HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 8, 1978

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

PETITION: ELIZABETH DOWNS BUS SERVICE

Mr. HEMMINGS presented a petition signed by 128 electors of the Napier District, praying that the House would urge the Government to extend the existing bus route to service that section of Elizabeth Downs not at present covered.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: POLICE COMMISSIONER'S DISMISSAL

Mr. GROOM presented a petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia, praying that the House would resolve that it lacked confidence in the Premier's handling of the dismissal of the former Commissioner of Police and that a full and proper inquiry of the matter be commissioned.

Mr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 54 023 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WILSON presented a similar petition signed by 977 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 920 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

SENATE VACANCY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the minutes of the joint sitting of the two Houses held on Wednesday, December 14, 1977, for the choosing of a Senator to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of Senator Raymond Steele Hall, by which Mrs. Janine Haines was duly chosen to be a Senator.

Ordered that report be printed.

OVERSEAS STUDY TOUR: HON. R. A. GEDDES

The SPEAKER laid on the table report on overseas study tour by the Hon. R. A. Geddes.

Ordered that report be printed.

OVERSEAS STUDY TOUR: MR. ARNOLD

The SPEAKER laid on the table report on overseas study tour by Mr. Arnold (Chaffey).

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Christies Beach Sewage Treatment Works—Stage II,
Heathfield High School (Alterations and Additions),
Magill Home Conversion,
Meningie Area School Replacement,
Port Lincoln Hospital Redevelopment.
Renmark High School Redevelopment.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

ROCKY RIVER DISTRICT

In reply to **Mr. VENNING** (October 20).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As a result of my visit to the Mid North in March and August last year, a considerable amount of correspondence was prepared by me and sent to Ministers for action and report. Since forwarding the originating minutes I can report that the majority of points raised with me have been dealt with and the outcome of each inquiry communicated to the parties concerned. However, there are still certain issues yet to be decided, some still being under consideration because they involve significant issues of policy subject to Cabinet approval.

It is not practical to locate and provide the honourable member with copies of the relevant pieces of correspondence in question. However, I am prepared to indicate the general nature of most of the issues raised with me. Most questions raised were either by local government bodies seeking additional road funds or explanation of funds allocation policy, or from common interest or community associations seeking Government financial assistance to support their various programmes or ideas. Others were simply requests to me to check progress of submissions currently before the Government or were purely of a personal nature.

As I have said, it is not practical to report on each and every response given by me, but I do wish to list an example of some of the decisions which I recall eventualising from my visits, as follows:

Upgrading of water supply to the township of Terowie.
On a $1 for $1 basis, a grant of $50 000 will be made for the construction of a new multi-purpose recreation hall for Peterborough.
Lease arrangements to be made between the Government and the District Council of Gladstone for the lease of the Gladstone Prison.
A grant of not less than $20 000 is to be made to the Jamestown Football Club.
The old school house at Redhill is to be demolished.
Progress being made toward plans for a replacement area school at Port Broughton.
Upgrading of general studies area of Jamestown High School by provision of funds in the 1977-78 Education minor works programme. Tenders for carpet and partition works will close Friday, February 10, 1978.
A grant of $11 000 to Gladstone District Council for construction of showers and toilets at a local oval.

Should the honourable member still wish to pursue specific matters in relation to my visit I will be pleased to follow them up for him.

POLICE FILES

Mr. TONKIN: Why did the Premier not take action on dossiers and other cards held by the police on persons without criminal records in 1970 when he came to office? The Premier has admitted knowing that files were kept in the Police Department on persons who had not committed any crime in 1968. He said then, "Files on people with certain political views have been shown to me in the past when in the hands of a Minister." He confirms this in an

article in *The Humanist*, in June, 1970, when he said that he was given clear evidence of their existence when he was Attorney-General and abhorred the keeping of such dossiers.

Yesterday, he excused his inactivity by saying that the files he was shown were not from Special Branch, but there was no mention of Special Branch in his comments prior to 1970, and whether or not they were records kept in Special Branch or other branches of the Police Department should not have affected the principle. This matter was raised at a monthly State Council meeting of the A.L.P. held on October 8, 1970, when a resolution was passed calling on the Government, if any such branch existed, to take steps to disband it and to have all dossiers and other material not related to criminal activities destroyed. This is shown clearly in the White Report. The Premier's explanation that the files that he was shown in 1968 were not Special Branch files is no excuse for his failure to take action when he came to Government, that is, if he were really as concerned about the principle of the matter as he says he now is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is commenting. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the Leader can devise some means of dealing with files of this kind in the Police Force, I shall be pleased to know, because I am blessed if I have been able to do so.

Mr. Tonkin: You seem to have managed—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The files to which I was referring in the statements that I made in 1968 and 1969 as Leader of the Opposition were not files on subversion or matters of this kind, and I have referred specifically to three instances that gave rise to those particular matters.

The first instance was a question where a public appointment was being made and a defamatory statement about the proposed appointee was made to Cabinet by the then Commissioner of Police as to his character. The Commissioner was challenged on that matter (all of this can be confirmed by the Deputy Premier, who was a Minister in Cabinet at the time), and he was asked whether he had any evidence of this, and he did not have any such evidence. He was told to see whether there was any evidence on it, and he produced three police patrol reports, two of which actually referred to the person concerned, each of them innocuous, and they did not give rise to the kind of defamation of that person's character which the Commissioner had originally made.

Mr. Tonkin: They were—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has already asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were police patrol reports, relating not to any crime but to incidents observed by police on patrol.

Mr. Tonkin: Dossiers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They were not; they were separate incident reports. There was not a particular dossier on the person concerned. They were normal police patrol reports. As has been pointed out to me by both Commissioners of Police, it is inevitable that event reports are made by the police. Therefore, there are names of persons who are not the subject of any charge and who have not been convicted in any way which are on police files. Actually, the material does not necessarily show discredit to those persons. Those are general police files.

Mr. Tonkin: But you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable Leader to order. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There were two other matters. The first was (and I referred to it in statements I made in 1968 and 1969) that in some Education Department reports, the personal files of Education Department employees, there was recorded information about the political views of appointees in the Education Department. It appeared that some of this might have come from checks made with the Police Force upon their being employed because, until 1970, it was normal to get a police report upon applicants for positions in the Public Service, including the teaching service. I put an end to that in 1970. From 1970 onwards, checks with the Police Department were not made.

Mr. Tonkin: You did not do anything about the files, though.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I do not want to have to warn the honourable Leader, I hope he ceases interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I turn now to the third matter, the only other one. When I was Attorney-General I was shown some information by Mr. McKinna in relation to scientology. There had been a number of complaints in relation to scientology that there had been threats of physical violence as well as blackmail against people who had been clients of the scientology organisation. These complaints had quite properly occasioned files to be raised in the Criminal Investigation Branch, but on those files, in the case of scientology, there had been certain other matters recorded about people who I later discovered on investigation as Attorney-General were perfectly innocent people. I do not suppose it was surprising that their names should have been listed, in view of the fact that the C.I.B. was investigating scientology, but I believed that those had gone a bit far.

How precisely one lays down criteria for the Police Force as to who is to be recorded in a C.I.B. investigation of that kind I am blessed if I can work out. I have not been able to work out a means of putting restrictions on it and, if the Leader can come up with one, I will be very glad to hear it. Subsequently, arising from this matter of scientology, the Hall Government introduced a Bill in Parliament in respect of scientology that I thought was a gross interference with the private liberties of the subject, and I bitterly opposed it in this House. That was again a matter of people who had not been convicted being on file. I pointed to the dangers of this in 1968 and 1969. I have not been able to lay down to the police particular criteria by which they are to distinguish about people in the process of making event reports or C.I.B. investigations. If the Leader can come up with some criteria, I will be very glad to hear them. I was not able to do it, and it was certainly not undertaken by the Hall Government or the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Tonkin: Can that be extended to the White Report?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will have to warn the honourable Leader of the Opposition if he does not stop interjecting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as Special Branch is concerned, that is a matter of quite a different nature. I was not informed of the existence of Special Branch until 1970. The only information I have ever had about it, apart from what was told to me by Mr. Justice Hope, was the reports of the Police Commissioner, until I got the report of Mr. Acting Justice White. At no time did I have any knowledge that in fact the nature of Special Branch went beyond what was told to me in 1975 by the Commissioner of Police, or before that, that the nature of Special Branch operations was in any way different from what I was told in 1970 by Brigadier McKinna. Until 1975 I had no reason to doubt that, and, on being given the information I got in 1975, which was reported in 1977, I had no reason to doubt

that, either, until I received the report of Mr. Acting Justice White.

APPRENTICES

Mr. WELLS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether any consideration has been given to the possibility of apprentices who have lost their jobs continuing their scholastic studies during their periods of unemployment? Because of the collapse of certain firms, many apprentice constituents of mine have lost their jobs. One young man in particular has completed 2½ years of his apprenticeship as an electrician and now finds that this time, apparently, will be wasted. Although he has tried hard and eloquently to gain a job as an apprentice electrician, he has been unsuccessful. This boy and other apprentices who have lost their jobs will thus waste their training. I hope that the Minister will find some solution to the problem that these young, unemployed apprentices face so that they can continue their scholastic duties until they can find jobs in the area of work they desire.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. Rather than hope that I can do something about it, the honourable member may be surprised to know that I have already acted in this matter. Many complaints have come to me over the past six or eight months, so it was necessary to do some investigatory work to see what could be done. The Apprenticeship Commission has determined not only to encourage any apprentice suspended because of the economic down-turn into furthering the scholastic part of his training but it will almost make it mandatory for the Further Education Department, which has agreed to consider the matter, to make available premises in any area for use of apprentices in this situation to continue their scholastic education during the period of the suspension. In that situation there is no difficulty at all. There was difficulty about what might happen to the apprentices' social service payments during the period when they were attending school.

We have a ruling from the Commonwealth Employment Service in regard to this matter, and that is that anyone who breaks continuity to attend classes for only one day will be paid for the whole period of that week he is off. However, a problem arises (and I am having the matter pursued with the Apprenticeship Commission at the moment, and I hope to be able later to inform the House on this matter) in regard to the block release, which is most used these days and it can be brought to a fortnight; the classes can range for up to a fortnight. There is no clear mandate at the moment for the social service payments to be kept up. We are pursuing the matter. I was hoping for a reply this week in case the question came up. I think the situation will be all right: the C.E.S. has been quite good about it in the past, appreciating the plight of these young people who, because of the economic downturn, find themselves in that position. The training situation is clear; there is no problem there. All the apprentice needs to do is to apply to the Further Education Department, and his scholastic training will be taken care of. I am looking at the other matter, which I hope to conclude shortly.

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: When and from whom did the Government obtain its advice that there was no power to suspend the former Commissioner of Police, Mr. Salisbury? The Premier stated in the debate yesterday that during his interview with Mr. Salisbury just before his sacking there was no power to suspend him, and I quote from the Premier's account of his conversation with Mr. Salisbury given to the House yesterday, as follows:

> He asked whether he was under suspension. I said that there was no power to suspend him but that he would hear very shortly, and he then left.

The Deputy Premier said yesterday during the debate that the information given to the Government was that there was no power to suspend. Both of those statements are in *Hansard.*

An opinion by a constitutional expert given to the Liberal Party immediately after the dismissal states—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: By whom?

Mr. Goldsworthy: I do not think I am at liberty—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that this is a professional opinion. If the Government likes to go to whom it considers to be a constitutional expert, it will get the same sort of opinion. He is a constitutional expert.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Who?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has the floor.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I quote from the opinion:

> The power to dismiss: Section 6 of the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1973 (S.A.), provides that: "The Governor may appoint a fit and proper person to be the Commissioner of Police." This provision requires to be read with section 36 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1975, which provides that words giving power to appoint to any office include "power to suspend or remove any person appointed under such power . . ."

I made a quick check of those Acts and I quote briefly from them, as follows:

> South Australia Police Regulation Act, 1952-1973—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He's now saying—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Minister of Transport likes to call me a liar, saying that we did not get a constitutional opinion, let him do so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I said—

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Even the Minister has the wit to turn up two separate Acts and see for himself. Let me quote from the Acts.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: A genius!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is a genius.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, you.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: He is afraid he will get as good as he gives, and he would not like that. Section 6 of the Police Regulation Act provides:

> The Governor may appoint a fit and proper person to be the Commissioner of Police.

Section 36 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1975, provides:

> Words giving power to appoint to any office or place, or to appoint a deputy, shall be deemed to include power—
>
> *(a)* To suspend or remove any person appointed under such power:
>
> *(b)* To reinstate or reappoint any person so suspended or removed:
>
> *(c)* To appoint temporarily or permanently some other person in the stead of a person so suspended or removed,
>
> in the discretion of the person in whom the power to appoint is vested; and
>
> *(d)* to appoint temporarily or permanently another person in the place of any person so appointed who is sick or absent

or is otherwise incapacitated, or when from any cause the office or place has become vacant.

These quotations show clearly that an elementary investigation would indicate the power of the Governor to suspend the Commissioner of Police and further highlight the absurdity of the haste with which this disgraceful sacking was executed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is commenting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government had advice from the Solicitor-General as to the position of the Commissioner of Police, the question of his appointment, and the question whether in fact the Governor had power to terminate that appointment. The particular opinion did not deal with the question of suspension or not.

Mr. Goldsworthy: So you misinformed the Commissioner.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has already asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter was discussed amongst the lawyers in Cabinet, and we concluded that, in view of the basis on which the Solicitor-General's opinion had been given, there was no power to suspend. I point out to the honourable member that Cabinet did not contemplate suspension. There was no question of our suspending the Commissioner for a period. In our view, it was inevitable, given the replies the Commissioner had given about the facts, that he maintained a right to withhold information from the Government and that he had to face the fact that he had done so (a fact that he has publicly admitted), that there were no means of maintaining him in the position of Commissioner of Police.

Mr. Millhouse: Why was the matter of suspension canvassed in Cabinet? Why did it come up at all?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will have the opportunity to ask a question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a question raised in Cabinet whether he should remain in office for a period, but it was considered that that was quite inappropriate in the circumstances. In those circumstances I took the action I did.

SELECT COMMITTEE

Mr. BANNON: Has the Premier seen press reports that some Liberal Party Legislative Councillors are contemplating the appointment of a Select Committee into the Special Branch files issue, and can he say what light such a committee could throw on the matter? There has been considerable confusion not only in the minds of members on this side but also in the minds of the public about precisely what the Opposition has wanted in relation to this matter. At the beginning the Leader of the Opposition said that it was a matter for Parliamentary debate, but that was apparently not considered satisfactory for long. He said on the Thursday that the report was released that it was too late for a Royal Commission, as that would not get Harold Salisbury back his job. On Sunday he had revived the idea of a Royal Commission, and on Monday he said that the Premier should either set up a Royal Commission or resign. He said, "I do not think a Royal Commission is going to reinstate Mr. Salisbury. That is not the point." In view of these extraordinarily confusing and conflicting statements, and this latest suggestion that has been thrown into the ring, I ask my question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A Select Committee of either House can be established to give information to the House basically on matters that are largely non-partisan. If a Select Committee is established on something which is a matter of partisan politics, it cannot be seen to be an unbiased and objective inquiry of any kind; it is merely a political exercise. If members of another place were to set up a Select Committee on this matter, obviously, they would be engaged in nothing but a political exercise, because what they could elicit from that limited group of persons who could be called to give evidence before it would not be a result of any objective inquiry at all.

Mr. Chapman: Would you go before them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not particularly interested in taking part in something that is obviously proposed as a purely political exercise by the Liberal Party. Given the opportunism and partisanship with which the Liberal Party has behaved in the whole of this matter, no-one could have any other opinion of some such exercise by another place.

RESIGNATION OF MINISTERS

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier give to the Parliament an unqualified assurance that he will henceforth require the resignation of any Minister who misinforms, or is responsible for misinformation being given to, this Parliament and, accordingly, the people of South Australia, and how does he justify his failure to uphold that principle in the past? Yesterday, the Premier challenged all members of this place to uphold the fundamental principles of democracy. He continued:

> The principles are as simple as they are great. The Executive Government of the State is responsible to Parliament and to the people. It must account for its actions, and account for them fully and effectively. Should any member of a Government of this State deny this accountability, mislead this House, the penalty is clear.

He then went on to say that there was no other choice than to resign. The Premier has made other statements along these lines recently. I refer to correspondence dated January 18 from Mr. Tremethick, the Police Association Secretary, in which Mr. Tremethick, among other things, abhorred the Government's star chamber methods of dismissing Mr. Salisbury. In reply, the Premier sent a lengthy letter dated January 20, a letter most unlike that signed by you, Sir, to the same person, Mr. Tremethick. However, in the letter that the Premier sent to Mr. Tremethick, he repeated this principle, and said that the Government resented and rejected the allegations made in Mr. Tremethick's letter. He continued:

> Mr. Salisbury was informed of the Government's grave concern on his failure to meet the responsibility of his post in giving accurate information to the Government, in that his action had led to a position of misrepresentation to Parliament; where if a Minister of the Crown had been similarly responsible for misinformation to Parliament, even if he had been misled by a public servant, he would be required to resign his Ministerial post.

In the second part of my question, and my reference to those many occasions when it has appeared that had that principle been upheld, either the Premier himself or a number of his Ministers might or should have resigned, I should like to refer to but a few examples.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting and arguing. I want him to stick rigidly to the question.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. The remainder of the examples that I give in explanation to my question relate to statements made and reported within and outside this place by the Premier himself. In 1973, he said, for example, "We will establish an environmental research institute." However, it was not done.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to argue while explaining his question. The honourable member asked for leave to explain his question, and he must stick rigidly to the question, instead of moving away from it and commencing an argument.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I apologise for that, Sir. I will not enter into my comments any essence of argument. I am purely citing reports—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not allowed to comment.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Sir. Without making any comment, but simply referring to reported statements made by the Premier and his Ministers, I will continue. In the same year (in fact, in October, 1973), the Premier himself made an announcement regarding the starting date of work on the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. In May of that year he announced on behalf of his Government—whether or not with the intention of misleading I will not comment about, of course—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting again. I want him to stick rigidly to what he has been speaking about previously.

Mr. CHAPMAN: A $3 000 000 tourist development at Wallaroo known as the Copper Coast development was announced. In 1973 again, "We will establish a waste disposal authority." His Minister was the Minister of Transport. In 1974 the Premier announced on behalf of the Government (and this is clearly reported) that an 8 000-seat stadium and an $80 000 000 redevelopment of Adelaide railway station, including an international motel, would be appropriated. In 1973, there was also the double-decker train issue, and I will not go into details about that, for obvious reasons. In 1973 there was also the announcement—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN:—of the electrification of the Elizabeth line.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he must resume his seat when the Speaker stands. I think the honourable member has explained his question quite well and has covered the matter quite well. I ask the honourable Premier to reply.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows full well that the matters to which he has referred were not misrepresentations to this House in any way. The honourable member has chosen to misrepresent to this House what I did on behalf of the Government on each of those occasions. Let us take the question of the proposed starting date for the Redcliff project. At that stage, the proposed date (and it was never stated by me to be anything other than that) for the starting of that project was the proposal of the working party in relation to that matter. That was our expectation at that time. He has referred to the Adelaide railway station yards. We issued—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That was the Hassell report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was a report by the Hassell consultants on what was recommended for the area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you had not issued it you'd have been—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The honourable member has taken a series of things which the Government had announced and on which we had reports or proposals. The thing at Wallaroo was a proposal by some private developers that they asked me to announce on their behalf.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He did not check the facts too well.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was not a Government proposal: it was the announcement by some private developers as to what their proposals were in relation to the development of Wallaroo. The honourable member has said that that is misrepresentation to this House. He knows that what he has said is absolutely baseless and ridiculous. I tell him that this Government will maintain the principles and traditions of the Westminster system, even though they are denied, derided and opposed by members opposite.

MINORS CONSENT LEGISLATION

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Premier outline to the House the Government's position in respect of the Minors (Consent to Medical and Dental Treatment) Bill? The question follows several newspaper reports about this Bill, which is now before the Legislative Council, that have, in my view, created the impression that the measure is a Government Bill. Whilst I am aware that the Bill has been presented as a private member's Bill, I believe that a statement by the Premier may help to resolve the confusion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Bill that has been introduced in another place is not part of Labor Party policy. It is a private member's Bill introduced by a member of our Party in another place. The ruling given appropriately by me was that it was a matter for a conscience vote as it was not a matter of Party policy.

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Did the Premier or the Chief Secretary make any specific requests in writing to the Commissioner of Police in 1970 for information about Special Branch; if so, will the Premier table all relevant correspondence relating to the matter; and, if the request was not made in writing, how was it made and what record is there of the reply by the Commissioner to that request? Page 74 of the White Report states:

> Attempts by the Government to intervene in 1970, 1975, and earlier in 1977 were deflected by Special Branch, speaking through the Commissioner.

The White Report documents most, but not all, of the correspondence concerned in 1975 and 1977. However, on the 1970 attempts the White Report records only three newspaper accounts of an A.L.P. State Council motion to disband Special Branch and to destroy all dossiers and other material held. On October 9, 1970, the Premier made a promise, through a newspaper report, to obtain a report on Special Branch from the Commissioner of Police. There is no evidence in the White Report or anything else that has been tabled in this House that such a report was ever obtained or sought by the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The querying of the Commissioner of Police was made orally and I received the information orally. I then made the newspaper comment which has been made, and the Commissioner of Police also made a newspaper comment, which has been reported on.

NAUTICAL MUSEUM

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Education provide any information regarding a proposed nautical museum at Port Adelaide? At Port Adelaide two steam tugs, the

Yelta and the *Fearless*, are at present tied up. The *Fearless* was bought by a private individual and was given to the National Trust, and the *Yelta*, the last steam tug used in Port Adelaide, has been bought by the National Trust. There is also at the Port an old vessel, the *Annie Watt*, the last ketch used on the coast trade. It is deteriorating, and it is necessary that this history of Port Adelaide should be preserved. At present, negotiations are going on for the sale of an old fishing vessel, the *Canowie*, built 98 years ago at Birkenhead, a vessel which also should be preserved. I suggest to the Minister that consideration should be given to adopting the practice obtaining in Western Australia, where the nautical museum is a branch of the State Museum.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have noticed recent press reports about this matter, in particular about the dedication to this cause which has been demonstrated by Mr. LeLeu, of Port Adelaide, and the great work he has done in this connection. I think that the general proposition, however it may be administered eventually, is very commendable. The problem is when and how all this might happen. In the brief period of time in which museums have been part of my Ministerial responsibility, I have not had a chance to discuss this matter with my colleague the Deputy Premier, to whom I believe a previous approach was made because, in his official capacity, he owns most of the land in the areas where such a museum might be set up. Now that the matter has been drawn to my attention, I think I should discuss it with my colleague, and I shall also refer it to Mr. Inglis and the South Australian Museum Board, to ascertain the current situation. I shall keep the honourable member and the House informed, because it seems to me something which would be very close to the hearts of the people at Port Adelaide and which would mesh very well with the general historic appreciation the people have of their own area.

