

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 November 1990

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ROADS (OPENING AND CLOSING) BILL

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Appropriation (No. 2)
Financial Institutions Duty Act Amendment,
Land Tax Act Amendment,
Marine Environment Protection (No. 2),
Pay-roll Tax Act Amendment,
Stamp Duties Act Amendment (No. 4),
Tobacco Products (Licensing) Act Amendment.

PETITION: ELLISTON HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 1 959 residents of South Australia requesting that the House urge the Government to retain acute care facilities at the Elliston Hospital was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 124, 133, 191, 193, 194, 213, 219, 224, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 261, 263, 266, 267, 269, 271, 272, 275, 278, 279, 306, 307, 308 and 317; and I direct that the following answers to questions asked during the Estimates Committees and answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SOCIAL JUSTICE STRATEGY

In reply to **Mr BRINDAL (Haywood)** 13 September.

The Hon. G.J. **CRAFTER**: The reply is as follows:

(a) List of superintendents in line management to the Assistant Director of Curriculum (Social Justice).

English Language and Literacy
Education of Girls
Poverty and Education
Multiculturalism in Education
Special Education
Orphanage Teachers Centre.

The social justice group includes Aboriginal Education. Officers in this unit report to the Coordinator—Aboriginal Education.

(b) 'Breakdown of people employed . . . ' on a contract basis'.
Multiculturalism in Education Curriculum Unit.

Number of teachers employed on contract
—full time 32
—part time 5
Number of clerical officers employed

—full time 5
—part time 9
Number of clerical officers employed on contract
—full time 1
—part time 2

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 1
—part time 0

English Language and Literacy Curriculum Unit
Number of teachers employed on contract

—full time 6
—part time 2
Number of clerical officers employed
—full time 4
—part time 0

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 1
—part time 0

Priority Education Curriculum Unit
Number of Teachers employed on contract
—full time 16
—part time 0

Number of clerical officers employed on contract
—full time 3
—part time 9

Number of officers (GME Act) employed on contract
—full time 1
—part time 0

Education of Girls Curriculum Unit
Number of teachers employed on contract
—full time 8
—part time 0

Number of clerical officers employed
—full time 0
—part time 2

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 1
—part time 0

Special Education Curriculum Unit
Number of teachers employed on contract
—full time 4
—part time 0

Number of clerical officers employed
—full time 1
—part time 0

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 2
—part time 0

Orphanage Teachers Centre
Number of teachers employed on contract
—full time 3
—part time 0

Number of clerical officers employed
—full time 11
—part time 7

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 14
—part time 4

Aboriginal Education Curriculum Unit
Number of teachers employed on contract
—full time 9
—part time 1

Number of clerical officers employed
—full time 8
—part time 0

Number of officers (GME Act) employed
—full time 2
—part time 1

(c) Output of the superintendents in terms of publications, policy. The Education Department Social Justice Strategy (draft).
Superintendent of Curriculum, English, Language, and Literacy
Assessment in English, A work required approach.
LLIMY tutor pack.
LLIMY teacher workbooks.
Media and English.
Senior Secondary English.
International Literacy Year, Brochure for Parents.
Oral Communication in English (about to be released).
Literacy Assessment, A Resource Book.
Superintendent of Curriculum, Education of Girls
Girls Learning, From Theory to Practice.
R-7 Sexual Harassment Curriculum Project.
Supportive School Environment, Facilities for Girls (draft).
Education of Girls in Low Socio-Economic Situations—
National Project of Significance (draft).

Class Room Practice for Girls, Project of National Significance (draft).
 Femininity and Reality, Project of National Significance (draft).
Superintendent of Curriculum, Poverty and Education
 Schools and Poverty.
 A critical Review of the Priority Projects Program.
 An Unequal Struggle.
 Evaluation—A process for Change (draft).
 Priority Projects Handbook (draft).
 Child Poverty and Education, Report of the First National Conference.
 Educational Directions for Girls in Poverty (draft).
 Newsletters (one/term).
 Broadsheets (approximately three/term).
 Country Areas Program—Parent Information Booklet.
 Country Areas Program—Brochure (about to be released).
 Newsletters (one/term).
 Broadsheets (approximately three/term).
 Social Justice and SACE (draft).
Superintendent of Curriculum, Special Education
 Policy for Students with Disabilities (draft).
 Equal Opportunity and Students with Disabilities (draft).
 Guidelines for Curriculum Writers.
 Student Achievement Record—Students in Special Schools.
 Problem Solving for Students with Intellectual Difficulties.
 Newsletter.
Superintendent of Curriculum, Aboriginal Education
 Aboriginal Studies R-12 Guidelines for Teachers.
 Home.
 Winda.
 Takeri.
 Urrakuli, Wakarla and Wildu.
 Aboriginal Dreaming Stories.
 The Dreaming and the Environment.
 Aboriginal Lifestyles before European Settlement.
 Dreaming Trails and Culture contact.
 The Pitjantjatjara People.
 Aboriginal People and the Communities Today.
 The Kurna People.
 Aboriginal Land Rights.
 The Ngarrindjeri People.
 Teaching Aboriginal Children.
 Aboriginal Children Speak 1.
 Aboriginal Children Speak 2.
 Bookayana Stories.
 Aboriginal Children's Games.
 Bush Tucker.
Superintendent of Curriculum, Multiculturalism in Education
 LOTE Bulletin.
 Languages Inservice Program for Teachers.
 South Australian Language Teacher Professional Development.
 R-7 Indonesian (draft).
 R-7 Vietnamese (draft).
 R-7 Khmer (draft).
 R-7 German (draft).
 ESL Curriculum Project Bulletin.
 ESL in the Mainstream (draft).
 ESL Newsletter.
 Language Links.
 Sources of Resources.
 Links.
 ESL Materials.
 Supportive School Environment, Cross Cultural Tension.
 Case Studies of Culturally Inclusive Practices.
 Learning Styles of Non-English Speaking Background.
 Students in Mathematics—Interim Report.

THE BUDGET AND ITS IMPACT ON WOMEN

In reply to Mr VENNING (Custance) 19 September.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The reply is as follows:

(a) The Farm Safety Seminars run in 1989-90 were funded by a Comnet Grant of \$12 500 from the South Australian Health Commission. This funding was initially provided to run four workshops. Six workshops were run within the budget and a subsequent seminar was funded by the Department of Agriculture in February 1990.

These seminars established a model that can be used for future seminars and enabled the development and prepa-

ration of master resources. It is believed that future farm safety seminars can be coordinated for approximately \$1 000 each depending on their location within South Australia.

The Rural Affairs Unit has made provision of \$2 000 for rural seminars in their 1990-91 budget; this allocation can be used for coordinating seminars on demand. This fund would enable the coordination of two farm safety seminars if the need arose.

To date no request has been made to the unit for the provision of a farm safety seminar.

(b) The Rural Youth organisation is a valuable training ground for rural young people and its network of 50 clubs provides many opportunities for these young people to develop their qualities of leadership and valuable skills. The figures referred to show only an apparent increase as the method of calculation differs between the years cited. The 1990-91 figure (\$60 000) includes all expenditure on this organisation while the 1989-90 figure (\$38,500) includes only direct salary costs and direct expenditure from State recurrent funds. Consequently, there is no anticipated real increase in funding and support for this organisation remains at the same level.

(c) There is no expenditure for the South Australian Rural Advisory Council described under either specifically targeted allocations to women and girls, or under general allocations. This council provides the Minister with advice on a range of issues of concern to rural people in general that are not of a directly technical agricultural nature.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

In reply to Mr GUNN (Eyre) 16 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Household support is currently available under Part C of RAS to provide assistance to eligible applicants who face conditions of financial hardship and who are considering whether to adjust out of farming or who have decided to adjust out of farming and are awaiting the sale of their property. Farmers who do adjust out of farming may also be eligible for a re-establishment grant, currently to a maximum figure of \$31 838. Part C is specifically designed to enable farmers to leave their properties with dignity and to re-establish themselves.

Although assistance is provided as a loan, advances may be converted to a grant provided the property is sold and the applicant adjusts out of farming within two years of first receiving household support. If in the opinion of the State authority the applicant has been unable to sell the property because of circumstances beyond the farmer's control, provision of household support funds may be extended for a further six months. Thus it is possible to provide household support for a total of 30 months, all convertible to a grant for farmers who sell their property and adjust out of farming.

There are currently no provisions under RAS, which is a Commonwealth-State scheme, to provide carry-on finance under any conditions anywhere in Australia other than:

1. Where severe drought conditions are causing farmers difficulty in obtaining carry-on funding. This is an interim measure for drought pending the Federal Minister's decision on the report of the Drought Policy Review Task Force.

2. Exceptional circumstances in Queensland and Western Australia where farmers are suffering as a result of pesticide residue contamination. It is not the purpose of RAS to maintain people on farms where the ability of the farm to trade on a commercial basis is impossible, even when RAS is provided. Farmers and their families who are in difficult situations can benefit from household support and re-estab-

ishment grants. These measures are specifically designed to assist adjustment out of farming.

3. A meeting of the new Ministerial Advisory Committee of Rural Finance Policy will meet shortly to review the appropriateness of current lending measures and criteria.

SEWERAGE SYSTEM

In reply to Mr HERON (Peake) 16 October.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD, for the Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department has a long history of professional service to the South Australian community. The department also has a well-deserved reputation for technical competence in the planning, design, construction and operation of the water supply, irrigation and drainage, and sewerage systems which have been provided by successive Governments to cater for the community's needs.

It is obvious that Australian water authorities are not ideally located in a geographical sense to be actively involved with the testing and evaluation of emerging technologies from Europe or the United States of America. Furthermore, the geographical remoteness of the major centres of population in Australia also contributes in some ways to a sense of isolation, especially from the major capital cities of Sydney and Melbourne.

However, in spite of these geographical disadvantages, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is able to use effectively a number of mechanisms to keep abreast of developing technologies within the water industry and so be reasonably well placed to evaluate optional technologies for departmental use. These mechanisms involve:

- the review of the prominent technical journals from around the world;
- personal interaction with officers from local, interstate and overseas water authorities, the consulting industry and commerce;
- representation on various Australian technical committees;
- membership to various local and international technical associations;
- affiliations with overseas research organisations;
- attendance with overseas research organisations;
- attendance at technical conferences; and
- research and development of appropriate technologies within the Engineering and Water Supply Department itself.

Finally, it should also be recognised that the mechanisms mentioned herein apply not only to the sewerage system but to the whole range of departmental operations.

KOREAN LANGUAGE

In reply to Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart) 18 October.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: There is not a uniform policy with respect to the translation of State Government department pamphlets into community languages. Each agency determines its own requirements depending on the type of publication and the particular target group within the community to which the message is addressed. Approximately 50 community languages are spoken in South Australia and it would clearly not be feasible to have all pamphlets translated into that number of languages.

Requests to the Language Services Centre for translation of publications usually cover the following nine major community languages spoken in South Australia: Chinese (Mandarin), Croatian, Greek, Italian, Khmer, Polish, Serbian,

Spanish and Vietnamese. Although the Language Services Centre does not have a Korean font in the wordprocessing software package, the requests for translations into Korean are undertaken through a casual translator who uses Korean typeface in the translations carried out.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

- By the Premier (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—
Government Management Board—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Health (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Chiropractors Board of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
Foundation South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
Nurses Board of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
South Australian Health Commission—Report, 1989-90.
Retirement Villages Act 1987—Regulations—Forms.
South Australian Health Commission Act 1976—Regulations—
Pharmaceutical Fees.
Prostheses Fees.
Outpatient Fees.
- By the Minister of Family and Community Services (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—
Department for Family and Community Services—
Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—
Soil Conservation Boards—Reports, 1989-90—
Central Eyre Peninsula, Central Flinders Ranges,
Eastern Eyre Peninsula, Gawler Ranges, Goyder,
Hummocks, Kangaroo Island, Lower Eyre Peninsula,
Lower North, Marla-Oodnadatta, Murray-Mallee,
Murray Plains, Northern Flinders, Southern Hills,
West Broughton and Yorke Peninsula.
Metropolitan Milk Supply Act 1946—Regulations—
Licence Fees.
Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985—Regulations—Practice
Fee.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Attorney-General's Department—Report, 1989-90.
Court Services Department—Report, 1989-90.
Credit Union Deposit Insurance Board—Report, 1989-
90.
- By the Minister of Education (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Supreme Court Act 1935—Supreme Court Rules—Export
Reports and Costs.
Commercial and Private Agents Act 1986—Regulations—
Grand Prix Security Agents.
Legal Practitioners Act 1981—Regulations—Indemnity
Insurance.
Liquor Licensing Act 1985—Regulations—Liquor
Consumption—Thebarton Oval.
- By the Minister of Children's Services (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—
Children's Services Office—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Goods Securities Compensation Fund—Report, 1989-90.
Road Traffic Act 1961—Regulations—Mass Limits.
- By the Minister of Finance (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Casino Supervisory Authority—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Correctional Services (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Department of Correctional Services—Report, 1989-90.
Correctional Services Advisory Council—Report, 1989-
90.
Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
- By the Minister of Transport (Hon. Frank Blevins)—
Office of Transport Policy and Planning—Report, 1989-
90.
- By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. S.M. Lenehan)—

Environmental Protection Council—Report, 1989-90.
 History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1989-90.
 Clean Air Act 1984—Regulations—Backyard Burning
 (Amendment).
 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972—Regulations—
 Permit System.
 Planning Act 1982—Regulation—Retail Showroom Def-
 inition.
 Waste Management Act 1987—Regulations—Medical
 Waste.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. J.H.C. Klunder)—

Forestry Act—Proclamations—
 Kuitpo Forest Reserve.
 Second Valley Forest Reserve.

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report,
 1989-90.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. R.J. Gregory)—

Pollution of Waters by Oil and Noxious Substances Act
 1987—General Regulations.

By the Minister of Employment and Further Education
 (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Industrial and Commercial Training Act 1981—Regu-
 lations—Declared Vocation (Amendment).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TEACHERS' SALARIES

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Education): I seek
 leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I wish to draw the attention
 of the House to the impact of recent salary increases on the
 State's education budget. The House will be aware that
 South Australia now has the highest paid teachers in Aus-
 tralia and that the total salary increases will cost the State
 in the order of \$64 million in a full year. Those major salary
 increases have created a financial dilemma for the Govern-
 ment in that there is a budgetary shortfall for this financial
 year of \$23 million.

I am pleased to advise the House that a meeting of key
 education organisations was held yesterday at which this
 financial problem was drawn to their attention. A number
 of options aimed at finding ways to pay for the shortfall
 were discussed. I want to place on record my appreciation
 of the productive contribution those organisations, which
 represent parents, students, school principals, teachers and
 non-government school sectors, made to that consultative
 process.

It was stressed during that meeting that the State Gov-
 ernment supported teachers gaining a pay increase. Our
 South Australian education system leads the nation with a
 quality education service that provides a broad range of
 support for teachers. As well as now being the highest paid
 teachers in the nation, they enjoy one of the best student
 to teacher ratios, the best class sizes, the most supportive
 professional development programs, and the best provision
 of non-contact time for lesson preparation and marking.

However, the Government is now faced with exploring
 options to provide for the budget shortfall so that we can
 maintain our commitment to an excellent and affordable
 education system. I can advise the House that today I am
 exploring one of the options raised during yesterday's edu-
 cation consultation, namely, that the salary increases be
 phased in rather than be paid immediately.

A phase-in period, while not overcoming the total short-
 fall, would assist and be in line with phase-in period, pro-
 vided for teachers salary increases in other States, and indeed
 in the non-government school sector in South Australia. We

have sought the cooperation of the South Australian Insti-
 tute of Teachers which, during negotiations, supported the
 view that any pay rises for teachers should be phased in.
 We are today applying to the Teachers Salaries Board to
 have this matter addressed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OPERATION NOAH

**The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Emergency
 Services):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As I foreshadowed on 24
 October 1990, I now table the report received by me from
 the Commissioner of Police dealing with his response to
 the recommendations contained in the document prepared
 under Mr Justice Stewart in relation to Operation Noah in
 1989. For members' convenience, the Commissioner has
 cross-referenced the recommendations of the official NCA
 report on this matter under Mr Faris QC and the recom-
 mendations of the Stewart document. I should add that the
 report of the authority, that is, the Faris report, and the
 police responses to its recommendations, was first released
 publicly by the Attorney-General on 25 January this year.
 The recommendations in the Stewart document were also
 publicly released on 31 January.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

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

RN4610 Flagstaff Road, Bonneyview Road to Black
 Road reconstruction and widening.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ABORTION CLINIC

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Will the Deputy Premier
 offer his resignation to the Premier in view of a letter I
 have indicating that he misled Parliament on 18 October
 this year? On 18 October I asked:

Will the Minister of Health clarify the situation concerning
 plans for terminations of pregnancy to be offered by the Adelaide
 Medical Centre for Women and Children, and will he dispel
 rumours that a pregnancy advisory clinic will be set up at the
 Queen Victoria Hospital which will become a 'stand-alone' abor-
 tion clinic after the physical amalgamation of the hospitals?

In his reply the Deputy Premier said that 'no such plan is
 in existence'. I have in my possession a copy of a letter
 dated 25 October signed by the Manager of the Queen
 Victoria Hospital, Marie Jonson, and addressed to the Exec-
 utive Director of the Health Commission's Metropolitan
 Health Services Division, Dr David Blaikie. That letter
 reveals, contrary to the Deputy Premier's answer, that in
 September the Health Commission initiated an assessment
 of a stand-alone facility at the Queen Victoria Hospital and
 that, as a result, the manager of the Queen Victoria Hospital
 has discussed the matter with senior staff, who have pro-
 vided a brief and suggested two locations at the Queen
 Victoria Hospital for costing considerations. This letter fur-
 ther states:

At present, we have a situation where the Minister is reported
 as saying that there will be no pregnancy advisory clinic at the
 Queen Victoria Hospital and correspondence from you [Dr Blai-

kie] (dated 20 September 1990) indicating it may be useful to do a preliminary assessment of this option.

The letter goes on to refer to a request I have made to the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children for specific advice on this matter by stating:

Obviously we need to have agreement on what information will be provided to Dr Armitage and to any inquirers.

Clearly, that suggests concern within the commission that what the Minister has said does not square with the truth of what the commission has been doing.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member may impart Stalinism to this Government, but I assure him that we are not infected with that virus. If in fact there are people in health units and in the commission who want to discuss a number of options, I would have thought that that was a perfectly healthy situation, but nowhere in that letter is it suggested in any way that I or the Chairman of the commission have entertained or made any decision that such a facility will be provided. Indeed, I expressly ruled it out in my answer to the question that the honourable member raised with me. I did it with a degree of levity, because I see such a suggestion as being quite laughable—that in quitting the site at the Queen Victoria Hospital, we should take everything away except abortion facilities. The whole thing is ridiculous—quite ridiculous. I know where all this came from; I understand that there were some discussions at one stage about the possibility, notwithstanding the Furler report, of the amalgamated institution (in the fullest sense of the word; of course, it is already an amalgamated institution), the collocated institution, at some stage in the future having to consider the possibility of such services on that collocated site. That has become distorted in the minds of a number of people into this ridiculous proposition which I have ruled out once and which I rule out again.

PIKA WIYA HEALTH SERVICE

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I address my question to the Deputy Premier in his capacity as Minister of Health. Can the Minister indicate whether some recent concerns at the board level of the Pika Wiya Health Service have affected the service provided to the Aboriginal people of Port Augusta and the surrounding areas?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: As the honourable member would be aware, this is a very important service; it provides primary health care to the Aboriginal people of Port Augusta, Davenport, Nepabunna, Leigh Creek and Copley. It provides antenatal care, a nutrition program, health promotion and an on-call GP service. It administers an extensive youth program for young people from as far away as Yalata and the north-west homelands. Also, a substance abuse rehabilitation program will be opened on 12 November which will provide a local and statewide service. It is managed by an Aboriginal board which employs approximately 50 people.

For all those reasons, one can see why the Government is taking the current allegations very seriously indeed. They relate to misappropriation of funds, the misuse of resources and irregularities in management practices. If any of these allegations are found to be proven, appropriate action will be taken immediately. I can tell the House that there have been some preliminary investigations and I would like to briefly share the results of those investigations with members. First, a Price Waterhouse audit of Pika Wiya's 1989-90 finances has been undertaken and no serious concerns or evidence of fraud have been discovered. Secondly, there has been an examination of a number of allegations by the

Port Augusta CIB but I am advised that, as yet, nothing justifies a final police investigation.

Further investigations are being proposed. They include a further financial audited record for the previous years, the appointment of an interim administrator and referral of material for further consideration by the Port Augusta CIB. That is as much as I know at this stage. These matters are being further chased up. That there are allegations is an irritant. Should they prove to have some degree of truth, that would be most unfortunate, but should any of this in any way interfere with the delivery of those services, that of course would be a tragedy. I give the honourable member and the House an assurance that everything is being done to ensure that, notwithstanding the investigation, the services continue to be delivered as sensitively and as efficiently as possible.

ABORTION CLINIC

Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition): In view of the information provided in the last question from this side of the House from the member for Adelaide, does the Premier agree that the Deputy Premier misled the House on 18 October when he said that no plans existed for a stand-alone abortion clinic at the Queen Victoria Hospital and, if so, will the Premier dismiss the Deputy Premier and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that the first requirement for a follow-up question to a question that had been asked would be to in fact listen to the answer and try to take that into account in asking the follow-up question. What we have just been treated to is a preordained strategy and a set of questions (and perhaps there will be some others that hapless backbenchers are sitting there holding that have all been typed out for them) which bear no relation to the information provided to this House. I could excuse it if it was the member for Murray-Mallee or the hapless member for Newland or somebody like that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Well, one of them is liable to do anything and the other is probably not yet experienced enough to know that they are being used. For the Leader of the Opposition to get his spokesman to ask a question and then to have a pre-prepared question which he is going to get up and ask willy-nilly, irrespective of the answer, is quite extraordinary. If we are to have a series on this, I would have thought that at least some of those basic rules ought to be observed instead of turning this into some kind of mechanistic farce.

The Deputy Premier and Minister of Health was asked a legitimate question, with documentary back-up to the question. He rose to his feet and responded to it completely and adequately. I would have thought that that was an end to the matter. Instead, we have this farce of a pre-prepared follow-up question which has no relation to the reality of that answer. My answer to the honourable Leader is 'Of course not.' I have absolute confidence in the Minister of Health. What he said was quite consistent and in full explanation of the matter that was put before him.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What's your question going to be, Stephen?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier is out of order. The member for Walsh.

STATE GOVERNMENTS

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): I direct my question to the Premier in the context of discussions, which took place at the recent Premiers Conference, on the matter of Federal-State relations. Is the Premier aware of yesterday's proposition by the Lord Mayor of the city square mile that the administration of the entire State of South Australia should be handed over to the Adelaide City Council? Is he aware of a claim that the United States has only two levels of government—

Mr Lewis: Four.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: I missed the golf call from the other side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh will resume his seat. I am sure that all members, as well as the Chair, are having difficulty hearing the questions and answers. The previous question from the Opposition to the Premier, which concerned the career of a politician, was a very important one. The questions deserve more respect from the House. The honourable member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Replacing my divot: is the Premier aware of a claim that the United States has only two levels of government? Will he correspond with the individuals making this claim and inform them of the relevant facts about the American political system? An article in this morning's *Advertiser* by Catherine Bauer entitled 'State polities should go, says Condous' reads, in part, as follows:

Adelaide Lord Mayor Steve Condous has called for the abolition of Australia's State Governments and the transfer of their powers to the seven capital city councils. He was immediately supported by Brisbane Lord Mayor Sallyanne Atkinson, in Adelaide for a meeting of the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors. Mr Condous and Ms Atkinson said Australia should model itself on the United States, which has only two levels of government. Mr Condous said, 'We might as well take over the entire job; throw the State polities out and let's run the State and city; let's get down to two levels of government, local and Federal.'

