introduce an additional phrase, 'to continue in any course', rather than simply in regard to teacher training.

The member did say that the colleges are not primarily concerned now with teacher training, but obviously they still are, so the Hartley and Adelaide clauses would have been, to some extent, adequate, but a declining amount of teacher training is taking place in these colleges; I think it varies from 80 per cent down to about 55 per cent of teacher training, depending on which of the four campuses one is considering.

I am not prepared to accept this amendment to clause 13. I believe that in any case the collaboration is too narrow. The admission of students and the right of students to continue in any course is a narrow area in which the collaboration of the council is sought. It is quite probable there may be contentious issues which could arise during the ensuring years that could demand Ministerial attention and which would be statutorily empowered. I do not propose to accept this amendment.

I believe the alleged Draconian implications behind clause 13 (2) are, as I said, more feared than fact. In fact, I received one letter from a source I will not name, because it will pinpoint a person, but one of the people who wrote in regarding this clause said that he and his group were not particularly concerned about the present Government and the personality of the Minister, but that in ensuing years a different Government and a different Minister might choose to interfere. I would suggest that a fear of that kind is improperly addressed to members on either side of the House. Ministers of Education generally over the decades have proved themselves to be reasonable people and they have trusted quite implicitly the people they have placed on college councils.

Furthermore, I would say that the allegation that we intend to open up other tertiary education Acts is improperly based. We do not intend to do that. This is one of the first opportunities that we have had to enact legislation regarding the colleges of advanced education, and slightly, I am not saying drastically, to strengthen the provision that already existed. I do not propose that the Minister shall interfere any more than would be absolutely necessary in the public interest.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am sorry to hear the Minister take that position. He is, I think, being somewhat illogical when he says that he does not propose to extend it to other Acts and yet he is saying that it is vital for it to exist here. There is some degree of contradiction between not extending it and saying that it is vital for this legislation. I do not wish to pass judgment one way or another on the present Minister and the way in which he will manage this clause; time will show. I just do not believe that it is good practice to allow such open ambit claims into the legislation, because I think the dangers do exist in the way in which they could be used.

The Minister in his second reading speech had a different emphasis from what he is now having. He is talking about extreme situations that may crop up from time to time. It did not occur to him at the time of the second reading speech, because he obviously thought the Bill was quite sufficient and we were not going to seek to amend it, then when we sought to amend it exactly in the frame of his second reading speech, he has now had to search around for other reasons that might satisfy the committee. I recall again that he at least adheres to the reasons he has given before and I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, McRae, and Peterson. Noes—Messrs Blacker, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 14—'Internal organisation of the college.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 6, lines 14 to 16—Leave out subclause (2) and insert subclause as follows:

(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1)—

(a) there shall be within the college a school or division designated the 'De Lissa Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies';
and

(b) there shall be within the college a school or division designated the 'South Australian School of Art'.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government accepts this amendment. The original intention behind including only the De Lissa Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies was simply a recognition that in the changes that took place in transferring the now De Lissa Institute from the former Kingston campus to the Hartley campus there was some strong suggestion that former Kingston-ites' interests were not fully protected, and that their accommodation was less than adequate. Many of those problems have been addressed and resolved over the past 18 months or so. We decided that in legislation we would perpetuate that provision contained in the Hartley legislation, which named the De Lissa Institute, and we also expanded the title of the institute slightly.

We also recognised that the South Australian School of Arts was specifically named in the Adelaide College of the Arts and Education legislation, but we felt that that institution was firmly entrenched, long-time recognised, and was in relatively little need of legislative protection. However, in view of the wishes expressed by the South Australian School of Arts to the member of the Opposition and to me, I am quite prepared to accept this inclusion.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17—'Student bodies.'

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 7, line 19—Leave out subclause (3).

I have debated this matter at some length in the later hours of last night and again today and, given our present time constraint, I do not think that I should go through my reasons again. However, depending on the Minister's response, I will reserve my right to take up maybe at least

one or two of my other opportunities to speak on this matter.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We do not intend to accept this amendment. In the first place, I think I have made quite clear that the present Government is committed to non-compulsory membership of any union, irrespective of whether they are trade unions or student unions. Perhaps I might refer to the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which is a non-compulsory union, but which has won the vast majority of teachers to its membership by the services that it offers. I know that it is not ideal to compare a student union with a professional union, but the principle is espoused by this Government. So it is a philosophical argument. Apart from that, we feel that organisations should win members to their unions or guilds and not draft or conscript them. I know that Australians have been against conscription for some considerable time, particularly members on the other side of the Chamber.