POLICE FILES

Mr. WOTTON: Has the Premier been informed by Mr. Acting Justice White or any other person of the contents or details of any dossiers, cards, or any other information held by Special Branch; if so, about which persons was he informed and who was the informer? The Premier stated, when challenged at a press conference, that he had not seen his own dossier. However, that does not mean that he has not been told by someone else of the contents of his dossier or, if it comes to that, of anyone else's dossier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Acting Justice White told me that, in relation to my own card index reference (not the file, about which he said nothing to me: I do not know even whether he saw the contents of that file and he said nothing to me about having examined it at all), there was something peculiar about it, that in 1975 it appeared that a new card index (a card in the index) had been put in, and what would have been a contemporary card index with all the others that went through for Labor Parliamentarians from the time I came into Parliament was not there.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There was probably not space for all the rumours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, he said there were very few entries on my card index, which made it a very much smaller entry than those for my contemporaries in Parliament. It appeared that something had been destroyed from the card index in 1975. Moreover, there were no cross reference ticks on my card index similar to those of my contemporaries in relation to particular event reports. He said that he had raised this peculiarity with the police officers who were in Special Branch, and they were unable to account for what they themselves admitted was a peculiarity in relation to my own card index file.

Mr. Salisbury said that he found that my file was there and that it appeared to contain material going back to the time before I entered Parliament, but that otherwise he had not inspected the file. He stated publicly that he really looked at only the outside of it, the cover. That is the only information I have about that matter. I have no information as to contents or anything of that kind.

The Commissioner of Police informed me that there was a file on a Liberal member of this House, and he told me what the contents of that file were. I said that I considered that the material recorded was not of a security nature, and, of course, it had certainly nothing to do with the matters that the Commissioner has said were matters of Special Branch. That is, it was not a matter of political violence or subversion leading to political violence.

The Commissioner said that he thought the things that were said by the member concerned, which were on record, were reprehensible and upsetting. I said that I might agree with that but that, in fact, it was not a matter of security and should never have been there. That was the only information that was given to me by either of them. I have no information from anyone else.

MR. PETER WARD

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Premier say whether a monetary out-of-court settlement was agreed upon to settle a dispute between the Premier and Mr. Peter Ward of the *Australian;* if it was, what was the amount involved and was or is any of this amount to be paid from Government funds; if so, under what line?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

WAGE REDUCTION

Mr. DRURY: Is the Minister of Labour and Industry aware of a report on the front page of the *Advertiser* of January 11, 1978, dealing with wage reduction, and is he aware of any attempts to halve wages in South Australia? The report is as follows:

> The Victorian Government and major employers moved jointly yesterday to halve the wages of 600 000 metal workers. . . The State Government—

which is a Liberal Government—

> and the employers served a log of claims on metal industry unions which seeks to reduce rates in the metal industry award to $100 a week. Metal workers earn between $180 and $200 a week.

Recent headlines in the *News* concerning proposals for no increase in wages for junior staff raise my concern that, in a district such as mine, namely, Mawson, where there are many young families, many of whom struggle on one wage, with heavy hire-purchase and house repayment commitments, it would be catastrophic for them to have their wages halved.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The first thing I want to assure the honourable member about is that this Government will be taking no such action. No such application will be made by this Government, nor is one contemplated. I recall the report not vividly but briefly, and I imagined when I first read it that it was a joke for any Government to place itself in such a position as the Victorian Government was doing regarding these wages. There is a strong feeling in the community that, if anyone has been neglected in the wage area over the past three years, it has been persons in the metal trades industry

groups. I do not think that that is news. I have had employers, trade unions, workmen and employers saying it to me generally over the past 18 months. One of the proofs they use to substantiate the claim is that tradesmen are becoming more difficult to obtain. Over the past five or seven years, there has been a terrific outflow from the metal industry trade groups into other industries. Tradesmen are leaving their jobs in thousands, and there needs to be some reason for this.

A man who has qualified after doing a four-year trade apprenticeship and who has the interest of that trade at heart does not leave lightly, or change his occupation or residence. My investigations have revealed that the tradesmen themselves are tremendously dissatisfied with wages. Employers will need to retrieve that position by encouraging the young to take on apprenticeships (and we will need them, because I hope that the Federal Government will not keep the economic situation at an all-time low for ever). If the economy picks up in the near future, Australia could be in a difficult position regarding tradesmen. I realise that, and that is one of the reasons why I have decided on pre-apprentice training. I have pushed the State Government into training more apprentices than it has ever trained before, and that is why I have encouraged employers to train more apprentices than they have ever trained before. Instantly the economy picks up, Australia will be in some difficulty finding sufficient tradesmen to go around. However, if Governments and employer organisations take unto themselves the right to try to reduce wages (they will not get away with it, of course), that will have a further effect on people being trained. I condemn the actions of the Employers Federation in Victoria and the State Liberal Government, which take unto themselves the right to interfere in our own applications. There is an application in which they have interfered now, thus delaying the application for some time. I suggest that they keep their noses out of it. There is no intention to make any such application in South Australia, and I hope that that will assure the honourable member of the situation.

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier say whether the interview between the Commissioner of Police, the Chief Secretary and himself, a precis of which the Premier read to the House yesterday, was tape-recorded or whether it was recorded by a stenographer who could hear the conversation? A strong voice of opinion is now rife among those who heard or read the report given by the Premier yesterday that it was too detailed to be merely a post-meeting summary. It would be appreciated if the Premier could inform the House whether Mr. Salisbury was told how the meeting would be recorded and that the report could be made public without Mr. Salisbury being asked to comment on its accuracy. People who have seen the detailed report consider this sort of practice will place real fears in the hearts of public servants, visitors to this State, and business men when being interviewed by the Premier. The matter must be clarified.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is my habit, in the case of crucial interviews with me by anyone, to dictate notes of those interviews immediately afterwards.

Mr. Tonkin: Immediately afterwards or during the interview?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Immediately afterwards. There was no tape recording of Mr. Salisbury, and there was no stenographer present or overhearing what was being said. The honourable member apparently is not aware of the practice of the Police Force in South Australia. It is common for the police to ask questions without making records at the time and, subsequently, while the matter is still fresh in their memory, to type or dictate notes of the interviews they have had. Lots of those interviews run into far more than what I recorded in relation to the Commissioner of Police on this occasion. I have had some practice at this, I may say.

Mr. Millhouse: The police do it in question and answer form.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not always, not by any means.

Mr. Millhouse: As a rule.

Mr. Venning: I reckon the place was tapped.

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

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham apparently has not been practising in the Police Court recently.

Mr. Millhouse: Yes I have.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, as the honourable member knows, I practised in the Police Court to a very considerable extent during my active years in practice.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a long time ago.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may be.

Mr. Millhouse: Consider the mistakes you have made in this case.

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

Mr. Venning: The Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River is definitely out of order.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I made the notes after the interview, dictating them to my stenographer. She typed them up and I subsequently checked them through with the Chief Secretary, who agreed that they were accurate. They have been published, and the Commissioner of Police has not for one moment contested the accuracy of what was recorded.

WHYALLA CLOTHING FACTORY

Mr. MAX BROWN: I assure the Premier that my question has nothing to do with Mr. Salisbury. Can the Premier ascertain or inform me now what is the current progress in connection with the Government's possibly leasing Mr. Stamoulis's clothing factory in Whyalla and also the possible purchase of some of his equipment? The Premier would be aware that during the investigations into the possibility of establishing a clothing factory in Whyalla it was thought that the final establishment would take between 18 months and two years. To reduce this period it was thought that Mr. Stamoulis's current building might be leased temporarily, thereby allowing at least some type of clothing factory to be established within six months or so. Has any progress been made along these lines?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. It is expected that very soon (I hope this week) the members of the board of the Government clothing factory will be appointed. I anticipate that that will take place tomorrow. Upon their appointment they will proceed with investigations in relation to Mr. Stamoulis's factory and the early appointment of a manager.

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question does concern the Salisbury matter.

Mr. Max Brown: I thought you would have got off it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member hoped I would get off it. Will the Premier table the opinion of the Solicitor-General which he mentioned in his reply to the member for Kavel earlier this afternoon which canvasses the position of the Commissioner of Police and out of which apparently the lawyers in Cabinet, who on my calculation are the Premier and the Attorney-General, decided that there was no power to suspend the Commissioner? I was surprised yesterday to hear (and for me it was the first time) the Premier say or suggest that there was no power legally to suspend the Commissioner of Police and that apparently Cabinet had acted upon that belief. That Cabinet acted on one that was so plainly wrong is a matter of some significance and is in itself a reason for a judicial inquiry, because that elementary mistake of law (and I suggest, with very great respect to the Premier, that it is an elementary mistake of law which he should not have allowed to happen) may have gravely prejudiced Mr. Salisbury.

The Premier has said that suspension was not contemplated, but he admitted that it was discussed; it must have been, for the off-the-cuff opinion to have been expressed at all. Obviously, after that, it could not have been contemplated as a course of action by Cabinet, if Cabinet was told that it was legally not possible. The fact is that Mr. Salisbury does not have open to him the avenues of appeal against his dismissal which are available to other members of the community. I will not go over that; I dealt with it last evening.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: I think Terry Groom dealt with your statement.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not on my information, although I have very great respect for the ability of the member for Morphett in these matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the floor.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Salisbury alone, almost, in our community does not have legal avenues of appeal available to him. Suspension and an inquiry would have been a way of giving him an opportunity to justify himself similar to that which other citizens have. I have pointed out the significance of this elementary mistake. If on so elementary a matter Cabinet was mistaken, it throws further doubt on the propriety of all the actions of Cabinet. I therefore ask the question—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has already asked his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —hoping we may see the opinion on which Cabinet apparently acted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that it is entirely contrary to Parliamentary practice to table opinions of the Solicitor-General or the Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: You've done it quite frequently when it suits you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has asked his question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The further matter is that, as I pointed out to the honourable member, the Solicitor-General was not asked about the question of suspension.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you take the responsibility?

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN: I do.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The information the Government had was—

Mr. Millhouse: It was entirely wrong.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I take the responsibility for advice given to Cabinet, but I point out to the honourable member what I pointed out to the House; that is, that Cabinet did not, in fact, contemplate suspension. We believed that it was quite inappropriate for the Commissioner to remain in office.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You gave wrong advice to Cabinet. You should have resigned.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is out of order.

TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Transport obtain information on the latest position relating to the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road, Tea Tree Gully? The Minister will be aware that I have previously explained why the intersection needs a high priority. Very regrettably, only recently a fatal accident has occurred at this intersection. On the last occasion I raised this matter the Minister informed me that it was expected that traffic signals would be installed by June of this year, subject to availability of resources.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have an updated report from the Commissioner of Highways, indicating that in the category of those installations 22 will be commenced before the beginning of June, including work on the North-East and Hancock Roads intersection. I cannot give any further details at present other than to point out that the work in question is in the planning stages scheduled for that period.

GRAPE SURPLUS

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Premier say whether the Government has initiated recent discussions with the Federal Government in an endeavour to solve the wine grape surplus problem in South Australia? It has now been established quite clearly, as a result of grower estimates, winery quotas and requirements, that there is about 40 000 tonnes of surplus wine grapes this year. I think everyone readily accepts that it is way beyond the capabilities of the State Government to solve this problem and that it is largely in the arena of the Federal Government, requiring Federal action, to put the wine industry back on its former secure footing. Has the Premier entered into negotiations with the Federal Government in an effort to solve this problem by limiting plantings, reducing the excise, and increasing the duty on imported wines, etc.?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have seen some information from the Minister of Agriculture about this. I do not propose to give the honourable member an answer off the cuff about the matter without checking my memory. I know that moves have been initiated, but I will get a precise, detailed answer for him.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House condemn statements by the Director of Tourism (Mr. Joselin) recommending that Adelaide Airport be upgraded to international airport status and support the State Government's stated attitude that Adelaide Airport shall not be developed as an international airport.

In this matter, we have seen the appointment of a man brought to the State as its chief tourist officer, the Director of Tourism, the Government having to go outside the State and, indeed, the country to make this appointment.

Mr. Evans: It didn't have to; it chose to.

Mr. BECKER: Yes. I can see no reason why someone in the department could not have been appointed to that position. Soon after taking up the position of Director, Mr. Joselin issued several statements and used his position in an area where he obviously had little local knowledge. He suggested that Adelaide Airport be made an international airport. There are many newspaper reports of his statements, with even responsible media editorials supporting the idea. On August 20, 1977, the *Advertiser,* under the heading "Airport could become a tourism booster", in an article on travel by Maxwell Whiting, stated:

SA's new Tourism Director (Mr. G. F. Joselin) says Adelaide Airport should become international to boost tourism and he does not think the anti-noise lobby has a case for opposing its use for overseas flights.

That shows amazing lack of knowledge and understanding of the situation of residents in the area surrounding the airport, as well as those who live in the metropolitan area generally. I fail to see how any person involved in promoting the Government's policy in any area, especially the area of tourism, would want to destroy the environment of all those people residing not only near Adelaide Airport but also in areas spread throughout the metropolitan area where they would be affected by the flight paths. One would have expected that a person in that position who I believe was an executive officer with an overseas airline company before he came to Australia and was in charge of chartered flights, a man who obviously should have or would have travelled throughout the world and would be familiar with airport operations in every major capital city of those countries where the airline company in question operated, would know the problem associated with airport planning and design and their effect on the environment.

If he did not, then I think he is probably not the person who should be occupying the position of Director of Tourism in South Australia. Once a town or city is promoted for tourism purposes and for the purpose of obtaining business, the profit seekers come in and that town or city is commercialised and destroyed for the local population. That has happened in countries throughout the world.

Just as mining operations can destroy the environment, jet aircraft can create problems; when moving people in the quickest way possible from point A to point B, the idea is to use bigger aircraft and, unfortunately, this creates more noise and requires more facilities and a greater area for take-off and landing purposes, especially in the case of an international airport.

I believe that the whole series of statements, to which I have referred previously in this House, should have been considered further by the Director. There has been no evidence that the Minister has done anything about this situation or those statements.

Mr. Groom: Would you sack him?

Mr. BECKER: We have had the situation where a person was sacked supposedly for misleading the Government, although that has not been proved. I believe Ministerial control should have been exerted on Mr. Joselin. However, of course, we have a double-standard Government, evidence of which the people of South Australia have seen at election time and then immediately afterwards in this place, when the Government knows it is free from any political pressure for the next three years.

Over the years that I have been in this House, even though to suit its own political purposes the Government has amended motions I have had on the Notice Paper, it has always had to back what I have suggested about preserving the boundaries of Adelaide Airport from extending further into recreation areas. However, it was not until the campaign started in my area back in 1970-71 that positive steps and attitudes were adopted by this Government about preventing the Federal Government from acquiring recreational land to extend the Adelaide Airport. Whilst the Government has jumped on the bandwaggon, one thing it cannot take away is the initiative of the local member of Parliament in protecting the environment for the residents living near Adelaide Airport.

I received a letter from the Secretary to the Federal member for Kingston, Mr. Grant Chapman, on March 15, 1977. The letter states:

Before Grant left for Canberra, he expressed the thought that you may be interested in the attached letter from Mr. Virgo, M.P., Minister of Transport, written to a Mr. L. S. Spurr of South Plympton, South Australia. Grant draws your attention to the first paragraph, which states that "the State Government supports the idea that international flights should operate to and from Adelaide."

I will read the letter from the Minister of Transport; it is written on Department of Transport stationery, Office of the Minister. It has a reference number, which I will quote —MRT 270/70—because I cannot read the date of the letter, which I suspect was March 7, 1977, but I cannot be too sure of that. It does not make much difference when the letter was written: it is its contents that matter. This is the letter the Minister of Transport wrote to Mr. L. S. Spurr:

Mr. R. Jacobi, M.H.R., referred to me a copy of your letter concerning international flights from Adelaide Airport. In reply I advise that the State Government supports the idea that international flights should operate to and from Adelaide.

Mr. Groom: Not Adelaide Airport, though.

Mr. BECKER: Do not play on words. This is the whole crux of the issue. There is no name for the Adelaide Airport; I have tried to have a name put on it.

Mr. Groom: You said "Adelaide".

Mr. BECKER: I have tried to have a name put to the airport situated in the West Torrens council area, and the Minister of Transport would not agree to give that airport a name along the lines of recognising Sir Charles Kingsford Smith. The Minister of Transport's letter continues:

However, we are committed to not allowing an extension of the Adelaide Airport beyond its present boundaries and are concerned about the noise effect Adelaide Airport is having on the surrounding areas.

I am really critical of the Minister of Transport from time to time but at least I will give him credit where credit is due. He recognises the problems. He states:

The State Government supports the idea that international flights should operate to and from Adelaide.

He recognises that the Government is committed, after a fair bit of campaigning in my area some years ago, to the boundaries not being extended. The Minister continues:

One of the major problems with establishing international flights in Adelaide is the need to establish appropriate international health and customs facilities. Unless the airport

is handling very large volumes of international passengers the cost of operating these facilities becomes prohibitive and the alternative of allowing international operators to pick up passengers within Australia and go through customs and health facilities at other international terminals such as Melbourne and Perth is ultimately just as inconvenient as catching domestic flights to the existing international terminals.

It is a pity that the Minister has not travelled out of the State in the last few months. If he goes to Melbourne airport and there is a bug in the computer or the weather is playing up, he will realise that it is the worst place in the world to be landed. The letter continues:

Another matter which apparently concerns international operators is the difficulty of achieving high utilisation of aircraft on flights within or across Australia. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that a number of existing international terminals already operate under curfew imposed during the night time and to add Adelaide, another curfew controlled airport, would make this problem even worse.

Yours sincerely, Geoff Virgo, Minister of Transport.

That clearly states to me the Government's attitude about Adelaide Airport. Therefore, I am at a total loss to understand how the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport allows his Director to make these statements and to allow them to go unchecked as regards advocating that Adelaide Airport should be an international airport.

Let me go back a little further in history to December 28, 1973. We can link all these documents together. This is a letter from Charlie Jones, Minister for Transport, Parliament House, Canberra, to Senator Cavanagh. He states:

On December 12, 1975, Senator Jessop asked the following question without notice in the Senate: "Is the Minister representing the Minister for Transport aware of the rumour which is current among residents who live in the vicinity of the Adelaide Airport that the South Australian Government has approached the Federal Minister seeking to have the Adelaide Airport declared an international airport? Is this a fact? Has this request been made? If it has, can the Minister say whether the Government is likely to agree?" You replied as follows: "There have been negotiations over a period of some years on the question of the Adelaide Airport. I do not know what stage they have reached or whether there has been any recent approach by the South Australian Government. I will make inquiries and let the honourable senator know."

There has been an approach by the South Australian Government for Adelaide to be made an international airport. While it is very difficult to see such a requirement, at least for the time being, it was agreed that this and other Adelaide Airport matters would be studied by a committee consisting of both Australian Government and State Government representatives. The terms of reference of that committee are attached. This advisory committee has now collated most of the relevant facts and is in a position to very carefully prepare alternative proposals. That comparison is a somewhat time-consuming exercise but it is expected that the committee will complete its work before the end of 1974.

The terms of reference are totally irrelevant. But there we are: whilst, on the one hand, the South Australian Government was concerned that Adelaide should have an international airport—

Mr. Groom interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: It has always been referred to as "the Adelaide Airport"; no matter how we twist the words (I challenge the member for Morphett to say whatever he likes in any legal phraseology) we cannot escape the fact that it has been the desire of some people to have what is known as Adelaide Airport converted into an international airport. However we have always had the safeguard that the State Government has opposed extending the airport's boundaries.

With all this in mind we must realise that there has been a joint State and Federal Government committee considering the problems associated with the Adelaide Airport, and this committee has been meeting for some time. Every year I receive a letter stating that a report is expected by June of that year, and this goes on and on. No matter what happens, the information was known to the Minister of Tourism, who should, if he practises what other Ministers practise, have control over the Director of that department and he should have been aware that this was just another exercise of trying to browbeat the people into accepting the fact that one day Adelaide Airport may become an international airport. It will not become one as long as I reside in that area and am the member for that area.

Mr. Evans: That's a big statement.

Mr. BECKER: It is not. It will not become an international airport whilst I am there, because I believe that the report, if it is ever made public, will recommend a site near Dublin. There have been other suggestions of where an international airport should be situated in South Australia close to Adelaide, but Dublin would probably be the best place. I have no doubt that at one stage Monarto was chosen. Early in his career Senator McLaren had some indication that Monarto was being considered and that investigations were being made for it to be the alternative airport for Adelaide. I believe the Premier of this State was aware of this investigation but said that it would not happen.

Mr. Venning: What are they doing at Adelaide Airport now?

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member need not be concerned, because the control tower facilities are to be resited near Tapley Hill Road opposite the German Shepherd Dog Club, but those facilities will not add to environmental problems associated with West Beach or Glenelg North. The new facility will improve safety and upgrade existing facilities, which are expected to meet requirements until the year 2005. I have further material to place on record about the attitude of people in my district and the attitude of the West Torrens council. I wrote to the council in November last year, after having had my attention drawn to the statements of Mr. Joselin and because some local councillors had expressed concern in the local newspaper. I compliment Councillor Garth Palmer and Councillor Joe Wells and their co-councillors who have always taken an interest in their constituents, especially concerning the impact on them of the Adelaide Airport. I suggested to the council that members of the council and I should call on the Minister of Tourism and his new Director to point out our attitudes, and that we as elected representatives of the people should have the opportunity to put to Mr. Joselin our objections to his statements. On November 28, 1977, the Town Clerk of the council wrote the following letter to me:

I am directed by council to acknowledge and thank you for your letter dated November 9, 1977, in which you suggest the possibility that a joint deputation wait upon the Minister of Tourism with a view to discussing the Government's attitude towards the operation of international charter flights into and out of West Beach Airport.

Mr. Groom: Do you realise that the council asked that Mr. Joselin ought to be sacked?

Mr. BECKER: You did not have any hesitation in sacking Salisbury, and you have not proved a damn thing against him. The letter continues:

Council also is concerned regarding the double standards that appear to exist with conflicting statements being made by different Cabinet Ministers and, accordingly, a letter has been sent to the Honourable the Premier seeking an assurance as to the views and intentions of his Government relating to the future use of West Beach Airport for regular international flights be it charter or otherwise.

In view of the action previously taken by council it is felt that, for the present, little could be achieved by a deputation such as that suggested. However, council would again like to thank you for your continued interest and support and I shall be pleased to keep you informed of any further developments, the effect of which will determine the course of action to be taken by council in the future.

Unfortunately, a report, printed in the local newspaper under the heading "Back jumbo flights: MP", stated:

Adelaide Airport should cater for international flights, a Liberal MP said yesterday.

That was one of my colleagues, and he also suggested that he believed Parliament should vigorously support any proposal for international flights to operate into and out of Adelaide Airport. The report also stated:

If the noise level became intolerable for nearby residents, then perhaps those houses would need to be bought to allow the people to move to another area, he said.