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He'd want to do better than the town hall extensions.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Walsh.

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER: This article claiming that the United States had only two levels of government appeared in the same edition as an article entitled 'Republicans ready to shield Bush from losses', which reported on today's elections in the United States in which millions of Americans believe that the positions for which they are casting their vote include 36 of the 50 State Governorships and more than 6 200 seats in State legislatures, apparently unaware of the claims made in the Clochmerle on the Torrens conference.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I must say that I was very surprised to read this statement, which was apparently issued as a result of yesterday's meeting of the Lord Mayors. My surprise was heightened by the fact that, together with my wife, I was a guest of the Lord Mayor at the 150th celebration dinner of the establishment of the Adelaide City Council, a very pleasant and well-conducted affair, which I enjoyed. My colleague the Minister of Local Government was present, as were members of the Opposition, and although State politicians all, I do not think this issue was raised with any of us, although I have not had the chance to check with my colleagues.

I spoke with the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Ms Atkinson, and, equally, she did not indicate to me that my presence there was superfluous or that State politicians had no real function in life. If without my seeing this report I had been

asked what the attitude of the city council was to the State Government, I would have drawn on the Lord Mayor's speech itself—a very good speech—in which he outlined the history of the city of Adelaide and pointed out that, 150 years ago in 1840, the council was founded and that it was the first municipality or local government area established in Australia. He said it was the first in the then British Empire, that is, the first in any part of that area controlled by Britain, outside the British Isles themselves. So, it has a long, proud tradition.

However, as the Lord Mayor pointed out, within the first two or three years of its operation, the council got into such financial and administrative difficulties that the then State Government had to step in and take over the administration of the affairs of the city, and the council went into a temporary dissolution. For the next six years or so, the corporation and its affairs had to be run by the State. If there had been no State instrumentalities or possibilities, I do not know what would have happened in that situation in Adelaide. Local government was eventually resumed. Right from the very beginning, in this respect, it certainly depended on the back-up, support and infrastructure provided by the State Government. Therefore, I was surprised to be told that we should be abolished as superfluous.

Aside from making mistakes in relation to the Federal system, one of the strengths of Australia is that it is a federation and, in that respect, is like the United States. One would have thought that the word 'States' would have tipped off the mayors of Adelaide, Brisbane and elsewhere that perhaps there were more than two tiers of government. In fact, there are Federal, State, county and city levels of government in the United States. It has something like six police forces: Federal, State, county and city, all with interlocking jurisdictions; the highway police operate as a separate entity; and, according to my colleague the Minister of Further Education, there are university or special institutional police. When we add that up, I am not sure that the United States is the place for one to look with respect to the rationalisation of the various levels of government.

To return to the point, I hope that the proposition is not tested too thoroughly in the electorate. The most recent test was the referendum on the alteration of the Federal constitution to provide for the recognition of local government as a constituted tier of government. One would have thought that, if there was enormous support for this, that proposition would have been eagerly seized upon as it would have immediately established the constitutional link between Federal and local government and paved the way for the eradication of the State area which has control over local government in a legislative sense.

I remind members that that proposal failed both in the majority of States and with the majority of electors. In relation to the recognition of local government, only 33 per cent of electors were in favour of such recognition and 66 per cent were opposed. In South Australia it was even more stark—29.8 per cent were in favour of recognising local government at Federal level, which was less than the national average. If one dissects the cities, one finds differing approaches but, with respect to our own city of Adelaide, and to use the seat of Adelaide which encompasses the city, the lowest vote recorded for favouring local government was in that seat—in fact, only 33.27 per cent felt that it was a good thing. So, public sentiment should be tested before one embarks on this exercise too wholeheartedly.

I will turn the other cheek with respect to this matter. We will not retaliate against the lord mayors and their suggestion that there should be changes. Indeed, only two weeks ago we signed an historic memorandum of under-

standing with local government recognising its role, independence and ability to determine its own destiny to a far greater extent than ever before. We feel quite relaxed about local government performing its task, and we believe that duplication can be avoided. It would be good if the Adelaide City Council, for example, took on responsibility for municipal library services and also looked at the question of whether or not it should pay the E&WS for some of the water used (currently provided by the State Government) to tend some of the parks and gardens. I will be delighted, at the earliest opportunity, to take up with the Adelaide City Council one or two other matters in the light of this aspiration to higher responsibility.

ABORTION CLINIC

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Deputy Premier. Taking into account the reply that has been provided—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:—by the Deputy Premier to the question asked by the member for Adelaide, when was the Deputy Premier first advised that the Health Commission had initiated an assessment with respect to establishing a stand-alone abortion clinic on the site of the Queen Victoria Hospital, and why did he fail to advise the House at the first available opportunity of the full facts disclosed in the letter dated 25 October from the Manager of the QVH to the Health Commission? If he was not aware of the assessment being carried out by the Health Commission, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: All I can really add to what I have already said is that in a discussion with the Chairman of the commission he mentioned that there had been some discussion on the amalgamated board about whether it was consistent or otherwise with the Furler report that, at some stage in the future, given that abortion procedures are carried out at the Queen Victoria at present, such procedures should continue to be carried out at the collocated hospital. That is all that was said. I indicated that I was not interested in it and the Government was not interested in it, and that was the end of the matter as far as I was concerned.

Now, if I am expected to come racing into this Chamber and report every discussion that I have with the Chairman of the commission, and for that matter with the Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Family and Community Services or the Commissioner for the Ageing, I am afraid that I would get the sort of reputation that I do not currently have of prolixity, and I am sure that a greater degree of boredom than already sometimes prevails in this House will overcome all members.

RURAL DOWNTURN

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): Will the Minister of Agriculture inform the House about his recent meeting with the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy (Mr John Kerin)? I understand that the Minister met with Mr Kerin in Canberra last week to discuss the severe rural downturn, and I also understand that he was accompanied by the President of the United Farmers and Stockowners, Don Pfitzner.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Indeed, I did visit John Kerin last Wednesday in company with Don Pfitzner, the President of the UF&S. This was in fact the first time that

any State Minister had sought a meeting with the Federal Minister with respect to the rural downturn, and it is also, may I say, an historic first for another reason, inasmuch as it is the first time that the United Farmers and Stockowners joined with the State Government to meet with the Federal Government to discuss the plight of rural Australia.

Certainly, we had the opportunity and the need to discuss many things because, while there is no doubt that many in the rural sector are heading into a crisis and there is no doubt that we are in a severe downturn, I remain convinced that the cheap headline grabbing that some members in this place seem to be keen to ferment are not the useful answer to the problems we are facing; rather, the kind of purposeful discussions that Don Pfitzner and I had with the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy are more to the point.

I know that this is the shadow Minister's eighth anniversary in this place, and I give him my personal congratulations for that. However, I would rather hope that he would attempt to take the same kind of bipartisan line that others in his Party have sought to do with respect to the seriousness of the rural situation. We discussed a number of issues. We were given a lot of time by the Federal Minister for Primary Industries and Energy—1½ hours in a formal meeting and then we had some hours that evening to canvass further some of the issues we discussed.

First, we dealt with the Middle East situation, and I had a chance to put the South Australian Government viewpoint that, if there have been any windfall gains in the petrol tax from world parity pricing, consideration seriously be given to some of that money being used to fund compensation for loss of payment on contracts that have been undertaken and to consider opportunities to pick up those sales that might be lost in the season ahead due to the Middle East crisis. The Federal Minister undertook to further pursue those points with his relevant colleagues and accepted the fact that South Australia has been very seriously affected by that inasmuch as 21 per cent of our exports go to the Middle East as opposed to 5 per cent for the country at large.

With respect to wool, I informed the Federal Minister—and I pick up the motion of the member for Flinders—that the Government supports the maintenance of the floor price of 700c and believes it is very important that that message be loud and clearly made to the world. I expressed my concern at those in the rural sector who are seeking to erode that position and simply encouraging buyers to stand back from the market place.

I also made the very important point that it was critical that the Federal Minister use everything within his power to seek out alternative markets for our wool because it is surely better that the 4 million bales of wool that we have stockpiled in this country are sitting in the warehouses of mills overseas rather than in the warehouses in this country and that, if that required the Federal Government to consider special lines of credit to enable those countries that normally buy our wool but do not have the foreign exchange reserves to do so at the moment, that should be seriously considered.

In that way, countries such as the Soviet Union, Poland and others could have the opportunity to access our wool at the 700c floor price, but through a line of credit specially provided. As to the citrus area, the Federal Minister clearly indicated that he well understood the seriousness of the situation in the Riverland and other citrus areas of Australia. He also indicated his willingness to pursue that matter further with me and the relevant State Ministers in Victoria and New South Wales.

I indicated to him that this House had passed a motion with the support of all members and that I therefore brought a multi-partisan message to him on the matter of the citrus industry, and I hoped that he would take that into account. I also indicated the views that we had expressed with respect to various trading measures, such as special measures to have emergency triggers when world trade conditions are particularly adverse with respect to floor prices. We agreed that rural assistance has to be further discussed at a forthcoming meeting of Federal and State Ministers that will be held on 12 December. I indicated that there were a number of issues that we wanted to examine on that occasion, and I look forward to further following those issues with the Federal Minister at that time.

I also took the opportunity to raise with him, as did Don Pfitzner (who spoke on many of the issues that I have already identified), the matter of Austudy and family allowance means testing, and the seriousness of the situation that that causes for many people in rural Australia. The Federal Minister said to me in response that he was aware of the concerns in that regard and that the matter 'is under the active reconsideration of the Federal Government'. In supporting the arguments with him I was able to identify just how serious an impact that has on many Australian rural families, and I look forward to the further outcome of that reconsideration by the Federal Government.

There is not time now to detail all the issues that we canvassed: suffice to say that I was pleased that John Kerin gave us the extensive and serious hearing that he did. I know that Don Pfitzner of the UF&S agrees with that comment and also feels that we had a good chance to express the very real concerns of South Australia with respect to the severe rural downturn that we are now facing and the urgency of the strategies to address what is a major downturn in world commodity prices affected by such things as the Australian exchange rate and also interest rates.

ABORTION CLINIC

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): My question is directed to the Minister of Health. In response to the question asked by the member for Heysen, the Minister of Health emphasised his apparent exclusion of the idea of a pregnancy advisory clinic at the Queen Victoria Hospital, which he stated on 18 October—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will ask his question.

Dr ARMITAGE: Do the Minister's words to the member for Heysen about a pregnancy advisory clinic, 'I am not interested in it; the Government is not interested in it; and that is it' tally with a response that I have in a letter from the CEO of the Adelaide Medical Centre for Women and Children of 30 October, which states:

There are no firm plans to conduct a pregnancy advisory centre from our Rose Park site when the Queen Victoria Hospital closes. However, in line with prudent management we are considering all options of which this is just one.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Yes, it tallies exactly, because it is Richard Gould's signature at the bottom of the letter and not mine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

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

Dr Armitage: You are responsible.

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

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

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

CARDBOARD CONTAINERS

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Can the Minister for Environment and Planning advise the House of any action being taken to reduce the volume of litter resulting from the indiscriminate disposal of cardboard containers? Deposit legislation has been very successful in South Australia in removing cans and bottles from the litter stream, and the absence of this type of rubbish is often commented on by visitors to this State. My concern is that to date we have not found a similar system to control the disposal of cartons.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this very important matter. In short, the responsibility for avoiding litter lies with both the manufacturer and the consumer and, to that extent, I would like to inform the House that cardboard cartons, particularly those used for flavoured milk and fruit juices, constitute a major proportion of litter items scattered over South Australia's beaches, streets and parks. Whilst I would be the first to acknowledge that these forms of containers have a very useful purpose by virtue of the fact that they provide a hygienic container and that they are easy to handle and store, it is also true that they are easy to discard. Some irresponsible people in our community seem to feel that as soon as the beverage has been consumed they may throw that container through the car window or onto the street, beach or park.

To try to counteract this phenomenon, the industry itself has acted very responsibly, and the South Australian dairy industry and the juice beverage industry, in concert with KESAB, have devised a campaign which I had the privilege of launching last week and which is called 'Pack it in'. This campaign is designed to target the whole community but specifically an age group that has been identified as being a group most likely to throw cartons through car windows, and so on. I am sad to say that that group comprises males between the ages of 17 and 24 and, therefore, the campaign has been targeted through SAFM and the radio stations that have been identified as those to which this group listens.

I think it is important to recognise the voluntary action taken by the industry in terms of trying to educate the community. As Minister for Environment and Planning, I will be looking very carefully and with great interest at the results of the surveys conducted by KESAB to gauge the effectiveness of the campaign, because it is only through proper assessment of the success or otherwise of such education campaigns that we can ensure that we clean up our complete environment. I thank the honourable member for his question.

Mr ANDREW PEAKE

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Can the Deputy Premier advise the House whether Andrew Peake has yet had personal contact from either the Minister or the Health Commission? I received a letter today from Andrew Peake saying that he still had not, at that day of writing, received any personal contact from the Health Commission or the Guardianship Board. He says that the Health Commission, or the Guardianship Board by whom he is employed, has made no attempt to telephone, telex or write to him at his hotel or

through the embassy, even though he wrote to and phoned them himself from Bagdad.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am getting a little irritated by all this. Mr Peake knows exactly what is his position and this carping criticism—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:—obviously reflects no credit. The honourable member might not have received (although I believe it was delivered to the House this morning—he might like to look in his box; it might be there) a letter from me, which brings him up to date on the position of Mr Peake. I am not sure from memory whether it exactly advises the honourable member who has been in contact with Mr Peake, but I am reliably advised that he does know exactly where he stands in this matter.

WOODVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): My question is directed to the Minister of Education. What is the Education Department doing to improve the tight accommodation situation for students at the Woodville Primary School, and can the Minister indicate when modifications to the administration facilities may start?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot hear the question. The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: The correspondence I have received from the school indicates, in part:

This year has seen a dramatic increase in the number of students (7.5 per cent in only two terms) and the school accommodation is now at a critical level which needs urgent attention. The result of this situation is:

1. Loss of withdrawal areas.
2. Loss of film room.
3. Loss of unit assembly area.
4. No place for music teachers to hold lessons.
5. Activity room fully booked.
6. No area for learning assistance programs.

This school desperately needs either more classrooms or a zoning program to limit our enrolments to enable us to regain and keep the facilities mentioned above.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I understand that the accommodation situation at the Woodville Primary School is tight, and I believe that about 500 students are enrolled at that school at the present time. The Education Department recently carried out a facilities review for the school and considered a number of suggestions for better use of existing space to help ease the accommodation problem in that school in the short term. However, the Education Department is also undertaking a demographic study of students in that area. Part of the demographic information being collected is the geographic distribution of students enrolled at the school.

I have been advised that up to 90 families with students enrolled at that school live outside what would be considered the usual catchment area for the school. The demographic study will look at the reasons for their going to the Woodville Primary School rather than to other schools. I might say that other schools in that district have vacant rooms and surplus education facilities. I understand that the school community has also raised the idea of establishing a zone of right for enrolments at the school. It is estimated that, if a zone of right were established, the school population would decrease over time to about 300 students who could be comfortably accommodated in the existing facilities. That would alleviate the need for very expensive additional accommodation being placed in that school and not being required in future years.

Area works project concept plans have been developed for an upgrading of some of the existing school facilities which are under urgent pressure at present, but the matter of further upgrading and additional facilities will be subject to this current review.

GRAND PRIX

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): My question is directed to the Premier. In view of the impact it will have on this year's operating result of the Grand Prix Board and therefore its potential to affect the amount of another budget subsidy to the board, will the Premier tell the House what was the total cost of staging the Cher concert, including Cher's personal fee, widely suggested to have been up to \$500 000? Further, can the Premier say whether the Grand Prix Board believes that Cher gave value for money following her non-appearance at the track on Saturday and the widespread disappointment with her concert performance?

Last year the board made a loss of \$1.4 million and this is being covered by a budget subsidy of this amount in the 1990-91 State budget. The Auditor-General's Report also reveals that the Government has given approval 'for a system of annual budgetary subsidies to cover future operation results of the event'.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Picking up the last point of the explanation, I said at the time the Grand Prix was secured for Adelaide, that we could expect to be subsidising the Grand Prix in direct terms to the extent of about \$1.5 million to \$2 million per annum, in 1984 dollars. On that projection, we would certainly be getting value for money. In fact, we have not had to provide such a subsidy. Last year's Grand Prix, which was severely affected by the airline pilots' strike and the wet weather on the day, was the first time we had to make a grant to the board from State revenue. I would have thought that that was a remarkable performance. We are way ahead in those direct terms.

The indirect contribution to our budget by that event vastly exceeds anything we have had to outlay and I would suggest that the economic effect on Adelaide, the promotional marketing which we have been able to achieve through it, make all that and more justified. So, my starting point in response to the question is to immediately tackle the underlying suggestion that any kind of subsidy to the Grand Prix is something to be deplored or is something unusual.

I believe it is unusual if the Grand Prix can make a profit in its straight finances. After all, the costs of setting up and taking down a street circuit are very high. There are high recurrent costs and capital costs. Considering the sort of revenue the Federal Government rakes in from the Grand Prix and the significance of the event, I feel it should contribute to our basic capital costs. Apart from its initial grant, it has not been prepared to do so, but we will persist with our application for it. For instance, if it was a Commonwealth Games, a World Cup or something of that sort, there would be a massive contribution. Year after year, we present an event which is about those dimensions, and that is why I think we have a solid argument.

I reject the concept that the Grand Prix is a failure if it does not deliver a direct profit. Every year the Grand Prix delivers a massive profit. The fact that the State uses some of that revenue in providing direct support to the Grand Prix is irrelevant. I am not saying that we should let that go off the planet; indeed, we might reach a point at which if that subsidy became too great it would not be worth our while to continue, but we are a long way away from that point. Because we have not had to outlay it, we already have some \$10 million in the bank, as it were.

To come back to the question itself, I do not know what were the costs in relation to the concert. All I do know is that the Cher concert associated with the Grand Prix was a very powerful marketing tool and obviously had a tangible impact on the success of the event. It was an extra, but it was an important part of the overall marketing strategy of the event, and I think it has proved very successful. That is the sort of decision that the board has to make and for which it is accountable. Whatever complaints might have been made about the free concert in the afternoon, there is no question that it was the most successful Grand Prix that we have seen.

The things beyond our control, such as the weather, were marvellous and the things we could control, such as the actual staging of the event and the range of activities, were unprecedented. The race itself, the centrepiece of the four days of the Grand Prix, was one of the best we have witnessed. It really was a fantastic time and it was just the sort of boost that we needed in South Australia to renew our confidence at a time when people such as the Leader of the Opposition say that unemployment will go over 10 per cent shortly, that we must be careful, that everyone's job is under threat. I do not know what the precise figures will be. We all agree that it is a difficult outlook. However, I do not believe that we should be trying to talk down the economy and getting satisfaction out of announcing these big target figures. To the contrary—and the sort of niggling question asked by the honourable member indicated that sort of attitude—let us try to emphasise a few positives, and activities over the past four days in Adelaide were a fantastic positive.

PASTORAL RENTALS

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Will the Minister of Lands advise the basis on which the Valuer-General determines rentals, whether his approach has changed and what factors are taken into account in determining the rent payable by lessees? In a recent article headed 'Pastoral rent appeal' in the South Australian *Stock Journal*, it was suggested that the Valuer-General had changed his approach to the setting of rents for pastoral leases.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I will answer this question in my capacity as Minister of Lands. I remind the House that, when we passed the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act of 1989, the Act required the Valuer-General to annually determine the fair market rent for only the Crown's interest in land held under a pastoral lease. This means that the value of any improvements not owned by the Crown will be disregarded. In determining this rent, the Valuer-General must take into account a number of factors, and I remind the House of those factors. We clearly spelt out the factors in the pastoral Bill, as follows: the Valuer-General must take into account the proximity and accessibility to markets and all other factors affecting the profitability of the commercial enterprise under the lease. Initially, a number of approaches were considered, as is normally the case with any valuation. However, the basic approach has always been the direct application of market rents and evidence from comparable properties.

Briefly, this means that the approach adopted by the Valuer-General is, first, to determine a rental based on comparable market evidence for the whole property as a going concern, and then the lessee's interests (that is, the improvements) are valued separately and a rental is imputed to those improvements at an appropriate rate of return as also indicated by market evidence. By deducting the rent

appropriated to the improvements from the total rent payable on the property as a going concern, the market rent for the Crown is then finally deduced.

A great deal of time and research has been carried out by the Valuer-General and his staff in order to ensure an accurate and equitable determination of these rentals. This has included many meetings with the UF&S pastoral task force and its private valuer. I reject the assertion made in the South Australian *Stock Journal* that the Valuer-General has changed his approach to the setting of rents. I remind the honourable member and the House that the setting of rents and the way in which the Valuer-General must proceed is laid down under the pastoral Bill, and that is the way that the whole thing is proceeding. I am sure, thanks to the question from the honourable member, that this will clarify the situation for both the *Stock Journal* and any other member of the community.

ST JOHN AMBULANCE SERVICE

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Is the Minister of Emergency Services now satisfied that we have in South Australia an ambulance service which is affordable to all despite the fact that, with the disappearance of volunteers from the St John Ambulance Service, the emergency call-out rates will double in the metropolitan area and treble in the country? Will the Minister explain why these increases are necessary when the Health Commission said in January that the cost of employing more paid ambulance officers at the expense of volunteers 'could be contained within the Health budget'?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: It seems more appropriate to direct the question to me as I, through my budget lines, fund this service. I point out to the honourable member that we are not looking at the total professionalisation of St John. Indeed, a very substantial volunteer component will remain in country areas.

Mr S.G. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: In response to the member for Davenport, that matter is in the hands of the St John organisation, as it should be. However, this Government would be very interested in maintaining a maximum of volunteer effort in the St John service for the obvious reason that it reduces the subsidy to be provided by Government. The other point is that, quite apart from the costs that the community has to meet because of the decision St John itself took last year to move to professionalisation in the metropolitan area and regional country centres, there is also the matter of upgrading of training now taking place.

A number of significant Government decisions have been taken in concert with St John to significantly upgrade the training of the officers involved. One would imagine that nobody in this House would cavil at such decisions, which require money and resources. For those various reasons the decisions which were announced at the end of last week were taken. In conjunction with that there will be an attempt to substantially bolster the subscription scheme, which I understand has been languishing somewhat in recent years. Again, the Government has a considerable fiscal interest in trying to ensure that the subscription scheme is widely supported. I am convinced that with the measures that have been taken there will be no diminution in the quality of the service and, indeed, with time we will see a significant upgrading.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education inform the House

of the benefits to be gained in South Australia from an agreement to move towards national uniformity in TAFE as decided at a special ministerial conference on training last Friday? I note from several reports over the weekend that the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training is claiming victory in his bid for a uniform national further education and training system. He is even quoted as saying that uniformity will enable our training system to respond quickly to the employment demands of industry. Is a uniform TAFE system the best system?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Like the member for Napier, I was somewhat confused by the press coverage of the special ministerial conference that I attended in Sydney on Friday. No journalists were present and therefore the coverage was even more confusing. Contrary to reports in the media which emphasised uniformity as the main point of discussion, the special ministerial conference was held to examine the outcomes of a national report on the training costs of award restructuring prepared by Ivan Deveson. There is no doubt that there are significant benefits to be gained by this State and the nation through the establishment of national skill standards for training, and South Australia has been a strong supporter of this development. National skill standards, transferability of those skills and portability of qualifications across State boundaries are essential prerequisites for a more efficient work force and competitive industries.