It is particularly inappropriate, I feel, to force students into union membership when students are at colleges essentially to study. Nevertheless, I recognise the role that student bodies play and will continue to play, I am quite convinced, in promoting that active student life at tertiary institutions. I am not nearly as pessimistic as the honourable member and other members of the Opposition are. I believe that well-managed student associations are capable of operating on a sound financial basis and perfectly capable of winning membership to keep them alive and active, but at the same time we believe that students, as with other sections of the community, have the right of freedom of association and the right to decide whether or not they should join a body. They should not be compelled to do so. This is, after all, their first experience of such things after they have left school, as a general principle. I realise that there are older students coming into the institutions in larger numbers.

Secondly, I believe that non-academic criteria such as the membership of a student union certainly should not be taken into account in determining whether a student is eligible to undertake his or her academic training. There have been a number of occasions when parents of students have contacted me, and I am sure other members, saying that their youngsters were under threat of exclusion from courses, from admission or even from receiving degree or diploma courses because of the non-payment of student funds.

That is not to say, of course, that some financial contribution to college life should not be demandable. That has certainly been included in a previous clause giving the council the right to nominate fees for legitimate college functions and other purposes. I believe that that inclusion would be adequate. Entrance to academic institutions should certainly not be based on union membership, particularly enforced union membership: it should be based on ability, merit and academic standing. I am convinced that student associations will continue to operate effectively in South Australia and in the South Australian College of Advanced Education. I do not think that that point is in dispute. There are plenty of young people who are willing to subscribe to membership of a wide variety of student associations, but they will be willing participants and not conscripts if this legislation is ultimately enacted.

Federal legislation prescribes more fully the use to which student funds should be put. The Bill before us in no way attempts to control expenditure of student moneys, whether it be for political, socio-economic, sporting or any other activities. The Government is not prescribing how voluntary funds which are legitimately paid over to an association should be spent. That control is exercised by the student body—the union of students. We regard that as certainly being a positive factor an an improvement on legislation which has been enacted and which is being considered in Federal and interstate academic fields. I believe that the services provided by student bodies can still be provided, but that would depend upon the wishes of the students.

The Government recognises that, although the decision to join an association is voluntary, a student who wishes to use that facility must pay for its use, whether it is a sporting facility, an amenity or something else. If they chose to do so the associations could charge different rates. Members could receive a subsidised rate for the use of services and non-members could be charged a higher rate. There are various ways of making the scheme work. I believe that the majority of students will accept the non-compulsory or voluntary principle of student unionism. The college itself can still charge a compulsory fee for legitimate college functions. The college council will decide upon those fees.

I now refer to another point which has been totally missed, when I think I was accused of removing the student voice. Of all the allegations that have been made that would be among the most specious, because if members check the legislation they will find that the academic staff has three members on the full college council, the general staff has three members and the student body has three members. Therefore, there is an equality of representation at the highest level of administration, that is, on the college council.

In relation to the establishment of a voluntary levy, the Government believes not only should the membership of the student body or association be voluntary but also that the fees themselves should be voluntary. I have chosen to introduce another amendment, circulated amongst members yesterday, to strengthen that aspect of the legislation. Those who use a facility or service provided by the student association or body should continue to pay for that use. If any one chooses not to use a facility he should not be compelled to either pay for it without using it or even subsidise it. That applies to the whole range of student facilities. The experience interstate where Governments have sought to ensure voluntary student union membership has shown that that intention can be avoided. In fact, it has been circumvented where the student membership was not compulsory but where payment of a fee was compulsory. In other words, if you are not a member of the association you still have to pay. Of course, that is circumventing the intention of this legislation.

So the amendment will remove that possibility. There will be no backdoor or *de facto* union membership supported, provided the additional amendment that I move is accepted by both Houses. So I do intend to amend the legislation to that extent.

I have been accused of being discriminatory against the South Australian College of Advanced Education. I would simply remind members that this is the first legislative opportunity that has been presented for me to exercise the philosophy of non-compulsory union membership. I have no intention of opening up other tertiary Acts for another purpose. If you open up an Act generally, you can put through quite a number of changes. I have no intention of opening up other tertiary institution Acts. I believe it would be wise to see how this legislation works and, if the worst fears of the critics of this clause are realised, we will have another look with a view to improving the situation. I am optimistic enough to think that this piece of legislation can be made to work effectively.