The member was following the policy adopted by the Government some years ago for the Hills area concerning the construction of the South-Eastern Freeway. I point out to this honourable member and to all other honourable members that I was President of the South-Western Suburbs Environment Association and, for the benefit of the member for Morphett, Dr. R. I. Jennings, the Labor Party endorsed candidate who ran against me at the recent election, was Secretary of that association. We wrote to the City of Los Angeles Department of Airports, and a reply dated September 27, 1971, was as follows:

Your letter to Clifton A. Moore, General Manager, Department of Airports, concerning the land acquisition program has been referred to this office for reply. Historically Los Angeles International was master planned in 1944 to operate with two sets of parallel runways. The southerly runway system was in operation, and the northerly system was proposed for further development and expansion. In 1953 the undeveloped portion of the airport was posted with signs which read:

LOS ANGELES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

THIS PROPERTY TO BE DEVELOPED FOR AIRPORT PURPOSES INCLUDING RUNWAYS AND MAINTENANCE
FACILITIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH MASTER PLAN ADOPTED
BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES—JULY, 1944

Despite the posting, the adjacent areas were subdivided and developed. It is unfortunate that at this time the airport did not have sufficient revenues to purchase this land. As we had no jurisdiction over the land, it was impossible to halt the home building without fair compensation for the land. With the growth during the 1960's, it became necessary to activate the north runway system.

The first acquisition began in 1965 for 379 parcels in the west approach zone. This project was completed in 1965. The next acquisition project was in East Westchester for an east approach zone to the north runways; followed by the acquisition of homes lying between the south and north approach zones, known as the Playa del Rey "Island"; and finally, the homes parallel to the north boundary of the airport. Enclosed you will find a summary sheet recapping the various projects and a map to assist you in identifying the various areas.

That department's project of land acquisition proposed on January 8, 1971, was to cost the City of Los Angeles about $70 000 000, and was to be spread from 1965 to 1970. More than $70 000 000 was to be paid in acquiring parcels of land and properties surrounding that airport. No-one could justify a similar acquisition near Adelaide Airport.

Mr. Evans: Would the cost be the same?

Mr. BECKER: No, it would be higher. I will give examples, if the honourable member wants to know. The average cost per acre of land in the Playa del Rey area was $267 000, and on completion the average parcel of land cost $46 000. In other words, that is $46 000 for what we call a block of land. An average residential property at West Beach would be valued at much more than $46 000. On Playa del Rey Island, the average cost per acre of land was $206 000, or $55 000 for an average parcel of land. One should consider that one could not buy a house in, say, the Fulham Gardens or Novar Gardens area for less than that. Indeed, one would not get the member for Morphett's house, let alone mine, for which I did not pay much, anyway.

I refer now to the East Westchester area, where the average cost per acre of land was $163 700, which brings down the average price for a block of land to $29 000. The Housing Trust has built houses at Novar Gardens only 18 months ago, and they sold for $28 000 to $29 000, well below current market values. When those properties were valued for land tax and other purposes, the values were set at about $35 000.

In West Westchester, the average cost per acre of land was $208 000, or about $35 000 for each parcel of land. That would be nowhere near comparable with values in the North Glenelg area, for example, where properties would sell for between $32 000 and $45 000. Of course, coming across towards the beach, one pays up to $80 000 or $90 000 for properties. Swinging around towards, say, Plympton North and Netley, one finds that there would be no comparison regarding values as properties there would sell for between, say, $45 000, $50 000, and $60 000. Many properties in my district and that of the member for Morphett would sell for more than $70 000. So, economically, it is just not on.

Under the plan to which I have referred, 2 200 properties were acquired and, if we wanted to put similar buffer zones, and so on, around and extend runways at Adelaide Airport the cost would be greater, about $100 000 000. We could build a new international airport, at, say, Dublin for considerably less than that. In most countries of the world, Governments use their airforce bases for international airports. So, it would not be beyond the realms of possibility for Edinburgh to be converted to an international airport. However, I believe that the authorities have left their run too late, because there would not be a sufficient buffer zone surrounding that air base now. Certainly, I would not advocate such a scheme now; it is too late.

These are the problems that are associated with Adelaide Airport. I am disappointed that Mr. Joselin was not aware of all the facts. I refer, for instance, to the involvement of residents, and to several of the public meetings that were held some years ago, which were indeed well attended. The first meeting that I called with only 48 hours notice was attended by 500 people. It was a spontaneous reaction, which was completely overwhelming. Other meetings organised by the Anti-Airport Noise Association attracted between 700 and 900 people. All local members of Parliament were involved. As I am awaiting information from Canberra regarding the joint

committee report, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I move:

> That this House commend the Federal Government for its sound economic policy which has markedly reduced inflation and established the conditions for economic recovery.

The results of the recent Federal election are now history. I refer to that election as such because it was the last election that we had in 1977. At the rate at which elections have been held during the past few years, one never knows when the people of Australia will be given the opportunity to elect either a Federal or a State Government. When that situation obtains in a country such as Australia, where we have experienced problems throughout our history, indeed since the foundation of this nation, it behoves political Parties and politicians to ensure that the stability of the country is always based on a sound economic footing. However, this cannot happen when political Parties force Governments to the polls every so often, or when Governments chop and change or cling to office by a slender thread.

It is a known fact on the international monetary scene that international bankers and economists observe and study a country and, when there is instability regarding its Government, their confidence in that country's Government suffers. It is important that Australia has always had a strong flow of international finance to prop up investment here as well as to assist our development and growth.

With the situation that we experienced between 1972 and 1975, it was only fair that everyone should be critical of those who were responsible for the policies of the then Federal Government and that they should wish to ensure that this did not happen again. How that Whitlam Labor Government ever fell for the three-card trick and allowed that situation to occur is beyond me. Regrettably, Australia will suffer for many years because of it.

During the Federal election, many statements and challenges were made regarding the current inflation rate. All sorts of "guesstimates" were being made by various economic experts. This motion was drafted before the Federal election was held. It proves, fortunately, that I was correct in saying that the Liberal Party would win that election, and that what I forecast and had in the back of my mind when I asked for my colleagues' approval to place this motion on the Notice Paper was correct; that inflation was falling and that the policies of the Fraser Government were working extremely well. I was waiting to hear the interjection, "Look at the thousands of unemployed people."

Mr. Slater: They don't matter much!

Mr. BECKER: They matter very much to me. I have been involved in industrial affairs for many years, as have many members opposite. I should have thought that they would know by now that we should not price our mates out of a job, but that does not worry some union officials. The weak will get weaker and the strong will get stronger. It applies in many trade unions as well as in other organisations, and that is where the unions have failed this country. The worker knows, because he has to suffer, go without, and lower his standard of living. He has to do all the really hard work and experience all the difficulties, whilst others sit behind desks, take it easy, and dictate policies and attitudes.

Much of the blame for the problems of this country can be placed at the door of the directorships and boards of companies, too. There are too many fat men sitting up top and not realising the problems. Too many businessmen's lunches go on for about half a day and too many persons are working three days a week on executive salaries. I know that that is a fact of life. I have had to read more balance sheets than members opposite have had to do. I have had to assess company and individual balance sheets, because I have had to assess the standards of living and habits of people to determine whether I should lend money to them. I knew the habits of my customers, and I suppose they knew my habits. As soon as I lent people money, they would want to take me out to lunch.

In congratulating the Federal Government on reducing and combating inflation in this country, I say that I think it is important to realise that the primary objective of the Fraser Government when it came to office in December, 1975, was to repair the damage that had been done to the economy in previous years and create a stable economic climate conducive to steady and permanent economic growth. That is the vital part of the future of Australia.

To achieve this objective, the Fraser Government adopted a comprehensive economic strategy, and its disciplined adherence to that strategy is now paying off. As I have said, I do not support the statements that that has contributed to high unemployment. The keynote is that, if people do not have confidence in their country, if we cannot attract investment, industry goes down. The migration policy was slashed. In some respects, I have much admiration for Clyde Cameron. However, I think the biggest mistake he made was in reducing the migration intake by half. He did it believing that he was protecting the jobs of workers here, and I admire him for this, but that reduced our opportunity for growth. I have always believed (and I believe it as much as the Minister for Planning does) that the migration programme should be stepped up.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Speak to Senator MacKellar about it.

Mr. BECKER: I have done that. I had better not say what Michael told me, but the problem facing him is that there are about 6 000 000 refugees in the world. Irrespective of who is in office in the Federal sphere at present and irrespective of who is governing many other countries in the Western world, what are we going to do about the 6 000 000 refugees who have nowhere to go?

The inflation rate is now down to 9·3 per cent on an annual basis, about half the inflation rate of 17 per cent in 1974-75 under the Labor Government. I think I have read that the rate was 18 per cent or 19 per cent, but I could never work it out as being that high. I know that the Premier stated before an election in Tasmania that the rate would get to 30 per cent, but he stated later that he might have been wide of the mark in that. I should have thought his economic division would have advised him better regarding that matter.

To me, statements about 30 per cent inflation and 1 000 000 people unemployed prove that the Premier's credibility is slipping. The inflation rate is continuing to fall further in each successive quarter. The latest rate is the lowest annual rate that we have had since 1972-73. Therefore, I believe that the Federal Government deserves recognition for its fine effort in this regard. When the Fraser Government took office, it inherited a Budget deficit of $4 500 000 000. This has been slashed by more than $2 000 000 000.

In 1976-77, the deficit was down to $2 740 000 000 and the expected deficit in 1977-78 is $2 217 000 000. Government spending increased by a massive 46 per cent

in 1974-75 and by a further 23 per cent in 1975-76. That is about 69 per cent in those two financial years. The present Federal Government's restraint in spending has had a significant effect in reducing the rate of inflation down to single-digit figures, without affecting essential programmes.

Apart from the huge deficit under Labor, there was a wage explosion which further fuelled inflation. In 1974 alone, wages increased by 28 per cent, pricing people out of jobs. This put the young and unskilled worker at a particular disadvantage. Of course, the others disadvantaged and discriminated against were the handicapped. Anyone who has a slight handicap now (let alone a totally handicapped person) is finding it extremely difficult to get employment, and this and all other Governments must solve that problem quickly. We know the severe effects of the workmen's compensation legislation in this State, and employers are taking on only workers who are 100 per cent fit. If a person has any slight trace of illness or disability, that person has a real problem in finding employment.

If the Government is successful in keeping wages down in the next year, inflation will fall further and more quickly. The 17 per cent inflation rate under Labor, caused by excessive growth in the money supply and excessive wage increases, did much harm and affected every Australian. New investments stopped. The mining industry and oil exploration ground to a halt and business closed down. Australian goods became less competitive here and overseas, and we began to export jobs instead of goods.

It is certainly encouraging to see that our economy is now pulling out of the mess created by the three years of Whitlam and to see that prosperity is being restored. It is a victory for the Fraser Government that inflation is now down to single-digit rates, that confidence within the private sector is being restored, and that people are now spending more, and that the base upon which we can expect accelerated growth has been laid.

As inflation is reduced further—and I am confident that inflation will be reduced to 6 per cent by the end of this calendar year—we will find investments increasing, spilling over into other industries, and generating more employment. It is common knowledge now, even among members of the Labor Party, and it is evident from numerous business surveys that confidence is growing with the Fraser Government's economic policies. This is an essential ingredient for job expansion because, until businessmen have the confidence to invest, jobs cannot be created. Simply injecting more public money into the economy to support jobs is not the answer. The real force lies with the private sector. This is where the jobs will be permanent, and therefore meaningful.

I think this is beginning to be understood by all; in fact, it was clearly expressed by the last Labor Treasurer, when he said:

> We are no longer operating in that simple Keynesian world in which some reduction in unemployment could apparently always be purchased at the cost of some more inflation. Today, it is inflation itself which is the central policy problem. More inflation simply leads to more unemployment.

I think it might be the best way to ensure that this will continue and that the economic problems of Australia will be overcome with concerted effort not only on the part of the Federal Government, but on the part of State Governments as well. As I am waiting for further information from the Treasury in Canberra, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

> That in the opinion of the House the provisions of paragraph *(c)* of section 83 of the Constitution Act unduly inhibit the Electoral Commission in making an electoral distribution and accordingly these provisions should be repealed.

Paragraph *(c)* of section 83 of the Constitution Act states:

> *(c)* the desirability of leaving undisturbed as far as practicable and consistent with the principles on which the redistribution is to be made, the boundaries of existing elecoral districts;

Clearly, in my opinion, that provision was included in the Act for two reasons; one was to endeavour not to disturb the electoral boundaries any more than was necessary, so that citizens on different occasions do not find themselves in different electoral districts; another was to protect certain sitting members. If one were to examine the electoral districts which were in force before the recent electoral redistribution, and if one were to study the terms of the redistribution, it would become clear that many Labor districts would not be affected by the redistribution. A study of the other terms of reference given to the Commissioners makes it obvious that such a provision would allow the Labor Party to have a distinct advantage when the boundaries were drawn.

If we are to have a system of electoral distribution that is fair (and also appears to be fair), this provision should not apply. When the Commissioners redraw the boundaries, they should redraw all the boundaries. Under the present distribution, some of the boundaries are quite ridiculous. In my own district, for example, the Commissioners could not have drawn the boundaries in any way that would have made it more difficult for me to represent the people. I do not blame the Commissioners, but the constraints placed on them by the terms under which they operated.

As you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from your knowledge of the area, the boundaries could have been better redrawn in other parts of the State. In Mallee, for instance, the boundaries could have been drawn in such a way as to make far easier the job of the local member in representing the people, without in any way affecting the political situation within that district, if the Commissioners believed it desirable to draw the boundaries to reflect the political views currently apparent in such districts.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's not what they do.

Mr. GUNN: Does the Minister really believe that the Commissioners do not know, after they have drawn the boundaries, what the decision of the people living within those boundaries will be? I am surprised that the Minister should display to the House that he is so naive. I do not believe him, and I do not think he would expect any other member to believe him. One has only to look for 10 minutes at the most recent redistribution to tell what the result of an election in certain districts will be. If the Minister is concerned to make sure that boundaries are fairly drawn and that no undue restraint is placed on the Commissioners, this section should not be in the Act.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Why give them any terms of reference?

Mr. GUNN: I entirely agree. In my view, few terms of reference are needed. If we are to have one vote one value, if we are to have 47 or 56 seats, the Commissioners should be told that we will have a certain number of seats in Parliament and that they should consider the community of interest, making the seats as reasonable as possible for the local member to represent.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Why should community of interest be an overriding principle over existing bound-

aries?

Mr. GUNN: I am not supposed to answer the interjection. I know the Minister was one of the people involved in drawing up the terms of reference, because he had looked at what the results would be before the terms of reference were put to this House. Does he really believe that the existing boundaries in South Australia allow people in all seats to have the same access to their local members as do the people he or the honourable member for Ross Smith, for instance, represents? As long as this section remains in the Act, people in all districts will not have equal opportunities of access to their local members. Many of the boundaries were drawn years ago and have been carried on over the years.

I do not believe the present provision is in the interests of the people of South Australia and it is certainly not in the spirit of one vote one value or of fairness and justice in electoral matters. Over the next few months I hope to discuss many matters of electoral concern, because I have strong views about the Constitution Act and the Electoral Act. I am not talking of gerrymanders or schemes to benefit one group against another. I want to see the best system, and I do not believe that this section is fair or just. I ask members to support the motion, and the Government to take appropriate action. It is a simple matter with serious implications relating to the manner in which the Commissioners draw the boundaries. I suggest that the Minister of Education should look again at the boundaries, especially in the districts I have mentioned. He would see how easy it could have been for the member and the people concerned if ony one to two minor variations had been made, but the Commissioners could not do that becuase of the unworkable terms of reference. I commend the motion to honourable members.

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

ELECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of the House the South Australian Constitution Act should be amended to allow people who wish to appeal against the findings of the Electoral Commissioners to lodge an appeal with the commissioners and that the commissioners shall take into consideration any such appeals before making their final judgment in relation to redistribution of electoral boundaries.

The current position in relation to appeals against the initial decision of the Electoral Commissioners is, in my opinion, unfair and unjust. This system has been designed to deny the average citizen in this State the right to have his objections heard. How many citizens of this State can or will avail themselves of the opportunity to go before the Supreme Court?

Why is it that, in relation to an appeal against the Commonwealth electoral redistribution, an ordinary citizen can make a written appeal to the commissioners, or he can appeal in person to the commissioners, which would appear to any reasonable person to be the proper course of action in relation to an appeal against the decision of the commissioners. Why did the Government embark on this course of action when it introduced amendments to the Constitution Act?

The Government has not properly thought through the matter. In the past few weeks we have heard much from the Premier and others that we have a Government that wants to be accountable to the people (it must on all occasions be accountable), yet it has taken a course of action that has taken out of the hands of the average citizen the right to have his opinion heard by the people drawing the boundaries that will certainly affect not only individuals but also the political direction of South Australia.

If it is good enough in other States to have such a provision, and if it is good enough in the Commonwealth (and for the past 50 or 60 years in this State it has been good enough to have such a provision under which people can personally appeal to the commissioners), why has that situation now suddenly been found to be unworkable? The Government has not properly seen through its decision in this matter. The provisions to which I refer are contained in section 80 of the Constitution Act, which details the methods that people can adopt to lodge an appeal. Obviously, that provision has been written in such a way as to make it impossible for the average citizen, unless he is in receipt of large financial assistance, to afford to employ the services of a solicitor (probably a Queens Council) to make such an appeal?

Not only is it undemocratic—it appears to be undemocratic. I sincerely hope that on this occasion the Government will take up this matter that I have brought to its attention. As I have just indicated, this is only one of several matters regarding electoral boundaries that I intend to bring to the attention of the House. Indeed, for too long political Parties have looked at electoral matters having only one thing in mind—what advantage they will gain from the action they take. They have not considered how their decisions will affect individual groups of electors or the people generally in this State.

True, it is natural to seek advantage, but we have reached a stage in discussing electoral matters where we should give the average citizen the right to have a say about the decisions of the commissioners, especially when the average citizen has no say in those decisions. These decisions will have some effect on the lifestyle of people for many years to come. I commend the motion to honourable members, hoping that it will receive their support.

Mr. BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 7. Page 1267.)

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): This short Bill deals with a controversial matter. Section 82a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act deals with the medical termination of pregnancy or, in less technical terms, abortion. The existing provisions in the Act have been operating since 1969, at which time the matter was widely debated. It was then dealt with as a matter of conscience and, certainly, that is the way in which it is presented and in which it will be dealt with on this occasion as well. This short Bill has only one substantive provision, which deals with the requirement that the superintendent or manager of any hospital shall give to the Director-General of Medical Services notice of any termination of pregnancy, and notice of the treatment of a woman in that hospital for any prescribed complication resulting from the termination of that pregnancy.

Regulations may be prescribed to set out the manner and the period of time in which these notifications shall be reported. In his second reading explanation the Deputy Leader said that he did not intend to canvass the wider debate that obviously still continues in the community regarding the South Australian abortion law. Certainly, he did not do so and I do not intend to do so, either, because the Bill does not treat with the key section 82a. The broad

issues and principles embodied in that section are not affected.

The Bill seeks to ensure that information on which public debate can take place over the question of medical termination of pregnancy shall be on as informed a basis as possible. The Deputy Leader quoted from the Mallen committee reports over the past three years, and reference was also made to the Nicholson committee, which reported to the Government on the development of obstetrics and gynaecology and related resources in South Australia.

The Mallen committee has referred to the fact that it is not completely satisfied that all medical terminations of pregnancy under the Act are being notified.

Further, that committee is not satisfied that all complications following procedures for medical termination of pregnancy are being recorded and described adequately. Hitherto, such recommendations have not been taken up formally, and the Bill seeks to do something about that particular recommendation. While the precise wording of the provisions and one or two ancillary matters should be examined carefully, it would seem to me (certainly at this stage) that whether one supports the *status quo*, whether one opposes it and believes that there should be greater restrictions on the availability of medical termination of pregnancy, or, alternatively, whether one believes the section does not go far enough and that there should be far greater freedom of decision for pregnant women and medical practitioners in deciding whether or not to terminate, it is unarguable that debate should take place on the fullest information and facts available. Therefore, I think that, on the face of it, the Bill is one that I certainly would be willing to support.

I am concerned that any figures which are published resulting from these notifications are recorded systematically and adequately, and I think that, under the section, regulations would be made to ensure that this was done. There may also be some concern that the details which are given should adequately protect the confidentiality of the individuals who are the subject of these details. Again, this can be done by regulation. These are matters that could perhaps be commented on and examined in the course of this debate. If one considers the drafting of the Bill and its intention, as stated by the mover, based on the recommendations of the expert committees that oversee this area, one can only agree that the amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to prescribe that there shall be notification both of terminations and of complications arising from terminations is something that will aid the debate on this matter, and should be supported.

Mrs. ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Abbott:

That this House note that the Commonwealth Education Commissions have a charter to examine the needs of education in Australia and make appropriate recommendations to the Federal Government for the funding of Government and non-government schools and other educational institutions in the States and Territories.

Accordingly, the House deplore the recent decision of the Commonwealth Government whereby specific and very restrictive guidelines have been given to the commissions. A clear undertaking that payments for recurrent costs to schools and universities would in this financial year be escalated by 2 per cent in real terms has been repudiated and there is to be no indexation of capital costs for any of the education sectors.

This House therefore calls upon the Commonwealth Government to restore growth to education funding and to withdraw the guidelines recently given to the commissions.

(Continued from December 7. Page 1273.)

Mr. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): To recap briefly on what I was saying when this debate was previously adjourned, and I sought leave to continue my remarks, I said that I could in no way support the motion. It is patently obvious that my Party and I could in no way support it. I believe that one outstanding feature of the Government's pre-election raising of this issue lies in the fact that not only the Opposition rejected the motion but the electorate generally throughout Australia also rejected it. According to the Australian Labor Party, this was an important integral part of pre-electioneering, and the fact that the Federal Government was returned with its second largest majority is a strong indication that our confidence in what the Federal Government has been doing has been sustained by the people.

The motion ignores certain aspects of the Commonwealth Education Commission's charter; it also implies that Government should have a blind acceptance of any recommendations brought to it by any commissions it appoints. That is not the position at all. Commissions are there to make recommendations, but certainly not to dictate to Governments, and that point was made clearly by the Premier yesterday when he implied that no organisation or individual should be able to dictate to Governments. The commission's report was not accepted in its entirety.

Part of the motion states that the House deplores the Commonwealth Government's recent decision to change the guidelines, but significantly the Schools Commission itself did not comment adversely on the Government's action in spending $566 000 000 out of the total recommended by the commission of $571 000 000. In other words, there is a quibble over a matter of $5 000 000. This, of course, was the recommendation made by the Government to the commission to make special allowances to the non-government schools. This motion was not under discussion at the time the member for Newland made his maiden speech but he, too, referred specifically to many of the issues included in the motion. He, too, like the mover, completely ignored the fact that, although there had been some cuts in the May, 1975, funding under the Whitlam Government, it was Whitlam himself who cut $105 000 000 in September, 1975, recognising that Australia was well and truly on its knees: the Liberal Government inherited a massive deficit.

Both members also ignored the fact that South Australia's financial management would have been thrown into some panic because, this year, for the first time in many years (and we are the only State that is doing it), we have budgeted for a deficit. So, one can understand the Government's concern at cuts, or apparent cuts, of any nature that might further embarrass it, especially when one considers that our country rail service has been sold and the money spent (and this was additional income to which no other Australian State had access). There having been massive spending in South Australia, one has to question where all that money has gone.