However, this is very different from uniform national training or some kind of uniform TAFE system, which is the last thing I want as Minister. This could mean an inadequate response to local industry needs, and bureaucratic and restrictive operating guidelines simply to ensure that there is a sameness about the service throughout the country. TAFE's record in South Australia excels. We have easily the best standard of TAFE in Australia, and that is acknowledged both internationally and in the other States. The Government and I are not prepared to jeopardise South Australia's high TAFE standard by accepting a uniformity of approach which could have as its roots the view that the lowest common denominator sets the standard, nor am I interested in a uniformity drive which promotes mediocrity, so I was rather puzzled by the report in the *Advertiser* which talked about a uniform TAFE being agreed to at that conference as that certainly was not the case. I do not want South Australia's superior record impeded by an approach—whether it be called national, uniform or Federal—which is inflexible. Any new arrangements must be genuinely cooperative, objective and use the expertise of the State system as we have the expertise of delivering the TAFE system.

The outcome of negotiations that we will enter into as a result of the special conference last week will be a key test of whether the Commonwealth and Mr Dawkins can achieve this level of cooperation. I am confused about press reports on the conference which indicate that Mr Dawkins supports some kind of industry run colleges. This was certainly not discussed at the conference. Of course, a key indicator of the Commonwealth's commitment will be the extent to which it supports the TAFE system financially, and I pointed out to John Dawkins at the conference that in recent years the Commonwealth's contribution to TAFE recurrent funding in South Australia has fallen from 21 per cent to 14 per cent, despite increased demand. So, the Commonwealth has been cutting our funds but telling us to do more, and that is not on.

GRAND PRIX

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Premier. What arrangement has the Government entered into

with the Grand Prix Board for 'a system of annual budgetary subsidies', and does this system include a repayment of previous subsidies in the event that the board records a surplus from future events? The Auditor-General's last report (page 245) reveals that the Government had given approval for a system of annual budgetary subsidies to the board, although the precise arrangements had yet to be finalised. This follows the board's 1989 deficit of \$1.4 million which has been covered entirely by a subsidy in the 1990-91 budget.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Those arrangements have not been concluded at this stage. The board has been fully preoccupied in staging this year's event, finalising the contract and various other matters. I hope to talk to the board in the first half of next year, with a view to trying to get some better feel for a regular arrangement in relation to this. Certainly, at this stage we are not in a position to put in some sort of budgeted figure, and I think that that will always be the case. Many factors determine whether or not you have a successful Grand Prix in financial terms or whether you fall on the deficit side.

I refer the honourable member to my answer a moment ago. In looking at the basis on which we went into this particular operation, we are a long way ahead because last year was the first occasion on which we had to provide some sort of supplementary assistance. I think that that is a remarkable achievement. Obviously, the event is a costly one, and there are uncertainties surrounding it. I believe we should be quite willing to provide some sort of subsidy, but we have to try to introduce some certainty in the manner of budgeting within the commercial parameters of the event. That needs careful discussion, and those discussions will take place in the first half of next year.

AUSTUDY

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): Will the Minister of Employment and Further Education tell the House what action he is taking to ensure that women and rural people generally are not disadvantaged by the recent changes to the Austudy guidelines? Several of my constituents have indicated to me their concerns about the difficulties they feel they will encounter next year due to the changes to parental assets testing, the allowances for married students and the definition of 'full-time' status.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I share the honourable member's concerns. I have raised these concerns with Peter Baldwin, the Federal Minister for Higher Education and Employment Services. Indeed, I have called for a review of the Austudy guidelines. Some of the changes to the Austudy guidelines introduced in the recent Federal budget concerned me greatly because of their potential effect on already disadvantaged members of our society, particularly women and rural students.

The reduction in the amount that a spouse is able to earn is particularly damaging. Low income households simply will not be able to afford the loss of income incurred by one spouse undertaking study. Many women gave up their educational and employment opportunities earlier in their lives to assume family responsibilities. So, this tightening of Austudy eligibility imposes yet another obstacle for those wanting to gain formal qualifications before re-entering the work force. The decrease in the assets that parents are allowed to have will be a severe blow to students from rural areas. Such students are already disadvantaged in having to meet the costs of living away from home and many, of course, are from farms with low annual incomes.

Another issue is the definition of 'full-time' status, as the honourable member indicated. Previously, a student was considered full time if he or she was undertaking at least three-quarters of an equivalent full-time study workload. The official definition of 'full-time' status has now been changed to 'one equivalent full-time student unit'. If interpreted strictly, this will significantly reduce the number of students eligible for Austudy.

Officers of the Office of Tertiary Education have checked today whether the three-quarters rule will apply and were informed unofficially that it would. However, I am seeking assurances that this will be the case as the three-quarters rule does allow for variation in course structure and management of student workloads. The issue of access and equity in education must always remain our foremost priority: providing a quality education for all unimpeded by economic and social barriers is obviously a basic responsibility of Governments. I find it intolerable that some talented people have not been able to pursue education to the highest level because of social and economic factors. Therefore, I hope that the Federal Government will take on board this call for a review of these Austudy requirements.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr ANDREW PEAKE

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Since responding to a question from the member for Bragg I have had brought to my attention the exact chapter and verse of contact between the South Australian Health Commission and the Guardianship Board and one Mr Andrew Peake, and I would like to place these circumstances, chapter and verse, before the House.

On 29 October this year a letter from the South Australian Health Commission advising A. Peake of the decision to grant a specific instance of special leave with pay from 20 August 1990, to continue as long as he remains a hostage, was faxed to the Department of Foreign Affairs Special Task Force leader Mr Frank Wourn at 1.55 p.m. A copy of that letter was couriered to Mr Peake's mother at 2.20 p.m. on the same day. At 3.20 p.m. Mr Andrew Peake spoke to the Chief Executive Officer of the Guardianship Board. He was aware of the decision to grant special leave and not require his paid leave entitlements to be utilised. The Health Commission was not completely satisfied, despite the fact that it was aware that contact had been made, and therefore the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission rang Mr Peake's hotel at 5.20 p.m. The receptionist advised that Mr Peake could not be located. Arrangements were made for the Chairman to call Mr Peake at 8 a.m. Baghdad time (3.30 p.m. in South Australia) on 30 October 1990.

On 30 October the Chairman's office, South Australian Health Commission, through an operator finally connected to Mr Peake's hotel at 4.50 p.m., although the call was booked for 3.30 p.m. Mr Peake could not be located. The Chairman of the commission decided to try to call Mr Peake again on 31 October 1990 and on 31 October 1990 the Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission finally made contact with Mr Peake at about 3.50 p.m.

So, to my knowledge Mr Peake has been advised in four ways of the decision that I took. The first was by way of the letter faxed to the Department of Foreign Affairs. The second was the copy of the letter couriered to Mr Peake's mother, assuming that his mother made contact with her son. The third was the telephone conversation with the

Guardianship Board and the fourth was the somewhat, for a period, frustrated and delayed but finally consummated telephone call from the Chairman of the Health Commission.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allotted for completion of the following Bills: University of South Australia, Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Merger of Tertiary Institutions),

Soil Conservation and Land Care Act Amendment, Summary Offences Act Amendment (No. 2), Road Traffic Act Amendment (No. 3), Rural Industry Adjustment (Ratification of Agreement), Wrongs Act Amendment, and Statute Law Revision (No. 2), be until 6 p.m. on Thursday 8 November.

Motion carried.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 September. Page 698.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the Bill, although it may not welcome it. The Bill represents but another chapter in the sometimes proud and at other times forgettable history of higher education in South Australia. Perhaps the most distinguishing feature of this change is that it lacks educational validity and is akin to an arranged marriage between two unlikely companions in order to become financially secure.

Before discussing the merits or otherwise of the Bill, it is important to review briefly what has gone before. In this Parliament today we are actually seeing the amalgamation of the Institute of Technology and a major part of the South Australian College of Advanced Education to form the University of South Australia. Before going into the details of the changes it is useful to look back in time. In 1874 the University of Adelaide was established by an Act of Parliament and commenced teaching arts and science in 1876 with a complement of 52 students and eight staff. Law, music and medicine were added in the following decade. Engineering was included in 1888. At the turn of the century the scope of the educational offering was further expanded with the establishment of the Conservatorium of Music—which, at that time, was an Australian first—and commercial studies.

Between the First and Second World Wars we saw the Waite Agricultural Research Institute formed (in 1924) and offerings in dentistry, economics, agricultural science, pharmacy, public administration and physical education followed. In 1889 the South Australian School of Mines and Industries opened its doors. As its name suggested, it was responsible for providing education of a technical nature for the mining industry, which was one of the major industries at the time, and for servicing other industry areas.

It changed its name to the South Australian Institute of Technology in 1960. Its education offerings from inception were more closely related to those of TAFE than to the role it performs today. However, we should remember that the engineering course at the University of Adelaide was partly at the instigation and with the concurrence and able assist-

ance of the South Australian School of Mines and Industries at that time.

In 1885 Roseworthy Agricultural College opened its doors. It is the oldest agricultural college in Australia and has provided educational offerings to post-secondary students over the full range of rural production. In 1861 the School of Art was formed. The Adelaide Teachers College followed in 1876 and the Kindergarten Training College in 1907. These institutions loosely formed what today is known as the South Australian College of Advanced Education, which itself was established by an Act of Parliament in 1982.

Prior to that—in 1973—colleges of advanced education were formed through the amalgamation of teachers colleges. This event signalled an explosion in higher education offerings, many of which arguably belong more appropriately within TAFE colleges or universities. Finally, 1966 marked the entry of the last major player in the higher education conglomerate: Flinders University of South Australia was originally to be a second campus of the University of Adelaide but became a distinct and separate entity in its own right with a charter to serve the university needs of the fast expanding southern suburbs of Adelaide.

There are some notable features of South Australia's higher education effort. Our achievement in establishing a university within 40 years of European settlement is remarkable, given that only 72 000 people of the 225 000 people living in South Australia actually resided in Adelaide at that time. We were very much a rural economy, and 72 000 people is not a lot; from memory, that is smaller than the size of the city of Enfield, so we did not have a large population to support a university. The establishment of a School of Art within 25 years of settlement and the arts offering at the inception of the University of Adelaide reflect a certain sophistication—or was it indulgence—within the numerous Governments formed during this early period. Members should recall that Governments came and went at a very rapid rate during the mid to late 1800s, so the establishment of these educational institutions was in itself quite a feat: notwithstanding all the changes taking place, there was a desire to implement this educational change, which was achieved speedily in the scheme of things. In fact, I suppose that if we went through the State's history we would find that we were the first State to equip our population with advanced educational opportunities.

In 1973 upon the initiative of Prime Minister Whitlam, the functional mould of the State's higher educational institutions was shattered. History does not allow us the luxury of indulging in a 'what if' statement along the lines of the then Labor Government's choosing to widen the horizons of the universities and the SAIT rather than choosing the course that was followed. If we measure success in terms of increased involvement by school leavers in post secondary studies, the Whitlam initiative would be deemed to be highly successful. But obviously that is not a useful measure, given that today we are considering the final dismantling of one section of the educational offering which has been with us in some form or other for about 120 years.

Educational institutions will stand the test of time only if they have well defined reasons for existing. It may well be possible to prop up certain activity forms from vested interest and bureaucratic manipulation, but eventually even that fails. In the case of the CAEs, there were many critics from day one. The Whitlam reasoning was unsustainable when considered in the context of the long-term educational needs of this country. There are some of us who do not believe that education for its own sake is necessarily of great benefit to either the recipients or the taxpayers. Obviously,

John Dawkins also arrived at the same conclusion, albeit 15 years after the system drowned itself in dollars.

What upsets me personally about the past 20 years is that we have spent billions of dollars reducing our capacity to perform in a dynamic world. Australia does produce scientists, engineers and medical researchers of world standing. However, there are never enough, and those with the greatest talent are forced overseas to complete higher studies or gain work experience. Too few return, because of the lack of opportunities. We have not cuddled intelligentsia; we have not promoted them or succoured them so that they can continue to contribute to an intelligent, 'smart Australia', as I think Prime Minister Hawke would say. We have spent an enormous amount of money in areas where we have not seen definable outcomes or actually improved our competitiveness on a world scale. It is ironic that South Australia indulged its fantasies in its first educational offering, at a time when it was appropriate to do so. It might well have been, and probably was, important that, having spent a fair amount of one's life on the land and in the mines, and in just surviving in a sometimes unkind environment, one had the opportunity of some of the finer elements of life that were given credence within our educational offerings.

That is what happened at the start. We had the School of Art, and arts and science were the two major features of the University of Adelaide. From 1973 we as a State and Australia as a country have been indulging ourselves where it is totally inappropriate to do so. The rest of the world has been whizzing straight past while we have been convincing ourselves that the highest achievement is to equip bureaucrats with the skills to exploit the system for their own benefit. We have developed a breed of socialists who can rationalise their champagne habits in terms of community good. We can look to our past sins and berate ourselves over the damage wrought on the Aboriginal community and occupy the time of hundreds of philosophers and researchers to quantify our tragic past but never get closer to the solutions.

We can talk about the greenhouse effect and holes in the ozone layer but conveniently omit to explain that Australia has put insufficient effort into training, educating and fostering the scientific and engineering talent necessary to overcome the problems.

I could extend this line of argument for at least an hour, because it reflects the feeling of lost opportunities, indeed the shame of allowing people of indifferent quality to so effect the educational offering in this country. It is my view that we have bought billions of dollars of junk over the past 17 years. The stage we have now reached is one of dollar domination. I suspect that, if the country was not in such economic straits, there would be little pressure to change existing arrangements. Can I suggest that, whilst economics is a pretty good reason to change the system, if it is not accompanied by commitment to excellence, the very act of rationalisation is doomed from the start.

In effect, we will squeeze 39 922 students (the count as at 31 March) into three institutions. I remind members that, at that count, the University of Adelaide had some 9 710 students; Flinders University, 6 710; Roseworthy Agricultural College, 751; SACAE, 1 338; and SAIT, 9 013, making a grand total of 39 922 people. As members would appreciate, this means that there will be a dominant institution under the name of the University of South Australia. By my calculation, the new University of South Australia will have some 20 000 students.

It is highly important to look at recent events, to understand why the change is taking place and then to draw

conclusions as to whether the changes that have taken place will be of ultimate benefit to South Australia and to the country at large. Those who have been on university councils—and I was on the Flinders University Council for seven years—would recognise that the matter of university amalgamations has been very high on the agenda for three years. It has been a vexing question, because the original green paper that was handed down by Mr Dawkins clearly stated that he really was not interested in educational output but was interested only in the dollars and cents of the system—the economic capacity of the system to produce more students and more graduates. That upset and excited the vast majority of the university community with whom I came into contact and I imagine that there were many pieces of correspondence from every tertiary institution whizzing backwards and forwards between their respective States and Canberra.

The paper concluded that there were such things as magic numbers: the original diagnosis was that an institution could not perform adequately or economically unless it reached a minimum size of 5 000 students. The Government suggested that an enrolment of between 5 000 and 8 000 students would be more economical, but such institutions would not benefit greatly from Commonwealth grants in the same way as institutions of more than 8 000. Some economists had worked out—and I am not sure what figures were used—that big was beautiful and that 8 000 students or more happened to be the optimum size for a university. We all know that that is fallacious, that it has no basis in educational history and that it has no basis of fact even on the grounds of economics because, if the system does not turn out quality, we are wasting our money. I suppose that if we asked 'What is an economical size?' there would be a variety of answers and the age old adage would apply: if you ask 10 economists to provide a solution, you will get 10 different answers.

The same applies to the question of what is an adequate size for a university. My children attend a small college of about 500 students. It is a warm and caring educational institution and is successful in what it does. It educates the children well and gives them a greater meaning to life, and it observes certain standards within its walls. That is important to me and to many other people whose children attend that college.

I know that many members of this House and others have decided to give their children a college education because of some of the things I have mentioned. Obviously if they thought that it meant obtaining the best outcome, they would enrol their children at the largest colleges. But we know that the quality of education is not necessarily related to size.

The Labor Government got the size wrong and, if one considered world comparisons using the bland statistics which have been the basis of this whole exercise, one would realise that South Australia—and Australia—has to turn out more graduates. We have to prove to the rest of the world that we are a very intelligent community. Some of the standards emanating from the United Nations reflect on such aspects as retention rates at the last year of secondary schooling, the percentage of students who proceed to tertiary training and, ultimately, the number of successful participants in the tertiary education sector. Different countries are compared to determine whether they have fulfilled their educational requirements for the population.

Australia has often been criticised in terms of its lacking in higher educational capacity and performance. Previously, it has been singled out as lacking in the scientific and engineering areas, but to date we have done little to redress

what I think is an underlying fundamental demand that must be met if we are to progress as a nation. When the Government decided to put the pressure on the higher education fraternity in South Australia, it did so by numbers, regarding 5 000 as being possibly adequate but 8 000 as being even better, with grants being applied accordingly.

In the initial debates on this matter, it was my view that South Australia should have three institutions, and I would hope that the former Minister would remember my saying to him on at least two or three occasions that that was the solution. Coupled with that, it was my belief that we had to cut up the CAEs and push them into each of the other institutions. It was also my belief that the Institute of Technology should be a University of Technology and that the educational offerings from the other institutions under the CAE banner would go to those areas most suited between Flinders University, Adelaide University and the Institute of Technology. There was a method in my madness, because I have never believed that the CAEs have performed responsibly.

I have been aware over a number of years of great dissatisfaction within the CAE institutions, the way they have been administered and their lack of quality offerings in many cases. That is a reflection not on the many people who have been performing a very useful and important function but on some of the power plays and power struggles taking place within those institutions. I believe it is because the CAEs have not had a tradition that they have performed so badly. In 1973 there was a breakaway. An enormous amount of money was put into this area of education—quite wrongly I believe—and perhaps history has proven me correct.

Those educational institutions never had a history that went back to the 1880s, with a strong sense of tradition. Their standards were set by people who were willing to take short cuts and who in many cases had no great pride in the total offerings that could be provided by the institutions. They were simply interested in the capacities and the opportunity to perform in their own right. I do not say those things lightly because I know that every member in this House has received representations from people within the CAE sector, either students or, more particularly, lecturers and teachers, who have been totally and utterly frustrated with the way that SACAE has performed. So, it was important to me that, if South Australia's higher educational institutions were to meet their charter, we should cut up the colleges of advanced education and promote the best of the people within those establishments. We must diligently find some ways to remove those who have not performed, or who depend on the system to remain therein, so that we can get on with the job of educating people in South Australia to the best of our ability.

There is some concern about the new University of South Australia, and that was epitomised by the rush to set up professorial positions. Members may recall an announcement about two months ago, that if the major players within the CAE did not get mobile, they would miss out on becoming appointed to the upper echelons of the teaching fraternity within the University of South Australia. A working party was set up for that specific purpose. Fortunately, that matter has been put on the back burner, as I understand it, and we do not need to discuss it now. It would have been my intention specifically to exclude and negate any appointments made prior to the introduction in the House of this Bill.

The Institute of Technology has reason to be concerned through the fear of domination. It has a very enviable record. It has a wonderful reputation for performance,

whether it be in the field of accounting, engineering, one of the technical areas or the Elton Mayo School of Management. The Institute of Technology has a long list of very successful students. It has been one of the jewels in South Australia's crown. If business and manufacturing employers were canvassed and asked which institution they believed had best met their needs, the overwhelming majority would reply in favour of the South Australian Institute of Technology, because it has provided relevant courses and strong instruction, and has ensured that the quality of its graduates is maintained. Perhaps some of the other institutions cannot lay claim to that, and that may cast a reflection on the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University and SACAE. The only institution on which I wish to reflect at this stage is SACAE.

There is a real challenge with the combining of these two very large institutions to form the University of South Australia. Neither I nor anyone else in this House would wish to see certain vested interests providing the leadership within the new University of South Australia. We want it to be the strongest, the most viable and most committed educational institution possible in this State.

There should be no dilution of effort on behalf of those people teaching the courses that have traditionally been provided by the Institute of Technology. Nor should there be a continuation of some of the corrupt practices which have dogged the South Australian College of Advanced Education. When I entered Parliament, I well remember the member for Hanson regaling the House on a number of occasions about the corruption within the SACAE through its failure to apply standards—standards of behaviour, self-discipline and administration—which assist the education process.

One of the great challenges of combining these institutions is to give the new university the sense of purpose and direction that has been found within the Institute of Technology since 1889 when the South Australian School of Mines and Industry opened its doors. It had a long and proud history and maintained that record as the South Australian Institute of Technology. The University of South Australia should be eminent in its fields and provide the best education possible. It should not be corrupted by the individuals who have survived within the SACAE system.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr S.J. BAKER: This is an important debate and it deserves the full attention of the House. It is a fundamental change in the way in which we address education in this State and it requires the total support of all members of Parliament. I point out to the Minister that, when we deal with the related Bill before the House, I will not repeat this debate, because I have outlined the principles in this contribution.

Members of Parliament have received correspondence about a number of concerns at the micro level. Questions have been raised about whether the University of South Australia will go under the nickname of the USA and, as such, be a name of great pride or great ridicule. I guess, if the United States happens to be doing particularly well on the international scene, it may well brush off in a very positive way. However, I imagine that if it is not doing well the USA or the University of South Australia may well regret its name choice. The Minister would recognise that there has been considerable correspondence about the name because the Flinders University is actually the Flinders University of South Australia and it feels cheated that part of its name is to be taken away and given to the University

of South Australia. My preferred choice was the University of Technology, although I understood that that name did not have great favour within certain elements of the SACAE.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was unanimous within the two institutions. The institute was against it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It has been pointed out that not only the SACAE did not like it but the Institute of Technology did not like it. When I discussed that matter with the institute people two years ago, they were very much in favour of the University of Technology of South Australia. So, there remains a question mark about the name. A number of alternatives have been suggested, such as Mawson, Hindmarsh, Playford and Walsh. The university could be named after any number of famous South Australians.

The School of Pharmacy has been the subject of lengthy and important debate. Members have been lobbied to put pressure on the Government to set up a centre for health sciences within the University of Adelaide, incorporating the School of Pharmacy. There has also been debate as to whether other courses such as physiotherapy and nursing should follow suit. From my short experience as shadow Minister of Health, I understand the depth of feeling among pharmacists, academics and the industry about what they believe is a positive step to establish such a centre within the University of Adelaide. It has a number of advantages and it would be a very important addition to the technological capacity and expertise within South Australia because, for the first time, all the medical and related courses would be brought together, working in harmony for the common good.