Perhaps those members of the House who read an article in the national newspaper, the *Australian,* on 2 December, where this legislation was commented on, will have seen a comment about the position in Western Australia. The claim was made that South Australia was the first to enact

this type of legislation. In response to that, Professor Street, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia, says that at the University of Western Australia voluntary membership was provided for in 1977. There, the student guild—it is not referred to as the student union—

Mr Trainer: You'd like them gelded.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If I heard the member rightly, as the father of two I think I can demonstrate the error of his ways. I do not know how many he has; I think I may have misheard the honourable member. I think it was a play on words.

Mr Trainer: Yes.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: However, I can assure members of the House that in Western Australia the student unions are operating effectively and profitably, and they are taking the credit for having introduced some several years ago, at least in the University of Western Australia, non-compulsory student unionism. It is working effectively.

I would like to think that this clause can be given some time to demonstrate its effectiveness. I do not think it is a direct threat to student unionism. We are not trying to remove the student voice from the campus; we have strengthened their voice where we believe it really matters—in the college council itself. I do not propose to accept this amendment.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am conscious of the fact that it is now 5.20 p.m., and we had some sort of understanding that we would try to finish this Bill by 5.30 p.m. I believe that the House managers should consider the situation, as some very serious things have been raised in the debate.

I think that, if the Minister of Agriculture had been in the Chamber listening to the Minister of Education, he would have been very concerned about what he heard, as the implications of what the Minister said about student unions for growers organisations and the like are very serious indeed. Student groups and student unions are not exactly synonymous with industrial unionism, and the Minister acknowledged that. They have different functions and purposes. Likewise, growers' and fishermen's organisations are not entirely synonymous with industrial unionism, although they have similar purposes. However, they, too, are compulsory.

When I put Questions on Notice to the Minister of Agriculture asking whether or not he intended to legislate to make a couple of these things non-compulsory, he said, 'Of course not.' Yet, in this situation the Minister says that the Government believes that they should all be non-compulsory. I hope that he is shuddering in some nether office in this building if he hears that, because I do not think that the growers will be happy about that when they hear about it.

The point was made by the Minister that parents had approached him concerning the possible exclusion of their children from courses because they had not paid fees. That is, of course, a problem that we need to address. It is my personal opinion that, if students do not pay compulsory fees, the option should exist for financial redress to seek payment of those fees. However, I do not believe that they should be excluded from participating in courses or undertaking degrees. That can be solved by other means: it does not have to be solved by the means proposed in this legislation. This is the proverbial sledgehammer, if that is all that this legislation is trying to do.

The Minister has now come out to establish where he stands on this matter. I wish that he had let me know his opinions a lot earlier. I wrote to him on 6 October about such things and asked a number of questions, as follows:

1. Do you intend to introduce any legislation covering student union fees in the near future and, if so, when?
2. Are you in support of or opposed to the uses to which student unions have put student moneys?
3. Do you have confidence in administrators charged with oversighting such funds?

I also said that I would appreciate the Minister's advice regarding the magnitude of complaints that his officers received on the issue. Until about 5.5 p.m. today, there was stony silence in reply to my letter. I presume that I will have to take the Minister's speech as the answer to my letter.

The other point that has been raised relates to what is to happen in the situation where tertiary education allowances have deductions made from them for student fees. Is that to cease forthwith with regard to the new college, and does that therefore mean that the administration of the tertiary education allowances will now have to divide into two categories, namely, that bundle of cheques that they send out with deductions, and the other bundle of cheques that they send out without the deductions, and thereby increase their administration costs? I imagine that the Minister will quickly wish to help meet those extra administration costs.

I do not believe that the Minister has adequately answered how student bodies have misused the combined co-operative association power of their members, or how they have misused their funds. Nor do I believe that the Minister has adequately answered how those bodies will operate in the future. They provide a useful and vital contribution to the life of academia and, just to solve some simple political obligations or debts, we now find that that will be put in jeopardy. I do not think that it is satisfactory to say, 'Let us see how it works. Let us give it a go.'

This is not the sort of motion that one can redress and resurrect again. It is not the sort of situation in which, once one has abolished them, one can easily flick the fingers and have them recreated. So, let us not walk down such a tenuous path on which we can easily slip, because we may not be able so easily to get up again like we can in other situations.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will continue to oppose this amendment. I point out the inconsistency of the member for Norwood, who chose to quote the United Nations charter. He referred to the question of discrimination, but now he chooses to remain silent on the United Nations charter on human rights which emphasises freedom of association.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I would have supported the Labor Party on clause 13 (2), and I venture to say that in another place there will be majority support for its view. I know I am not allowed to say that, although I have said it now. With regard to clause 17, I am not with the Labor Party, but that is not to say that the Labor Party might not get support from the Democrats in another place, because we have our own ways in these things.