There is a substantial expenditure in the current term of State unemployment relief money. I believe that the Premier quoted $35 000 000 over between two years and 2½ years. Perhaps some of that relief money might have been lobbied for by the Minister of Education toward unemployed teachers, for whom we are all expressing

considerable concern. Be that as it may, the facts and statistics quoted by the mover of the motion and by the member for Newland completely omitted some salient points that are very much in favour of the way in which the Commonwealth Government has administered the country over the past two or three years. Of course, the Commonwealth Government has aimed to reduce the massive deficit that existed when the Whitlam Government left office. There was a state of bankruptcy. Any company in anywhere near such dire straits would have been out of business long before. In those days we were moving toward a state of galloping inflation, which would have led to anarchy. Anyone who has read Dr. Cairns's book *Quiet Revolution* will realise that that was well and truly on the cards in 1975.

The motion leaves much to be desired. The member for Newland raised the issue of Government schools v. non-government schools. I dealt with this question last session, and I will not raise it again in those particular terms. There is some indication that by expanding the sum put into education one will improve the quality of education. That sort of argument does not hold water, either. There is absolutely no guarantee that, if extra money is spent, there will be extra quality. It is significant that the Minister himself has said that there was no evidence at all that education today is any worse than it was 20 years or 30 years ago. When one considers that we are now spending billions of dollars more on education, hundreds of per cent more per student on education, one would surely look not for parity but for a vast improvement in standards; no-one can say that we have that. Therefore, to ask for an increase in funding is not necessarily to guarantee that we will get an increase in the quality of education.

I have repeated time and time again that I believe that the most important part of education is teacher-student rapport. I have seen excellent rapport in the tattiest of buildings. Further, I have seen excellent teaching of large classes in poor circumstances. The quality and calibre of staffing, coupled with a steady reduction in class sizes, so that we can have a better teacher-student ratio, are part and parcel of the answer that we are looking for.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: You are not advocating giant monoliths?

Mr. ALLISON: We do not have to build giant monoliths; that is a side issue which I will deal with later. Much can be done with the present funding. There are many substandard buildings in South Australian schools; no-one will deny that. However, teachers are a most important part of education. If we can guarantee the quality of staffing we have gone a long way in solving many problems in education. I mean the personal calibre of teachers as well as what is imparted to them in colleges. There is a swing of the pendulum toward old-fashioned normality—toward conservatism in education. Parents are demanding it. That was patently obvious from groups I addressed during the State and Federal election campaigns. I hope the message has got through to the Minister and to Education Department officials. Certainly I have done my best to convey my impressions to them. I think Senator Carrick defended himself admirably, because he showed considerable bravery in saying long before the Budget was announced what he would do, giving every State the chance to complain and giving parents the chance to come along. He gave plenty of notice; he was not backward in coming forward. His own portfolio was one of the portfolios which had the least cut, at a time when every Ministry was being asked to cut back. So, he did not do such a bad job in defending his portfolio. State Ministers could emulate him when they are bargaining in connection with State Budgets. I will have more to say on this issue.

The extra $75 000 000 which South Australia received under Federal funding which was ignored on the other side is too big a sum to be hidden under the carpet. The South Australian Institute of Teachers is demanding its slice, as I suggested it should before the Federal election. The additional Federal funding highlights the fact that, when one blames a Government for ostensibly making cuts in education, one should look at the duality of the funding structure—the fact that there are Federal education grants on the one hand and money which is given to the States on the other hand for the States to decide their priorities. This is where every Minister and back-bencher ought to lobby strongly to ensure that he gets some of the funding.

When the Premier came away from the last Premiers' Conference when these matters were being discussed he said that he was reasonably happy with the way things had gone. Presumably the Premier, with his priorities in mind, thought he would be able to meet the most urgent needs in South Australia. Whether education was high on his priority list is another matter.

I refer now to what seemed to be almost hatred on the part of an honourable member; I thought it was a little tongue in cheek, because it was a little too vitriolic for his comments to be real. I refer to his comments on the sum being allocated from the State funding area to the non-government schools area. I commented that the Schools Commission is able to find fault with only a small proportion of the Government's recommendations regarding its total Budget of $571 000 000. The honourable member sought to make the Government a whipping boy by using the Schools Commission. Of course, the commission did not itself do that.

I refer to table B8 of the Schools Commission report, which showed that the total State allocations for recurrent expenditure on education for 1975-76 were $1 967 200 000. In 1976-77, the figure was $2 241 500 000. If that maintenance factor increase, which is 28·4 per cent of the total 1975-76 Budget, had been maintained (I say "maintained" and only "maintained") in 1976-77, the education allocation for recurrent expenditure in 1976-77 would have been only $2 166 500 000. So, it is clear that, through the new federalism funding, the States themselves were able to increase their education spending in 1976-77 by $75 000 000 in excess of that "maintenance of effort" principle.

The member for Newland allocated all the credit for increased spending on education in South Australia to the State Government. In fact, the Federal funding and the increase in money which the Government could allocate completely at will were largely responsible for that increase in State spending on education. The main point behind this is that, when anyone quibbles over the transfer on the Schools Commission's recommendation of a mere $5 000 000 from State funds to non-government school funds, obviously it is a very petty issue. State Governments are able to spend $75 000 000 more on State schools than they had in the preceding year, yet we are quibbling over $5 000 000 which has gone towards the non-government schools.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: A principle is involved, though, isn't there?

Mr. ALLISON: A principle is involved as far as the non-Government school people are concerned. I have the job of listening to the Institute of Teachers and to the Australian Parents Council. I try to get a balanced point of view and not to represent the Government for the Government's point of view. The Institute of Teachers seems to have softened its approach over the past three months following the Federal election, which was quite

decisive.

We make three main points. The Government feels that the Opposition is accusing it of favouring non-Government schools and of neglecting State schools. The Opposition in Canberra is also saying that the Federal Government is taking from the needy and giving to the rich and that it is destroying the independence of the Schools Commission. The latter point has already been dealt with; quite simply, the Schools Commission can recommend the spending of $571 000 000, and having only $5 000 000 of that questioned is hardly destroying independence of the Schools Commission. In any case, the commisioners came up very sharply showing that their independence had not been removed and they proceeded to criticise the Federal Minister, who then had to answer as best he could. I will deal with that answer in a short while.

We have heard that there is discrimination against the State schools, but what does the Australian Parents Council say? It feels that it has rights, too. Its point of view seems to have been heard before the Federal elections in 1977. It says that it is the right of all parents and children to expect parity in distribution of Government funds for education.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Parity in standards, that is.

Mr. ALLISON: I will get to what Whitlam did in a moment. It is the right of parents to choose the type of school they feel best suits their children without financial penalties being imposed on them by Governments because of that. It is the duty of Governments to ensure first that these rights can be exercised by all citizens, and secondly, that the availability of general options in a free and plurastic society is there for people to make the choice. I think the Duke of Edinburgh put the comment when he was here several years ago that it would be a darn shame if we tried to put the rubber stamp of State scholarship on every single student.

Mr. Klunder: Are you talking about the quality of it?

Mr. ALLISON: He did not say it in exactly those terms, but he did say "rubber stamp". "Rubber stamp" in South Australia means a State one. One cannot say that the Opposition is going to rubber stamp anything, because it is not in power. He said that we should not put the rubber stamp on children but that we should give them a choice. If one chooses to send one's children to a State school (and I do not know whether the Premier and other Government members did that, but I chose to do so), one should be given the right of choice. Let us not forget that it was Mr. Whitlam who committed the Federal Government to a 20 per cent grant to all schools. It was an across-the-board amount to all non-government schools. I ask honourable members to keep that figure in mind, because I will refer to it later with some figures that they may find interesting. The Australian Parents Council believed, before the Federal election, that discrimination existed against parents of children who chose non-government schools. That council made three points, the first being while Government school children receive a full, basic, per capita grant from the Australian Government for the necessities of education, children in non-government schools do not: they receive varying proportions of that amount.

Secondly, the parents say that non-government school parents bear a double financial burden because, like other citizens in Australia, they contribute through taxation to the education budget and then again by way of school fees, simply because they exercise their right of choice in non-government schools. Let us not forget that not all people who send their children to non-government schools are in the wealthy class. I inspected a school in my district recently which shows signs of wear and tear. It is a non-Government school. The parents associated with the school are not affluent and would welcome an increase in funding, whether from State or Federal resources. I have taken up this matter with the Minister, in any case.

Thirdly, the parents say that their right of choice is further threatened by the failure of Governments to give sufficient money to obtain arbitrary schooling targets set by the Commonwealth advisory body, the Schools Commission. They were critical of what was happening at Schools Commission level. They would surely have welcomed what came out of the Government's recommendations. They also say that only non-government school parents are asked to maintain and increase their financial contribution by sending children to schools of their own choice. Lastly, only non-government school children are even categorised into various levels of work for society's support of their education.

Mr. Klunder: There are different grades.

Mr. ALLISON: I know that there are different grades. I am quoting what the parents have said. We know that those points can be taken and analysed and that there are different bases for spending money. Let us not forget (and I pointed this out last time I spoke) that, if all the non-government schools had to close because they became bankrupt, there is no way the State or Federal Government would get out of this by spending less money than they are spending now; it would be a more costly operation. If honourable members look at the statistics I gave (they are recorded in *Hansard* so I will not go through them again) they will see that, if every school student were to transfer to a State school, it would cost more and there would be a problem simply to accommodate them, because the properties need not necessarily pass to the Government if the schools went out of business.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Just an apology for pelf and privilege.

Mr. ALLISON: I am quoting from the Australian Parents' Council and if the Chief Secretary says that is an apology for wealth and privilege—

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Pelf.

Mr. ALLISON: Pelf is wealth: I translated from the Anglo-Saxon accurately. I am Anglo-Saxon and often use four-letter words. "Love" is a four-letter word, but there is not much love between the member for Newland and the non-government schools, from the message he gave us.

Mr. Klunder: Some schools.

Mr. ALLISON: Some non-government schools; shall we say he was selective? I am trying not to be. I am trying to be calm, cool and rational and to analyse the situation. In the first term of 1977 the Australian Parents' Council President, Dr. Des Dineen, a respected South Australian, gave the reasons behind the lobby.

I suppose the document from which I have just read was part of the lobby, although it was a much later document. It summarised what he said, and among the points he made was the following:

> We have seen change occur over the last decade and this voice [and that is the Australian Parents' Council voice] has materially created much of this change.

That council has had to work hard for the change that has occurred. Let us not forget that it influenced Mr. Whitlam, the previous Prime Minister. He listened to the Australian Parents' Council. He continued:

> There are pressing immediate goals to be achieved. The implementation by the present Government [Fraser Government] of its election policies on educational funding is overdue.

From that pressing recommendation by Dr. Dineen came

the recommendation that the Schools Commission take only $5 000 000 out of $571 000 000 public spending and redirect it. Dr. Dineen continued:

> We have waited long enough for the re-establishment of the enshrinement in legislation of a basic per pupil grant to all children in non-government schools. In 1972, this was 20 per cent of the average cost of educating a child in Government schools. Are we to accept any less now?

Is there anything wrong in asking the Federal Liberal Government to do what the Federal Labor Government has been praised for doing by the member for Newland by implication, when he expressed the decline since Whitlam has gone? He did not express the decline at $105 000 000 while Whitlam was still there. He maintained that taxation legislation (there has been a change in taxation structure) with its punitive effect on parents of children in non-government schools has had a scandalous effect on the disposable income of all socio-economic groups. This has had an insidious effect on the maintenance of effort by fee-paying parents, and that has created an area of urgent and serious concern. While some members on the Government benches accuse people who send their students to private schools of having pelf, plenty of money, so many people who send their children to private schools do not come into the wealthy class. They make considerable sacrifices to send their children to schools to get an education they think is necessary for them. Whether or not members opposite agree with that, they surely have a right of choice, which devolves not only upon that type of person but also on the students, too; and not only students in schools but students in colleges and universities, and I will try to extend the argument to show what a sane, rational man I am instead of being singularly selective in my criticism.

Mr. Venning: Charlie Wells went to P.A.C.

Mr. ALLISON: He is none the worse for that. The member for Ross Smith and plenty of members opposite claim excellent scholarship from having attended non-government schools and I suppose their parents would have supported my present arguments—at least, I hope they would because they would be hypocritical if they did not.

Mr. Bannon: Nonsense! Because they are good schools, that doesn't mean they should get State support.

Mr. ALLISON: That is the weirdest argument, that you are ready to finance a student to go to any school, to some extent, and yet if someone elects not to go to a State school but to go somewhere else, then the Federal Government should not provide any money to supply that education; and yet these people are still paying taxes. That is the implication.

Mr. Max Brown: Where do you get that information from? The Labor Party has given more money to private schools than ever the Liberal Party did.

Mr. ALLISON: Then why are members opposite criticising Senator Carrick for doing the same? The honourable member has just made his longest speech this year, by way of interjection.

The SPEAKER: Order! That remark is not in order.

Mr. Bannon: We are opposed to A-class schools getting special treatment.

Mr. ALLISON: We shall show members opposite the structure, of how there is a decline in funding, and it is a Whitlam figure, not a Carrick figure—20 per cent. I wonder how David Combe, the Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, who was the captain of P.A.C., would view this argument.

Mr. Keneally: What is your policy?

Mr. ALLISON: I stated my policy on the same platform as Senator Carrick and the Minister of Education in South Australia at Cabra Convent at pre-election time. If the honourable member was not there, he missed a treat.

Mr. Keneally: Didn't they let you speak?

Mr. ALLISON: Let me say that I got back and so did the Liberal Government, much to the honourable member's surprise on both counts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. I hope the member for Mount Gambier will address the Chair.

Mr. ALLISON: So, attempts have been made by members on the Government benches to suggest that substantial cuts would occur in Federal funding to State Governments in 1978.

Senator Carrick has maintained that there was substantial capacity for real growth. He was ridiculed by members of the Australian Teachers Federation for saying that. They, too, like members opposite forgot the duality of funding. The Federal Government has given large sums of money to the States, which have to fix their own priorities. The Teachers Federation is well and truly aware of it because it is lobbying far more strongly at State than at Federal level for additional funds for teachers. John Gregory, President of the Institute of Teachers, was hoping yesterday that the State Government would come forward with money to employ those 1 400 teachers who are apparently surplus to State needs but who could be employed, and he felt there was some need to change the teacher-student ratio in primary schools. That would be one step forward, but how much the Government is prepared to spend we do not know, because I understand that for every 100 teachers it will cost us about $1 000 000, and of course the priorities and the amount of money in the Budget have to be weighed. I ask the Government to do that wisely. I understand the problems that any Government has in maintaining a balance. It is possible that not all of the 1 400 teachers are of the same calibre and quality. In any community, we cannot expect everyone to be equally worthy of appointment to a particular job. There has to be some discrimination, obviously, just by sheer selection on merit. One assumes that parents are looking for quality in education; but, even so, many of those teachers could be employed.

So where do these suggestions lie that the Federal Government has substantially reduced funding? We have already dealt with the Schools Commission side of things ($5 000 000) but the Commonwealth Government announced its decision to increase its grants to non-government schools by about $13 000 000 in 1978, while holding its total schools expenditure programme virtually constant. There was not really the threat of cuts; it was scare-mongering for the Federal election, as this motion was, too.

Mr. Klunder: But there are more students now.

Mr. ALLISON: Yes; they are staying on in school because of the employment situation.

Mr. Klunder: Would you agree that there have been cuts per capita?

Mr. ALLISON: I have not examined the figures yet; I can give the figures I have. The honourable member ignores the fact that, had the Whitlam Government been in power, inflation, which was roaring away, would have been about 25 per cent; it is now 9 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has the floor.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: Why don't you make it 75 per cent?

Mr. ALLISON: I was following Cairns's statement, and Cairns was, after all, the Treasurer. There was a rapid

succession of Treasurers. In his book *Quiet Revolution* he hinted at the situation.

The point that has been missed is the fact that, while the Federal Government is being accused all the time of being discriminatory and of possibly cutting expenditure on education, who is responsible for by far the largest proportion of spending in education? No Government member has leapt up and shouted, "We are," but we have to pay 85 per cent, which means having 85 per cent of the responsibility and the other 15 per cent is a small amount. If you cut that 15 per cent, the reduction is not nearly as much as the 85 per cent. This is another case in which Government members misrepresent statistics and completely ignore the fact that the State Government is responsible for 85 per cent of funding in education. They made a heck of a play today about potential cuts to that remaining small 15 per cent, and there is no way that they can deny that.

If Government members try to belittle that fact, I have demonstrated that the States have shown an absolute and adequate capacity to increase their spending. Had the spending for 1975-76 been maintained, with a 28·4 maintenance of effort factor built in, they would have spent only $2 166 000 000 in the following year, but they spent $2 241 000 000. The States have clearly demonstrated a capacity to offset any minor cuts in the Federal Government's 15 per cent. The marks are on the board and there is nothing you can do to erase them. The statistical evidence clearly shows that States generally can cope.

More that that, the statistical evidence shows clearly in every State *Hansard* that at Budget time this year most of them could reduce taxation in some way. The Premier has claimed credit for reductions in gift amd stamp duty and fees on transfers of property between spouses, and so on. There has been some remission of taxation, not across the board, because we have had massive increases in other taxation. Other States have been able to come up this year, with the aid of the Federal funding system which is working well, with a balanced Budget, but we have not. We are budgeting for an $18 000 000 deficit, and probably at the bottom of the motion is that we are one of the States having problems.

But are we not having problems right across the education spectrum? I will deal with that point soon, but I suggest there has been massive spending in some parts of education which, if we are in the dire straits that the Minister and Government members suggest, should be examined. Perhaps some controls could be exercised, but this is not in primary, secondary, and non-government school assistance: it is in a different area.

Regarding non-government schools, I have to ask this question: does each Government member disagree with Whitlam's decision to bring up non-government school grants to 20 per cent of the funding per capita for Government school students? If they do, that is the answer to it, but if they do not disagree with what their own socialist Federal Prime Minister did (and no-one said they disagreed when he announced the grants) they should bear the following facts in mind.

In the first year of the Fraser Government it introduced significant new policies for Government and non-government schools. For non-government schools these included renewing the percentage linking of per capita grants to the average cost of students in State schools. It also granted an additional $4 000 000 to Government schools in 1977. Further, it brought up an emerging aid of up to $750 000 to schools in temporary financial difficulty, and this is something that showed the Government's concern for schools for which bankruptcy was imminent. It had capital assistance for non-government boarding schools.

There was an extension of the disadvantaged schools concept to country areas, and a $3 500 000 joint Government and non-government schools scheme was introduced. There was a $1 000 000 joint funding for additional education assistance to children in Government and non-government institutions. A loans guarantee scheme was legislated for. There were advanced offers of building grants to enable projects to be commenced sooner. There was $1 900 000 additional funding to category 6 schools, and there was an increase in per capita grants to all six categories.

This was in the first year of the Fraser Government, when cuts were at their direst in Australia. That showed no lack of concern for education when other portfolios were being hammered. For 1978, the percentage linking of per capita grants is to cost an extra $8 000 000. In addition, in 1978 (and this is what Government members were carping about) there are other schemes. The sum of $3 000 000 has been ear-marked for capital building programmes in new growth areas, and South Australia has its share of those areas.

Also, $2 000 000 is to be applied to levels 1 and 2 schools as an initial step towards restoring that basic 20 per cent funding established in 1972, this being matched by all States except South Australia. I am not complaining that South Australia has chosen to allocate its funds on a needs basis, but the Government should bear in mind that at the Cabra meeting the Liberal Opposition stated that it would escalate its funding for per capita grants across the board for non-government schools much more substantially than the 20 per cent.

Mr. Klunder: You are not complaining: do you think the other States should not complain?

Mr. ALLISON: I am not complaining, because I understand that with this Government's financial administrative pattern it has problems that a Liberal Government would not have. I am being sympathetic to the manner in which the Government administers the funds. However, I wonder where the railways money went to: that is really what I am asking. There is no reason why decisions that favour non-government schools should adversely affect Government schools, because I have said that the Government is 85 per cent responsible for school funding while the Federal Government is 15 per cent responsible.

If you are to carp over trying to redistribute some of the money paid to the Federal Government in taxation, and if you criticise the wealthy for sending children to private schools—

Mrs. Adamson: Not only the wealthy.

Mr. ALLISON: No; this is a specific criticism, but let us not forget that the very wealthy in Australia are in a small minority and not all of the wealthy in Australia send their children to private schools. Far more people in the less than wealthy category send their children to non-government schools.

Members opposite are using statistics to bring a minority group of people into disrepute and, at the same time, by doing so, they are discrediting everyone who chooses to send his child to a non-government school. That is an unfortunate point of view.

Mr. Bannon: We're just suggesting that they should pay for it, not the State.

Mr. ALLISON: Government members are suggesting that the people concerned should pay for it in its entirety, and that none of their taxation money should go towards the private schools.

Mr. Bannon: Don't they get tax concessions?

Mr. ALLISON: One sees that it is a diminishing taxation

concession when one looks at the taxation forms. I have already commented on the quality of roles in education. I have said that the State and Federal Governments have responsibility and that the Federal Government has a dual method of allocating funds, some to State schools and some to Government Schools. A significant point that was elicited from the Schools Commission report is that, despite the carping by Government members that has been going on, the targets that State Governments set through the Schools Commission for educational standards have well and truly been met for State schools. As reported in the Schools Commission finding, all States in Australia indicate that they have reached the target that they set for 1980.

Mr. Klunder: To whom do you give the credit—the States or the Commonwealth?

Mr. ALLISON: Let us put the matter in perspective. The Commonwealth funds 15 per cent and the States fund 85 per cent. However, a considerable amount of that 85 per cent (and there has been a considerable improvement) has over the past two years come from the Federal funding system, which gives the States (an additional $75 000 000 for South Australia this year) an opportunity to allocate according to their priorities.

Mr. Klunder: But you contradicted yourself, didn't you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mount Gambier has the floor.

Mr. ALLISON: I am trying not to take the credit for anything or to give the Federal Government total credit for anything. I am merely pointing out that a completely one-eyed and one-sided argument and motion, as propounded and moved by the member for Newland, are not tenable. One has to be rational and understand the situation from both points of view, just as I tried to analyse the point of view of the Australian Parent Council. I am trying to remove Party-political bias from what was obviously a Party-political motion brought up as a pre-election ploy. In hindsight, now that the Federal Government has been returned to office, I find it much easier to debate this matter coolly and rationally than I would have been able to do two or three months ago when I last spoke.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That meeting was in my electorate. It wasn't a bad meeting.

Mr. ALLISON: It was a delightful meeting. Indeed, it was one of the nicest meetings that I have ever attended. It was reputably run. The only fault with it was that which was proclaimed by one of the members, who said that every member, both Liberal and Labor, on the platform and the audience itself was too smug: we did not seem to raise enough contentious points. But, of course, that is because promises were made.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And June Schaeffer lost her place in that question she had had written out for her.

Mr. ALLISON: I did not see the question. I do not know whether she had it written out for her. I do not recall her question: I was feeling too contented with what had happened during the evening.

Be that as it may, the representatives of the non-government schools showed that evening that they had a problem, and State and Federal Ministers and shadow Ministers showed that they understood the difficulties. There was no dissent on the platform, and that highlights the dissent among certain members in this Chamber today. South Australia's own Minister did not highlight any of the ill feeling that has been shown across the House in regard to Government and non-government schools and what right they have to funding. That is shown by the fact that this State is responsible enough to continue funding the non-government schools.