The question has not been resolved and the Minister is still receiving representations. I understand that there are other equally valid reasons why such a change should take place, and I believe that the sooner such an important change takes place, the better. When one considers the numbers involved in the institutions, one finds that the loss of the School of Pharmacy and perhaps a number of other related schools would not make a great dent in the total numbers to be covered by the University of South Australia.

Questions have been raised about the asset division between the three institutions—how we should carve up the SACAE, who gets the assets and who gets the staff. These matters are being resolved, but some debate is still going on about a particular piece of real estate. There has also been debate about the awarding of degrees, such as whether the new institution should offer degrees in its own right for those students who have effectively completed their education under the South Australian College of Advanced Education or the Institute of Technology. Should those students graduate as members of the University of South Australia? Further remarks will be made on that issue when we debate the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Merger of Tertiary Institutions) Bill.

Concerns have been raised about the lack of money available to facilitate the merger. Members have received correspondence from Flinders University stating that the amount of money made available—I think it was \$200 000—is insufficient to complete the documentation of the new university. I remember that a lot of money was made available to coerce institutions to amalgamate, but it must have all disappeared over the past 12 to 18 months.

I would have thought that, under normal circumstances, it was sufficient money—far more than \$200 000—for the Flinders University to function effectively from day one when it absorbs the Sturt College. I have mentioned the professorial drive by a number of budding intellects in the South Australian College of Advanced Education, and I am pleased that that has been put on the backburner. I would

certainly like to see the appointments made only on merit. The people with the capacity, the drive, the inclination and the dedication to excellence should get the jobs rather than the people with the best connections, as has been the problem in the past with SACAE.

The question of voluntary student unionism is a very important one now that we are talking about changing the education system in South Australia. As a student during the 1960s I got rather frustrated, excited and, in fact, very angry about the fact that my student contribution was helping the regime in Hanoi to produce bombs. That happened to be student politics of the day. The student union had a number of offshoots and made decisions which I believe reflected poorly on the education institution—the University of Adelaide—the student union itself and on me for paying union fees. If there had been any way that I could have avoided paying the fees whilst remaining a student, I would have done so.

I believe that there should be a clear separation of the basic needs of the university and the role played by the student union in the provision of facilities, whether they be sporting, canteen or restroom facilities, or all the other things for which the student union may or may not be responsible. A clear need exists, and under different corporate arrangements we would see a different style of management. Traditionally, the student union has been the responsible body for many of the facilities that abound in the universities.

The question that I would like to embrace at some stage—and it requires more thought than I can muster at this stage—relates to the separation of those components which are necessary and important for the proper functioning of the university from those that become the licence of the various manipulators within the politically motivated clubs. If there was a way around that dilemma, I would embrace it and put an amendment before the House but, at the moment, there is no way that I can do it. However, I will give the matter considerable thought over the next few months, because in some ways this is a somewhat interim Bill.

The matter that has vexed people more than the larger issues is at the micro level, the student representation in the council, and I understand that that will be addressed.

I support the change that is taking place, not simply because it is close to the idea that I expressed two or three years ago but because there is some sense to the change. I repudiate the principle that you get good quality education in large numbers and also repudiate the principle that seems inherent in the Dawkins approach, that is, that big is beautiful and that somehow we can have a sausage machine for education and provide what this country needs with the sort of guidelines under which we are operating within the Federal and State spheres.

I would like to see the Federal Government bite the bullet and say that it wants the population to produce far more people with training in the sciences and in engineering and technical spheres, because those areas will either make or break this country. They are not the flourishing arts faculties which we can say provide a broadening of education and a wider horizon upon which to look at the world. They are important components of a total education offering, but they are not and should never be the prime educational components. The prime educational components are what this country needs to be great, and what the country needs to produce and to be competitive.

I will be more than satisfied if the Federal Government says that we have to lift our science quotas by 50 to 100 per cent. In fact, I will be overjoyed as we will then have

come to grips with the reality of what the education system should be providing. We can provide the wide range of arts and philosophy courses, but they should never be the main components of education in this country as they have become. If anybody looks at the dollars and cents spent on higher education in this country, they will find that the majority has been spent on achieving nothing for this country—nothing whatsoever! We have wasted very much in the past 20 years. With those few words I support the legislation and wish the new institution a lot of good luck. I will certainly support any endeavours to make this institution—the University of South Australia—one of the great institutions of this country.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill but not enthusiastically and with a great deal of reservation. During my period in this place I have seen what has happened to education. I hope that this move does not lead to the end results we have seen in other areas. I know that university politics is alive and well and that a lot of vested interests are tied up in this move. I had a period on the council of the University of Adelaide and, having seen university politics first hand, I think we could even learn a wrinkle or two on occasion from them. Having said that, my main reservation is in relation to what will happen with respect to education provided by the South Australian Institute of Technology.

I do not know much about the Colleges of Advanced Education. I visited them once to give a talk on what the Liberal Party was all about. I was invited by some character called Mike Presdee at the Magill campus. I told them what the Liberal Party was all about. He provided me with a reading list that he gave the students and it was an unrelieved diet of Karl Marx, so I was not surprised to see him bob up for preselection for the Labor Party in due course, although he was unsuccessful. I am told that he is way off to the loony Left. As an unbiased course in politics, Mike Presdee's reading list prescribed a total diet of Karl Marx. I told him so and, after telling him what I thought the Liberal Party was all about, I excused myself.

The only other thing I know about the Colleges of Advanced Education is that they train an enormous number of teachers that we cannot afford to employ. That may not be their fault, but they did train a lot of first class people to be teachers. However, because we cannot fire teachers, no matter how bad they are, we could not give these excellent young people jobs. I do not know who to blame for that, but that is the situation. I do not know much about the Colleges of Advanced Education or about the Institute of Technology. I have a son who graduated from the institute, and that gave me an insight as a parent. I was more than pleased with the education he received. I am also well aware of the standing that the former School of Mines enjoyed and, more latterly, the Institute of Technology from the very foundation of the School of Mines in 1889 or thereabouts.

Mr Lewis: Just over 100 years.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. If members are interested, a little book called 'An Age of Technology' traces the first 75 years of the School of Mines. More latterly, the library has an article by Mr Evans (and I do not know whether he is a professor), a well-educated and well-balanced Welshman, who, before his retirement, ran the Institute of Technology for a period. The article describes his years as the Director of the Institute of Technology and outlines the history of that period.

I think that one can say, without fear of contradiction, that the people the Institute of Technology and the former

School of Mines turned out were well trained for the work they proposed to do, and that work was most valuable for the community and the nation. So, there is a history of excellence in their particular field. My only concern is that that will be diluted in the name of so-called 'liberal' education (not Liberal in the political sense but in the broad context of what 'liberal education' means).

If this new university provides education that does not have at least on one of its campuses this technological bent, the State and the nation will be sore losers. I disagree with the comment in relation to the Dawkins plan, that is, that big is beautiful: I have never been sold on that. I do not know whether members read the 'Focus' section of the *Weekend Australian*. 'Focus' contains some quite good articles, in my judgment, and I usually read it.

Mr Ferguson: What about Mr Keenan; do you agree with him?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He writes the economics section. I read him. He used to belt hell out of us week after week, and I got sick of that. But when he turned on Keating I thought that he improved enormously. I must confess that my favourite writer on that page is B.A. Santamaria. He is highly educated, highly intelligent and has an amazing knowledge of not only the local but also the world scene. I rarely find myself disagreeing with him. However, members can make their own judgments. I find John Hyde's free-market articles, week in and week out, a bit indigestible on occasions; but, on the whole, Hyde is not bad. I do not always agree with Ian Lowe. He has a job in a university somewhere or other; I think he has a science degree. He is anti nuclear energy, which I find a bit strange, and he has some pretty ratbag ideas on some issues.

In the *Weekend Australian* of 14-15 July, in an article entitled 'Strange Way to Become a Clever Society', I found something that struck a respondent chord. Amongst other things, Ian Lowe said:

The bizarre obsession with amalgamations is another problem. To be sure, it made some sort of sense to combine universities with adjoining colleges to produce integrated institutions.

It made no sense at all to herd together small, effective colleges to produce multi-campus conglomerates with no identity, no soul and no sense of purpose. It also made little sense to encourage colleges and their staff to stop doing the jobs they were doing well and conform to the different norms of the universities.

It was depressingly predictable that the leaders of many universities would fall over each other in their eagerness to comply with the will of Commonwealth and State Governments, united in their desire to reduce the cost of higher education. It is hard to see how the diversion of energies into the rash of amalgamations has contributed to the provision of better or more appropriate education. When it became apparent that the Senate—

that is, the Australian Senate—

report was critical of recent Government policies, the Federal Minister for Education reacted by saying that the report was shallow and poorly based.

That sums up my point about the disappearance of the South Australian Institute of Technology. Some of the greatest teaching institutions of the world are not ashamed to call themselves institutes of technology, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology springs to mind.

The only major point I want to make concerns the charter of the university, which is in the Bill as follows:

5. (1) The functions of the university are as follows:
 - (a) to preserve, extend and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, scholarship, consultancy or any other means;
 - (b) to provide tertiary education in such disciplines and areas of study as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of industry, commerce, the professions or any other section of the community;
 - (c) to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of the Aboriginal people;

- (d) to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of groups within the community that the university considers have suffered disadvantages in education;
- (e) to provide educational programs for the benefit of the wider community or programs for the enhancement of the diverse cultural life of the community, as the university thinks fit;
- (f) to perform any functions that are ancillary or incidental to the functions referred to in the preceding paragraphs.

I compare that with the charter of the Institute of Technology, which is spelt out in the Institute of Technology Act 1972. I believe that this reflects the function of that institute and largely reflects the function of the School of Mines initially. The Act provides:

- (2) The functions of the institute shall be:
 - (a) to provide advanced education and training in applied science, technologies, applied arts, administration, commerce and such other fields of knowledge as the council may determine;
 - (b) to develop liberally-conceived educational programs and an active corporate life;
 - (c) to promote the dissemination and practical application of knowledge in the fields with which the institute is concerned, for the advancement of industry and commerce and the benefit of the general community.

It seems to me that the charter of the institute is totally submerged in the terms of the new charter, with a whole range of social responsibilities that seem to have developed in some other areas. I take as an example what happened in the area of secondary education during the 1970s.

I was unashamedly conservative as a teacher. When I was trying to teach matriculation physics and the new mathematics was all the go, I was teaching the top classes in the fourth largest high school in the State. On one occasion we had done the physics and were on the last line, which contained some basic computations—about three factors in the numerator and three in the denominator. I asked the class to find the answer but, after about 20 minutes, I could not get three answers to agree. So, when the mathematics consultant who was bringing in the new mathematics came to the school I said to him, 'This new mathematics might be great, but as far as I am concerned it is hopeless. The kids cannot do basic computations.' He waved his arms in the air and said, 'What does it matter? They are getting ideas.'

Mr Lewis: Makes you wonder what sort of ideas.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I am unashamedly conservative in education. It is no wonder school children are crippled mathematically and in the use of the mother tongue. No-one gets any structural language nowadays. You could not do grammar because that was repetitive. You could not learn the structure of language. We cast off all these dead languages, but at least they taught the structure of language and what it was all about. If I do declare an interest, it is that I am unashamedly conservative in relation to changes in education. What did we see in the 1970s? Whitlam opened the floodgates as though money would solve every problem. Money was pouring out of Canberra so fast that the education authorities here could not dream up schemes fast enough to spend it.

Mr Ferguson: They couldn't spend it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They couldn't spend it. It was thought that money would solve the problem. Alby Jones, the then Director of Education, received medals for writing his much vaunted memorandum on freedom in authority. He became a member of the college. Hugh Hudson was the Minister. They got rid of technical high schools because they were considered to be inferior and the ordinary high schools were considered to be elitist. It was a bit like the movement to secondary modern schools in Britain.

When I was shadow Minister of Education I looked at them and found that they ranged from awful to good.

Any idea of technical education was thought to be for the labouring classes and there was this social push to get rid of technical education as if there was something inferior about it. Many kids used to lap it up. They came out well trained with a core education, but there was an emphasis on technical education. What happened? We poured countless dollars into some sort of general education where children learnt a bit about everything and not much about anything. The debate on education is raging now.

What really happened in the 1970s was that we handed over control to the union in terms of promotions in the Education Department. Of the panel of five making promotion decisions, two were from the union, two were involved in equal opportunity and one person was from the department. The union runs education. The Minister hides behind the director. The Minister now never fronts up publicly in terms of secondary or primary education. Up gets the new Dr Boston who has to fight the battles while the Minister hides and the unions call the tune. It is no wonder that parents are deserting the secondary system in hordes and sending their kids off if they can afford it to a church or independent school, because they know what they are getting.

Certainly, as the Institute of Technology disappears into this new university with its new charter, I hope that the excellence that was valued highly in technological and technical education by industrialists of this State and mining companies is not lost. I know of firms which recruit their graduates from the institute rather than from the academically inclined universities, because they value this practical and technological bent spelt out in the charter, which is now to disappear.

Certainly, I was totally opposed to the merger with Flinders University, because the institute would have disappeared totally. Here, it will be a dominant force. The Bill marries with the institute the South Australian College of Advanced Education, about which I do not know much—and what I know I do not much like. I cannot comment because I do not know the institution. But, I know the institute and I know the contribution it has made over a century, and not only to its students—and it is all about the students, because such organisations do not exist for the politics of empire building, which is the bottom line for sure. The education system does not exist for the teachers, although the union now calls the tune. It exists for the students and it is there to serve them.

All I know is that the Institute of Technology has provided students with something they wanted, that is, something which fitted them for their avocation in life and which was highly valued by the people who would employ the graduates. If we are to get half baked graduates from the classes like my mate, Mike Presdel, who was filling them up with unrelieved Karl Marx, and if the institute is to lose its identity, its focus, it will take a long time before anyone can convince me that this is a move in the right direction. Indeed, I will never be convinced.

As to the size of the new institution, we all know the thinking of the bureaucracy: if you are the boss of a bigger show, you are a more important person. Those are the politics about which I am talking. I reject the idea of Mr Dawkins that he will save money by having this sort of bigger structure. That is nonsense. But I do agree with the sentiments of Mr Lowe: I do not often agree with him, but I agree on this occasion. He says that, because they are small and operate in a certain sphere, they do well, but by

diluting that excellence we will get something that will not serve the students, the community and the employers better.

Finally, I have been impressed by the suggestion that there be a centre of health sciences and by the material that I have received concerning such a centre. Such a concentration of expertise in the one area is the sort of thing about which I have been talking. All the people involved want it and I do not believe that this is empire building. Pharmacists, the university and people like F.H. Faulding—the employers—want it. F.H. Faulding now has a world reputation. Part of the institute's history is that there have been benefactors, community minded people who have been willing to pour resources into the institution simply to keep it going for building programs and the like over the years. When people like F.H. Faulding are willing to support the idea of a centre for health sciences, it seems to me that there is something in it.

I have read of the people who are supporting it, and I go along with the idea that we should not dictate to universities what they should do. However, anything we can do to encourage the formation of this centre for health sciences should be done, not just to get more of Dawkins' money. That will probably occur, too, but we can bet that, if we get funds from Dawkins for that project, someone elsewhere will miss out. This project will be a concentration of effort in an important area and all the important people concerned in this area support it. I am certainly not interested in people trying to keep their slice of the action so that it makes them bigger and better and so that they become, as bosses of an institution, more important. That leaves me stone cold.

I have now explained to the House the reasons for some of my reservations. As I said, the institute is about to be diluted by this amorphous mass about which I know little, but I do know that the institute has done an excellent job from its very foundations as the School of Mines in the last century. If that focus is to change, it can change only for the worse as far as students, the community and employers are concerned. With those reservations, I support the Bill.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): My contribution to the debate will be pretty much the same in principle as that of the member for Kavel. It is gratifying to me to constantly hear a man of his experience and diverse talents expressing views that rest easy with me, views which encapsulate concerns as well as stated goals where they relate to legislation in general and this legislation in particular. There is no question about the fact that when we finally pass this Bill, as will be our wont, the State will lose a measure of emphasis which it has had in its post-secondary education in the pursuit of excellence in the development and application of the technique of doing things.

As the member for Kavel has explained, the School of Mines and Industries, as it once was, benefited the development of this State greatly through the graduates it produced. The school became the Institute of Technology and the pursuits embodied in the School of Mines were incorporated into the institute. Over the more than 100 years it has existed, the institution has provided South Australia with the kind of professional expertise required to make South Australia second to none in this Commonwealth in respect of how it has been able to make use of the unique natural mineral resources of this State.

Let us face it, the most recent unique natural mineral resource that South Australia has discovered and developed has been the mine at Olympic Dam on the Roxby Downs pastoral lease site as it was. The mine is now serviced by

people living in the town of Roxby Downs. It is unique. No similar deposit has been discovered anywhere else in the world. No deposit has been developed in the way the Olympic Dam ore body has been developed. I mention that because all members will know how important that is to the present and, more particularly, to the future of this State. Members might not be so aware of the value and importance which development of the copper deposits in Burra and northern Yorke Peninsula has had in the past. However, these deposits would not have been developed anywhere near as extensively or efficiently as they have been developed had it not been for the existence of the predecessor of this institution, the name of which we seek to change today and the functions of which will change with it. I guess it is more important that we contemplate the change of functions than the change of name.

The centre taught people the techniques that were relevant not only to the mining industry and other light and heavy industries in this State but also to the agricultural industry: for instance, wool classing was taught at the School of Mines, or the Institute of Technology as it became known. Had it not been for wool classing, we would not have been able to market our wool clip anywhere nearly as effectively in this nation. Australia's wool classers came from that institution. It provided us with the means by which, without anything better having been developed, we could by sight and other sensory perception objectively classify the wool that we had grown on and shorn from our sheep into categories that provided buyers with a consistent description of the type and style of that wool. More recently in our history, in the past two decades, we have seen the development of objective testing of fibre thickness and yield per kilogram as the means by which we can do that. This development is based on the techniques that were first established and taught by the institution as it was at that time.

The institution has always been relevant to the day it served and has been willing to accept the challenge of change, in so doing ensuring its continuing relevance. I am not sure that in this legislation we have attached adequate significance and importance to that aspect of its historical existence and service to our State; in fact, I am quite sure that we have not. By making those remarks, I do not detract from the contribution that has been made by the South Australian colleges of advanced education and their predecessors in our educational history, and I am talking in particular about the South Australian School of Arts and the Teachers Training College, as it used to be known. That institution, for instance, did an enormous amount to provide us with the skilled professional people who ensured that we had an education system to provide for our children the kind of conceptual skills they needed to tackle life. We were again very successful and effective in that.

Models of approach taken and shown to be relevant by those institutions have been adopted around this country and elsewhere in the world in times leading up to the past decade or so. However, during the past decade or so the success of the efforts we have made seems to me inversely proportional to the extent that institutions which have adopted Marxist philosophical concepts as models for their teaching and administration have been less effective. In other words, the greater the degree that Marxism has influenced the thoughts and opinions of administrators and teachers in those institutions, the less effective have been their contributions to the national and international arena.

In Marxism there is no commitment to excellence, no recognition of individual ability and no incentive for individuals with outstanding ability to make an outstanding

contribution. Public recognition *per se* is not sufficient and has been shown to be inadequate in those societies that have been totally dominated by that philosophy. To that extent, the member for Kavel was most accurate in his appraisal of the unfortunate consequences of importing those ideas. However, we all learn by our mistakes and I trust that this State and nation and, indeed, the society of man on this planet have learnt from that mistaken experiment.

Looking at the measure as it stands, I would have to say that it does not contain a model for governance of any other similar institution. By saying that I support the second reading and the Bill to its third reading, subject to its successful amendment, I do not mean that I believe that other universities in South Australia or anywhere else ought to follow the model of governance provided under this measure. Clearly, that will have to be reviewed during its early years of operation. I trust that this House, in conjunction with the other place, will agree to the establishment of a committee of our members constantly to review the function of the new institutions as they emerge and as the process of merging impacts upon the way they perform their primary tasks to society.

Invariably, a measure of politics will be played by some if not the majority of the people involved in the administration—the governance—of each of the new institutions when they come into existence, and this Parliament has an obligation to the society that elects it to ensure that, notwithstanding the natural consequence of that kind of interplay between the individuals in the policy making process for each of the institutions, we secure for those institutions and through them for South Australia realistic universities functioning in the best interests of society at large and not just of the narrow community of which they are comprised in the collegiate sense.

I now consider the functions and I have a couple of comments to make in passing, relevant to clause 5. Mines goes missing altogether. That is tragic; it ought still to be retained. We will never retain our civilised state unless we recognise the necessity to win resources from the earth, to do that efficiently and sensitively and to use them to provide ourselves, whilst we occupy our space on this planet, with the things we need to give us the good health so essential to the life that enables us to do all the other things and to live in care and concern for our fellow human beings. If we do not give any institution the specific charter to continue developing techniques relevant to winning those resources in this way, we could end up the poorer for it.

It would not fuss me much if engineering faculties at large were to be located within this new university. Perhaps, while I am on this point, I should mention that I think that mines and mining have been so important to the history of this State, along with agricultural production, that it would not have hurt to give the institution some name other than the University of South Australia, to name it after some very important person who has contributed an enormous amount to the sustained security of this State's economy during the period it has been in existence, both as a province in the first instance and as a State, after Federation. I say that not because it is my family name but because there is one that stands out above all others: that is the name of Lewis.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I said not because it is my name but because it stands out above all others. I refer to Essington Lewis, a person who has done an enormous amount for this State's economy over the years in which he, following his forebears, was associated with mining in South Australia. That probably goes back to the days when copper was first discovered at Burra. There is no question about

the fact that, had it not been for the philanthropic commitment of people engaged in that industry, we would not have the kinds of institutions we have enjoyed in our more than 150 years of existence as a self-governing entity.

The second thing I find quaint is the omission of 'truth' from the functions; it is not mentioned once. Nowhere is there a charge laid upon the new corporate institution being established to be committed to the discovery and maintaining of truth. However, we do see measures involved which I and, I am sure, all of us want to see, such as clause 5 (c), which states:

To provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of the Aboriginal people.

And clause 5 (e):

To provide educational programs for the benefit of the wider community or programs for the enhancement of the diverse cultural life of the community, as the university thinks fit.

I would have thought that paragraph (e) covered paragraph (c). Notwithstanding that point, it disturbs me to see any mention in law of a particular race of people as distinct from anyone else in the community. We all belong to the same species. We have the capacity to provide disadvantaged groups with additional opportunities according to that disadvantage, and no-one's disadvantage is in any way related to the fact that they are of one race or another. It has something else to do with their life's chances.

It is possible to find larger groups of people disadvantaged within one race as opposed to another, but it is not because of race. For us to suggest that it is so is to acknowledge something that I think is inappropriate, namely apartheid. Separate development is bad. It is bad in South Africa; none of us would deny that. I wonder how many of us understand just how inappropriate it is in many of the Middle East countries, as well as in the USSR. It is equally bad in Malaysia, where one cannot get into a Malaysian tertiary institution, or obtain a Government scholarship to come to this country for advanced study which may not be available in Malaysia unless that person is a Malay by definition (and that implies racial origin as well as being of the Islamic faith). That is wrong, and it does not enhance the standing of any country with such racist policies. I do not want to see it ever contemplated here. Therefore, I do not see any necessity to make such a big deal of it in the functions of the university, especially when we leave out such a concept as 'truth' as part of the function statement.