Members interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: If they do not want support in another place, I will have a word with Lance Milne about it. In my view, there is a principle here. I am not in favour of compulsory unionism; I have often spoken against it. This is a form of compulsory unionism, making people belong to a union, whether it is a student union or whatever it is. I realise that it makes it quite difficult for academic institutions, the tertiary institutions, and that is a problem. Like the Minister, I have had representations on a number of occasions from people who have complained about having to pay the fee, and theoretically there is no doubt that their complaint is absolutely justified. I am quite sure that members on this side of the Chamber privately agree.

I also know of the difficulties involved if people will not pay fees to a union that runs the facilities, dining rooms and so on. I do not know how you get over that, except to

have them run by some other body, by changing the whole organisation. If that must be, then that must be. I would rather see these fees voluntary at all institutions. I know that we are only dealing with the C.A.E., but that does not fuss me, either. I hope that as time goes by the compulsory element will be taken out of the arrangements in the universities as well.

Be that as it may, despite the very strong views which have been expressed by the present C.A.E.s about this (and I have just received a letter from the Salisbury College of Advanced Education to the same effect), I propose to support the Government's amendment and oppose the Labor Party's amendment too. I might also say that I do not believe that there ought to be any anti-discrimination clause in the Bill.

Mr CRAFTER: I rise to defend myself against the allegations by the Minister about my being hypocritical in this matter. I notice that the Minister refused to answer my direct questions to him whether he sought Crown law advice or any other advice on, or even whether he turned his own mind to, the question of conflict with international declarations and the decision of the Government to include certain provisions in this Bill. The Minister drew conclusions from my own non-participation in this debate, and I thought that there was some undertaking with respect to time for the passage of this matter. However, I am sure that the Committee will excuse me if I briefly defend myself against that. I would have thought that the essential point of any legislation, and certainly this is the view of members on this side, who do not hold anti-union views, as the member for Mitcham is well known to have held during his political career—

Mr Millhouse: What did you say I hold?

Mr CRAFTER: Anti-union views.

Mr Millhouse: What absolute nonsense; I will have to get up and correct again now.

Mr CRAFTER: The member for Mitcham has been well known throughout his political career to attack the trade union movement.

Mr Millhouse: That is absolutely absurd. I am surprised that you would say that sort of thing; as a rule you have more sense.

Mr CRAFTER: It is well recorded in the journals of this State. There is embodied in the awards of this State and Federally, in legislation controlling these organisations, conscientious objection provisions. It has never been the policy of the Australian Labor Party to have compulsory trade unionism. There are clauses for conscientious objection, and they are embodied in the various Acts of Parliament covering this matter. That is not provided for here.

In his second reading explanation the Minister indicated that the aim of this is to attack socio-political student organisations; that is the real reason why the Minister is acting in the way in which he is. He has not yet explained to the House whether the Government will make up the shortfall in the provision of essential student welfare and other services on campuses if there is a reduction in student fees and, indeed, whether there will be any discrimination from those who pay fees and those who do not, with respect to their ability to obtain benefits provided by means of these funds.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I rise in indignation to refute the charge made by the usually temperate and sensible member for Norwood, that I am anti-union. I am not anti-union, and to suggest—

Mr Max Brown: You don't like them.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I do like unions. They have an important role to play in the community, as they always have had. I do not like it when unions go to excess and attempt to dragoon people into joining unions. If I am anti-union for that reason, then I suppose the member for Norwood is right, but I do not believe that that makes me anti-union at all. I believe that they should be voluntary associations. It is absurd for the honourable member to say that I am anti-union or to suggest that, by opposing his Party on this particular matter, that shows what I have always been; that is, anti-union. That is absurd. I resent it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Millhouse, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Peterson. Noes—Messrs Blacker, Rodda, and Tonkin.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move:

Page 7, line 19—After 'compulsory' insert 'and it shall be unlawful for the council to impose or collect any fee on behalf of, or for the benefit of, any such association or council'.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Millhouse, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blacker, Rodda, and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Peterson.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 18 passed.

Clause 19—'Power to make statutes.'