It is simply that the people operating non-government schools feel that they are entitled to more. They, as Australian voters, ratepayers and taxpayers, are entitled to lobby for assistance whenever and wherever they see fit. People who think they are going to deprive them of that right will, to use the Premier's term, get their come-uppance in future. We cannot ignore a section of the people. The part of South Australian educational funding that I have some interest in (and my interest certainly has increased over the past few months) is further education. I have commented that the spending in South Australian education is not completely balanced, and people are referring to the $21 000 000 spent on Regency Park and to large sums of money currently being spent which are on the present Budget and are being projected for future years in further education.

Two important inquiries have been conducted. At the Federal level, there is the Williams Report and, at State level, there is the Anderson Report. The Anderson committee of inquiry still is to have its report lodged in this Chamber, but the report should not be too far away. We still have considerable projected spending in the field of further education, and I am wondering whether much of this projected funding is not pre-empting recommendations that may come from the Anderson committee.

I have received urgent correspondence from people in advanced education who are concerned and from people in universities who are equally concerned, and there is the question of where the Further Education Department fits into the whole education spectrum and whether this massive injection of funds is justified, when one considers that it is firmly committed. There is no secret that, throughout Australia, we have 20 to 30 colleges of advanced education, teacher-training institutions, which now, for many reasons, are surplus to State needs.

A burning question arose from the Board of Advanced Education submission to the Anderson committee, and the Adelaide, Kingston and Murray Park teachers colleges and others were fearful about what might happen to them, because it was implicit in that report and in other comments that we had two, 2½, or three teachers colleges surplus in South Australia, based on present needs. Further, there was the Borrie Report and the various reasons why South Australia's population has been declining.

There is no way in which I see it possible to support this motion and lay all the blame at the door of the Federal Government. The difficulty certainly is not entirely the fault of that Government, and I will deal with that matter now, before dealing with Further Education Department. These advanced education buildings may become surplus to advanced education requirements, and what will happen to them? The Anderson committee has not reported or made recommendations yet. Therefore, the Government has not acted, yet we have large Further Education Department buildings being planned.

There are reasons (and the fault certainly is not with the Federal Government) for the apparent surplus of teachers colleges of advanced education in Australia. The reasons that I have listed will not be in order as I pick them out. Since 1968, the constitution of new teachers colleges in South Australia at Salisbury, Torrens, Murray Park, and Bedford Park did greatly increase the number of teachers in training, and the Borrie Report, which came out subsequent to the building of these colleges, highlighted the fact that we had a declining population. Therefore, we have new colleges being built just as we have Further Education Department buildings being built, proving to be surplus. I understand that in Australia at present about 30

teachers colleges are surplus.

Governments, past and present, Federal and State, throughout Australia seem to have ignored the implications of the Borrie Report. We must give balanced blame. The Borrie Report clearly pointed out that the population in Australia was declining. People thought that that could not possibly be happening. Students were permitted to enter teachers colleges without having firm indications that jobs would be available at the end of their training period. Of course, students coming out now were admitted under the Whitlam Government, and that highlights the fact that we cannot blame any Federal Liberal Government for this situation. The students were not entering college during the present Federal Government's term.

Then there is the question whether students should be able to choose whether they are going on to further education, advanced education, or university, and whether they should have a choice about whether they are going into teacher training, themselves taking the risk about whether they will be employed and the risk about whether they have the required standards of excellence and are therefore the first to be employed. There is the question of how far we should go in giving everyone complete freedom of choice in education across the whole spectrum. After all, the taxpayer is paying for it, and are all taxpayers getting equal benefit from this education? I am not giving the answers: I am only showing how many questions can be raised. I do not think there is any question that a number of teachers colleges has been blamed. I think Peter Samuels came to Adelaide and has written articles on the matter.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Let us not have Peter Samuels.

Mr. ALLISON: All right, I will go on to Dean Jaensch, who commented, during a talk-back programme that I heard in June last year when I was driving to Renmark, that it was possible to take some chops off the cost of university staffing and still have a very good meal for the students. He is a responsible commentator on university and education affairs, and he thought that there was a possibility of pruning across the board, just as Senator Carrick recommended.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There is no control over entry into teacher training.

Mr. ALLISON: There is control by sheer numbers and merit, and where you draw the line.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is all.

Mr. ALLISON: That is an important control because many people are wondering how they got on the bottom side of the line when—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson interjecting:

Mr. ALLISON: The universities have escalated their staffing and the number of courses, but so have some teachers colleges. They have entered into competition with each other.

These are things that the Anderson committee has investigated. I do not seek to give answers to them, because I, like others, made a submission to that committee, and I assume that, after seeing all the evidence, that committee will be in a better position than I to come up with a balanced opinion. That is why the committee was appointed.

There is the interesting fact that the conception rate in South Australia is reported to have fallen and that the abortion rate has increased, and we are even finding that such things as a national contraception week were encouraged in South Australia last year, which surely must have some effect on the potential number of students coming through towards our schools, and ultimately our colleges and universities, for the next 10, 20 and 30 years. We have to look that far ahead in spending multi-millions of dollars on large educational institutions.

These are points which any Minister of Education, State or Federal, must bear in mind. There is no doubt that the immigration rate has declined, quite intentionally, because of economic problems across the length and breadth of Australia. The statistics show a migrant loss, because so many migrants have been returning to their homelands; whether for short or extended visits, which in many cases become permanent visits because of the re-employment situation in Australia, will be shown in its true light only over a period of years. We cannot lay the blame at the door of any single person or Government. The former Minister of Education surely must bear some of the blame for making decisions to build some of the colleges in Adelaide which I sought for Mr. Gambier in 1970 at a South-East education seminar. It was the first seminar the Minister attended. He said there was no hope of getting it because the $8 000 000 of Federal funding was already allocated to Adelaide. His comments are on file in the *Border Watch*. No-one at the time pointed out to the responsible Minister that the population of Australia was declining.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I cancelled the college proposed for the south of Adelaide.

Mr. ALLISON: That was a wise move.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And I refused—

Mr. ALLISON: The situation would have been even more embarrassing had the Minister not made that decision. Further, a great many teachers college students are said to have taken relatively easy options, and not necessarily options geared to school requirements, so that people have been coming out of colleges and sent into schools not with the qualifications required in those schools, and they have been told they might not necessarily be teaching in the subject which was their major at college, but would have to be somewhat adaptable. Of course, 20 years ago, in my own situation, I entered into teaching without any pre-teacher training at all. The pendulum has come full circle, from absolute dire need to take on teachers to the point where we have a tremendous surplus.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Twenty years ago we were prepared to employ blind Freddy.

Mr. ALLISON: You probably found him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am not being personal.

Mr. ALLISON: I realise that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ALLISON: I did have an I.Q. test. There has been a greatly increased expenditure on education, and this has actually hardened public opinion in many areas against the teaching profession. There is no doubt about that, because people are actually expecting more quality of education. As I have said previously, they are expecting more quality of education for the amount of money being spent. It is not just this Liberal Federal Government which has this problem; it is a world-wide problem. I have statistics for the United States and for parts of Europe, where there are large surpluses of teachers in the face of declining student populations. It would not be fair to single out the teaching profession, because there are 6 000 surplus doctors in South-East Asia alone and 3 000 surplus doctors in Italy. The legal profession reports that it will soon have an excess of solicitors in training, and so the teaching profession should not be singled out, as this motion singles out the teaching profession, education, and the Federal Government for criticism.

It is part of a world-wide multi-professional problem. I hope that I have given a fairly balanced point of view in bringing these points to the attention of the House.

Certainly, I am not being discriminatory against any single person or organisation, political or non-political.

Returning to the Further Education Department, with the Anderson Committee Report still to come before us, with that potential surplus, at least in relation to an immediate surplus of advanced education buildings, the need for some rationality in further, advanced and university education is clear. In Australia we have about 0·9 people with technical expertise for every one person with a degree, while in the Western world, including Russia as well, there are between six and nine people with technical skills to every person with a degree. Obviously, there is a large area where Australians need to be retrained or even just trained.

There is a tremendous imbalance between people with degrees and the back-up staff to support them. This means either that people with degrees are doing tasks which are below their capacities, or that many jobs are simply being neglected because we do not have sufficient people with technical skills across the board to do them. That is highlighted by the Minister of Labour and Industry's comment when he predicted, as many of us have predicted, that there will be a shortage of apprentices, a shortage of people with technical skills to back up people with degrees. Apprenticeships are on the decline.

In referring to the Further Education Department and its college at Kilkenny, the new college at Regency Park costing $21 000 000, the new colleges at Gilles Plains and Noarlunga, and the new college at Tea Tree Gully, I ask whether these college have been planned with a fixed number of apprentices and with definite apprenticeship needs in mind. The Minister was unable to provide the statistical evidence sought by members on this side during Question Time.

How much of further education funds are being indiscriminately expended more in hope than in expectation of meeting South Australia's needs? I can quote a specific example. About three years ago the Kilkenny college was enlarged, and land was purchased for it. Regency Park college was then in the planning stage at a cost of $21 000 000, yet now we find that Regency Park, in order to prove that it is viable in the engineering section, has absorbed Kilkenny. Surely that was never foreseen when Kilkenny was enlarged and land was purchased three years ago, yet that is what has happened.

The point is that Regency Park, that monolithic $21 000 000 establishment, has absorbed recently an expanding college. That situation must be extrapolated. Gilles Plains college is to be constructed at great cost, as is the college at Tea Tree Gully, but will the Gilles Plains college be absorbed ultimately by the new Tea Tree Gully college when it becomes functional?

I refer to the O'Halloran Hill college, which some people have called a white elephant. When Noarlunga college is constructed, will it draw students rapidly and effectively from O'Halloran Hill, so that that institution will really become a white elephant? These questions must be asked, and I will ask them as Questions on Notice so that I can obtain answers from the Minister. Certainly, I do not expect answers while I am debating the matter. It is admitted that the apprenticeship system stems from the medieval guild system. It is archaic in concept and probably should have been replaced long ago.

For many years I have wondered about this and have communicated both with the Minister of Education and the present Minister of Labour and Industry over the past three years, and even before that while I was student counselling, asking what was being done to give students work experience so that they would know better what apprenticeships they should enter, and also about giving adults the chance to train in apprenticeships. This is a dire problem with many unions, including the smaller unions, who think that their members may be put out of business by having too many adults coming into the trade, especially in today's financial climate. These questions must be examined and the whole rationale of further education and advanced education must be considered in that light as well as in relation to the training of students straight from school.

Education is a constant fact of life. I have personally retrained voluntarily many times in my life simply because I have changed my field, even in the Education Department itself. There has been retraining involved in moving from one field to another. As I have had the opportunity, I believe it is right and proper for every other person to have a similar chance to retrain, either voluntarily or otherwise, especially if one becomes redundant or chooses to move to another field of endeavour.

These are matters that the Anderson Committee has still to report on. Have these aspects been considered by the Further Education Department? If they have, I believe that it erred in not presenting the facts far more substantially to the Anderson Committee. I have seen the draft report of its submission to the committee, and I believe that far more could have been made of the statistical data, had it been available and had it been used. Certainly, when one is spending many million of dollars one should do more in solid anticipation than just hope that development will be in the right place at the right time. I refer to the development at Regency Park and Kilkenny—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It's not an—

Mr. ALLISON: Perhaps the Minister should grieve on this issue—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I do not need to grieve: Kilkenny is expanding in a number of areas, so something has to be taken out of it to allow for expansion.

Mr. ALLISON: This is one question I will put on notice. I will give the Minister of Education a chance to pick the former Minister of Education's brain. In debate in this House criticism was made of the Federal Government's handling of further education funding. The point has to be made that last year funding for further education across the board in Australia increased by 9 per cent. South Australia's proportion was 22 per cent.

In migrant education I found it significant that simply by picking up the telephone each day— the Minister referred to this matter as the adult migrant education saga— and communicating with Canberra, I was able to obtain information almost immediately which had been transmitted to the Further Education Department and the Minister in South Australia, and bring that information to the notice of this House daily. True, on some occasions I was told that I was commenting, and I do not see how I was commenting, other than by the Minister. However, I quoted what information was available here and what was subsequently proved to be true.

The figures are on record in *Hansard* and they have not been refuted. The point was made at that time by a Miss Blesing (she has the same name as a former member of this Parliament in 1936), who suggested that the Federal Government had substantially reduced spending on migrant education is South Australia, saying that there would have to be great cuts in the migrant education programmes in this State.

The facts subsequently proved that to be totally untrue, and I suppose that Miss Blesing's claims were in the mind of the mover before the most recent Federal election. The point was that South Australia, for its adult migrant

education programme, received $159 000 in additional funding, or 12·5 cents per capita for South Australians. New South Wales received $226 000, or only 4·5 cents per capita; Victoria received $270 000, or 7 cents per capita, and Western Australia received $31 400, or 2·6 cents per capita. The Queensland and Tasmanian figures were not available.

The point has to be made that, far from neglecting South Australia as we are asked to do by means of the motion, the Federal Government was giving South Australia more than it was giving to any other State on a per capita basis.

The point has to be made that supplementary funding was available which surely the State Minister himself must have known about, and this was available on application. The Opposition knew about it, and we were not slow to point out to the Government that money was available. The Minister said that he would have to check on the figures, which he did. We had some dispute over the final figure, but the Federal Government pointed out that that dispute was largely because of a difference in accounting. I believe that, as the Federal Government gave South Australia more per capita than it gave to any other State Government, we might now ask the Minister whether, in view of the absolute urgency at that time (it was published by a subordinate member of the D.F.E. in the newspaper and supported by the Minister and other Government members), South Australia was being neglected. If this programme were so absolutely urgent, first, I ask, and the mover might answer since he was expressing concern, whether the Minister has now reinstated all of those programmes that were cut so drastically as a result of Senator Carrick's dire action.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You won't be too sweet with your mates tonight.

Mr. ALLISON: I have no worries about that. Secondly, what specific plans for innovatory programmes has the D.F.E. put forward in relation to its adult migrant programme, and have they been submitted to the Federal Government for funding? These were programmes for which additional money was available at that time from the Federal Government on application, and the mover was well aware of that at the time he moved his motion. We had some dissent over the method of funding. It is significant that a Government member chose to name in the House a research assistant employed by the Leader of the Opposition, and to call him to task for telephoning an accountant at the D.F.E. and asking him for information on how money was obtained from Federal sources. That member of the research staff did that at my request, and probably the reason for the Minister's ire was that we received the information before he received it. That showed that there is some difference in the actual method of obtaining money from Federal sources.

The Federal Government claims that it prefers State Governments to submit accounts monthly in arrears, whereas South Australia is the only State that persistently submits its requests for money quarterly in advance. I am not complaining about anyone who gets on the first tram, with cap in hand. That highlights that there was a difference in figures simply because of different accounting methods. This, too, was brought out clearly in subsequent correspondence that was not put before the House, largely because I was told that I was commenting at the time. The point has been well and truly made that even in that area no real blame could be attributed to the Federal Government for the funding of adult migrant education.

In the field of university education Senator Carrick made the point that, although there had been a promise of increased university funding, he was committed to maintain a 2 per cent across-the-board spending for the triennium. This was certainly not a cut, although one also has to bear in mind that the Federal Government has at the same time considerably reduced the inflation rate, thus diminishing the amount that was taken from every dollar under the Whitlam Government by inflation. We lost 20c in the dollar in 1975, whereas we are losing only about 9c in the dollar this year. So, there has been some improvement in depreciation, and that is to the credit of the Federal Government, which has arrested the decline in the value of the dollar—something the Whitlam Government did not do. It cut education spending at the same time as the dollar was decreasing in value. The point must be made in regard to university funding.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Universities are suffering the most.

Mr. ALLISON: I would have to be honest and say that universities were suffering more than any other institution. There is also, if one listens to many people, including academics, considerable room for pruning and for re-examination of what is happening in universities. That has been going on. There has been some self-examination by universities over the past 12 or 18 months, and that should not do any harm. The point was made by Senator Guilfoyle that considerable criticism was levelled at her doorstep regarding spending for pre-school institutions. There again, she pointed out that the sum made available (and here again I have all the statistics, but as I am running short of time I will not quote at great length) by the Federal Government was not spent either last year or in the previous year, not because of any meanness on the Federal Government's part but because the sum which was committed by State Governments and which was met by the Federal Government was less than the Federal Government had anticipated. The money actually spent on pre-school education was less than was anticipated. It was less than the Federal Government budgeted but, here again, if the mover is going to attribute an unsympathetic approach to the door of the person, he will be proved wrong, because Senator Guilfoyle allocated the surplus to the following year's expenditure.

It became an increase in spending, and people were not penalised, as so many Government departments are, for not spending the whole of the money allocated in any one year. Instead, the money was allocated in the subsequent year. I am giving a comprehensive analysis of facets of education. I will not say much more on this occasion, but actually I have much more information that I could give, not at my insistence but at the insistence of the Government member who moved this motion as a pre-election ploy. I hope the message has well and truly got home that his criticism of the Federal Government was misplaced. If he does not believe that, perhaps he will realise, from my balanced coverage of education problems, that he cannot blame any one group of people for the situation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How many criticisms have you had of the Federal Government?

Mr. ALLISON: I have not had any.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How balanced does that make it?

Mr. ALLISON: I am trying to speak, too, for the small minority who voted for the Labor Party at the last election.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is ingenuous.

Mr. ALLISON: It is not: it is extremely conscientious. It shows a dedication to education which Government members do not have, because they have been singularly one-eyed in their criticism of the Federal Liberal

Government. Through everything that has been said by members on both sides of the House one has to express considerable concern for trainees in the teaching profession who, through no fault of their own, have been permitted to train but are no longer guaranteed jobs, because of the declining student population as much as anything else but also because of the current economic situation. One can only hope that an increase in the birthrate, some joy from the current increase in the marriage rate, an increase in the immigration rate, and certainly a pick-up in the economy will all militate toward an improvement in the overall employment situation. One can only hope that many teachers who are currently unemployed will soon be employed. In the meantime, I hope the Education Department will accept some of the responsibility and will allocate some of the money from the duality of funding toward employing some teachers, even if only on a contract basis, a part-time basis, or a permanent part-time basis by letting people opt for that, by letting people retire prematurely if they wish to do so, by making people take long service leave, or by letting people opt for a year's leave without pay if they wish to have it. There are many possibilities that could alleviate the problem. None of the viewpoints I have put forward are viewpoints that would support the motion; rather, they support the Federal Government's line of action. I oppose the motion.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND VALUATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Dr. Eastick:

That this House is of the opinion that land valuations used for rating or taxing purposes should reflect a value which relates more directly to actual land usage.

(Continued from December 7. Page 1276.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion. The member for Light, who moved this motion, is asking that, when we are assessing property values for the purposes of rates and taxes, we should take into consideration the existing usage of land and what the value of the land is for that particular use. The present system has undoubtedly caused many conflicts in the community, particularly where environmentalists have claimed that people have developed land prematurely or where a landholder has argued that, because the urban community is moving out near his property, he has been forced to change his previous practice with the land, because of the high rates and taxes that have applied. The Adelaide Hills area and some of the old market garden areas of metropolitan Adelaide are the worst affected areas in this respect. The member for Victoria would know some places in the South-East where vineyards have been established in areas previously used for grazing and other purposes. Those vineyards have considerably increased the land value in respect of existing farmers, who have been either rated out of their properties or forced to sell areas to grape growers. The member for Chaffey referred to areas where there are surplus supplies of grapes. So, there is a problem under the present system.

The Government member who spoke on this matter said that we could not have a dual system or a multiple system. We already have a multiple system to the extent of a dual system. Section 12 *(c)* of the Land Tax Act allows people who have a rural pursuit and who obtain a substantial amount of their income from that pursuit to have their property rated as a rural property. There is total exemption in some areas. I have previously explained how unfair the present system is. In Queensland there is more than one method of valuation, and the system works; that State is successful. So, it can be done. If we are genuine in our concern for keeping open space in the community and encouraging people to remain in rural pursuits near the city or in other pursuits in other sections of society, so that the total society can benefit, we should ensure that we do not rate them out through land valuations. Valuers rightly argue that, under the present system, they have no alternative to placing the values on properties that they are placing.

The points made by the member for Light are valid. There is a way of solving the problem, and we should accept the solution and ensure that we put it into practice. It may take a while to iron out any difficulties that may appear, but that can be done. The Valuation Department would co-operate in this respect. It would make it easier for local government rating, and people would hold in higher respect the Engineering and Water Supply Department and other departments involved in taxing and rating. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 8. Page 1326.)

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): The University of Adelaide is an institution close to the hearts of South Australians. It is an ancient institution, considering the relatively short history of our country, and many members in this House have been fortunate enough to be educated there. Whenever amendments to the Act come before this House it behoves us to give them close attention. They do not come often and they are usually important. As we respect this institution, we should ensure that we give it every consideration. Many of the amendments in this Bill have been considered by the university since 1972. Some of the amendments are the results of decisions of courts in this land, while others relate to requests by the University Council to streamline the administration of the campus. Other amendments are designed to give a more democratic basis to various parts of the university community. The Opposition supports this Bill, but not without some reservations reflecting our concern about various facets of university life. The Opposition intends to introduce an amendment during the Committee stage.

Most of the amendments are uncontentious, and I will deal with those first. I do not think that anyone in this House would be against the university's having the power to award honorary degrees. The only safeguard that we must consider (and certainly the University Council must consider this) is that the awarding of such honorary degrees is not done on a frivolous basis, which we notice happens with some overseas universities. Nevertheless, the University of Adelaide is the only university in Australia that does not have the power to award honorary degrees. As it is an uncontentious issue, it would be carping to criticise the intended amendment.

The request relating to the appointment of a Deputy Chancellor is reasonable and, of course, it is a machinery matter in the administration and running of the University Council. There are three members of this House on that council and two members from another place. I am proud to be a member of the University Council, especially as it

was the university where I was educated. I am proud to have been nominated by my Party to be a member of that council.

Mr. Bannon: You were elected by the Parliament.

Mr. WILSON: The member for Ross Smith is correct. He has a close connection with the University of Adelaide, having held high office with the university union, I think. I am told he was a good chairman indeed.

Mr. Tonkin: He probably thought it was practice for later on.

Mr. WILSON: I understand that the grooming in university politics is almost as good as a grounding in Labor machine politics. I think it is essential that members realise that the University Council is a cosmopolitan type of body. It has representatives from the academic staff, representatives elected by the students, representatives from this House and another place, and 12 members elected from outside the university. The university, of course, is keen to keep this balance by which over one-third of its members are elected from outside the university campus.

This Bill seeks to amend the constitution of the University Council. The Bill seeks to add an additional member from the non-academic staff. The university staff consists of three divisions: the professional staff, which is, of course, the administrative staff of the university; academic staff; and ancillary staff, which includes, among other things, laboratory technicians and the like. The present University of Adelaide Act allows representation from the academic and other staff. This Bill seeks to add another representative from the ancillary staff, thereby giving the council representation from the three levels of university staff. To do that, the University Council is concerned to maintain the balance with those members who are elected from outside the university campus. To achieve that, the outside representation is increased by one, thereby increasing the total number of the council by two.