When I look at the composition of the university, I support the notion that we ought to allow the Pharmacy School in the process to leave the new university. Indeed, it ought not be part of the new university; it ought to be part of the University of Adelaide's new Centre of Excellence related totally to the health sciences. The Pharmacy School wishes to be incorporated in that proposal, and the University of Adelaide will happily provide the umbrella facility.

When I consider student associations, as referred to in clause 9, I am compelled to make the observation that, whilst we require students to make a contribution towards the establishment and upkeep of facilities that are ancillary to the main purpose for which those students are attending the institution, nonetheless we in this place have a Joint Parliamentary Service Committee which we expect the taxpayers to finance, and none of us specifically has to make any contribution to that.

I would want to see that the new council of governance contains representatives of the Parliament so that the new university is not disadvantaged by a lack of communication with this place in comparison to the existing Adelaide and Flinders Universities. Accordingly, I urge the House to adopt

the recommendations to be made by my colleague when the appropriate amendments are considered in Committee.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. P.B. Arnold): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): I will make a brief contribution in respect of this Bill and indicate my support for it at the outset. I will deal with the least important aspect first, and that is the name of the new institution.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: The University of Such!

Mr SUCH: That is a brilliant idea that the Minister has come up with, but I decline the honour. I believe it is unfortunate that the name in question has been chosen, because there was an opportunity to adopt either an Aboriginal name or the name of a famous South Australian who had been associated with education. I would have been particularly keen to have the institution named after a woman who had made a significant contribution to education in this State. However, in the final analysis, it is up to the people who will comprise the institution to decide on the name. I do not seek to interfere in that respect. It is unfortunate, because the name that has been chosen, USA, will lead to confusion with the Flinders University of South Australia and, in the not too distant future, I believe it may result in the Flinders University deleting the latter part of its title to minimise the confusion.

As I said earlier, however, the name is the least important aspect of the institution because, ultimately, people external to the university will judge it. It could be called an Institute of Technology, a university or whatever, but it will be judged ultimately by its peers in the educational arena, the wider community and, indeed, the world at large.

The Bill provides for an appointed council, and in Committee an attempt will be made to refine and improve that proposal. It would be regrettable if it were to be a permanent feature but, thankfully, it will be only an interim measure whilst the university is being established. Universities should govern themselves and implementing an appointed council runs counter to that notion.

We should not overlook the contribution that people have made to the various institutions which have given rise to this new university, and I refer to Adelaide CAE, Torrens CAE, Salisbury CAE, Murray Park CAE, Adelaide College of the Arts and Education, Wattle Park Teachers College, Adelaide Teachers College, Western Teachers College and the Institute of Technology. We should put on record the contribution to education in South Australia of the staff and students from those institutions. Although I will not list them all, I mention the contribution of Colin Thiele, with whom I was associated at Wattle Park. The staff of those institutions have been dedicated and the students have been conscientious, and I am sure that this tradition will continue.

Drawing on history, I know that one of the strong points of the new university will be the fine teaching tradition that existed in those institutions. Whilst there is often a tendency to focus on the importance of research, and I do not take away from that, we should not overlook the importance of teaching at the tertiary level. Too often we overlook the significance of good teaching, and within this new institution fine teaching should be rewarded, as should fine research. The two are complementary: there cannot be one without the other.

This measure puts much emphasis on equity considerations, and that is a worthwhile objective. However, we should not confuse equality of opportunity with equality. They are not the same and there has been a tendency in recent years to confuse them. I believe in giving people a

go, and I am thankful that many years ago Flinders University gave me the opportunity to undertake further tertiary study on the basis of teachers college qualifications.

It is important that, in the pursuit of a more equitable education system and institutions, there is no attempt to sacrifice quality. I am pleased that the Bill requires the university to strive for excellence in teaching and research and for the attainment of the highest standards in education. That is absolutely critical. It will not help disadvantaged individuals or groups if the opportunity to strive for excellence is undermined or weakened in any way. In fact, one does those people and those groups a disservice if one moves away from a commitment to excellence.

The member for Murray-Mallee mentioned that the Bill does not contain any reference to truth. One of the essential roles of a university it is to seek truth. It may not be a trendy expression but that is one of the fundamental objectives of a university, although it is not always easy to achieve in the face of political pressure. A university worth its salt must always seek truth and be prepared to defend the right of people to seek truth. Regrettably in recent years there has been a weakening in that resolve by some of our tertiary institutions and I would like to see that trend reversed.

Universities must defend their basic role against threat from any direction. Universities must promote the fundamental role of seeking and revealing truth and of engaging in high quality research and teaching. It is also important that, in the new university and in other universities, administrative functions do not take priority over teaching and research functions; nor that administration continues to grow, particularly at the expense of teaching and research. This new university, along with other universities, should be willing and able to resist fads and fancies, ideologies of the moment, which put great pressure on the institution. They must ensure that they resist and critically examine the requests and demands that politicians, political Parties and ideologues put upon them. I apply that to the Party to which I belong as well as to other political Parties.

As I indicated earlier, I am pleased that the Bill places strong emphasis on equity. Universities should be the last places to engage in discriminatory practices or be undemocratic, unjust or unfair. I trust that this new university will be both in and of the community, that it will be active at the local, State, Federal and international level. I trust—and I see it reflected in the Bill—that the university will seek to promote, protect and enhance the merit principle in respect of all promotions.

Given its traditional and strong commitment to equity, I believe that this new university will continue and enhance its role in presenting and promoting a human face. Too often universities become cold, uncaring places, and this university could set the pace in promoting and encouraging positive human values and practices reflected in care and concern for others, boosting self-esteem; in short, a university that has a human face. Too often we down play what are essential aspects of the human person. I would like to see within this university an emphasis on a human and caring face.

I wish the new university well. It faces a great task, because in the first few years it will be critical for it to establish and enhance the credibility that already accrues to its constituent institutions—those that form the new university. It must not and should not be allowed to become a poor relation in respect of the other universities. Big is not always better but, in this case, it is a step in the right direction. I look forward in the Committee stage to improv-

ing this Bill with some amendments that will contribute to making it one of our great universities.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Napier): I support the Bill. As the Minister is well aware, I have always held in awe universities and those people who have availed themselves of a tertiary education. I represented Parliament on the Adelaide University Council for a short time, and that merely served to heighten the awe with which I regard such an establishment. In fact, it would be fair to say that, apart from the time when we took afternoon tea and were allowed to smoke (even in that august body, there was argument as to whether smoking was allowed), most of the debates went over my head. I do not think that is a reflection on my ability to understand the machinations of universities. Let's face it, if you can understand the machinations of this place, you will be good for anything!

I served for a short time on the Adelaide University Council. In fact, I replaced the now Premier when he was elevated to the ministry. Members on this side who were then in Caucus may remember how I was appointed. There were three Terry's in Caucus at the time—Terry McRae, Terry Groom and me. Caucus was looking for someone to replace the Premier on the council. First, Terry Groom was put up. He informed Caucus that he was a member of the Flinders University Council. Then Terry McRae's name was put forward, and someone pointed out that he was in Ireland and could not avail himself of the exalted position. Subsequently, being a new member, I was nominated. I thought that I would be smart, so I said that I could not read and write, but the then Deputy Premier said, 'Here's a good chance to learn.' So, I went onto the Adelaide University Council. At the time those members who served on the Adelaide University Council went on to become Ministers. It worked out in my case, so in some respects I was quite happy to serve on the council at that time.

I recall the awe in which I held universities and the people who attended them. I came from a fairly humble household in the United Kingdom. In fact, it was typically working class and I make no apology for that. It was a very loving family. Members opposite may not believe it but I was considered by the people of the school that I attended as having some potential for greater things in life rather than ending up as a politician poised on the brink of superannuation. I was considered to have some potential but, like many youngsters of my era, further education could not be considered as we had to leave school at an early age and go out to find work to augment the family budget. I do not regret that. Later I had the call to arms and had to take the Queen's shilling, which was the terminology in those days. I served for two years in the defence of democracy in Iraq. After seeing the stuff-up that has occurred over there since I left, I think that I should have made the armed forces my career in life and perhaps we would not be paying the petrol prices that we are today.

One part of the Minister's second reading explanation impressed me immensely, and I now come to the serious part of my contribution. If one looks at some of the meanderings of members opposite, we find that they talked about everything but the Bill. I intend to talk about the Bill. I would like to think that the Minister and the Government are very serious when they refer to access and equity for all people with respect to higher education. I will quote that part of the Minister's second reading explanation to satisfy the House that I am talking about the Bill. The Minister stated:

I also wish to highlight the very great importance this Government places on access and equity in higher education. As South

Australia's largest university, spread across six campuses, it reaches into all socio-economic strata.

That is not about big being beautiful; it is about ensuring that the university is available to all sections of the State. Sadly—and this is through no fault of the Government but rather a fault of the system—in the past certain groups in our society, particularly young people, could not gain access into the tertiary education system. The Minister further stated:

It was not so long ago that parts of the system were dedicated to excluding many apparently 'ordinary' people so that the excellence of a minority could be fostered.

Nothing could be further from the truth in that regard. In the days when the cost of university education was high, very few from the area that I represent ever made it. With the advent of the Whitlam era, when higher education was to be free and available to all Australian society, we find upon looking at the figures that the percentage changed very slightly amongst young people. A lot of mature age students took advantage of what happened during the Whitlam years to get into tertiary education and I do not hide that fact. I congratulate all the mature age students who were able to do it. However, very few young people took advantage of the system.

With the advent of the tertiary tax, the Federal Minister's catchcry in selling that way of funding education was that tertiary education would be available to working-class families. I know that it is early days yet to ascertain whether there will be any significant increase in the number of youngsters from the northern, southern and western suburbs getting into tertiary education, and I refer to those who were previously denied the chance for many and varied reasons. Perhaps that is an indictment of our education system as a whole.

Just because there will be six campuses and tertiary education will be available may not mean that people will flood in from Elizabeth or Munno Para, but the fact that the campuses are there may encourage youngsters to avail themselves of that kind of education. More importantly, the teaching profession may go out and encourage youngsters to become involved. In respect of Aboriginal people, the member for Murray-Mallee said that there has never been any difference and that Aboriginal people can get into tertiary education. With all due respect, that is a laughable attitude to take. I remember when in opposition it was my responsibility to shadow the member for Coles who was the then Minister for Health.

Mr Ferguson: One of the best Ministers they had.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The member for Coles was one of the best Ministers in the Tonkin Administration, and also one of the better performers, but I do not have to stand up here and curry favour with the member for Coles. In one debate the member for Coles as Minister talked about the longstanding availability of a position in the University of Adelaide Medical School to a member of the Aboriginal community. I do not remember her exact words, but that is generally what the member for Coles said.

She also said that we should congratulate the Adelaide Medical School for making a position available to a member of the Aboriginal community. The fact is that at that time, and even now, Aborigines had so much stacked against them that they had Buckley's chance of getting through the normal primary and secondary schools system and taking advantage of a place offered in the Adelaide Medical School.

I would like to think that we are not just paying lip service to the Aboriginal community, that programs will be set up and a genuine effort will be made at all levels to ensure that Aborigines can pick up the chances that are freely given to members of the white race. What surprises

me is the rather grudging support of members Opposite. I refer to comments I made earlier about the awe in which I held people who had a tertiary education and the fact that they had a better chance in life than me.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: As the member for Henley Beach says, I came from the university of hard-knocks. Being a very modest man, I would agree with that: you can certainly see the scars. We heard the Deputy Leader meander along and contribute nothing at all; we heard the comments of the member for Murray-Mallee, and one can excuse him (and I have to be very careful otherwise members opposite might threaten me again and get out my personal file); and we heard the comments of the member for Fisher. They all had the luxury of a tertiary education but, comparing them with me, I have not done so bad after all.

I support the Bill. I congratulate the Minister for in effect going from university to university, to the institute and to the colleges of advanced education and putting this line which is about equity, fairness and efficiency. He did not accept any white flags. He was dedicated to the job. I congratulate the Minister for this, his first major Bill in this Parliament, and I urge all members to do likewise.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE (Coles): I support the Bill and I wish the new University of South Australia well in what I think will be an extraordinarily demanding foundation stage. The foundation stage will be demanding for a variety of reasons, not necessarily in priority order. Those reasons will be based on finance and on the experience of the past which may not necessarily readily equip the new institution for its role in the future as a university. I say that because the role of a university is quite distinctively different from the roles that have been performed and fulfilled in the past by the institutions which are merging to form the new university.

The role of the Institute of Technology, which has been outlined by previous speakers, is almost self-explanatory: it is a vocational role. The role of the South Australian College of Advanced Education was well-defined in the speech of Professor Donald Stranks, then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, in the Stirling Memorial Lecture delivered in 1977. He described the CAEs as having a threefold role. In fact, Professor Stranks was quoting from the Commission on Advanced Education in its report for the 1977-79 triennium. He outlined the three basic characteristics of CAEs, as follows:

1. They are vocationally oriented, providing multi-level courses.
2. They are tertiary (or post secondary) in character but flexible in their approach to entry requirements, teaching methods, modes of study and design of courses.
3. They are applied in emphasis, oriented toward teaching at an undergraduate rather than postgraduate level.

On the other hand, the role of a university is quite different, and the Universities Commission in its sixth report remarked as follows:

... the purposes for which universities are founded and for which society continues to maintain them include the preservation, transmission and extension of knowledge, the training of highly skilled manpower and the critical evaluation of the society in which we live.

That latter brief is clearly much more demanding than that which the CAEs have been called upon to provide. I want to spend a moment on the phrase 'the critical evaluation of the society in which we live'. For that evaluation to take place we need trained minds, critical thinkers and those who have some degree of detachment which the 'evaluation' function implies. Universities should be places where the highest priorities are placed on scholarship and where the pursuit of truth (to which the member for Murray-Mallee

referred) and knowledge, through research and scholarly writing, are thought to be equal in importance with the teaching functions that most people associate with universities.

One of the first things I want to do in wishing the new university well is to express the hope that its Vice-Chancellor and staff will be public advocates for learning and for the relevance of that learning to the society which the university will serve. It is one of my regrets that, no doubt despite their best efforts, the universities in South Australia today do not in my opinion enjoy the status in the public mind that the then sole university, the University of Adelaide, did during my youth. In those days the word from on high, so to speak, of the Vice-Chancellor and the professors of the various disciplines, was taken to have very great value. It was listened to and relied upon, in my opinion, to a much greater extent in the 1940s, the 1950s and the 1960s than is the case today.

There are societal reasons for that. We now have much greater and more numerous sources of information and elucidation today than we did then. Status is more likely to be questioned, as is the content of statements. Nevertheless, one of the many roles of a university, in my opinion, is to relate to society, to make society think, to insist that society continually examines the purposes for which education is provided and whether it is provided to meet the needs of society. The role of the universities in influencing our future is immeasurable.

The quality of the professional people who graduate from those universities determines, to a large extent, the quality of life in this State. The quality of our health professionals, lawyers, engineers, teachers and thus the fabric of the society we enjoy has its roots in the quality of teaching at the university.

When considering the establishment of the new university, it is impossible not to pay tribute to the University of Adelaide and the role it has played in this State's history and, indeed, to the Flinders University which, in its 25 years of relatively short establishment, has nevertheless had a profound impact on the State. The fact that South Australia enjoys a very high standard of medical care to name but one discipline, is due in large part to the extremely high standard of medical teaching and medical ethics that have been imparted to our undergraduates and graduates throughout the time that the medical school has been established.

Of course, the same goes for the other faculties of law, architecture, engineering and the arts. Clause 5 of the Bill refers to the functions of the university and identifies the first set of functions, as follows:

... to preserve, extend and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, scholarship, consultancy or any other means.

I want to dwell briefly on the word 'consultancy' and express my concern about the extent to which universities are relying on consultancies and business arrangements to obtain revenue independently of that coming from the Government. I have no quarrel with the goal of independent income for a university. In these straitened times particularly it is immensely valuable and I have no argument with the notion of it.

However, I do believe the notion of consultancies should be questioned because of the potential of such consultancies to compromise the true role and functions of the university. Therefore, I would like to quote from an address given to the Australasian Workshop on Climatology by Professor Peter Schwerdtfeger, of the Flinders University of South Australia, as retiring Chairman of the Australian National Committee for Atmospheric Science. This speech was deliv-

ered at Macquarie University, Sydney, on 1 February 1990 and, in his speech, Professor Schwerdtfeger stated:

When the collective might of all of the institutions—he is referring to his university, Government agencies and commercial organisations—

descends on the . . . marketplace, one of the first casualties must be the but marginally profitable private consultant. Also, universities, which have been a traditional valuable source of informed criticism in a wide range of areas of competence, have suddenly discovered that they cannot afford to risk giving offence for fear of provoking someone who may be contributing to a decision on a contract.

It is that last sentence that is the critical one. I refer to the possibility of compromise in academic freedom and objective detachment in examination of a case without fear or favour that exists when universities become prey to the race for the almighty dollar and decide that they have to establish consultancies and other business enterprises in order to maintain their teaching and research functions. That must be one of the important roles of the new university council, that is, to examine the extent to which consultancies are being used by the university as a source of income, the nature of those consultancies and the guidelines and framework in which they are undertaken, invariably in the first instance financed by taxpayers' money.

The second point I would like to make relates to the second series of functions of the university as stated in the Bill, as follows:

The University must strive for excellence in teaching and research and for attainment of the highest standards in education.

This is where we come to money. I do not see this university succeeding in its critical foundation stages unless it is funded properly. I say that as a member of the board of the Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. The Magill campus is merging with other campuses to become part of the new university. Magill runs a variety of courses: one of the most notable courses is mentioned in this Bill, that is, the course in early childhood and family studies conducted by the De Lissa Institute of the South Australian College.

Magill runs a notable school of journalism and also a business and communication studies course among others. The restructuring that will be necessary as a result of the establishment of this university will require additional funds. No-one at the Magill campus would argue that the campus is not overstuffed—they acknowledge that it is—but there are areas of inequity and it is impossible, obviously, to transfer someone from early childhood education, for example, to business studies if there is overstaffing in one area and understaffing in another. The fact is that in business studies at the Magill campus there is a ratio of 24 students to one staff member in a circumstance where the ratio should be 15:1. I want to quote briefly from the major conclusions of the Review of the Accounting Discipline in Higher Education, which was conducted under the Chairmanship of Professor Russel Matthews and which presented its report to the Federal Minister for Education on 2 July this year. The conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. As a result of a long period of chronic neglect, the accounting discipline in higher education is in great need of support and revitalisation.

The second conclusion states:

... higher education institutions . . . have failed to provide the accounting discipline with the resources needed to maintain adequate standards of teaching.

Reference is then made to Government funding, disposition of fee income, academic staffing, teaching and staff accommodation, computing facilities and support services where there are major shortcomings. This might have been a

description of the Magill campus of the college. The report continues:

There is a failure by both the Commonwealth Government and higher education institutions to develop and adopt systematic and equitable criteria and methodology for resource allocation. The result is gross inefficiency and wasteful use of resources in higher education.

The conclusions go on to state:

The effects on the accounting discipline of discriminatory and unsystematic resource allocation procedures are compounded by the fact that the discipline is forced to operate in a highly competitive market.

In short, its graduates are inevitably and quickly swallowed up by commerce and so free market forces and arbitrary planning and resource allocation mean that the discipline is struggling for some kind of recognition within the tertiary sector. There are 30 recommendations, and I merely refer to the sixth conclusion, as follows:

Major policy decisions on student growth and the introduction of fee paying courses are often taken by higher education institutions for financial rather than educational reasons.

That is by way of a plea to the Minister to recognise, as I am certain he does, and also for his colleagues to recognise that, unless this institution is funded adequately at the start, the mergers will be built on very shaky foundations indeed. Adelaide and Flinders Universities as established universities already have inbuilt research infrastructure. This new university has virtually no such thing and, unless funds are made available from the outset for that to be established, there is no way the university can fulfil its function not only in the national but also in the international community. The research function is important and, again, that was summarised by the committee of inquiry into post secondary education in Western Australia as follows:

[The universities of Australia belong] to an international community of universities. Within this system; there is very free communication and exchange of ideas and persons; their activities are deeply influenced by traditions maintained within that wide community; and very importantly, their standards both in teaching and research are exposed to the scrutiny and judgment of sister universities elsewhere in Australia and throughout the world.

There is no doubt that the eyes of Australian academics will be on this new university and, unless it can perform with some degree of excellence, given the constraints that are placed upon it, within a very short time it will be so far behind its well-established colleagues that the handicap may well be too great ever to be overcome.

I conclude by referring again to the two organisations that are mentioned under clause 8 of the Bill relating to the internal organisations of the university. Those two organisations, the De Lissa Institute of Early Childhood and Family Studies and the South Australian School of Art, have served this State extraordinarily well over more than a century. The South Australian School of Art has produced artists of national and international renown. The De Lissa Institute in its former roles as the Kingston College of Advanced Education and the Kindergarten Training College has established South Australia as internationally eminent in the quality of early childhood education. That in turn has influenced the quality of education and the quality of our professional people and of our ordinary citizens throughout the life of this State.

All those things need to be taken into account by those who are to be on the council of the new university, by those who will be staffing it and by the Minister and the Government that funds it. On that note, I reinforce that, unless adequate funds are made available, the new university will be suffering under an enormous handicap which it may not be able to overcome. The next two or three years will be absolutely critical.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): I would like to address a few remarks to this Bill. The concern of some members with the naming of the institution is fairly irrelevant. Whether it is named the Lewis Institute for Truth, the Bob Such Centre for Excellence and Monarchy Studies or the Hemmings Institute for Technology, it really makes little difference. Quite seriously, I agree with much of what the member for Coles has just said about the importance of the next few years in terms of funding. The first dimension for this institution that is to be created through this legislation is to ensure that it has an adequate funding base.

Having said that and having referred to the naming of the institution, I would like to return to what I think is a much more important concept, namely, the question of access and equity. I remember my own days as a student of the University of Adelaide and I had a very different experience from that of the member for Napier, who was knocking on the doors and eventually got in on the council stage prior to becoming a Minister. When I heard that remark I hurried out of the Chamber to check on who was on that council and I found that my good friend the member for Spence was on it and, until recently, the member for Price had served with distinction for several years on the University of Adelaide Council; I wish them both well in their future endeavours. I look forward to seeing the continuation of that honourable tradition which the Premier, the member for Napier and, no doubt, others in the past have carried on.

I had a different experience from that of the member for Napier. In fact, as a student, I went to Elizabeth High School in what is now year 9, or second year as we called it then. In 1965 there were 528 students in that year at that school, the population of the whole school being in excess of 2 000. By the time I left, the population was in excess of 2 270, from memory. Of those 528 students in second year at Elizabeth High School, 150 reached matriculation, 33 reached a tertiary institution of one kind or another and six went to the University of Adelaide. Those figures were inflated, because my old school which I had attended from year eight, or first year, namely, Elizabeth Boys Tech, supplied two students who went through to university. They went right through the tech school system to the end of Leaving, as it was then, and matriculation. Those two were successful. They were two of a total population of 1 100 and, in the first year I was at the boys tech, there were about 250 students. In the whole Elizabeth area at that time there was a start-up population in the high schools and the technical schools of about 1 800, and many fewer than 100 ever got anywhere near tertiary institutions of any kind.