The CHAIRMAN: On page 9, line 14, I have made a clerical amendment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (20 to 28), schedule and title passed.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I propose to make a long and interesting speech on the third reading. I know that I can speak only about the Bill as it came out of Committee. I regret that it still has clause 13(2) in it. It is a very bad clause indeed, because academic freedom and freedom from political control is essential. If I had been here I certainly would have voted against that clause. I hope that, before the Bill goes right through Parliament, that clause will have been cut out. I have some confidence in believing that it will be. I hope that gives comfort to those who may be anxious about the matter. Whether I had been here or not will not affect the ultimate outcome. I am sorry that it leaves our Chamber with that clause in it. I am glad that clause 17 has been strengthened. A majority of us in this Chamber make perfectly clear that we are against compulsory unionism.

Mr Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is not often that I get an accolade from the Liberal side nowadays, least of all from the member for Mallee. I have on this occasion, and it makes me wonder whether or not I am right. I regret one gap in the Bill. I regret that there is not an anti-discrimination clause in it. I understand that an attempt was made to get one in

and it is not there. It is a pity that there is not one there. If I had my way, there would be one.

I cannot say that I am confident that there will be such a clause when the Bill passes through Parliament. Apart from that, it seems to me the Bill is all right, and it is desirable that it goes through before Christmas. I hope it does, but not in its present form. In its present form, I would hope that it did not go through at all.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I did not wish to speak on the third reading and I apologise for doing so, because I gave an undertaking that I would not. We will oppose the third reading, not because we want to hinder the amalgamation of the college in this State but because we believe that the Bill as it has come out of Committee is unacceptable. We hope, by our actions, to convince the Government to introduce another Bill to meet the proper obligations of legislation to amalgamate a college, and one that does not trespass on these other areas that are quite iniquitous in many regards.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs. Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Millhouse, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blacker, Gunn and Tonkin. Noes—Messrs Corcoran, Hemmings, and Peterson.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

VALUATION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 17 (clause 4)—Leave out 'repealed' and insert: 'amended:

(a) by striking out from subsection (2) the passage "and in the prescribed form"; and

(b) by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsection:

(2a) Where the prescribed particulars required under subsection (2) are included in an account or notice sent by a rating or taxing authority to the owner of the land to which the particulars relate, that account or notice shall be deemed to constitute the notice of valuation required under subsection (1).'

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

Motion carried.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISIONS (DISCLOSURE OF REASONS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 2097.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is, effectively, a taxation measure. It is part of the Government's Budget. It is a revenue-raising measure and as such we will not be opposing it, although we are somewhat unhappy about it. In pointing out its revenue purpose, I do not believe it was proper for it to be introduced in another place. Financial measures should orginate in this House. I believe the proper way of dealing with this Bill, because it is part of the Premier's package of taxation measures, was for the Premier to introduce it in this House and have it properly debated here before it went to another place. However, it comes to us from the Legislative Council.

During the second reading debate in another place, my colleague, the Hon. Mr Sumner, made very eloquently the points about the Government's taxation and revenue policies that are highlighted in this Bill. It is very odd indeed that a Government, that claimed to be a low-tax Government, which was going to reduce Government expenditure in so many ways, has in fact proved to be a Government which has made the most savage increases in State charges of any Government—and that trend is continuing. This impost is part of that package.

I do not intend to go at length through the various taxes and charges which have been levied by this Government. Suffice to say that in scope and in ferocity they have been unprecedented. Of course, they are largely a factor of the Government's complete financial failure, its inability to balance the Budget, its inability to calculate the effect of its revenue proposals prior to its election to office and, of course, its inability to regenerate, as it saw it, the South Australian economy. In fact, the economy has plunged to great depths under this Government, despite the promising signs of 1979, which has meant that estimated revenue collections from such sources as pay-roll tax have been much lower than usual.

The Government is in very great financial trouble indeed. One can understand why it is attempting to push through revenue measures of this kind. However, let us look at the Bill itself. This Bill will have an immediate effect on the cost of living. It will have an immediate effect on an important commodity used by people for their recreation and pleasure. It will have an immediate effect on the health and prosperity of the community and on the hospitality industry, which is at the base of tourism in this State. In other words, its effects, transmitted throughout the economy, will ultimately rebound not only to those by whom the tax is directly payable, but also to their customers, consumers and the industries they support. In so many ways this is an unfortunate and repugnant tax. It raises by 1 per cent the basis on which the fees are payable. Of course, there is one—

Mr Slater: Its a 12½ per cent increase over all.

Mr BANNON: As my colleague points out, that is a 12½ per cent increase overall. As I understand it, it will raise the price of a schooner of beer by 2c. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That pursuant to section 18 of the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1978, the members of this House appointed to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works under the Public Works Standing Committee Act, 1927-1978, have leave to sit on that committee during the sitting of the House next Tuesday.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 8 December at 2 p.m.