The University of Adelaide has often been the centre of controversy and this was so in October of last year, when Mr. Walter Crocker retired from the university and wrote two articles which appeared in the *Advertiser*. I do not say for a moment that I agreed with everything Mr. Crocker had to say about the university; in fact I do not. However, he said something about the size of the University Council. According to my reckoning, the University Council presently has 33 members, and this Bill will increase the number to 35 members, so that many people are involved in the decision-making process. We are often accused in this House, with 47 members, of not coming to decisions quickly. The same position applies, I can assure the House, to the University Council. Part of one of Mr. Crocker's articles, which appeared in the *Advertiser* of October 27, 1977, states:

> Many of the defects in the administration of the University of Adelaide stem directly from the composition and functioning, or malfunctioning, of the University Council.
>
> There are 35 members of the council and a governing body of this size is too large for efficiency. It is commonly agreed that no Government Cabinet can function properly if it has more than a dozen or so members. That is why the concept of an inner executive Cabinet has been developed where Ministries are larger. A committee of 35 encourages speechifying, especially speechifying directed to some outside constituency group. It discourages the need for quick, relevant interchange in conversational tones between men and women with a sense of proportion and of the importance of public business.

He may have been talking about this House when he mentioned that. He continues:

> The University Council was not designed, alas, to carry on university business efficiently so much as to represent in the trendy style of the times a variety of groups and interests—academics, students, members of Parliament, typists, cleaners, and so on.

In part, what Mr. Crocker says, in my observation, is true, but then I am assured by persons in the university who should know that, once we have a committee of any sort of more than, say, 15 members, it really does not matter how many we have. Nevertheless, the point is valid that certainly the University Council should look very closely before wanting to increase the size of the council again.

As I mentioned, some of the purposes of this Bill are to correct errors or omissions in the Act brought to light by decisions of courts. One of those decisions concerns the jurisdiction of the State Industrial Commission in respect of university staff. It was ruled by the Industrial Court in the tertiary institution staff jurisdiction case in 1974 that, because of the provisions of sections 9 and 22 (1) (d) of the University of Adelaide Act, the Industrial Commission in South Australia had no jurisdiction to make awards binding on the University of Adelaide. So the University Council says in a document that all members should have:

> The University Council has decided, however, that it does not wish, as an employer, to be treated differently from other employers, so far as the jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission is concerned, except in relation to the academic staff.

Some members will be aware, and certainly the member for Ross Smith will be aware, that academic staff come under the Academic Salaries Tribunal. That report from the University Council also states:

> It may be noted that, according to legal advice obtained by the university, the Industrial Court, as distinct from the Commission, has full jurisdication in relation to all staff at the university, so that under section 15 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, all staff including academic staff, have access to the cases of unfair dismissal or applications concerning long service leave.

I think we all agree with that, and this Bill seeks to bring the university staff other than the academic staff within the ambit of the Industrial Commission.

I do not wish to deal with much more in the Bill at this stage (I shall have more to say in the Committee stage) other than to talk about the university union. First, this Bill seeks to incorporate the university union. I think that is excellent, because no body handling the amount of money that the university union does and providing the services for the students that it does (and I have been privileged to see at first hand just what the university union does for the students and I congratulate the council of the university union and the affiliated organisations on the way they provide these services) should be unincorporated. The University of Adelaide has 8 500 students, and the union fee for a full-time student (and bear in mind that fees are collected on a weighted student-average basis) is $118 and, when this is multiplied by 8 500, it means a lot of money. No body handling that amount should be unincorporated. I quote from the report of the University Council on this matter, as follows:

> The disadvantages of the union's present lack of corporate status are seen to be as follows: (1) the lack of power to hold or lease land or other property in the union's name; (2) the lack of power to be a party to any contract; (3) the doubts and concern about the legal position of union council members in relation to contracts entered into whilst they are administering council affairs, and the possibility that union council members may personally incur liabilities whilst properly discharging their functions, and that such liabilities cannot be met out of union funds.

That is the important point of incorporation: it removes liabilities from those who are elected to the government of the union. While talking about the union, I should like to mention what I consider to be possibly the controversial aspect of this Bill—the determination and collection of union fees. As I have said, the university union has 8 500 students, who pay what used to be called a statutory fee or levy of about $118 for a full-time student to the university, and this fee is then remitted to the university union in amounts of about $10 000 every so often. Because of a decision by, I believe, Judge Stanley of the Industrial Commission, who raised doubts about the validity of the present provisions of the University Act, the Bill seeks to amend the Act to allow the university to have that power as of right and of Statute. Of course, that is a reasonable request, and certainly one which this Opposition will support.

However, in talking of the collection of university fees for the student union, it is necessary, I think, to relate to the House the way in which those fees are distributed. As I have mentioned, the university itself collects the fee mandatorily from every student and, at the time of the collection of the fee, a student may, because of conscientious objections, state in writing that he or she does not wish to belong to the university union and, in that case, the university accepts that they have a right to those feelings and those objections and allows them not to be members of the union. However, the fee is still mandatory, because the union provides services, one of them being the provision of up to 6 000 hot meals on any day, which is a considerable service to the university students.

Besides that there are many affiliated organisations to which I will refer. The main thing is that the university allows students, who have a conscientious objection to joining the university union, to make their objection valid and remain out of the union although insisting that they have to pay a fee because it is a fee for service. The university union is not a trades union but is more an association of students.

What happens when the university union receives money from the university in lots of $10 000? That is a considerable sum, and is distributed in several ways. One of the main ways is in maintaining the university refectory and other dining halls and all of the other services provided by the university union. It also pays, on application from affiliated organisations, money for various purposes. It supplies money to the Craft Association and to the University Students Association, amongst others.

What happens when the money reaches the students association? The Adelaide University Students Association is affiliated with the Australian Union of Students. I do not have to remind members of the chequered career of the A.U.S., although it seems from press reports in the past couple of weeks that at least there is a more moderate governance of that union.

How does the Students Association of the University of Adelaide remit its fees to A.U.S.? The A.U.S. is made up of constituent bodies, and does not have an individual membership. In other words, the students of any one campus vote whether their students association should be a constituent member of the A.U.S. If there is a majority vote, all students in that university are automatically members of the A.U.S. and thereby receive the benefits or otherwise of belonging to that body.

When a student belongs to a university students association that is affiliated with the A.U.S., he receives an identity card with his or her photograph on it, and it states that the student is a member of the A.U.S. and of that particular university students association. Because of ructions in the A.U.S., many students wish they were not members of that union, and I daresay that there are many who wish they were members of it. Students have no say other than in a ballot because, if by a simple majority of 50 per cent plus one of the vote of all students (and we must bear in mind that only a small percentage of students usually vote in these ballots) the university association declares that it wishes to join the A.U.S., all students are automatically joined up in that union.

Because of ructions in this union, we have seen 11 university campuses withdraw from the A.U.S. I make that point because it cuts both ways; there are students on those 11 campuses that have withdrawn from the A.U.S. who wish to be members but, because of the constitution of this body, they cannot be members. The Opposition believes both to be a negation of justice and rights. If a person wishes not to be a member of any association, he or she should not be forced to join. This practice applies in relation to the trade union movement because if a person in that movement (and I believe that I am correct, although Government members can contradict me later if I am not) does not wish to pay a compulsory levy to the A.L.P. he does not have to.

Mr. Hemmings: What about the Pharmaceutical Guild?

Mr. WILSON: And he can do the same there, too. All the Opposition wants to do is to give the students of our university, which is very close to us, the same right. In Committee, we will try to amend the Bill to allow a student the right to not join the A.U.S. if he has a conscientious objection to doing so and is willing to state that in writing. If he does that, we do not expect that he should receive that proportion of his membership fee back: we believe that should stay with the university union. We do not believe that a student should get out of paying his A.U.S. levy because he has a conscientious objection. We believe that the money should stay with the university union where it can be used towards the servicing of the rest of the university community as well as those students who do not wish to belong to the A.U.S.

The Opposition supports the Bill: we think it is important, especially as this sort of Bill does not come before us often. However, I ask the House to consider carefully the questions I have raised about the rights of individuals, as the Government makes much play about those rights. I ask members to examine carefully what we propose to do.

Mr. BANNON (Ross Smith): The fact that we have a University of Adelaide Act and that the government of the University of Adelaide requires both Houses of Parliament and the Governor's assent to alter it is probably something of a historical anomaly. It is an anomaly that has been continued in the Flinders University of South Australia Act and in the Colleges of Advanced Education Act. It is certainly derived from the nineteenth century foundation of the University of Adelaide when it was seen (and remains to this day), as a major public institution relying heavily on public funding and on community support. I would not quarrel with the member for Torrens when he calls the university "our" university in the sense of the people of the State of South Australia. (We should talk about our universities, as we have two.) It is that origin of the university and its important place in our education system and in the training of professionals in the community that has resulted in an Act of Parliament establishing it and amendments to that Act being required if it is to change its form of government.

However, I think we should remember (and this is most

important) that the Act is really in the nature of enabling legislation. It exists not to allow Parliament to control the university and to enter into that institution and attempt to interfere with the way it regulates itself, but rather its primary purpose is to enable that institution to have certain legal status and to enter into legal contracts and perform other functions. This purpose could largely be achieved these days by incorporation but because of the nature of the university and its historical antecedents and the way it has developed, it is done through an Act of Parliament rather than through incorporation.

I repeat that this is enabling legislation. Parliament should be very careful about any alterations that it seeks to impose on that institution when the institution asks us to amend its Act to facilitate certain changes that it wants to make. If Parliament feels that what the univeristy is asking it to do in some way attacks basic or important principles that involve the public funding of the university and our sense of its value as an institution, or distorts its purpose in some way, doubtless Parliament would question that, but I submit in this situation the proper course is for the Parliament not to make amendments unilaterally but to refer back to the institution the proposals it has and ask it to reconsider those proposals in the light of comments or criticism that may have been made in Parliament.

This Bill in effect has gone through that process. It has been examined by members of both Parties interested in the University of Adelaide. It has been examined particularly by members of the University Council drawn from both sides of this House who have special interest in and knowledge of the university. The proposals before us have come from the University Council, I understand unanimously, which means that they have come with the concurrence of members from both sides of the House who took part in the deliberations. As such, we have had a monitoring effect, through our elected representatives on the council, on the proposals before us. I say that to indicate the gravity with which we should consider any suggestion about amending the Bill.

The Bill is the measure that the University Council has asked us to enact. It has been talked about in that council and by both Government and Opposition members. Therefore, I believe that, unless there is some extraordinarily fundamental or serious objection to any of these provisions, we have no right or cause to interfere with the Bill. The university is, and should be, a self-governing institution. Its method of organisation probably is the most refined and advanced form of participatory democracy that one can find in any institution.

That has created problems, which have been referred to by the member for Torrens when he was quoting statements by Mr. Walter Crocker, but those problems in part are the price of participation, just as we know that many times this Parliamentary process means that decision-making is slow and more complicated than it need be, and the process of making decisions on important matters sometimes can be impeded rather than aided by the existence of this democratic institution. That does not mean that we should do away with it. It is important that we have these democratic forms, and the same thing applies to the internal workings of a university. They may at times be cumbersome. There may be problems sometimes in decision-making, but they represent an advanced form of participation.

The very composition of the council, to which the member for Torrens has referred when speaking about the amendment that gives one of the ancillary staff a right to take a place on the council, indicates that kind of participatory democracy. If you like, the council comprises several worker directors, which probably makes the member for Davenport feel a little uneasy, in the sense that the academics do work in the university (whatever insulting things may be said about them), and the ancillary staff, laboratory technicians, professional officers and others work there, as do the students, also. They are all ensured places on the highest governing body. They are worker directors in the sense that the workers in that institution are represented on its governing body.

Mr. Dean Brown: You were one who said the University Council was a large and cumbersome body.

Mr. BANNON: I have said that sometimes, to ensure representation, we create a more cumbersome structure than we would like, but the important thing is that we have more acceptance of decisions and more confidence that decisions made have the consent and support of those in the institution. I think that is what we should be working towards in all areas of society, particularly in the business sector, in the management of companies, and so on.

Mr. Dean Brown: The University Council, as you know, is management by exhaustion.

Mr. BANNON: That is not so. When major matters of principle are to be discussed, the council comes into its own, and this is true of any body. It is true of boards of directors of private companies that, by and large, they are endorsing or rubber stamping decisions made by executives of those companies, except when some major principle or change of direction occurs, when the board asserts its authority and makes the decision in a less automatic way. That is how it works at the university, too. The member for Torrens has referred to that aspect and to the amendment that gives access to industrial tribunals. What he describes as the controversial matter of union fees obviously is the matter about which we will have to debate, and he has foreshadowed an amendment that we will be able to examine in detail.

Let us get the sequence of events in proper perspective. It is true that there is a mandatory collection by the university of a fee on behalf of the union. As the member for Torrens has pointed out, at that stage conscientious objection may apply. A person need not be a member of the Adelaide University Union; he must pay a fee, and this is the situation in conscientious objection to unionism, under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act. The reason for objection by the person is his conscientious objection to being a member of the body, not the financial reason that he wants to avoid paying the fee. That ensures that it is a true conscientious objection, by requiring the collection of the fee. Those fees go to the union, which is governed by a representative elected council.

Therefore, the decisions made by that body are made by a group that is elected by the whole membership. It governs, in other words, by their consent. It cuts up the cake amongst the various groups affiliated to it. Some money goes to facilities, some to the various clubs and societies and, most important, some goes to the students association. At one stage money for the sports association came through the union, although the association may now get its money directly; I am not sure about that.

The students association, in turn, is governed by an association council democratically elected by the whole membership. Its decisions are made on behalf of the majority of members, because those members have put them there, just as the decisions made by the Government represent the views of the majority of people who have voted for it. If over a period the people object to those decisions, they will vote accordingly. That is how the students association operates. That is the second tier of a fully representative council. That association decides whether the body should be affiliated to groups such as the Australian Union of Students. There is provision for any

affiliate of the Australian Union of Students to withdraw from that union by a majority vote in a democratic way of the members of the affiliate.

There is this recourse for those who object to A.U.S. membership. They can campaign and, in fact, this has happened periodically on all campuses in Australia, including Adelaide University. Students can campaign to withdraw from A.U.S. However, it is rare that the majority of the student body wants to do that, because it realises that there are several important advantages in belonging to a national student body. I will not go into them in great detail now, but there is one small aspect of that body's activities, what one might term the political activities—the political pressure group activities—which certainly arouses controversy amongst the members and the affiliates. However, the important fact is that the decision of the students association to be an affiliate of A.U.S. is a decision that must have the support of a majority of those students on the particular campus.

That is the safeguard for people who object. If they are objecting to A.U.S. membership, and they are in the minority, then they have not much to beef about. They should work within that institution and try to change it. In formulating its policies A.U.S. is governed by a democratically elected council, so that at each stage there is an area and an opportunity for the individual to assert his rights, to make his point known, to vote on it, and to campaign in support of a proposition that he wishes to put.

Many of the Opposition members are sitting where they are now not because they want to sit in Opposition and oppose us all the time: they would much prefer to be on this side, but they are not here because the people will not put them here. Therefore, they have to accept decisions that are made by us with which they do not agree, because they are members of this larger community. The argument is no different when one goes down to the student level. What portion of the money goes to A.U.S.? It is a small proportion of that union fee, small indeed. If a student likes notionally to suggest that he does not want to be in A.U.S., he can see all his money going to union facilities, because certainly each person's $118 could be swallowed up by any of the other facilities or services offered.

Mr. Wilson: What about the principle?

Mr. BANNON: The important principle is that, providing the proper democratic channels are open to a person to change that decision and affect the policies of that organisation, I do not see that we have any objection whatever to the manner in which fees are collected and the manner in which the union, the students association and A.U.S., in turn, make and formulate their policy. I urge that the Bill be supported in its present form.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): We cannot let that contribution go unchallenged. The fact is that A.U.S., because of its activities in recent years has, to put it mildly, come into rather bad odour in some quarters. It has been unashamedly political in its activities and many university students are fed up. Indeed, I understand that 11 campuses in Australia have opted out of A.U.S. altogether, and that is a sizeable number. There is much discontent regarding the operations of A.U.S. in Australia at present.

Mr. Tonkin: Mostly due to the activities of its executive.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: True, so for the member for Ross Smith to assert that everything in the garden is just lovely, and that we have no cause for concern, that students should just accept the *status quo,* that they are in a position where they can influence things and, therefore, they should pay up their money cheerfully and exercise their democratic rights, is hardly satisfactory in this situation.

We have often said in relation to industrial legislation that a person who objects should have the opportunity of opting out. This position applies in other States, especially in Western Australia, where the opportunity is given to people, who are pressured or who are legally obliged to join unions, to opt out. It is reasonable that students should have the opportunity to opt out of A.U.S. membership if they so desire. No-one argues at all about the activities and worth of university unions. In fact, the word "union", which has existed for many years (I know it goes back to my university days and probably even well before then), probably has a connotation in these modern days that is rather unfortunate.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Not at all.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the eyes of many of the public—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: The reactionary one-third.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister sets himself up as an authority on statistics, but I do not believe that those statistics are particularly valid. Surveys indicate that about 70-80 per cent of the Australian public are opposed to compulsory unionism. I believe that the sort of sentiment expressed tonight by the member for Torrens would strike a more responsive chord throughout the populace than would the views expressed by the member for Ross Smith. Therefore, it ill behoves him to preach to us, and to the member for Torrens, in particular, on this matter.

This Bill seeks to increase the size of the University Council. Notwithstanding the statement by the member for Torrens that the aim has the support of the council itself, I believe it is a move in the wrong direction. As a former member of the council, during which time the council was enlarged, I saw that its operations became considerably more inefficient. There were council members then who are still council members now, holding important positions in public life in South Australia, and I could not help but think, as doubtless they thought, that they could be more usefully employed elsewhere than listening to the sort of debate that developed after the council became structured; that is, after we got these little competing groups within the university coming in. It seemed to me that those from outside the university with no axe to grind must have got fed up with university politics. The University Council has become cumbersome. If honourable members read the comments of Sir Walter Crocker in his analysis of the university, they would find that that was one of the points he made. I joined the council at the same time as Sir Walter Crocker in 1970, and I share entirely the views he expressed in the article published in the *Advertiser.* With the current moves towards the structuring of these bodies and bringing more and more people in, we have no alternative, particularly in view of the council's decision to support this Bill.

Mr. Allison: For the sake of industrial peace.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: These democratising waves go through institutions from time to time.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: You aren't very impressed by it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The overall effect is not impressive. I am pleased that the Minister has the drift of my remarks. He is at his acute best this evening. This wave is difficult to swim against, and for that reason we have little option. In my time on the council, students were brought on to it, and I do not apologise for saying that I was one who had grave reservations about that course. Having served on the council with these students, I was agreeably surprised at the attitude of most of them. The students have been changed from time to time, but the first two students were first class, and took the business of

the council seriously. Although that did not occur in the case of all students who served on the council in my time, it worked out reasonably well.

I wanted to support what had been said by the member for Torrens and to refute the remarks of the member for Ross Smith who, no doubt like his colleagues, has basically some kind of industrial axe to grind and has an opinion that the Opposition does not accept. If we wanted to quote statistics, we would probably be supported in our arguments in this matter by 75 per cent of Australians.

Mr. Keneally: You're supported by 75 per cent on every issue, except at elections.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: As I pointed out earlier, the Labor Government was a minority Government in 1975, and it knows that.

Mr. Klunder: You're not in a position to boast, are you?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not boasting; I am stating facts of life. We used to get the Premier leading marches for democracy, and the chief argument in that charade was that his Party got more than half the votes in South Australia, but was denied the Government. They were not very good at mathematics, because I do not know how they made allowance for uncontested seats in those days.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has answered the interjection, so I hope that he will return to the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Government members will keep imputing improper motives to what I am saying, and I must educate them. In supporting the Bill, I indicate my support for the foreshadowed amendments to be moved by the member for Torrens.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. WILSON: The University Senate was not pleased with part of the definition of "undergraduate member" when the Bill was originally drafted, referring to the election of an undergraduate member by the students. To the definition of "undergraduate member" had to be added the words "including a graduate who is enrolled for a bachelor's degree". What is a graduate, and what is an undergraduate? Is a graduate of the university who is enrolled for another degree a graduate or an undergraduate? That is why the words "including a graduate who is enrolled for a bachelor's degree" have been included.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Jurisdiction of Industrial Commission."

Mr. WILSON: I move:

Page 7—

Line 1—Delete "section is" and insert "sections are".

After line 7—Insert following section:

30.(1) In this section "prescribed association" means any association of persons which is in receipt of monies from the Adelaide University Union.

(2) No prescribed association shall have power to pay to any body an affiliation fee or other fee of a like kind where that affiliation or other fee is calculated by reference to a number of members of the prescribed association where that number includes any such member who objects to the payment by the prescribed association of that affiliation or other fee.

My amendment seeks to allow a student the right to object, in writing, to an association of the university that wishes to enrol him compulsorily in an outside body. When the Adelaide University Students Association pays its affiliation fee to the Australian Union of Students, the amendment will allow the association to pay that fee less the affiliation fees of any members of the students association who have notified in writing that they have a conscientious objection to being enrolled in the Australian Union of Students. This is a basic exercise in democracy. The member for Ross Smith says that the exercise in democracy is handled by the elections for the students association, but he denies the fact that even this State's trade unions give people the same rights as we are asking the Government to give to the students of the University of Adelaide. This is a basic right, because no-one should be forced to join any association to which he has a conscientious objection. This principle runs throughout the Government and the community, yet the Government has indicated that it will oppose my amendment.

I urge the Government to reconsider this basic right. My amendment does not make it onerous on the students association. All it requires is that it remit fees to the Australian Union of Students, or to any other body where the situation may arise, less the per capita levy for every member of the organisation who indicates a conscientious objection. The levy would not have to be refunded to the student, but would remain with the university union.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Education): I ask the Committee to reject the amendment. The Government does not find it acceptable. It seems that the Liberal Party has a "get the A.U.S." policy at present.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I refer the honourable member to the legislation introduced by the Court Government in Western Australia, which is far more savage than what the amendment intends.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You should talk to Senator Carrick.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am well aware of his stand on this matter, which I find testy in the extreme. I by no means believe that the A.U.S. is any great friend of my political Party. I am also aware that fashions and trends change very quickly on the campuses, and this year's cause is completely forgotten next year. This is something that should be determined on the campus by the normal processes of the university. Opposition members have made much of the fact that certain university unions have disaffiliated from the A.U.S.; in other words, the remedy is there if people wish to take it. The member for Torrens referred to a document that had been made available to members who had displayed interest in this Bill. The document sets out the feeling of the university council on this matter. Commenting on the determination and collection of union fees, it states:

> The university strongly approves of the union conducting these extra-curricular activities, and it recognises the right of the union to decide which activities it should support. It is considered proper that the fee should be determined and collected by the university on behalf of the union, and that the fee should be a compulsory levy on all students; it may be noted, however, that provision has been made in the rules of the union for the exemption from payment of the fee of students who can establish a conscientious objection to joining the union.

So, the university has shown its willingness to accommodate people who have objections in certain directions. If it wishes to extend this accommodation, it is quite entitled to do so. My objection is to making it a statutory obligation on the university, when clearly the university has considered this matter and rejected it.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I support the amendment. During the second reading debate the member for Ross Smith said that, unless there are fundamental and serious objections, Parliament should not meddle with the Bill, as it has been requested by the university. This issue of freedom of choice for the students is a fundamental issue. While it is true that the university has requested amending

legislation, it is also true that, because the university is administered under an Act of this Parliament, we have a responsibility in respect of every line of the legislation.