It is to the great credit of Governments that they have addressed those issues. I know that the member for Napier said that after the great Whitlam reforms (to which I will return in a moment) some little change occurred with respect to the composition of the university in particular. I suspect that there is more than a grain of truth in that. The last time I looked at the figures I understood that in 1970, which was the year I first attended Adelaide University, about 14 per cent of students came from the blue collar working-class backgrounds. That figure in 1986 was about 6 per cent. However, I think that in some of the other tertiary institutions the success rate has been very much greater for those who have come from that background.

I am no expert at all on the question of Aboriginal students and their success in the system but I suspect that we probably have a long way to go where they are concerned. I do note, however, that in the past 20 years there has been a marvellous increase in the number of students from ethnic backgrounds who have managed to get into

tertiary institutions of one kind or another. I think that some groups are represented in larger proportions than they are represented in the community. Certainly, many ethnic parents have taken the view that an education is the goal for the next generation and they have encouraged their children and pursued and pushed those goals to them, very much to their credit.

I want to reflect back to the time when I went to Adelaide University. I must say to the member for Napier that in the 1960s—and I am sure he remembers that time—most of the students who went through with me had to become teachers and that is why there are so many such as myself who are ex-teachers of one form or another. Teaching was a ticket to an education; there was a shortage of teachers and teaching scholarships were provided on the basis of about half the average wage and one had to serve out an average three year bond. I happily prepared to join in that system; it was much easier than laying concrete, which is what I did during Leaving and Matriculation to pay my own way, because my family had no means of keeping me at school after I was 16.

There was no chance of that at all. In fact, I graduated to a much easier job sanding down washing machines and refrigerators and respraying them for a company by the name of REC. I will not go into what happened to that company, except to say that eventually the managing director cleared off with several hundred thousand of dollars and also, I think, the secretary. That was over 20 years ago. By that time, I had graduated and was ready to go to university. I was to be attached to the Adelaide Teachers College as it was then.

I well remember one of the chief officials, whom I will not name but who was a man of great stature, quite near the top in seniority, with a reputation of keeping students on the straight and narrow. He was a bit like the country cop of yesteryear who would give a clip under the ear to any student who behaved slightly differently from the norm. One Adelaide Teachers College student got into the lift with this very senior official on one occasion; the student was actually thumping the walls of the lift, and the official asked, 'What's the problem?' The student replied, 'I've got to tell you straight: this place is awful'—using a string of adjectives—'they won't let me do the subjects I wish to do.' After he thumped the walls a few more times, the official asked him, 'Do you know who I am?' The student said, 'No, I haven't got a clue.' The official told him that he was one of the deputy principals of the place. As the doors opened, the student turned around and asked him, 'Do you know who I am?' The official replied 'No', and the student then said, 'It's a bloody good job' and ran out. The reality is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will relate his comments to the Bill.

Mr QUIRKE: At that time, access into the university for many working-class kids was through the then Adelaide Teachers College. In fact, for many students, the only hope they had at all was to obtain that kind of scholarship. The Commonwealth scholarship system, which provided a means-tested scholarship or bursary of one kind or another, was in general the preserve of most of the private schools. It was not entirely their preserve, but largely it was, and for one very good reason: they had a level of teaching which in those days was quite superior to that in many of the State schools, simply on the ground of student numbers.

In my school days at Elizabeth, class sizes of 50 to 60 were the norm; in fact, today's classes of 10 or fewer for some matriculation subjects were unheard of. This has had the effect of getting many students from working-class backgrounds and others knocking on the doors of tertiary insti-

tutions. In fact, this Bill establishes an institution that I believe will be more accessible to kids from that sort of background. In my case, I attended the university full time for one year, although I enrolled for three years. I had to work full time for two of those years. In fact, I never took up the teaching scholarship option. They got my name mixed up with someone else's, but that will be the subject of another speech when we debate educational bureaucrats and why I love them so much.

I taught for four years in the Education Department and, later, for another nine years in a private school. I took the view that our institutions were progressing along the lines where they were opening themselves up to a broad spectrum in the community, and I welcome this Bill because it will be one of the most important stepping stones in that context. For members on this side of the House, the concept of tertiary education being available across the whole spectrum of the community is really what we are on about. I would say to many of the speakers preceding me who have worried about the excellence question that I see no incompatibility at all with a broad entrance into a tertiary institution. The pursuit of excellence is one of the principal goals.

I am somewhat worried about the way in which the excellence of a minority has been held up as being one of the saving graces of the old university. I suspect that it has been the argument of the old elitists that older institutions are now being watered down in standard because the kids on the other side of the railway track are finally getting into these institutions. There are many examples of kids who have come from working class backgrounds and who have excelled in the arts, sciences, technology and many other areas. I suspect that there is a whole pool of talent out there, particularly among working-class kids, that has not been tapped in South Australia and many other parts of the world because access to education for those kids quite often is beyond the means of their parents to provide.

In fact, my Federal colleagues have let us down in many ways. One of the last reforms of the Whitlam Government which Fraser could not unpick, although he tried very hard in 1979, was an attempt at that stage to introduce university fees. I remember it very well because, among other things, it actually encouraged me to go out and finally obtain a ticket in the Labor Party, for which I had been handing out how-to-vote cards for many years previously. The opposition I have always had to tertiary fees is still current today. Whilst the past 20 years have been good in many respects in terms of access and equity for all members of our community with regard to entrance to tertiary institutions, we have now set in train a fee system that will act as a positive deterrent to many students, and many parents will see it (probably wrongly in my view) as being beyond their means to pay.

As a consequence, I welcome many of the Dawkins reforms. Federal Minister Dawkins has seriously questioned where our universities and tertiary institutions in general are headed. I think the member for Kavel argued that the bureaucratic approach of 'big is beautiful' is not necessarily correct, and there is probably some truth in that but, on the other side of the question—and this is where we need to defend what Mr Dawkins has done—he has recognised that the cost of providing education for a wide cross-section of the community is absolutely crucial. There is no doubt that, with the overheads down, this new institution in South Australia will have efficiencies which can be realised, and that means more places for students.

I congratulate the Federal Government on providing a large number of increased places for students. There is no

doubt that Minister Dawkins has gone out of his way to increase the number of tertiary places. However, I lament the fact that, if the member for Napier is still here in 10 years, he will probably be reporting that the blue collar component within the university will be the same or even less, and the reason for that is the other side of the Federal ledger, namely, the fact that fees are now being charged and the general feeling among working-class kids that, if you do not have a guaranteed job at the other end, you do not enter these sorts of courses.

I suspect that what will happen is that Governments will find it very tempting to increase fees. Certainly, the community fears that that will be the case. As to the general tertiary governing bodies, I welcome the fact that members of Parliament sit on the council, and I think that members of the broader community and people from industry—people from all walks of life—should be encouraged to serve on the university council. In effect, that makes those institutions, which are largely funded by taxpayers' dollars, relevant to the community. In many respects, the ivory towers of yesteryear in the form of the highly prized universities have been dragged kicking and screaming into the twentieth century. One of the Bills before the House should set up South Australia to become the clever State in the clever country.

Through this Bill, I hope that we can seriously address many of the issues that confront education today. One of those is the accessibility of tertiary education to Aboriginal groups and lower socioeconomic groups, in particular. The other principal issue is the structure of secondary curriculum, with which South Australia and the other States have grappled. Suggestions have been made about a national curriculum standard.

Another issue that definitely needs to be looked at is the way in which universities relate to our society. Tertiary institutions should relate closely to the needs of the community and the needs of the economy. More than at any other time in our history we are vulnerable to international change, and we should look to education to provide some of the means and bridges by which we can maintain and improve our standard of living. It is essential that we tap into the great pool of students who, for one reason or another, do not enter tertiary education. There is a great waste and this measure represents steps in that direction. I support the Bill.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I support the Bill and, in doing so, I am not saying that if I had the sole judgment of this issue I would have taken this path. However, others who are closer to the issue and who have worked on the project favour three universities. I am not sure that the State of South Australia needs three universities. I feel that two universities would have worked just as well, but the decision has been made and I am happy to support it.

It has been suggested that more people will be able to get into university, and they should be encouraged to take a higher education. I do not disagree with that but I hope that society never puts such an emphasis on tertiary education as to suggest to those who do not have the desire, the capacity or the support to enter tertiary education that they are lesser people. Through peer pressure, some people have been forced down a path they would not normally have taken, and they take their own life or have breakdowns. More and more of that is occurring in our society today, and it is not because those people lack the capacity to contribute to society but because we as a society say that education is the be all and end all of trying to get on in the world.

In his second reading explanation on 5 September, the Minister commented that this is only the third time in our 154 years as a State that we have created a university. I do not know whether that is of significance. The main thing is that the results from those institutions are excellent. The Minister went on to say:

Members will be aware that Commonwealth Government support for growth and reform in higher education will focus on those institutions which make up the unified national system of higher education. As educational institutions fulfilling university functions, it simply makes a lot of sense to organise our institutions into a system that is recognised for what it is, provides social and educational value, and is eligible for substantial Commonwealth funding. The Unified National System provides for fewer and larger institutions than have existed in the past, and, in so rearranging, hopes to achieve more effective coordination on matters such as course provision, disciplinary specialisation, and credit transfer.

The reason we are merging the Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education to create a new university is money, because the Commonwealth Government—Big Brother—has said 'Toe the line or else.' Once that was agreed, a decision had to be made as to how to go about it, and we have chosen to go down this path. As I said, I support it, because the majority want it, and I cannot offer any legitimate reason as to why we should have only two universities. My only reason is that, as a person who thinks about public funds, it may be more economical.

I was amazed to read the motherhood statements in the Bill, which aims to establish a tertiary institution that will attract national and international recognition. It lists the functions of the university as follows:

to preserve, extend and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, scholarship, consultancy or any other means.

I would have thought that was automatic, but people can say I am wrong. Another function is:

to provide tertiary education in such disciplines and areas of study as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of industry, commerce, the professions or any other section of the community.

I do not know why we do not just say 'all sections of the community'. I cannot see any reason for that sort of motherhood statement. Paragraph (c) provides:

to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of the Aboriginal people.

The same thing applies: I think that Aborigines are a disadvantaged group in this country. When white people first came here from Europe the best guesstimate was that Australia had about 350 000 Aborigines. However, in this country today we would be lucky to have 60 000 pure bred Aborigines, although there are plenty of half-castes, quarter-castes, and so on. South Africa had exactly the same number of dark skinned people at the time white people settled there about 400 years ago, yet today there are now 26 million pure bred blacks in that country. The white settlers did not poison the waterholes of the black population, push them over cliffs and try to eliminate them altogether; they just said that they could not intermarry. It is amazing that we have to say that a section of society has to be recognised in this way. It should be automatic whether or not one is handicapped or disadvantaged on socioeconomic grounds or whatever. In other words, it is a motherhood statement.

The Minister's explanation states that the two institutions that are to amalgamate to create this third university did recognise this need and that they were doing it without any special commitment in a motherhood statement. Paragraph (d) provides:

to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of groups within the community that the university considers have suffered disadvantages in education.

That is exactly the same: it should say 'all people'. I now turn to the principles to be observed by the university. The Bill uses the phrase 'his or her', but I believe that other words could have been used. The Bill provides:

The university must not, in performing its functions—

- (a) discriminate against any person on the ground of his or her religious or political affiliations, views or beliefs.

The phrase 'his or her' in that provision is unnecessary. It could simply state: 'discriminate against any person on the ground of religious or political affiliations, views or beliefs'. The same applies to the next provision, which is as follows: unlawfully discriminate against any person on the ground of his or her sex, sexuality, marital status, pregnancy, race, physical or intellectual impairment or age or any other ground.

Because of this modern trend towards equity, we start inserting it—unnecessarily, in my view—in legislation. We do not need to do that; we need to say only that there has to be fairness and equity in the system. The Bill provides that the university 'must not' do certain things. I guarantee that the university will not eliminate tutors who are prejudiced against an individual student because of their background, which is sometimes the case with universities now. Those of us who are in politics may have experienced it with our children in such institutions, because the tutor knows the student's background. The university cannot stop it happening.

An honourable member: It happens all the time.

Mr S.G. EVANS: It happens all the time; the honourable member is correct. The motherhood clauses do not give the protection that we think they should. When I was appointed to the Flinders University Council I had virtually the lowest formal education of any member of this Parliament, and I joined the council feeling quite insecure. In the past I have worked with up to 65 men of differing backgrounds, some of whom came from captive nations and had a university background, but a language difficulty stopped them getting into their profession. These people, such as those outlined by the member for Napier and the member for Peake, said, 'Why should I pay taxes to have these people educated in an institution so that they can charge me huge fees because they are a doctor, a specialist, a lawyer, an engineer or whatever?' Many working-class people cannot see the benefit of a university in relation to their lifestyle, and I can understand that because I had some of that feeling also, even though I went into business and had to pay the fees which some of these professionals command.

When I made that point to the university council—that the university did not set out enough to promote what it did for society by way of its research and achievements that are for the benefit of all mankind—it understood the point and from that time started to seek more publicity. This country lacks corporate and private support for our tertiary institutions, in particular the research departments of universities. One sees yacht races and millions of dollars being spent to improve the ability of a vessel to traverse water, but if that money were put into research in the universities it would be of much greater benefit to this country. I hope that some of the corporate bodies that seek advertising or programs to gain some public recognition will talk to the television stations of this State, if nowhere else, about programs concerning the research people from the universities and the projects they are working on. These programs can be in a language which the ordinary lay person can understand, and they can be shown regularly giving each of the three institutions a turn.

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

Mr S.G. EVANS: The corporate sector and people with private resources should try to channel more money towards

our universities, particularly in the area of research. Now that three universities will share the funding, and more so in the research area than in the past, this matter needs to be taken up by people from all sides of politics to try to get the message across.

The member for Coles made the point that, with the new University of South Australia that we are creating under this Bill, money will be required for research facilities in that institution. That is true, but I hope that the House realises that the existing two universities, which have significant research facilities, still lack resources and the necessary funds in the research area. Members opposite have made the point that some people find paying fees, which were introduced by the present Government and supported in the main by the Opposition, difficult in terms of assessing what will happen in the future, especially as there could be an ongoing increase in the amount that people will have to pay to enter an institution, except for those people on lower incomes who could be given concessions by whichever Party is in power.

There is no doubt that lack of funds will be a concern if we are to attempt to put more people through an expensive tertiary education process. Along with that we will have the expectations of a bigger group of people who believe that they should be entitled to a job in the area in which they are qualified, or at least a salary commensurate to the salary that they could earn. That attitude is already showing up in the community, and it will become an even greater problem in the future. It will mean that some people with qualifications who do not have the appropriate personality to convince people in power, whether in private enterprise or in the public sector, that they have the ability to do the job, will fail in that area and promotion will come back to the old personality factor when all other aspects might appear to be equal.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that 'University of South Australia' was a good name because it would be more readily recognised nationally and overseas. I agree with that and I can understand why the people who decided on this name thought that it was such a great idea. However, there is a grave risk that the new university will be recognised not just in Australia but also overseas not because of its achievements but because of its name. In his explanation the Minister virtually admits that, if someone says that he comes from the University of Adelaide or Flinders University, people will ask where the university is located. In many parts of the world people would not be familiar with the names 'Adelaide' and 'Flinders', but they would know that South Australia is the southern part of Australia. The Minister referred to several countries or States with universities tied to the name of the country or State.

Certainly, I can understand the uneasiness of Flinders University, in particular, and less so Adelaide University about the impact of the new name. There is no doubt that the people who took up the name saw a distinct advantage: the new university could immediately take one step ahead of the others in the recognition factor over the next 20 years or so. True, it will not impact now but, when our children or grandchildren go to university, the University of South Australia will be recognised more readily regardless of its achievements. I certainly hope that the achievements of each university occur through ability and through the pursuit of excellence. Nevertheless, I can understand the concerns expressed by both universities—and perhaps Flinders more than Adelaide—in respect of the amalgamation of six campuses creating a massive institution with more than 13 000 students.

Flinders University might find it hard to get its share of grants and handouts. I am not attacking the present Minister and I do not want him to think I am doing that. The Minister shakes his head, but he is a bird of passage like I am: here one year and gone the next. I am talking about what will happen down the track. One university will be much larger than the others, and it will have greater lobbying ability and more schools through which to apply pressure. People might say that I am wrong in this, but future events will prove whether I am right or wrong.

The other area to which I refer is the Minister's belief that it is important to recognise the commitment of certain people who helped bring about the agreement to amalgamate certain institutions and form the new university. He named those people. I want to include the commitment and feeling of the people in the two universities and their final agreement. No mention has been made of them. People at Adelaide University and Flinders University must have some doubts about how the new university will work, where the funds will come from and how research money will be allocated. They must be concerned that one university might be pushed more than the others. Certainly, I can understand some of their misgivings when the matter was first discussed. Therefore, I believe that we need to thank them for their commitment while they sit back and see the change unfold. True, people at Flinders University have a concern about the new name, although they voted to change their original decision.

Finally, I hope that the new University of South Australia, Flinders University and Adelaide University do their best to inform the public of their research successes. The academic community can show its colours out in the community in Australia and overseas. Research done in the universities benefits local people and other human beings, industry and commerce, but it is never made public in simple terms on television or radio. This is a great opportunity to ensure that those people who pay the taxes and fund the institutions have a better understanding of the role that universities play. I was one of those who came into this place ignorant of that role.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I would like to thank all members for their contributions today. There is absolutely no doubt that we are debating historic legislation. This is only the third time in the history of our great State that a new university has been established. It would be remiss of any of us if we did not realise the import of what we are doing here tonight. In terms of that history, in setting up a new university, we do not want in any way to take away from the South Australian Institute of Technology or the South Australian College of Advanced Education their rich educational and research history. Both of those institutions are more than 100 years old and I had the privilege of being not only a member of the South Australian Institute of Technology Council for four years but also a member of its centennial committee. That institution, like SACAE, has made an outstanding contribution to this State and, as part of the new University of South Australia, it will continue to do so.

Much has been said tonight about access and equity. I wish to clear up a few points in this area. We are not talking in any way about promoting access and equity above excellence. I believe that access, equity and excellence can comfortably coincide. Indeed, many members have made the point that for too long in South Australia's history areas of the State and groups of people who were disadvantaged

were perhaps not seen as part of the natural community of the existing universities.

I congratulate Flinders University and the University of Adelaide for their approach in terms of access and equity programs, but we have to do better. Like the members for Napier and Playford, I reflect on my own origins. I am the first person of the extended Rann family in 1 000 generations to go to university and one of the few people from my side of town in New Zealand to have that opportunity. I guess that we all have a fundamental commitment to broaden educational opportunity for people in this State. When first elected the member for Salisbury I visited the high schools in my area and asked how many students of those high schools went on to university. I was told that they did not know and that concerned me. When I spoke to a career guidance counsellor about what efforts were being made by the universities, the Institute of Technology and SACAE to encourage people from the Salisbury and Elizabeth areas to go to university, I was told that there was little contact.

I was told a rather tragic story about a group of four young people who were doing very well at one high school and were encouraged to go to a university open day. They were taken into a tutorial setting and the tutor asked them their names and from which schools they came. They went around the room with people saying that they went to St Peters, PAC and so on and, when these children said where they came from, the others laughed and the students were taken home in tears. They had taken a big leap forward in terms of looking at university life as perhaps one of their options, but they rapidly rubbed it out of their horizons. In areas like Salisbury and Elizabeth there is not the culture of encouraging young people, either by parents or peers, to go on to higher education. I hope that the access and equity provisions that have been the hallmark of the South Australian College of Advanced Education will be infused into the new university to ensure that that culture of encouraging young people from disadvantaged groups or certain geographic areas of the State embraces higher education.

I also reflect a little on the name of the university, about which there has been some speculation. I understand that the member for Murray-Mallee suggested that Lewis University was an option. Had I been given prior notice of his suggestion I would perhaps have given it greater consideration. A number of names were mentioned such as Playford and Mawson—both admiral suggestions. None of us should be ashamed of the name of this State. I am quite happy to admit to people in this House that I am a patriot of this State. We have a university named after an explorer and one after Queen Adelaide and none of us should be ashamed of enshrining the name of the State into the new university title.

The new university is not an Adelaide institution; it must truly be a university for all of South Australia, which is why these access and equity provisions have been inserted. We will have a campus at Whyalla. I understand that the new university senior executives want to negotiate with other areas of the State to see whether we can extend through distance education and interactive video the direct delivery of university courses to rural areas. I am sure that members opposite, many of whom represent rural areas, would support those plans.

There have been questions about why we have singled out Aboriginal education. The South Australian Institute of Technology has the task force on Aboriginal studies that has been nationally pre-eminent in the area of Aboriginal education. The South Australian College of Advanced Education similarly has one of the outstanding centres for

Aboriginal education in this State. Therefore, the new university will have the option of forming the first faculty of Aboriginal studies and education in the history of Australia. That would also enable it to bid for funds for a centre of excellence under various research criteria set by the Federal Government. The broadening of education opportunities for Aboriginal people should be a fundamental part of the access and equity provisions of this new university.

As to its size, it is not a 20 000 student (full-time equivalents) but rather a 13 000 student university. The member for Fisher said that Flinders University might be threatened because of its smaller size in comparison with the other two universities. I do not believe that that will be the case as Flinders University is of a size comparable to that of some of the outstanding universities in both Britain and the United States. We have been hearing a lot about size, that big is not necessarily the best, and Flinders has an outstanding international reputation in medicine, oceanography and a whole host of areas. It should not feel threatened. I do not believe that the title 'Flinders University of South Australia' will make one iota of difference. Indeed, in advertisements for positions at Flinders University the words 'Flinders University' are in bold and the words 'of South Australia' in comparatively smaller print. Flinders University of South Australia has an independent international reputation and will not be threatened either by its size or the name change.

I congratulate the senior executives, councils and negotiating teams of the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the South Australian Institute of Technology. I also congratulate, from the University of Adelaide, Professor Marjoribanks, Frank O'Neill (the Registrar) and, from Flinders University, John Lovering and Vin Massaro for their role in putting aside parochial prejudices for the better educational provision in this State. That has been very important. Earlier this year, after some considerable debacle in higher education, I was pleased that people got their heads together and looked at what was best for South Australia.

Mention has been made of the money that is available and how there must be extra provisions for the new university to get off to a flying start. Back in March of this year I negotiated with my Federal counterpart John Dawkins for a \$25 million capital works package to ensure that the new university did not just get off to a good start but to a flying start. The Levels campus will be the recipient of much of that money in terms of a major upgrading in areas such as engineering and the high technology sector. We have been able, because of the goodwill shown by the chief executives of these institutions, to successfully negotiate with the Commonwealth for a considerable funding boost. The new university will get off to a very good start.

I have been very grateful for the advice I have received from the member for Elizabeth and for his knowledge as a member of the University of Adelaide Council. He has been invaluable. I thank the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House, Rob Lucas, for his bipartisan approach to consultations in this area. I hope that we will proceed with both these Bills in that same spirit as all of us here with an eye to history as well as the better education provision in this State want to see an outstanding result. I am sure that that will occur. I believe we are about to establish a university of international importance. The Institute of Technology is known internationally in a range of areas such as engineering, high technology and electronics. The South Australian College of Advanced Education has undoubtedly the best reputation in Australia for distance education and for the training of teachers and nurses. This will not be a poor relation. It will be our largest university and will also

be large in spirit. I thank members for their support for this legislation before we proceed to the Committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Interpretation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: As I and other members said, there is a big question mark about the name 'University of South Australia'. I understand that much of the concern about that name has disappeared. Is that name now accepted across the board by all institutions?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have certainly consulted widely on the naming of the new university. Indeed, I wanted to achieve a clear consensus in this area and, in fact, we have achieved more than that. I understand it was a unanimous resolution of both the Institute of Technology Council and the Council of the South Australian College of Advanced Education that the name 'University of South Australia' be embraced. Mention was made by members opposite that previously the Institute of Technology wanted to be known as the South Australian University of Technology. That was the case when I was a member of its council and I was an advocate of that position. However, the clear preference of both councils and both educational communities is for the name 'University of South Australia', because the title 'University of Technology' would not adequately reflect the broadening role of the new institution. So, we believe there is clear support for that. In fact, I went as far as seeking the advice of the general public on this issue by saying on radio and in the press that we were looking for people's suggestions, and we had about two letters.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—'Establishment of the university.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: Subclause (2) provides:

The university is a body corporate with full juristic capacity to exercise any powers that are by their nature capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

Under clause 6 (2) five areas are identified in which the university may operate. Did the Minister seek legal advice as to whether there would be any conflict between the two provisions, because there is overlap?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The provision is simply to highlight the autonomy of the university. Indeed, I think that any university worthy of its name should be guaranteed that we will not as a Parliament, as members of Parliament, as a Government or any other part of our society, seek to interfere in its educational delivery. We have received the advice of the university sector, and I understand we have received legal advice, and there is absolutely no conflict in that area. Indeed, it is a similar provision as those which apply to universities around the country.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—'Functions of the university.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I note the Minister's reference to subclause (1) (c), which provides that one of the functions of the university is to provide such tertiary education programs as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of Aboriginal people. I appreciate the comments made by the Minister, and the reasons for this inclusion. It is our contention, however, that whilst we will not oppose the proposition, it is perhaps inappropriate to place it within the legislative framework. I leave it at that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I can understand the honourable member's interest in this area. However, I want to stress that both the current institutions are regarded as national centres of excellence in the area of Aboriginal education and Aboriginal studies. We have a unique opportunity to establish that it is truly the national centre and that it is recognised by the Commonwealth as the national centre,

and this is the reason that we have highlighted it in the legislation. Of course, we believe that, on every social indicator, Aboriginal peoples—the first Australians—have been the last Australians in terms of health, education, longevity, employment and a whole range of social criteria, and we want to stress the special role of this university in encouraging, through distance education and other programs, the current emphasis of its component parts on Aboriginal education.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I had not intended to rise on this question of Aboriginality; I have other questions to ask, but, as it has been raised, in view of the Minister's commitment in the legislation to the advancement of the education of Aboriginal people and in view of the fact that South Australia has the finest collection of Aboriginal art and artefacts in the world (and we hope that will be augmented further), does the Minister see any relationship between the museum collection, the potential for acquisition of the Ruhe collection and the work of the new university?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is a very good question. Indeed, I understand that there is already a very close association between the people involved with the South Australian College of Advanced Education and the museum; indeed, the same applies to the museum and the Institute of Technology's Aboriginal task force. There is a close relationship between the institutions. Of course, this is principally about the education of Aboriginal people and about Aboriginal people and their culture, but I would certainly be pleased to refer the honourable member's question to the institutions with a view to seeing whether they can build closer links.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Subclause (1)(a) identifies a function of the university as being to preserve, extend and disseminate knowledge through teaching, research, scholarship, consultancy or any other means. I refer to the word 'consultancy'. Acknowledging that the university has discretion to conduct its affairs as it thinks fit and with virtually unfettered autonomy, and given that there is reference to consultancy in the legislation and, as I recollect and understand, not in the legislation with regard to other universities, has the Government any opinion as to the potential for compromise in terms of academic objectivity and detachment—which should be, and indeed is, a hallmark of universities—and the role of consultancies as undertaken by universities?

It seems to me that, although the revenue from the consultancies is valuable and the value of intellectual property produced by universities should not be allowed to be dissipated, so to speak, without any return to the university, the growing tendency for business enterprises to be established by universities and for consultancies to be entered into poses a potential threat—and I do not say it has actually become a real danger yet. In light of that potential threat, what guidelines, if any, exist within the established universities and what would the Minister see as appropriate, given the autonomy of the new university, to prevent any potential whatsoever for compromise of the university's scholarly role in determining with total objectivity any matter that is put before it?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Institute of Technology has intellectual property or a commercial arm called Techsearch in the same way that the University of Adelaide has Luminous, which is involved in the commercialisation of the intellectual wealth of each institution. I was on the council of the Institute of Technology and also on the board of Techsearch until I entered the Ministry. With more experience in that area, the Institute of Technology had more

stringent rules in terms of consultancies; that is why Techsearch was established. Indeed, it was believed by the Institute of Technology, as it was by the University of Adelaide, that consultancies by academics not only help bring in money to the university but also help students and staff ensure that their studies become relevant to the wider society.

Each university in Australia deliberately limits the proportion of time that any academic can spend on a paid consultancy, and that is very important. Whilst the universities recognise that their academics have a teaching and research role, they stipulate 25 per cent, 15 per cent or 10 per cent of the time that an academic may be involved in direct consultancies; that is, consultancies either directly with a professor, perhaps being engaged by a major oil company or a Government, or through an intellectual property arm such as Techsearch and Luminous.

In each of the current institutions, staff consult in a variety of paid and non-paid areas. Indeed, consultancy does not just involve monetary gain; in fact, a number of consultancies involve no financial gain. Some involve arrangements including the joint use of equipment by students. Those consultancies occur in the health, teaching, social welfare, science, engineering and geology areas, and so forth. In terms of the functions of the university, we are recognising what exists. It is certainly something that is in the charter of the universities throughout this country. There is nothing new in it.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: This is the clause that particularly interested me. In terms of the 1972 Institute of Technology Act, the institute has had a clear charter which followed closely that of the former School of Mines, which it succeeded. In this clause, all the technological, technical and practical bent of the Institute of Technology has disappeared. As delineated in this clause, all the technological and practical bent which was so valued by industry and commerce, and which quite frankly performed a function that the other universities were not performing, seems to have disappeared. This was my major cause of concern when the Institute of Technology was to disappear.

As I said earlier, the institute caters not only for the needs of industry, commerce, mining and so on, which it has done successfully for over 100 years, but also for the needs of the students, and provides a different education from that of universities. The charter spelt out in this clause is, I guess, a typical charter for a university—a broad, liberal education with a few sociological functions thrown in, with the Aborigines rating a mention also, along with one or two other matters. The practical, technological bent of the institute has disappeared. In practice, if that means that the functions currently performed by the institute and its role are to disappear, my concerns would be realised. Under those circumstances, I would not support the Bill.

I ask the Minister to comment on what he understands will happen in terms of the functions currently carried out by the Institute of Technology. They do not appear in this Bill, although they are quite clear in the 1972 Bill. The institute had to provide advanced education in applied science, technologies, applied arts, administration, commerce and such other fields of knowledge as the council may determine, and it was to promote the dissemination of a practical application of knowledge in the fields with which the institute was concerned for the advancement of industry and commerce and the benefit of the general community. The institute performed that task admirably and catered for a range of students who would not be successful in a university as such.

That was spelt out in the charter of the institute and it was not ignored. The charter of the new university has none of those features mentioned and, for that reason, I am concerned that this is just another university that loses all this practical, technological emphasis which was so valuable to the community and the students who have been attending.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member makes some important points. However, there is some confusion. Legislation for a university would highlight that the university would strive for excellence in teaching and research. This is quite different, and I stress that it has the total support of the Institute of Technology Council and the SACAE Council. Clause 5 (1) (b) provides:

to provide tertiary education in such disciplines and area of study as the university thinks appropriate to meet the needs of industry, commerce, the professions or any other section of the community;

And, further, in paragraph (f):

to foster and further an active corporate life within the university.

Mention has been made already of the word 'consultancy'. We are trying to emphasise in the functions that this will not be some kind of area of pure truth but it will have a hands on, relevant and practical approach to the South Australian community. It is quite clear to me that the Institute of Technology is pre-eminent in a range of technological areas in this nation, and I certainly learnt a lot as a member of its council for four years. I know that it is the very clear wish of the merging partners that that pre-eminence be continued. Indeed, as I have just mentioned (and the honourable member may not have been in the Chamber at the time), following the merger agreement, I negotiated with John Dawkins to obtain a \$25 million funding boost for the new university, obviously contingent on the merger, and I understand that a great slice of that money will be spent on The Levels. That is not the sociological end of things—it is more of the hard edge and high tech engineering side of the university. For once, the honourable member and I have similar thoughts about the importance of this hands-on approach.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am happy with that answer. I make the point that the Minister must agree that the role of the institute as we know it is greatly diluted in this current charter. I realise that the functions of the university as such would dilute the role of the institute because all CAEs are being incorporated into this new university but, nonetheless, the charter of the university was clear cut. Its direction was spelt out and, as I pointed out, the directors of that institute have fulfilled to the letter the role and functions which the community wanted and which were spelt out in their charter. This charter is not as precise, as far as they are concerned. However, I am very glad to have the Minister's reassurance that, as far as he is concerned, that role will continue. The only thing that cheers me up in all this is that, in my view, the institute will be the dominant force in this new amalgamation. If it had gone to Flinders, the role of the institute would have been swallowed up in academia as perceived by Flinders.

That looked as though it would happen under pressure from Dawkins, because if we did not toe the line we would not get the money. In my judgment, that is no way to conduct the affairs of this nation. I am glad that the Minister and I are on the same wavelength, because it has not always occurred in the past.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: My question refers to clause 5 (2), which makes it a requirement for the university to strive for excellence in teaching and research and for attainment of the highest standard in education. In my

second reading speech I referred to the need for funds to finance the restructuring that is necessary as a result of the merger and the establishment of the new university. I made the point in respect of the Magill campus, which is in my electorate and whose interests I stand here specifically to represent, that, although the campus would not deny that it is overstaffed, the excess staff are in the wrong place.

In the School of Business Studies, Communication Studies and Teaching Practice Supervision, there is a dearth of staff and, unless those issues are addressed from the outset, those disciplines will suffer and be under a handicap which could well affect them for several years to come. What discussions, if any, has the Minister had about the use of the South Australian college reserves, which I understand are of the order of \$544 000? Will those reserves be put to restructuring purposes? Will they be designated for research? Will they be distributed in a variety of ways?

In addition, \$26 million was allocated by the Federal Minister. Over what period of years will those funds be allocated and what proportion of them will be used for capital and recurrent spending? Has any designated proportion been allocated to research and what proportion, if any, at this stage is envisaged for restructuring in order to ensure that at the outset the staffing of the new university is in accordance with its demonstrated needs and student numbers?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I point out that the \$25 million funding package was for capital works and for capital works only. It was part of an allocation for capital works and we received a total of about \$38 million for the State. The \$25 million is considerably in excess of what the institutions believed they would get and it was the target that I aimed to achieve from the Commonwealth for capital works provision for the new university. On the question of restructuring in terms of the amalgamation moneys, and in addition to that capital works money, we have been able to secure \$1.5 million for the actual merger process and the actual meshing together.

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: For the first year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that \$1 million has already been handed over, so there is \$500 000 to go. In terms of when that money will be spent on capital works, the agreement announced by John Dawkins was over three years. Obviously, considerable capital works are involved and I know that much of the allocation will be spent at The Levels.

It would be improper for me to interfere with respect to the reserve funds of the South Australian college. I cannot direct it as an institution where it should put its money just as, with the \$25 million funding package, I cannot say what buildings are to be built or that a monument must be erected to any Minister. That would be inappropriate as well. There is a process of consultation but it is not for me as Minister to direct the college what it should do with its own reserve funds.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—'Powers of the university.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 2, line 23—Leave out 'to those students' and insert 'on those persons'.

This is a technical matter. Clause 3 defines 'student' as a person enrolled at the university as an undergraduate or postgraduate student. Legal opinion has been sought and the advice is that the University of South Australia is restricted to conferring awards only on students who have enrolled. Thus, students enrolled in joint degrees, such as Flinders students enrolled in a joint engineering degree with the Institute of Technology or, in future, with the new

university, or students enrolled in joint international programs, may be precluded from University of South Australia degrees. Both the Flinders University Act and the University of Adelaide Act allow the universities to confer degrees on those persons who have met all the requirements, and it seems appropriate to have this Act consistent in that regard.

I was in Indonesia in May at the University of Bandung, which is the pre-eminent technical university in Indonesia. It is interested in offering joint degree programs with institutions in South Australia but those students studying some units or courses in South Australia would not actually be students but persons of the university, so we are seeking to ensure that the provisions for the new university are the same as those that apply to Flinders and Adelaide Universities.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: Clause 6 (2) provides for the university to acquire, purchase, take on hire or loan, sell, lease or otherwise dispose of or deal with real and personal property. That provision gives me the opportunity to ask a question that I would have asked under the previous clause had I not used up my three questions. It relates to the capital funds which have been provided by the Commonwealth Government. I know that the university has unfettered discretion and the Minister would not interfere. Nevertheless, someone in the university might read this and, even if that does not happen, the Minister might take note, and I am sure that, in private conversation, he has some influence as to the style in which the new university buildings will be built. Anyone who visits the campuses of the South Australian college knows that those buildings, which were built in the early 1970s when money was running out of everyone's ears and energy was something to be used in a profligate way with complete disregard for its cost or ultimate availability, have an extraordinarily high maintenance rate and are in no way sympathetic to this climate or their disposition.

I can only express the hope in this Chamber that any capital funds used for the construction of new buildings in the new university will have as their design goal the best possible use of natural light and ventilation and the need to conserve recurrent costs in terms of maintenance. I hope that the Minister agrees with me and that, when the opportunity arises, his colleagues will press this point with the university. Upon it depends not only the pleasant working environment of the academics and students but the ability of the university to meet its costs in the most efficient way and to use natural and financial resources in a way that recognises that both are finite.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The honourable member raises some very valid points. As a former member of the Public Works Standing Committee, I point out that, under new requirements, details of capital works for any building must be presented to that committee. So, I think there is a good niche there for Parliament to have a role. I think all the points raised by the honourable member are very valid; indeed, I agree with them. It might be useful as a bipartisan effort, after the passage of this legislation and after an interim Vice Chancellor is appointed, to have some discussions. Given that the university will have a pre-eminent role in technology and in energy research, there might be a way of setting a national example.

Mr FERGUSON: I refer to the Public Accounts Committee report tabled in this House on 6 September. It contained the results of a very large study that was made of statutory authorities in South Australia and their account-

ability to the State and to Parliament. Section 4, page 22 of the report in part stated:

Although both universities have numerous links with and a considerable degree of general participation in the community, there is no public mechanism available to investigate the effectiveness and efficiency of the universities financial operations. Public accountability through audit and report to Parliament by the Auditor-General would not result in a loss of independence by a university, nor in a loss of academic freedom. The committee is aware that elsewhere universities are audited by the Auditor-General. Examples include universities in Western Australia, New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory. The committee recommends that both the University of Adelaide and Flinders University of South Australia be audited by the Auditor-General.

I think that that just about sums up what the committee thought. In view of the fact that considerable amounts of public money are invested in our universities, the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee was that the audit ought to be undertaken by the Auditor-General. What are the Minister's views on this?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I agree with the honourable member. This Bill seeks to enshrine the matter in legislation for the first time in South Australia. I certainly believe that there is considerable expenditure of public funds and that there should be adequate accountability to the public.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—'Principles to be observed by the university.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 3, line 14—Leave out 'unfair'.

This amendment concerns an unfair disadvantage. Any disadvantage would be considered unfair so, basically, the word is superfluous.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition accepts this change.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 3—After line 14 insert new subclause as follows:

(4) Nothing in this section derogates from the operation of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984.

This clause has been the subject of considerable comment by a number of academics, the universities and, in fact, by parliamentarians in relation to whether such a clause should be in the statutes or whether it is more appropriate to rely on the Equal Opportunity Act. There has been widespread dispute as to whether we should include it in this Bill and, if so, in what form.

If we accept that it should be in the statutes, and because there is discrimination between the legislation relating to the Flinders University and the Adelaide University, there is some concern as to whether we should have the most up-to-date version in this legislation or whether it should contain provisions that are similar to the legislation covering the two universities, because each of those pieces of legislation are showing their age.

I believe that the legislation covering the two universities omits the latest amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act which concerns sexuality and intellectual impairment. So, there has been some dilemma about this question. There is also the argument as to whether there should be some congruity between all the statutes and whether the statutes amendment process should actually cover this rather than changing this area to the exclusion of the other areas.

Comments have been received in respect of religious or political affiliations. It is no secret that for a number of years I have been trying to get the Equal Opportunity Commissioner to take into consideration those times when union officials affect someone's livelihood by their actions because that person is not, or refuses to be, a union member. The Equal Opportunity Commissioner keeps writing back to me saying, 'I am sorry, Mr Baker. That is political and we don't handle political matters under the Equal Opportunity Act.'

So, there are some disputes that relate to the inclusion of this clause and all the aspects of it.

Importantly, the amendment we have before us—and I will accept the clause as it stands because it is the most up-to-date provision on discrimination and includes religious and political affiliations, which I happen to like—ensures that there is no conflict between this legislation and the Equal Opportunity Act which there could be without its insertion. There is some dispute about that fact, of course, but we wish to clear up this matter.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government is happy to accept this amendment. Indeed, I think we will be left with the most advanced clause on equal opportunity of any university in this nation. So, I am very pleased to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Student associations.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 3—

Line 24—After 'University' insert 'that is to be formed for the purposes of promoting the interests of students, or students and staff'.

Line 25—Leave out 'An' and insert 'such an'.

The amendments are a closer representation of what the clause tries to achieve. Whilst there is general acceptance that the overseeing bodies of student unions should have constitutions and rules approved by the council of the university, it was believed that this was inappropriate for every university club or group. I am not sure whether we have totally got it right with this amendment, but at least it comes to grips with our concerns.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government is happy to accept the amendments: indeed, it was looking at similar amendments. The amendments clear up some ambiguity. In fact, it would be a waste of the new council's time if it had to review the constitutional rules of, say, the macrame league of the new university.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—'Establishment of the council'.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 4, line 15—Leave out 'seven' and insert 'five'.

As a test case, I am moving only the first part of the amendment. Through the amendments on file, the Opposition is attempting to ensure that two representatives on the new council come from the South Australian Parliament. As the Committee would understand, both the University of Adelaide and Flinders University have parliamentary representation. This Bill does not provide for such representation, although there is discretion for the Minister to appoint seven people. I understand that the Minister is thinking of accepting the principle but that he may have some second thoughts about the process. The amendment is a test case to determine the will of the Committee.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government cannot accept the amendment at this stage. There has been some discussion amongst various parliamentary members about a way of ensuring parliamentary representation, and the Government has no problem in that regard. However, we are concerned about the way the amendment is drawn at present. There needs to be more discussion and consultation. I can give the Committee the undertaking that the Government is happy to have parliamentary representation, but we must determine how that can be achieved without delaying the progress of the Bill and the establishment of the new university. I know that the member for Napier is keen to be involved with the new university, as are other members of the Committee. I appreciate the interest of the Opposition

in this area. Although we cannot accept the amendment now, we are willing to negotiate.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 4, after line 30—Insert new subclause as follows:

(7) This section expires on 30 June 1992.

This is a contentious amendment, although only six months is involved. The Government believes it would not be practical to have a sunset clause applying after 12 months because the Bill asks the interim council to report back to me as Minister within 12 months. This period is necessary for the council to assess carefully the structure of the new council. It would be unworkable to have a new council in place on 1 January 1992 without severely truncating the time available for the council review and for legislation to go before Parliament.

I can foresee a situation where the interim council has to report on the new structure by the end of next year and by 30 November 1991 provide me with advice, and I have to somehow cobble together amendments, to consult and bring the amendments before Parliament. We would have no university: it would be hanging in limbo. We need those extra few months, and that is the view of the university sector itself. We have to give the new university a fair go to get its house in order.

Mr S.J. BAKER: If the Committee has read my amendment, it will know that the Opposition believes the date should be sooner rather than later, and we have nominated 31 December 1991. It is important that the rationalisation process proceeds quickly, before we become entrenched. It is appropriate that at the end of one calendar year, which is one university year, the new university council should take shape. We understand that the Minister has a problem with timing in respect of our proposal. Perhaps it is incumbent on the Minister to impose an earlier date such as February or March that would be more appropriate, given that the new council will begin to operate as of February. While the Opposition will not oppose the Minister's amendment, it will be the subject of further discussion. Although there are weaknesses in the 31 December 1991 date, there are also weaknesses in the 30 June 1992 date.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 4, lines 28 to 30—Leave out subclause (6).

This subclause provides:

In nominating persons for membership of the council, the Minister must seek to achieve equal representation, to the extent that is practicable, of both men and women on the council.

The Opposition believes that appointments should be based on merit, although it is important to have good representation. However, that should not be governed by principles of sex, handicap, race and so on. The council should have the best opportunity to succeed, and the existing subclause could hamper the range of possibilities that the Minister could pursue in his desire to see the new council perform to its maximum capacity.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We pursued this course in the legislation recognising the broad parliamentary support for our access and equity provisions and the equal opportunity provisions are the most advanced. However, on the situation of the council we are looking at a situation where the current Institute of Technology nominates 10 people, the current SACAE council nominates 10, and seven members can be appointed by the Minister or by the Governor in order to ensure that the new university gets under way. This is to help the progress of the merger.

Basically, in case we had 20 males or 20 females (which is unlikely, because there are sensible people involved) the ministerial appointments could go some way to redressing

the balance. As I understand it, there will be a gender mix in the choice of the two institutions. I strongly support a clear gender mix in terms of those councils. It is very important that the councils are reflective of the entire community. It is a question not of tokenism but of equity. We have outstanding women in academic fields, industry, commerce and the professions and I want to achieve a gender balance. However, in the interests of this bipartisan support for equal opportunity and access and equity, I reluctantly support the honourable member's amendment. I also point out that the member for Elizabeth, who I mentioned earlier as having made an outstanding contribution to the deliberations on this new university, has also raised the point, so I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I wish to make a few general remarks about this pivotal clause. It has exercised the minds of a number of people. As I said, the discrimination clause (clause 7) caused some consternation; this clause probably caused more unrest amongst the academic community—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Hours of debate.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Right. A fear exists that the right result may not prevail as the Minister is in a prime position. I understand that the Minister will take note of all that is set before him and will not, as has occurred on occasions when I have been on a college council, change nominations with the people being nominated not turning up.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: That is right. In the end I succeeded. It is right and appropriate also. We are debating a serious matter—the acceptance by the Minister of the recommendations of the councils of the two governing bodies, plus the Minister's determination as to who those seven people will be. It is a matter of great sensitivity and, indeed, any imbalance will result in difficulties for the interim council. I understand that the Minister is quite relaxed about the new council being an elected council rather than an appointed council.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Absolutely.