The Opposition represents a large proportion of the people of South Australia who feel strongly that this is a fundamental and serious issue. They would want their views expressed. We are speaking on behalf of the students of the present and the future who may wish to disaffiliate and not be forced to join A.U.S., even though Adelaide University might choose to be affiliated with A.U.S. The other side of this principle is just as important; that is, if the Adelaide University wished to disaffiliate, there would be students who would be disadvantaged and who would wish to belong. So it is a fundamental principle which should be considered by this Parliament. I urge members to support the amendment.

Mr. BANNON: Regarding the question of conscientious objection, I see nothing in the amendment referring to conscientious objection. It simply says, "Any such member who objects". He can object for any reason; the reason may be frivolous, important, conscientious, or sheer bloodymindedness, and this provision will apply. So, in the form in which it is drafted, the amendment does not involve any conscientious decision or test thereof.

My second objection is more fundamental. I support the Minister's remarks. The way in which this provision is drawn gathers up all sorts of organisations and could involve far greater problems than just the "Get the A.U.S." intention spelt out by the Opposition. The amendment refers to prescribed associations, meaning any association of persons in receipt of moneys from the university union.

As I said during the second reading debate, associations in receipt of money from the university union extend over the whole range of activities and associations of the university—not just the A.U.S. The effect of the amendment would be, for example, that, if a member of the Medical Students Association objects to being affiliated to the Australian Medical Students Association, he can simply be struck off the list and not pay his affiliation fee. The same can apply to an organisation dear to the heart of the member for Davenport, the Agricultural Science Students Association and its national body. Most of the sporting clubs are affiliated to their major sports: for example, the cricket club is affiliated to the South Australian Cricket Association, the rugby club to the Rugby Union, the football club to the Amateur League, and so on. There are debating federations and numerous national organisations to which associations of persons in receipt of moneys from the university union belong.

The important aspect that this amendment overlooks is the question of the rules of affiliation of the national body. It is one thing to look at it from the viewpoint of the students association of the Adelaide University and to say that any affiliation fee must discount those individuals who object and it is another thing to look at the rules of affiliation. It may be (and it is true in a number of cases) that the body requires affiliation on the basis of the number of members of the union or association. If a capitation membership fee is levied by the South Australian Cricket Association on the university cricket club for it to belong and if that is to be on the basis of the number of members and if one member objects to being a member of the S.A.C.A., although he is happy to be in the cricket club, that body at the university would be prevented by this provision from being affiliated to the S.A.C.A. It would have to let that affiliation lapse. This would apply to the A.U.S.

If the A.U.S. rules demand that, for legitimate affiliation, a body must be affiliated up to the number of members of the union and if the University Students Association says, "We have 5 000 members, but 200 object, so we are remitting to you the capitation fee less the fee for those 200", that body can reply, "That means that you are not legitimately affiliated". It could lose its affiliation. This problem is not encompassed in the amendment, which is clumsily drawn and will have more far-reaching effects than Opposition members realise. It does not involve conscientious objection. However it is drawn, it just will not be satisfactory. Let the Minister's argument stand on this matter: it is to be determined on the campus. Why are we wasting our time dabbling in campus affairs? We should get out of this area and let the council, the union, and the students run the university. They have come to us and said, "We can live with this." The university council is a responsible body and we should leave their legislation alone.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid that the member for Ross Smith is right about the drafting of this amendment. It seems to me that it could give a right of veto in many cases, which is not contemplated at all by the member for Torrens, at least from what he said. The member for Ross Smith is keen on cricket and he mentioned the cricket club but it could be that the Labor Club wanted to give money to the Labor Party, which it probably does, or the Liberal Club give money to the L.C.L.

Mr. Dean Brown: This amendment does not preclude that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am afraid it does. Those bodies, it seems to me, would be prescribed associations. I think that the amendment, and I am sorry to say this to the member for Torrens, has been badly drawn. I agree wholeheartedly with the principle behind it and I hope that, while it will be beaten in this place, the old gentlemen in another place will try to do better with the drafting and send it back to us because there is an important principle behind this; that is, the fact that many people, many university students, greatly resent having any of their money go to A.U.S. As the father of a student who has to pay the damn fee, anyway, I do not altogether like it either.

There should be some way of opting out. After all, we had a good theoretical lecture from the member for Ross Smith about democracy in voting, and so on, during the second reading debate. I cannot refer to his speech, but let me say in passing that the method of voting for the Senate, in which I have had to participate in the past few years, must have been devised by an academic madman; it is the most complex system one can imagine. It is so bad that it has to be done on a computer and it takes days even then to work out who has won. It sounds great and probably is terribly democratic, but it is democracy gone mad as far as voting is concerned. The theoretical lecture he gave us about democracy and people having to abide by the will of the majority is sound in theory, but we know from what has happened in the A.U.S. that it has not worked out in practice. He knows that, too, but he did not say so.

I believe on grounds of principle, and the only one I refer to is article 20, Part 1, of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is supported by this Government, according to an answer I got to a Question on Notice once (supported in theory not practice), that no-one should be forced to join an association. This amendment, although it does not achieve it, is meant to put that principle into practice, as I understand it. I am going to support the amendment because of the principle behind it. I know it is going to be defeated and therefore the question of draftsmanship in this Committee does not matter. I hope that the member for Torrens will be able to get someone in another place, and I am very respectful towards that other

place, of course—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why did you call them "a lot of old men" a few moments ago?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I usually call them "old gentlemen". Be that as it may, I hope this amendment, or an amendment embodying this principle, will be launched in another place, will pass and come back to us in an acceptable form.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: With due respect to what the member for Mitcham has just said, I ask him to look again at the amendment because I think he has misunderstood it. The member for Ross Smith did not put the same interpretation on it as did the member for Mitcham. If he listened carefully to what the member for Ross Smith has said the amendment proposes that any body or association that is affiliated, and therefore receives its money from Adelaide University Union, becomes a prescribed association, such as the Labor Club at the university, the Students Association, the University Cricket Club, or any other body.

The second part of the amendment clearly indicates that no such prescribed association shall be entitled to pay an affiliation fee to an outside body on behalf of students who object to joining that outside body. In the case of the Labor Club, if 30 per cent of the club objects to affiliation with the State Branch of the Australian Labor Party then the affiliation fee paid from the Labor Club to the Australian Labor Party would only be the affiliation fee for 70 per cent of the membership. The same will apply to the cricket club. Of course, I doubt if they would be members of the Labor Club if they objected to affiliation with the Australian Labor Party at the State Branch level. I doubt whether they would object to paying an affiliation fee to the South Australian Cricket Association.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: They might be pro-Packer.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If they object to playing cricket or being associated with it, especially if they are using the facilities, they will not.

Mr. Millhouse: The Minister's interjection is quite relevant, at this time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If they had objected to that particular body it would be acceptable in the same way, since all students have to join the association. If they object to joining A.U.S. (which a large number do, not the majority) then they can opt out from a fee paid by the Students Association to the A.U.S. There is nothing undemocratic or unreasonable about that. It is not saying no affiliation fee can be paid at all because some people objected, and affiliation fees are only paid by those who do not object.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what it meant to say, but it does not.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If one re-reads the second part of the amendment it clearly states that. It states:

> No prescribed association shall have power to pay to anybody any affiliation fee—

then, if you miss out the middle part because it is simply adding to that—

> which includes any such member who objects to the payments by prescribed association that affiliation or other fee.

It clearly indicates no affiliation fee will be paid on behalf of a member of a prescribed association who objects to any outside affiliation fee.

Mr. Millhouse: It may mean that, but it certainly isn't clear.

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

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Ross Smith has raised a number of points about the principles involved. Even though the member for Mitcham and I disagree about the drafting (and I appreciate that he is superior counsel in such matters to me) the principle is agreed on and that is that person should have the right not to be forced to be affiliated with an outside political body. It is a basic principle of any democracy that there should be freedom of political association.

Even the Government in this State accepts that, because there is a right for a person not to have to join any particular trade union if he is a conscientious objector. The Federal Government appreciated that and introduced that into its industrial legislation and it has been introduced into the Western Australian industrial legislation. Virtually every union allows that because it allows a person to sign out of paying the sustentation fee to the Australian Labor Party, so it is a practice which is accepted and acknowledged by this House. It is accepted by the Australian Labor Party and by the trade union movement, so I do not see why the member for Ross Smith can suddenly jump to his feet and say that we are trying to introduce some new and undemocratic principle.

The member for Ross Smith says that the democratic process already exists. Certainly there is a democratic process which allows people, first, to decide whether or not the Students Association will affiliate with A.U.S., but once there is affiliation that does not mean that every person at the Adelaide University should be forced to become affiliated with A.U.S. That is the part where I depart from the member for Ross Smith because that is against basic democratic rights.

The amendment achieves what the member for Torrens claims it achieves. I suspect that even the member for Mitcham accepts that it probably does (although he says it may not have been well drafted). That is his personal opinion. Even the member for Ross Smith acknowledges that the amendment achieves that. I support the amendment.

Mr. WILSON: I wish to take the Minister up on just two points. He said that, because the university gave students the right to opt out of joining the union for conscientious reasons, that right could flow through to the fact that they need not join the students association. It may well be that a student wishes to join the union and therefore receives the benefits of the union and the craft association and other bodies, and he may also wish to join the students association, but does not want to be affiliated with an outside political organisation. If it is good enough for the university, it is good enough for the university union and the students association. There are writs out against the university on this very matter. I beg the Government further to consider it. It has been said that, if this Bill is passed, then because the Adelaide University Students Association remitted only the per capita levy for those students who had not objected to joining the A.U.S., it would contravene the A.U.S. constitution and would be disaffiliated. That is unlikely to happen but I accept that argument that they may be *ultra vires* the A.U.S. constitution; but I am convinced that the A.U.S. constitution will be amended anyway; it certainly cannot go on as it is.

If that is a fall-out from this legislation, I heartily support it. The Minister mentioned the Western Australian legislation and said that it was very severe. I agree; I consider it was Draconian in the extreme. We introduced this measure because it was not Draconian; it merely stated a principle. I ask the Committee to support that principle.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Eastick,

Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Hudson, Klunder, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Mathwin and Nankivell. Noes —Messrs. McRae and Virgo.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 1. Page 1158.)

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): The main purpose of these amendments to the Apprentices Act is basically to ensure that there can be a mature age for apprentices; there are other minor amendments to the Act, but there is no intention other than to bring it up to date. I wish to raise this issue of a mature age for apprentices. At present, no-one can take on an apprenticeship after the age of 19, because he will not complete his apprenticeship by the maximum age of 23.

This means that a person must make the basic decision to take on a trade apprenticeship before the age of 19 years. In our present society many people do not make such a decision until they are in their mid 20's: young people leave school and may go overseas for two or three years or take on several jobs, but in their 20's they regret that they have not taken on an apprenticeship. They may want to further their knowledge of a particular trade. This amendment as proposed would allow people over the age of 23 to be apprentices and to start a trade irrespective of age.

The Minister has put forward this proposal, which was put forward by the Liberal Party as part of its election promises for the 1977 election. It was announced by my Party on January 23, 1977, as part of our policy, when we promised to eliminate the age restrictions. Soon after the election, on September 29 the Minister announced that his Government would introduce legislation to this effect. I congratulate the Minister for that announcement, because I believe it was the proper thing to do. The Minister was also congratulated for that policy in an editorial in the *Advertiser.*

For too long there has been a discrimination of younger *versus* older people on their ability to take on an apprenticeship. Many people believed that the age restriction was an outmoded idea, although some sections of the trade union movement thought differently. I appreciate their reasons. No doubt they were concerned that, at this time with many young people unemployed, there may be a greater attraction for older people to be taken on as apprentices, so increasing the unemployment problems of young people. There is some validity in such an argument, but I do not believe that it is sufficient to maintain this rather archaic idea that there should be an age restriction. Many Federal industrial awards have already included such provisions so that there can be adult apprentices.

Also, the new proposal is not only for adult apprentices and people taking on a trade for the first time, but it will allow adult people with a particular trade training to retrain into an area if redundancy occurred. It may not be an associated area, as they can be retrained now in such an area, but they may want to take up a different trade, and this would allow them to do so.

I congratulated the Government on the policy announcement, but I was disappointed when I saw the contents of the Bill presented to the House. Clause 18, which is the critical clause, does not put into effect the policy announced by the Minister. The Bill allows the relevant advisory trade committee to decide whether or not there should be mature apprentices in that trade. Furthermore, this Bill allows any one member of that advisory committee to veto such a proposal. I understand that, generally there are six people on such advisory committees: two employers, two trade union representatives, someone from the trade union commission or the commissioner, and an education authority person. The Bill will allow any one of those people to veto any proposals.

I understand that an amendment proposed by the Minister may alleviate that position slightly, but it will possibly require a majority of people attending a meeting to approve such a proposal. That means that, in effect, any one person at the meeting can still veto such a proposal, and that is unacceptable. If the Minister promised to South Australians that all persons of any age could take on an apprenticeship, he should have introduced a Bill that puts that promise into effect. It is shabby politics to make such a bland statement, and then allow a veto power so that everyone on the advisory trade committee must be willing to approve of such a move. Of course, the areas from which will come the greatest objections and the areas that have been so intransigent in such matters, will be those who veto such a move. In effect in the critical trade areas there will be no change in the present practice, because individual trade unions will veto the proposals.

I said that I had some appreciation for the reason put forward by trade unions for objecting to this move and their fears that employers may have a tendency to take on older rather than younger people, so that older people will fill all the apprenticeship positions and those coming out of school will be ignored. Another alternative would be to allow any person who has worked in one trade for a period of, say, seven years, by making an appropriate application to obtain suitable qualifications of a tradesmen. Such a provision is made under the Tradesmen's Rights Regulation Act. Perhaps this proposal should be considered, and the Legislative Council could include it if my amendment is rejected. I also object to this Bill because the advisory trades committee is no longer an advisory committee but can now make decisions, and that is contrary to the purpose of such a committee.

Finally, I refer to the major headline in the *Advertiser* of September 29, "Apprenticeship age limit may go", and the report under it states:

> The South Australian Government plans to introduce legislation to remove the age limit of apprentices.

This legislation does not put that promise into effect. We have been deceived and misled, and I urge the House to support my amendments because their purpose is to put into effect the announcement made by the Government on that occasion. I support the second reading.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): In supporting the Bill, I will answer some of the criticisms by the South Australian Employers Federation. The amendments contained in this Bill became necessary to meet changes in technical training (and I refer to correspondence courses) in order to provide the opportunity for adults to become tradesmen and to ensure that sufficient tradesmen are being trained to meet the needs of this State. I was rather surprised at

some of the comments made by the Employers Federation in the circular to members of this House and another place. The Industrial Director (Mr. Gregg) in that circular states:

> Legislation as proposed in Bill No. 33, to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950-1974, in the House of Assembly fills us with dismay. Does the Government really want to:
>
> (1) Foster apprenticeship,
>
> (2) Help youth unemployment recover,
>
> (3) Encourage free enterprise to develop, and
>
> (4) ensure that the public has a right to expect competent tradesmen and further expansion of qualified persons to attend their needs?
>
> The Bill appears to militate against an employer taking a risk in entering an indenture to train.

An attachment to that circular states:

> The future of Australian industry and the trends which are apparent make it most important that apprenticeship be fostered to ensure that trades be perpetuated. A further pressing need is to explore every angle to alleviate the youth employment situation, and apprenticeship is one avenue that can be expanded. Similarly, there is a backlog in young persons who are unable to secure work experience and a means to allow those persons who have had second thoughts on their vocation or calling to now participate in schemes of apprenticeship at an age beyond that now permitted in the present Act.

Regarding the first query, "Does the Government really want to foster apprenticeship?", I should have thought that the Government's record stood alone. The Minister stated in his second reading explanation that, notwithstanding the high level of unemployment and the uncertain economic climate, it was expected that the total number of first-year apprentices in South Australia in 1977 would exceed 3 700, which would be an all-time record. The Government is doing all that it can to foster apprenticeships.

On the question of helping youth unemployment to recover, this State Government probably has done more to assist the unemployed youth than has any other Government in the Commonwealth. Whilst the Government recognises the need for a higher level of economic activity and a boost in confidence in many areas, the State Government played its part last year by directing all State Government departments to employ, in addition to their own requirements, as many apprentices as they had capacity to train. As a result, 117 additional apprentices commenced their indentures. That was a very commendable direction indeed. At the same time, the cost of training these apprentices has been completely met by the State Government.

Further, this Government has injected many millions of dollars into the unemployment relief schemes that have helped a great many youths who could not otherwise find employment or, in fact, find an employer who was prepared to train them as apprentices. This reminds me of a constituent whose son answered an advertisement in the *Advertiser* for a position in my district. The constituent told me that there were 184 applicants for the position. He also told me that his son received a letter after he had been interviewed by the employer, congratulating the lad not because he got the job but because he was number 32 on the final list. This shows how difficult it is for youths to find employment in the areas in which they live. Perhaps Mr. Gregg should have forwarded his letter to the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser).

Regarding Mr. Gregg's comments about encouraging free enterprise to develop, I am not sure just what Mr. Gregg means or requires here. However, this Government, the present Minister of Labour and Industry, and all previous Ministers of Labour and Industry, have consistently appealed to and encouraged employers to take on their full quota of apprentices. As the Minister has pointed out, the Government subsidises the cost of board and lodging during their period of block release training and pays the fares incurred by apprentices in travelling from their homes to technical colleges and return.

The comment about ensuring that the public has a right to expect competent tradesmen and further expansion of qualified persons to attend their needs is, in my opinion, a slur against the technical colleges and the teaching and training staff of these colleges. Does Mr. Gregg realise that employers also have a responsibility towards further expansion of qualified persons to attend to their present and future needs? I refer to a training scheme recently adopted by the Postal Telecommunications Technicians Association of Australia. An editorial in the association's bulletin, headed "A progressive staff structure", states:

> Late last year the association finalised a review of the staff structure affecting its members in the A.P.O. It concluded that significant changes should be made to the existing structure to provide for meaningful and rewarding employment for base level positions in the future. The proposals for change which the association has now developed are based upon the following beliefs:
>
> (i) That all individuals in the structure should have a reasonable opportunity to advance to higher levels and obtain extra pay and more responsibility.
>
> (ii) That any prerequisite for advancement by way of qualifications or experience must be justified essentially by the measure of what is necessary for the work which has to be done.
>
> (iii) That it is highly desirable for persons occupying upper level technical and managerial positions to have had experience and training in base level skilled positions.
>
> (iv) That individuals can attain the skills and knowledge necessary to work at higher levels through experience—as well as by means of a course of formal training.
>
> When one considers the existing structure it would appear as though its originators had none of the above beliefs. The Telecom assistant cannot become a tradesman. The telecom tradesman cannot promote as a technician or technical officer. The technician is offered an academic course as the only way to become a technical officer. A person can "act" for 20 years and still not be eligible for promotion to the job he has occupied. The present structure at the base levels is inequitable, archaic in its restrictions, and unnecessary in its insistence on formal, sometimes irrelevant qualifications. It must be changed.
>
> The association is conscious of the pressures which have built up in the membership for reform of the existing structure at the base levels. We now know where the problems are. We intend that those problems be rectified. The A.P.O. must recognise the need for a progressive staff structure. The indications at this stage are that the A.P.O. recognises that problems exist but the time table for solving them is indefinite.
>
> A new structure with new opportunities for advancement for all base levels must be introduced in 1975.

I have been told that that progressive staff structure was adopted and that it is working exceptionally well. It is an example that could be used by all employers. I can also appreciate the apprehension of several trade unions concerning adult training in apprenticeship trades. Those unions have expressed serious concern at the lack of co-ordination and consultation by the Australian Government and the Department of Labour with the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the trade union movement

generally in relation to procedure and operation of training and the general attitude to apprenticeship trades. The unions have also expressed concern at the retrenchments occurring in industry in the current circumstances, many resulting in cancellation or deferment of indentures. As the amendments in the Bill have been adequately dealt with in the second reading explanation, I will not deal with them. I simply urge all members to support the Bill.

Mrs. ADAMSON (Coles): I support the Bill at the second reading stage, but I have strong reservations about some clauses. I oppose clause 18 particularly. It seems archaic and medieval to permit, in 1978, legislation that has the effect of locking people into trades.

We are now entering (and we have heard this from many members from the Government side, including the Minister), a period of flexibility, diversity and mobility in the work force, in which people are chosing alternative occupations, with people of middle age and even older wishing to embark on new careers or new trades. The effect of clause 18 would render that impossible on the say-so of one or two people.

Last year the Minister raised expectations, which were welcomed throughout the industrial community in South Australia. That news was welcomed on this side of the House. It now appears that they were false expectations, however, because the Minister assured us that mature-age people would be able to train as apprentices, but the hard facts of the matter in this Bill show that mature-age apprenticeships will be available only if a certain number of people on a trade advisory committee gives permission.

If it is Government policy that we should have mature-age apprentices, why does not the Minister bite the bullet and put this programme into effect? Why are there these qualifications? People in my district have made representations to me about being mature-age apprentices, and I am sure that there are many more who have not made representations to me but who are anxious to start as mature-age apprentices, too. Their expectations were raised by the Minister. Indeed, I received several inquiries after the announcement was made, and I was able to assure those people that it was Government policy and that it would be put into effect.

It now appears that, unless this clause is amended, these people could be disappointed. It seems sheer hypocrisy to me that we should say, "Let us have mature-age apprentices", and then say, "But only if a group within that trade says that it is all right." What are we to say to the people whose trades are presently over-supplied or for whom there is a declining demand and who want to change their occupation? What are they to do from now on? Are they to serve behind a delicatessen counter or in another shop, or should they do labouring work merely because they will not be permitted to embark on another trade? If the Government is serious (and it certainly gave the impression that it was when it made that announcement), it will accept an amendment to clause 18 in the Committee stage.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I should like to assure the member for Coles that the Government is serious about its amendments to the Apprentices Act. It is important to understand the historical background to the provision, which has prevented adult apprentices for many years, not only in South Australia but in all other States of the Commonwealth. In fact, some States have not even moved as far as South Australia has moved at this time.

I can visualise the circumstances in which craft unions find themselves in regard to any change to their tradesmanship rights. These people have lived with this provision almost since time immemorial. In fact, the provision inserted into the Act in South Australia many years ago was inserted by a Liberal Government, and subsequent Liberal Governments made no attempt whatever to delete that provision.

There has not been in my time in this Parliament any attempt by the Liberal Party, either through a private member's Bill or otherwise, to deal with this situation. Suddenly, now that the Government is trying to do something about it, we find honourable members jumping on the bandwaggon and making all sorts of criticisms of the Bill, yet no genuine attempt has been made before to try to solve the problem.

I believe that in all things we do we ought to do them slowly and cautiously, giving some thought to the matter. Therefore, merely to open up the whole area of apprenticeships and allow at this stage a flood of adult people to apply for apprenticeship training would not help the current situation which, irrespective of how we debate its cause, is drastic. I said today in reply to a question that I sincerely hoped that that position would not remain and that the economic circumstances in Australia would improve quickly.

However, when we look at the situation now and know what will probably happen in the next 12 months, the worst thing we can do is to train people who will be unable to obtain employment. The member for Spence referred to the record intake of apprentices last year, and that occurred because of the Government's actions at the end of 1976, and our action in encouraging employers, Government departments and everyone else concerned to be conscious of the need to train more apprentices, but that same position did not obtain at the end of 1977 for the intake in 1978.

I am willing to say now that we will be down in our intake of trainees, although we cannot establish that reduction at this time; but there will be many hundreds of apprentices fewer in 1978. If that is the case, what is the purpose of willy-nilly going into any situation allowing the intake of adult training for people who will be unable to obtain employment.

The situation as I understand it, specially in Victoria, is that there have not been many adult apprenticeships sought. I do not know what position will obtain in South Australia once this legislation becomes law; there may or may not be many applicants. However, I can give this assurance to the House: in the first year I will be keeping a close look on the position. Certainly, I will not allow an unfortunate situation to develop; at this stage I believe caution is the keynote.

We should provide some provision and protection for people who are concerned about their jobs. I will not tolerate a situation of abject refusal by trade committees for no apparent reason to allow people to train. I undertake that this position will be watched extremely closely and taken care of in some way. There will be a review of the situation, or amendments, or whatever is necessary to handle the situation. However, I do not believe that the trade committees will act in that way. I believe that the trade committees comprise a conscientious group of people who will examine in detail all of the applications before them. Certainly, they understand their industries better than I do, because they are working and involved in them, or belong to an employing group in an industry. There is no doubt that they are adequate bodies to examine whether or not there will be any possibility of a flood of new workers in any industry. I do not know of any other organisations or bodies, certainly under my

jurisdiction or in relation to apprenticeships, who can evaluate the situation better than can trade committees.

The question simply is, so far as the Government is concerned, that we must be careful about this whole matter. Nevertheless, we are determined that adults shall have their rights. There will be no deviation regarding Government policy on this matter. It may be that we will never need to question trade committees at all. If the percentage of adult apprentices coming into the work force in South Australia reaches the Victorian level of 1 per cent or 1.5 per cent of the total apprenticeship intake in each year, or a figure near that target, clearly there has been no deliberate attempt by the trade committees to stop the intake of adult apprentices.

If the figure does not reach somewhere near that, or if we get some definite proof that there has been a deliberate attempt, obviously the Government will not tolerate it. In accordance with its policy, it will certainly see that adult apprenticeships apply. That, in my view, is the main complaint the member for Davenport had about the Bill. I appreciate his frankness and the fact that he did not deliberate on the other provisions of the Bill which are really mechanical matters and which can be examined in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Page 2, line 1—delete paragraph *(e)*.

In moving this amendment, I will take it as a guide to the passing of other amendments, including the deletion of clause 18. The purpose of my amendment is to remove completely any reference to age limits. If the amendment is carried, there will be no age limit, so that any person may apply for apprenticeship, irrespective of age, and it also removes the veto power. The Minister argues that, if the advisory committees appear to be deliberately blocking the establishment of mature-age apprentices, he will review the position in a year's time. Why give them the ability to block the provision and threaten that, if they use the power, he will amend the Act? That is not logical or rational, and the Minister must realise that. The Minister is caught in a dilemma.

Mr. Bannon: You believe in revolution, not evolution.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I believe in honesty, and the Minister has been less than honest. If he is to make changes, the relevant decisions should be made by the Government, and not handed out to his power groups elsewhere. The Minister has said that there will be no age restriction, yet, because of the dilemma in which he is caught, he is prepared to allow other people to decide, and not the Government or Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: Why take this amendment as a test of clause 18?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If the Committee adopts my amendment, it will need to remove the definition of mature-age apprentices, because there will not be any: everyone will be an apprentice, irrespective of age. The Minister is caught in a dilemma because certain trade unions are not prepared to accept the amendment. He has been put under pressure, and he is straddling the fence. His half-way measure is shabby and deceitful, and I will not accept it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry): I stand by my reply to the second reading debate. I thought that the member for Davenport would be decent enough to accept my explanation. One rarely sees any decency or honesty in him.

Mr. Gunn: You can do better than that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did not interject while the honourable member was speaking. He said that I was dishonest, and I am objecting and making a similar accusation against him. The legislation is a genuine attempt to solve a problem that has been with us for 40 or 50 years. There has been no genuine attempt previously, and I am accused of dishonesty. I object to the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I owe the Minister an apology. I was in the gallery when he was making his explanation on the matter. I do not suggest that he is dishonest, but will he briefly go over the explanation again? As it looks at the moment, I think that clause 18 is objectionable. If he does not want to re-explain, he does not have to; I should have been in the Chamber. Am I permitted to debate clause 18 now?

The CHAIRMAN: If the amendment to clause 3 is a test regarding clause 18, and if it is defeated and the amendment to clause 18 is not proceeded with, the honourable member will be in order in linking his remarks to clause 18 now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not bother about the amendment technically before us, because it involves only a definition referring to clause 18. I had not taken any particular interest in this matter until I received a circular from the South Australian Employers Federation on the matter. I have also spoken to a member of the federation who has explained to me the objections it has to clause 18. It seems to me that those are relevant objections. As the clause is now drafted (and I think that the Minister will change it a little), there would be a power of veto in members of advisory trade committees.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! After some consideration the Chair has decided that the Committee will not further debate clause 18 at the moment. We will put the amendment to clause 3 now and debate the wider issues involving clause 18 when we reach that clause. This will keep matters in perspective and avoid confusion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If clause 18 were to be deleted, would we go back and remove this definition?

The CHAIRMAN: We could recommit if the circumstances arose.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will reserve what I want to say on clause 18 until later.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Entry into apprenticeship by mature age apprentices."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

Page 5, line 20—After "Committee" insert "present and voting at the relevant meeting".

Some complaints have been registered with me, and I have also received correspondence from the Employers Federation concerning criticisms of the amending legislation. One of the matters raised is that, with the provisions as they now stand, any member of a trade committee could absent himself from a meeting which was going to discuss adult apprenticeships. In those circumstances there could not be a unanimous decision of the committee. I think I am being honest in my approach by agreeing that the Government would not want that to occur. The Government wants this arrangement to function properly and sensibly. This amendment would mean that a vote would be taken of all those people who were attending the trade committee meeting at that time. No-one could absent himself deliberately from the meeting and thereby stop adult apprenticeships from being recognised.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The amendment is fractionally better, but it is still totally unacceptable. All it means is

that anyone objecting simply needs to attend the meeting and to vote against the proposal. Under the amendment, everyone who attends the meeting must be willing to approve the proposal. The amendment provides for a unanimous decision of those present. Anyone who may have previously stayed away may now attend and vote against it. So, there is no real change at all, and I still oppose the provision. It is unfortunate that the Minister is not willing to take a bold stand. Actually, it would not really be a bold stand. The Minister should not sit on the fence.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On this matter, it seems to me that the member for Davenport is right in what he has just said. As this clause reads without the amendment, someone staying away from the meeting can, by that very act of absence, exercise a right of veto. The Minister will take that away, but the right of veto is still there, but it must be exercised at the meeting. It does not take away the right of veto from any one member; he can exercise a veto by simply turning up at the meeting.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Surely he must justify it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. All a bloody-minded person has to do is go along and say, "I vote against it." There is nothing in the provision that says he has to justify it. So, one member of the advisory trade committee, without giving any reasons, can veto it. I cannot see any justification for that, nor can those who have talked to me about this matter. Certainly from my limited knowledge of the matter (and I have just examined the original legislation) I believe that section 26a, which does not apply to mature age apprentices, merely says that the commission has to approve of the employer and certain conditions. Here, on the matter of mature age people, we have to go as far as an advisory trade committee. Many people say that, if this provision goes in, it will completely defeat the whole object of the exercise, whatever the reasons. If that is so, the whole clause is bad. This piffling amendment will make it so triflingly better that it is not worthwhile.

Mrs. ADAMSON: This clause is absolutely cock-eyed. It is all very well for the Minister to say we should proceed cautiously but, by having this clause in the Bill, we are institutionalising a bad principle; namely, individuals can have the power of veto and thereby thwart declared Government policy to the disadvantage of individuals. That is against Government policy and against the best interests of trades.

Amendment carried.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Abbott, Bannon, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Drury, Duncan, Dunstan, Groom, Groth, Harrison, Hemmings, Hopgood, Hudson, Klunder, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, Whitten, and Wright (teller).

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Becker and Mathwin.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clause 19—"No apprentice to be employed until commission has approved of employer and place of employment."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have said what I am going to say on clause 17, because that was the first of the clauses which increase the penalty. This clause increases the penalty from $100 to $500. On my information there is no real justification for any increase in penalty, and there is a fear amongst employers that this will greatly discourage and frighten employers as regards apprentices. All I want to do (I know it will fall on deaf ears on the other side, anyway) is, on behalf of those who have spoken to me, protest against any increase in the maximum fines that are imposed under this Act.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In 1966 when these penalties were first arrived at the amount was $100. That is 12 years ago, so in value of currency—

Mr. Millhouse: It hasn't gone down quite as much as that, has it?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I would not be surprised if it had. This was examined solely on the basis of increases in penalties in other legislation, so it is strictly in accordance with other legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 20 passed.

Clause 21—"Applications to be notified to commission."

Mr. DEAN BROWN moved:

Page 5, line 31—after "applies" insert "in writing".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT moved:

Page 5, line 31—Leave out "an" first occurring and insert "his".

Amendment carried.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

Line 36—delete "Five" and insert in lieu "One".

This is the same point as the one raised by the member for Mitcham. The penalty of $500 is too high. As this is a new provision, I believe it should be only $100.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rely on what I said previously in the reply to the member for Mitcham.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (22 to 29) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I take this opportunity to refer to what I consider to be the bad financial situation still being experienced, particularly in Whyalla. Despite the very great improvements to the Workmen's Compensation Act brought in by this Government, we are still unfortunately experiencing long drawn-out delays in finalising these cases. I want to speak tonight about a legal firm, which I do not intend to name. I do not believe that we in this House should haphazardly name people, but I believe that the firm in question is delving into the financial situations of people, and this is having an adverse effect on them.

Over a period of many years, I have had a long experience with workmen's compensation cases and during those years I have seen many financial and physical hardships suffered by workers and their families. On many occasions, members opposite describe members of this Government as being violently opposed to matters concerning the financial problems of insurance companies and employers. I believe the financial problems of employers in this regard are caused by overpayments wanted by insurance companies from them to cover workmen's compensation.

On many occasions I have experienced long-drawn-out legal arguments over workmen's compensation but,

having said that, I want to be the first to give credit to some legal people for their great assistance in this field. I could name certain legal firms which have played an important part in workmen's compensation claims. Again, I do not want to name them but we on this side of the House all know there are many such firms. I voice my grave concern in this matter as the local member of Parliament for an industrial area, having regard to my relationship with my constituents. I always believe and have always felt that a constituent has the right to see his or her local member and to raise various problems with him; and some reasonable hope should be given to the constituent by the local member that the local member will investigate the complaint and at least give a reasonable reply.

I have worked on that basis as long as I have been in Parliament, and before that as an industrial advocate. On that basis, I have had a very good relationship with Government officers, with the Royal Automobile Association, with the State Government Insurance Commission, and with the Housing Trust, but unfortunately I failed in this instance to have such a relationship with this firm of solicitors. I fail to see the real difference between obtaining assistance from the people I have referred to and assistance from a solicitor. I find no difference in my own mind. As I expected previously and again expect tonight, one of the great difficulties in workmen's compensation cases has always been the difficult and lengthy time needed for settlement. I accept that the parties on both sides want the best deal they can get in the settlement of a case. I do not believe that a legal practitioner should be dogmatic to the extent that a telephone conversation or a friendly word could not be carried on between the legal profession and, in this case, the local member of Parliament.

I draw to the attention of the House the file of correspondence in a case in which I have been involved in my area. It came to my attention at the beginning of March, 1977, nearly 12 months ago. At that time I took what I believed to be a truthful and proper report from my constituent about his problems. Unfortunately, I have now found that in this case it appears there is medical evidence to show that he is a malingerer.

If the solicitor had had the wisdom to suggest that to me privately or in correspondence, the whole question could probably have been dealt with and properly settled about 12 months ago. Unfortunately, I could not get a reply from this solicitor by telephone, in conversation, or by letter. On March 22, 1977, I first wrote to the solicitor and stated at that time where the gentleman had been working and that I understood that he had been paid compensation by an insurance company, and I drew to the solicitor's attention that, because of the length of time which was about four years, the question of settlement would be on a lower rate of pay than it would have been at present.

Despite that, and after numerous letters to the Minister of Labour and Industry and the Attorney-General as to what happened, and also to the Metal Workers Union in order to get assistance from it, I had to write another letter to the solicitor on December 14, in which I said that probably this correspondence would not be recognised as my other correspondence had not been, but I drew to his attention that in a statement of payments a certain amount was paid and that there seemed to be a discrepancy. I said that I would appreciate some advice as to whether my figures were correct and, if they were, I asked what had happened to the other sum. I did not think anyone could take affront from my correspondence, as I was asking for information.

Within 24 hours (after waiting for 12 months) I received a letter that accused me of being, shall I say, a liar, and also stating that he could not give me the information as he regarded it as confidential between him and his client. However, it was his client who first came to me to get the information. Within 24 hours I had written to the solicitor telling him that if a more ready reply had been available in March instead of December, 1977, other correspondence would not have been necessary.

I say genuinely that I believe solicitors are no different from others in our society. Surely they should recognise that there is complaint about them and that there should be a proper relationship existing not only between them and their clients but between them and the local member of Parliament.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Yesterday, the Premier, in challenging every member of Parliament to uphold the fundamental principles of democracy, said:

> The principles are as simple as they are great. The Executive Government of the State is responsible to Parliament and to the people. It must account for its actions, and account for them fully and effectively. Should any member of a Government of this State deny this accountability, mislead this House, the penalty is clear. Resignation or dismissal from office.

I should like to draw to the attention of the House a matter—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member is that passage out of yesterday's *Hansard?*

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, but the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The same principles are explained by the Premier in a letter that he wrote to Mr. Tremethick on January 20, and I quoted the contents of that letter earlier today in Question Time. Clearly on record is the Premier's commitment to this Parliament about the bases on which a Minister shall be called upon to resign. What I have quoted to the House in precis form is that, where a Minister of the Crown has been similarly responsible for misinformation to the Parliament, even if he had been misled by a public servant in his department, he would be required to resign his Ministerial post. It does not matter whether it is in *Hansard* or not. The thing is that the Premier has written that in letter form and I have quoted from a copy of his own letter.

Let us put that statement by the Premier to the test and look at what he did in recent times to the former Commissioner of Police, Mr. Salisbury. He misled him and, after all, he is a member of the South Australian public. It is a dismissal offence, to use the words of the Premier. He misled Mr. Salisbury on September 13 when he replied to a specific question by Mr. Salisbury at interview. "Have I got the opportunity of suspension?" said Mr. Salisbury, or he questioned the Premier with words to that effect, and the Premier, in reply, said—

Dr. Eastick: That was the 13th of when?

Mr. CHAPMAN: On Friday, January 13, 1978. He asked whether he was under suspension and "I"—that is the Premier—"said there was no power to suspend him but that he would hear very shortly, and he then left." What was he to hear very shortly? Was it a reconsidered opinion, a legal opinion, or another opinion that might be promoted by Cabinet, which met on Monday, January 16? We all know that on that day Cabinet met to further discuss the dismissal of Mr. Salisbury.

It is clear from my listening to what occurred in this place in recent days, particularly today, when I heard my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, direct a question to the Premier. He asked the Premier to

nominate the authority from which he gave the legal advice. He asked the Premier where he got his advice from, to name it, and it appears that the Premier did receive advice on the matter of Mr. Salisbury's position. The Premier admitted that his Cabinet had advice from the Solicitor-General.

He did not admit, of course, that he had advice particularly on the point about suspension, on the very question which had been raised with him by Mr. Salisbury, the sacked Commissioner. However, as pointed out by the Deputy Leader, clearly the Government did have the power to suspend. Section 6 of the Police Regulations Act, 1952-1973 (it is not long since the Act was before Parliament), provides clearly that this provision requires to be read with section 36 of the Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1975, which provides that words giving power to appoint to any office includes power to suspend or remove any person appointed or suspended under such power. The Acts Interpretation Act, 1915-1975, clearly demonstrates that the words "powers to appoint to any office" do include the power to suspend. The Solicitor-General, as the Premier said, apparently was consulted.

The Premier then, unbelievable as it may seem, discussed this subject with his Cabinet. By his own admission he discussed it with the Attorney-General in Cabinet. They concluded, on the basis of the advice they had received from the Solicitor-General, that there were no powers to suspend. That is a lie. That is a misleading statement, whether it is recorded in *Hansard* or wherever; it is an untruth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member in this Chamber knows that he cannot use the word "lie".

Mr. CHAPMAN: I withdraw the word "lie". It is an untruth, and it is a deliberate attempt, not only in the first instance to mislead Mr. Salisbury, but it is an attempt to mislead this Parliament, and accordingly to mislead the public. If the Premier had not included the words "on the basis of the advice given to him by the Solicitor-General", that there were no powers to suspend, it would not have in any way implicated the Solicitor-General. However, now, by the Premier's own admission in this Chamber today in reply to the Deputy Leader, he has committed his own senior public servant. In my opinion, he has committed the Solicitor-General to having misled the Premier and, accordingly, the Premier has misled Parliament.

I refer to the point made by the Premier only yesterday, that in the circumstances where a Minister misleads Parliament, either directly or as a result of misleading information given to him by a public servant, he shall be dismissed. Someone is telling an untruth, either deliberately or by accident. There was a semblance of apology in the Premier's comment yesterday, and again today, about his reply to Mr. Salisbury over the suspension point, but at no stage has he cleared his name in respect to the other misleading statements he has made, as I stated, when he embraced the reference to the Solicitor-General. Either he did not seek and obtain advice from the Solicitor-General at all, in which case it belies his statements or, if he did seek and obtain advice from him, in line with what he said today, the Premier should resign forthwith. That is not my opinion—that is the Premier's opinion. That is what the Premier told this House and hundreds of people in and about this building yesterday: that those are the circumstances a Minister is subject to and in which he will be dismissed.

In the past few weeks the Premier has committed the very offence for which he says a Minister is subject to dismissal. Whether this point is supported by the whole of the Opposition or not—

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr. CHAPMAN: —and I tend to suspect that it is especially by my colleagues on the right, it is our view that the Premier should resign because he has grossly misled this Parliament during the process of a subject, which has raised incredible passion throughout the community, which is highly sensitive and delicate and which should be resolved in the only way as we said yesterday—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: —by a Royal Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member went over his time. He did not sit down. If he does not do so in future, he will suffer the consequences.

Mr. DRURY (Mawson): A matter of concern to me is the inadequacies of the existing Landlord and Tenant Act. In so far as the provision for removal of tenants is concerned, the law requires a landlord to obtain a court order before eviction takes place. Presently, the legal processes—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the honourable member is talking about a Bill that is now before a Select Committee of this Parlaiment. Therefore he is disbarred from debating it in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will decide the point of order. I want the honourable member's point of order again.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I understand that the honourable member is debating the substance of a Bill that is currently before a Select Committee. Therefore, it cannot be debated during an adjournment debate.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid that the honourable member is out of order.

Mr. Chapman: Try another subject.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DRURY: I think that we have dealt well with the Salisbury affair. My subject matter deals with the current law referring to an eviction that has taken place.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has the right to speak on that matter, but he cannot mention any Bill currently before the House.

Mr. DRURY: I did not do so, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member began with the Residential Tenancies Bill.

Mr. DRURY: In that case, I apologise to you, Sir. What took place in my district recently was that a constituent of mine was renting a property and, during her tenancy, she became in arrears with the rent. On a Saturday morning several weeks ago, she went shopping at the local supermarket, during which time the landlord arrived at the property. Her children had been left in the property watching television. The landlord ordered the children out of the property, and proceeded to remove her furniture and other effects.

Mr. Slater: Mr. Chapman is probably the landlord.

Mr. DRURY: The subject is too serious to be mirthful, because of the traumatic effect on the children, as one can imagine. The landlord stored the effects under the carport and, when the woman returned from the supermarket, what should she see but all her personal effects and furniture out in the open and her children locked out. One of the neighbours arrived and said that the children were in her house, because they were upset. The woman proceeded to go into another neighbour's house to arrange shelter for the night, because she had nowhere else to go. At such short notice, it is a wonder that she was able to collect her thoughts enough to do that.

The landlord, in taking this action, was definitely outside his rights. The tenant, after all, has certain rights. I believe that whilst the landlord needed the premises

genuinely, because of a family situation (he found that he was unable to stay at his parents' house; I do not dispute that) nevertheless, the method used to remove the tenant was definitely wrong. Therefore, I think that under these conditions the present law is definitely inadequate, and I will be glad when the present law is amended.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): There being five minutes remaining—

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I reiterate the sentiments expressed earlier by the member for Alexandra. We find a most serious situation as a result of what the Premier said recently. He misled the former Commissioner of Police during the interview in which obviously the Premier was contemplating sacking the Commissioner. From the extensive record that the Premier had of the final interview on Friday, January 13, with Mr. Salisbury, he said that Mr. Salisbury obviously thought that something could occur as occurs in Great Britain, where a Chief Constable is not summarily dismissed; in Great Britain he would be suspended, an inquiry would take place, and the findings of that inquiry would be examined by the Home Secretary, and a decision then made. Mr. Salisbury said, "Am I suspended?" The Premier said, "We have no power to suspend you." That was patently false. Either the Premier was completely ignorant of the law (an alarming situation) or he deliberately misled Mr. Salisbury.

On Monday, the Cabinet met, and we were told that during the discussions the lawyer members of Cabinet decided that they had no power to suspend. We were also told (and this has not been clarified) that an opinion was sought. The Deputy Premier said that the opinion that they got was that they could not suspend the Commissioner of Police. The opinion came from the Solicitor-General. I find it incredible that the Solicitor-General would give an opinion to the effect that they could not suspend the Commissioner. The Premier has been challenged to table that opinion, but he has refused to do so. Obviously, the Premier is thereby admitting that there was an opinion. Either the Government did not have an opinion from the Solicitor-General or, if it did, it was a wrong opinion.

Whatever the rights of the matter, the Government had misled the public, either as a result of false information from the Solicitor-General or because it was ignorant of the law. According to the high standards that the Government says that it is setting (and this is the principle that it enunciates as its excuse for the summary sacking), it was misled and the public was misled. This was the circumstance that led to the summary dismissal of Mr. Salisbury. Therefore, from the words of the Premier himself, he should resign. Mr. Salisbury has been misled, and the public has been misled. The Government says that it is a result of false information from the Solicitor-General; that is the implication. Whatever the reason, the public has been misled, and Mr. Salisbury has been misled. From the words of the Premier, he should resign.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is precisely the same crime of which they accuse Mr. Salisbury.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. In future, I hope that, when the Speaker stands, he does not have to call "Order" so loudly. On two occasions I have had to do that today.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The allotted time for this grievance debate expired at 10.29. I was speaking, and the clock had not indicated 10.29 when I was in the last three words of my remarks. In those circumstances, I believe it was a little tough to chop off my last three words, in view of the fact that the time allotted for the grievance debate had not expired.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will make that decision. I will continue to take such action, as I was required to do earlier when the member for Alexandra was speaking.

Motion carried.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 9, at 2 p.m.