Mr S.J. BAKER: First, will the Minister accept the nominations provided by the two institutions? Secondly, what sort of person will he nominate for the seven positions?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We maintain our position on this clause. I have indicated repeatedly in discussions that the vast majority of members of the interim council will be elected as they will be elected by the Council of the Institute of Technology and the Council of the South Australian College of Advanced Education. What has been left in reserve to ensure that the merger process proceeds is some area where we can nominate people following wide but rapid consultation, as we want the university to be up and running on 1 January. We want to ensure that it achieves true excellence and appoint pre-eminent people following discussions. The Deputy Leader is right: there has been enormous debate about the provisions and it is the fairest we can achieve in order to get it up and running.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I do not want to pursue this matter at great length as I understand that the Minister has gone about it with a great deal of goodwill and consulted widely. I have had good feedback about the consultations in which the Minister has been involved as he has bent over backwards to accommodate the views of a wide range of people. Will the Minister give an indication of the sort of people likely to be considered to make up the balance?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No-one has been selected at this stage, or even thought about; I want to see who will be offered up for the council from the Institute of Technology and SACAE. I will look at their spread of professional

expertise and, if there are gaps, I will fill those gaps. I have indicated to a number of people in the university sector that I believe it is important, in terms of the new university not only being rapidly established but rapidly gaining an international reputation, that we invite an interstate chancellor or vice-chancellor—someone pre-eminent in that area—to be an inaugural council member.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 11—'Conditions of office.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: My amendment to this clause is consequential on matters previously canvassed. In view of previous undertakings by the Minister, we would be happy if the clause was left in abeyance until the matter is sorted out in another place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—'Delegation by council.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have had representations about the council's power of delegation of functions and such bizarre examples were cited as the power to elect the council being delegated. Is the power of delegation under this clause consistent with that under other university Acts?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There has been disquiet about whether the council should be allowed to delegate. It would be intolerable if the council could not delegate and this clause spells out very clearly that the council may delegate, to whom it may delegate and the procedures surrounding that delegation. The clause is standard for Government legislation and in no way weakens the council's power, because the ball is firmly back in the council's court all the time. I understand that it is standard delegation power for universities internationally.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Is it consistent with the powers of delegation under the other two Acts?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—'Vice Chancellor'.

Mr INGERSON: I note that subclause (3) provides that the first Vice Chancellor will be appointed by the Governor on a joint recommendation of the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education. Could the Minister put an end to the rumour that is currently very widespread that the Vice Chancellor has already been appointed without the consultation of those two bodies?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, I know there has been a rumour. I know that in Singapore, Tony Tan, who is the Minister of Education and who is a former graduate of the University of Adelaide, appointed himself as the first Vice Chancellor of the University of Nanyang. I also know that in Brunei my friend and colleague Mr Aziz, the Minister of Education, has appointed himself as the Vice Chancellor of the University of Brunei. I give the Committee a solemn undertaking right now that I have absolutely no intention of appointing myself as Vice Chancellor of the new University of South Australia. I know there is a demand, but I will not be responding to that demand. Seriously, I also want to say that no appointment has been made. When this legislation has been passed, the institute council and the SACAE council together will decide who is their preferred choice as the interim Vice Chancellor. I will accept whoever they chose, except myself.

Clause passed.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—'Reports.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 6, line 36—Leave out 'before the expiration of' and insert 'no later than 30 June in'.

I understand that this is acceptable to the Minister. It really puts a specific time on when the report must be given to the Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We cannot agree to this amendment, despite my commitment to bipartisanship. I think we have already explored why we believe that this would put the university and this Parliament in an untenable situation in terms of meeting those deadlines. It is consistent with our earlier position, and, therefore, unfortunately we must reject the honourable member's amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 6, line 39—Leave out ',' and insert 'and'.

This is a matter of grammar.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As I said, this is a historic Bill and we accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 6, line 40—Leave out 'fair' and insert 'for achieving substantial'.

We believe that this would achieve substantial representation from interest groups within of the university. 'Fair' is such a fluffy, marshmallowy sort of word. This term actually adds some substance to the provision.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Even though I am rapidly losing support behind me, I accept that amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 6—line 40—After 'university' insert 'by an elected membership'.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 7, line 5—Leave out '31 March' and insert '30 June'.

This amendment seeks to bring the Bill into line with the Flinders University and the University of Adelaide legislation. This gives the university a little more time and makes it consistent with my approach in other areas this evening.

Amendment carried.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 19—'Audit.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 7—

Line 11—Leave out 'may at any time, and'.

Line 12—After 'audited by' insert 'a registered company auditor appointed by the council for the purpose or, failing such an appointment,'.

That is a bit of gobbledegook, unless one has read the provision. It provides that the council shall have the right to appoint its own auditing team or company and, if it fails to do so, it may make a conscious decision to appoint the Auditor-General. The reasons are two-fold: first, it is consistent with the provisions in the other two universities' Acts and, secondly we are dealing in this circumstance with a university that has dual Federal and State responsibilities, yet a State instrumentality is the only body capable of auditing the books. Whilst I do appreciate what the Minister has said about the capacity of the Auditor-General—and I happen to endorse those remarks wholeheartedly in the interests of consistency and order and for a whole range of reasons—there may well be some conflicts about tying down the new body to the Auditor-General. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment.

Mr FERGUSON: I must oppose this amendment, and I am surprised to see it before the Committee, because a recommendation has already been put forward by a bipartisan committee—the Public Accounts Committee—of which two members of the Opposition are members. The recommendation is that the audit be undertaken by the Auditor-

General. This position should not be weakened. The amendment would restrict the Auditor-General from looking at the finances of the university, even if people within the university had made a complaint to him; his hands would be tied.

With respect to the ridiculous argument that the provision is consistent with that in the legislation of other universities, the recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee refers to the other universities and suggests that amendments be made to their legislation in order to let in the Auditor-General. So, merely being consistent does not make it right: what is right is the recommendation which has been made by the Public Accounts Committee. It has been endorsed by a bipartisan committee of this Parliament. The other argument that there is a dual Federal and State authority makes it even more imperative that the Auditor-General be allowed to audit the books. I am sure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, being the avid reader that he is and being careful about and consistent with the propositions that he puts before the Parliament, would have read the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee in full.

Those recommendations refer not only to the universities but to all the other multitudinous organisations for which this State delivers funds for the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth has made no provision for an audit and is not likely to because its funds go all over Australia and it expects the State Governments to make sure the funds distributed by them are distributed and looked after properly. The second arm of the argument just does not hold water. As it is, clause 19 is pathfinding legislation. It is something that the whole Parliament should applaud and it follows the Public Accounts Committee's recommendations. It should be passed as it is.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I certainly endorse totally the remarks of the member for Henley Beach. This new university will be receiving not only millions of dollars of Federal public taxpayers' funds but also millions of dollars of South Australian taxpayers' funds. I point that out because it will have a major role in terms of the delivery of nurse education in this State. I understand that more than \$10 million of State funds will be involved. It is quite appropriate that there should be some accountability through the Auditor-General. I do not believe that the Auditor-General's involvement would in any way reflect on the university's independence, and I know that that is the view of members opposite, because he is an independent officer of this Parliament, not of the executive arm of Government.

We are breaking new ground in South Australia with this clause. However, it is not novel in terms of Australian university administration. It has been pointed out already that this applies in New South Wales, Western Australia and maybe in other States. I very strongly support the role of the Auditor-General in terms of university administration in this State, and I am surprised that the clear and unequivocal recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee has not been accepted by all members of Parliament.

Mr S.J. BAKER: A number of organisations are responsible to this Parliament and engage auditing services which are clearly and distinctly different from those provided by the State Government in the form of the Auditor-General, and deliberately so. In just looking at the performance of some of the financial instrumentalities, I would have liked to get the Auditor-General in to look closely at the decisions made by some of those primary financial institutions that come under the umbrella of the State Government. I would have loved to do that but, for some reason, that is not possible. They made their own decisions and determinations on the auditing staff. Indeed, if we interfere with that proc-

ess, we are seen to be interfering with the autonomy of those instrumentalities.

For example, a deliberate decision was made in respect of the South Australian Government Financing Authority, the organisation with the greatest cash throughput of this Government. We did not actually include in the legislation a requirement as to who should audit its books, but the provision was that they should be audited by an appropriately qualified body of auditors. I understand and appreciate everything that the member for Henley Beach and the Minister have said, but two principles are involved here. The first is the extent to which we should prescribe the Auditor-General in the legislation, given that a number of instrumentalities do not have their books audited by him—for very good reasons—although I would love them to be on occasions. Secondly, if the honourable member read the relevant reports, he would have seen that the extent to which the autonomy of the institution would be affected by the State Government or its instrumentality being imposed upon that institution was not canvassed.

It all sounds well and good on the face of it, but to impose that body on the universities in contradistinction to existing practices and to what happens in other areas is fraught with a little danger. It sets some precedents that we may have some trouble living with. I will very gently say that the amendment should be supported. I will be absolutely delighted if the council says that it wants the Auditor-General to audit its books. It is not appropriate that the legislation should enforce that provision, otherwise we may be getting into some very interesting territory with respect to finances.

Mr FERGUSON: I cannot let that contribution go unanswered. The proposition just put to the Committee by the Deputy Leader ignores the Public Accounts Committee's recommendations. In essence, I agree with the first part of the honourable member's remarks, that there are certain financial instrumentalities, statutory authorities and other Government enterprises from which the Auditor-General has been in a sense debarred. It is a recommendation of the Public Accounts Committee that, in most instances, the Auditor-General be allowed to audit those books and papers. Therefore, it would be completely inconsistent for this Parliament to ignore the recommendations and turn around the principle in this legislation.

However, the Deputy Leader introduces another principle in his argument. We had two principles to start with but he now suggests that the Auditor-General be prescribed in legislation. This Parliament must be consistent and, wherever possible from hereon, when dealing with these institutions, we should in fact prescribe that the Auditor-General conduct the audits. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with the Auditor-General going in and looking at the university's finances? Why does the Opposition want somebody else? What is wrong with leaving the proposition as it is?

Dr Armitage: What is wrong with giving them the choice?

Mr FERGUSON: Why give them a choice? The recommendations put forward by your committee—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair.

Mr FERGUSON: The propositions put forward by the Parliament's committee, and agreed to by that bipartisan committee, were that the Auditor-General ought to be able to audit the finances of the university—not only Adelaide University but also Flinders University. The Deputy Leader omitted one vital piece of information from his remarks on this issue, and that is in relation to financial instrumentalities. The Minister in charge of the financial instrumentalities has the power to direct the Auditor-General to look at

those institutions if he so desires. That gives it a much wider base than the narrow one that the Deputy Leader is putting forward. This proposition is a good one and I see no reason why it should not be adopted.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—'Power to make statutes.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 8—

Line 22—after 'Gazette' insert 'and laid before each House of Parliament'.

After line 25—Insert new subclauses as follows:

(2a) If either House of Parliament, pursuant to a notice of motion given within 14 sitting days after the statute is laid before that House, passes a resolution disallowing the statute, it ceases to have effect, but the disallowance of the statute does not affect the validity or legality or cure the invalidity or illegality of any act or omission occurring in the meantime.

(2b) Notice of a resolution under subsection (2a) must be published in the *Gazette*.

These amendments are part of our process of accountability with statutes, tabling and gazettals. The first amendment is included because, initially, the University of South Australia will have no senate or convocation to approve statutes, and Parliament is the appropriate checking mechanism. The second amendment is straightforward and ensures proper parliamentary accountability.

Amendments carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It has been put to the Opposition by people who scrutinised the legislation and corresponded on this matter that clause 23 (1) (g) mixes up degrees, diplomas and certificates with fellowships, scholarships, exhibitions, prizes or other awards and, although this may be pedantic, it was suggested that it would be appropriate to separate those awards which are earned by fulfilling the obligations of the university from prizes or other awards.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The point is that we are giving council power to make these awards. Major prizes are keenly sought after in academia, and I am sure that the honourable member was a recipient of one such prize. I would be the last person to refer to the honourable member as a pedant. That is something for the university to sort out and, if there is major debate about it when the legislation is assessed in 12 to 18 months time, we can sort out these things.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 24—'Power to make by-laws.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 9, line 27—Leave out 'motor'.

Page 10—

Line 20—After 'need not' insert ', in the case of an offence arising out of the parking of a vehicle,'.

Line 26—Leave out 'motor'.

After line 29—Insert new subclause as follows:

(13) In this section—

'driving', in relation to a vehicle, includes riding.

The first amendment provides that a person in charge of a vehicle, whether it be motorised or otherwise, will be subject to penalty should he or she transgress.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I disciplined my staff and advisers for not taking into account the current oil crisis and the fact that students will be turning to horse and cart and bicycle travel. This is a major amendment and one that may well be the Deputy Leader's hallmark in this Chamber. I am pleased to accept it.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I understand that it is necessary in legislation to provide for by-laws. However, at the second reading stage I suggested that, although we are nearing the year 2000, it is odd that the university council may make, alter and repeal by-laws for all or any of a substantial number of purposes which are listed in the Bill. These by-laws may be instituted by council subject to the

checks and balances of Parliament, but some of them are archaic. We are talking about equity and access, and members on this side of the Chamber, and others, have made impassioned pleas that working-class kids be able to obtain a university education. We have also spoken about Aborigines. I applaud the Minister, his advisers and all those who have been party to this legislation.

Clause 24 (1) (b) reminds me of the impositions placed upon me when I was a child. I used to go to the park, but I found that I could not walk on it, I could not take my dog on it, and I could not smell the flowers on the lawn because some instrumentality had decreed that people could not walk on the grass. For those members opposite who feel that this is a flippant contribution, I assure them that it is not. If I read the Minister correctly, this third university is all about high technology, about bringing out the best in people. Yet, the Bill provides that people cannot walk on the grass or smell the flowers. Dare I say it provides that people cannot pick a flower for someone they fancy in the faculty! It is a bit rugged.

Mr S.J. Baker: Are you telling the Minister that he has not done his job properly?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will not answer that interjection. Will the Minister assure the Committee that, if at any time it seems that the iron hand of the university bureaucracy is coming to the fore, the university council will be given short shrift?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that the honourable member is concerned about paragraph (k). I could probably arrange dispensation for the honourable member's whippet or greyhound to be allowed on to the university. I will certainly raise the point about preventing damage to any fixtures, chattels, trees, shrubs, bushes, flowers, gardens and so on. I will raise these points with the appropriate officers to ensure that there is a light hand and not an overly Stalanistic approach to the administration of these provisions. I understand that the honourable member also has concerns about the regulation, restriction and prohibition of tobacco or other substances on the campus, and I would be more than happy to raise that with his wife.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Perhaps the honourable member could be given a special permit to damage whatever he wishes and to smoke whatever he will so that he can return to his childhood days.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the Minister for considering the query I raised with him prior to the dinner adjournment in relation to paragraph (l). I am not concerned about alcohol; my question concerns tobacco, and I do appreciate the Minister's possibly talking to my wife about it. Do I take it that, if a by-law were to be made by the university in regard to the smoking of tobacco, areas would be set aside for students, lecturers or university council members to indulge? After reading the by-laws I might withdraw my nomination to sit on the university council.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I understand that most of the institutions currently have both restricted and non-restricted areas relating to smoking, rather in the same way as occurs at Parliament House. I probably can arrange a discussion on this subject between the honourable member and the interim Vice-Chancellor when he or she is appointed.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 25 and title passed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank members for their contributions. I think there has been a degree of seriousness and noting of the historic nature of the debate as well as a degree of appropriate levity and wit. I appreciate the advice and support of all members in the deliberations this evening. I think that the Bill will substantially improve the delivery of higher education in South Australia.

I want to make one correction. In discussions on clause 18, when I moved an amendment to change the reporting date from March to June, I said I wanted to make it consistent with the other universities. It is consistent with the Flinders University, but the University of Adelaide reports on 30 September. There was no intention to mislead members, and I am sure that the House will take my word on the matter. I again thank all members for their support and involvement in this important debate.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (MERGER OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 October. Page 979.)

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this enabling piece of legislation, which is consequential upon, although quite different from, the legislation we have just considered in respect of the formation of the University of South Australia. Much of the debate on the University of South Australia Bill, which detailed some of the history of the changes that have taken place in higher education in this State, will not be repeated during this debate. I ask members to refer to those contributions so that there is no need for repetition.

It is quite clear, as the Minister pointed out, that we are entering a new era. Some of the small are becoming large, and the large are becoming larger. The Bill before us brings together in legislative form the three institutions and the building blocks that make up those institutions. For those members who are not fully aware of the changes that have taken place, it is important to understand that, under the new arrangement, the University of Adelaide will have added to it Roseworthy Agricultural College and the city campus of the SACAE; Flinders University will have added to it the Sturt campus of the SACAE; and the University of South Australia combines the Institute of Technology and the South Australian College of Advanced Education Magill, Underdale and Salisbury campuses. They are the fundamental and major changes resulting from this legislation. We hope that these changes will be smooth and that the outcomes will be to the positive benefit of the South Australian community.

I do not intend to canvass the arguments and the contributions made during the Bill just considered, but simply say that there are some fundamental changes in the way in which these units will now operate. For example, those who have loved and cherished the Roseworthy Agricultural College—although I do not think any of us were here when it was first established—will now recognise that that college cannot determine its own destiny; it will be an integral part of the University of Adelaide. I am sure that the wide contribution to the health and well-being of the agricultural community through the teachings of Roseworthy Agricultural College will be preserved, because there is a commitment on behalf of all concerned to do just that.

The extension of Flinders University campus to include the Sturt college, which is actually on what was previously

Flinders University ground, is a very logical addition to that university, not only because of proximity but also because the nursing component is important in terms of its relationship to Flinders Medical Centre. Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University have an extremely close working relationship and commonality of councils.

The last but not least is the University of South Australia, whose establishing Bill we have just debated. There will be changes in arrangements. For administrators the job will become much more complex and taxing because there is more to be considered than was the case previously under the single umbrella. The enabling legislation, as its name suggests, is simply the means by which these things happen. Over the next year there will be a number of legislative changes and other changes that will make clear the final terms of the amalgamation; there will be other changes in the statutes and other matters that need to be ratified by Parliament in terms of the final composition of those universities.

If members refer to the Bill they will see that some of the matters include the vesting provisions in respect of property, the transfer of staff, superannuation, the transfer of students and courses, reporting obligations, transitional provisions and the preservation of statutes and by-laws. There has been a strong suggestion that now is the time—during this period of change—for some of the changes mooted over several years to actually transpire. During the debate on the previous Bill it was mentioned that this was an opportune time for the School of Pharmacy to be moved from the Institute of Technology to the University of Adelaide and be combined with the medical and dental schools to form a centre for health sciences.

There have been a number of other proposals that have not reached fruition because of intransigence and the complexities of those changes in respect of institutions. It is no secret that the institutions hold on like grim death to the courses that they provide because, with those courses come money, power, teaching range and quality—all the elements that go to make up the institutions of higher learning. Whilst it is easy for me and a number of members of Parliament to stand outside the system and claim that it is fundamentally wrong and that there must be change, it is far more difficult for change to be implemented. We have seen an unwillingness on behalf of institutions to say, 'We will give up certain elements of our course offering because it will benefit another institution.' It just does not happen that way. Universities happen to be very selfish institutions. The CAEs have been very selfish institutions.

No-one wishes to give up anything, and perhaps university staff rationalise this by saying that they doubt whether the recipient of the new course can do as good a job as the institution giving up the course. Whatever the explanation, the fact remains that change is necessary. There has to be a dynamism in the system. We cannot just keep providing the same old tired contributions. We are fortunate in South Australia to have fine academics who take up the challenge and push back the barriers by changing the course content yearly, who travel and read widely, who provide up-to-date course content and who are not fearful of change because change is the very essence of their lives. We also have in our institutions staff who fear change and who want to live out their remaining working years within the hallowed halls of learning. They will exasperate the process of change by being intransigent in their attitudes. The many people who have contacted us in correspondence are right: now is the time for change.

We note that a number of propositions have been before these institutions for a number of years. I mentioned the

School of Pharmacy as an important one, and as shadow Minister I signalled my support for its transfer to the University of Adelaide to form a centre for health sciences. We have had other examples such as drama from Flinders University; there has been a demand to move perhaps it to the Centre for Performing Arts at the University of Adelaide. We have had the age old question of whether Flinders University should have an engineering component and whether the whole of the engineering faculty from the Institute of Technology should be transferred to Flinders University.

We have had this delightfully strange situation with the Elton Mayo School of Management at the Institute and the Master of Business Administration program at the University of Adelaide. We have had graduates of legal practice at the South Australian Institute of Technology, the legal practice at the University of Adelaide and now legal practice is to be provided at Flinders University.

So, it is a very diverse and interesting lot of changes that have been mooted over the years, but unfortunately very little occurred until recently. There is some consternation that the process of change has been frustrated and now is the time to strike. We support the mechanisms and will be speaking on them in Committee whereby the process of change can be speeded up if it is deemed to be in the best interests of the South Australian community. Other nitty-gritty questions need to be answered as they are not fully addressed in the legislation.

The Bill deals with the status of students. Does a student who has qualified for a certificate, diploma or degree from one of the institutions being enveloped by one of the larger institutions receive the degree of the recipient institution or should there be some life left in the old institution to confer degrees certificates or diplomas. There is the question of graduates and their rights on the new campuses compared with some of the traditions that those campuses have maintained as far as their ex-student organisations are concerned. Much of the debate has already taken place on the principle of change because we have dealt with the University of South Australia legislation. It is left for us but to agree to the enabling legislation before us in the form of this Bill and the Opposition supports the Bill before the House.

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Forever is not in question: nothing at any time is ever fixed forever.

Mr Brindal interjecting.

Mr LEWIS: Even though Roseworthy existed for over 100 years as a separate independent institution, and other institutions at post-secondary level have existed accordingly for a long time, we now find as a consequence of the determinations of Minister Dawkins that we are to see mergers. I thank the member for Hayward for reminding me of that point by the way of interjection at the outset of my remarks.

In the first instance I commend the way in which the Bill has been drafted. As the Deputy Leader has said, the Opposition proposes to support the Bill facilitating the changes necessary to create new institutions: the merger of Roseworthy, the University of Adelaide, parts of the South Australian Institute of Technology and the South Australian Colleges of Advanced Education with Flinders University and, more particularly, the South Australian Institute of Technology with the residual campuses of SACAE into the new university, so called the University of South Australia.

I commend the way in which the Bill has been drafted, because it enables us to address within the one Bill under its separate parts each of those mergers in a fashion that ensures that they are relevant to the purpose for which they

were drawn without confusing any other function of merger that is occurring between other campuses and institutions. Part II relates to the merger of Roseworthy Agricultural College with the University of Adelaide. Just on student numbers and course diversity alone, it could have easily been a very much lopsided affair, although it has not been. The larger institution—the Adelaide University—in particular is to be commended for its commitment to a more realistic and democratic approach to the merger than might otherwise have occurred had it displayed the kind of pig-headed attitudes which have been displayed by some institutions around the country in recent times.

I make that remark in the context of institutions at a national level in other places and States; it is not necessarily directed towards institutions in South Australia. We have heard it said, and we know, that we will have some 'real universities' and some 'Dawkins universities', and they are the ones that will be less able to settle down into a role that the community can accept and respect readily. Fortunately, the University of Adelaide merger with Roseworthy Agricultural College is not one of them. Under the dictates of the general policy, that is a merger which will work quickly from the outset, which will be rapidly accepted by the community of South Australia and the wider community of our nation. It will retain for the new institution the international high standing and reputation that both institutions have enjoyed to this point. That is what is most commendable in consequence of the discussions and negotiations that have taken place. For whatever part anyone has played in those discussions over the past couple of years, from the Minister at the bench through the ranks of senior academic staff, to tenured staff, to just the rank and file staff members and student bodies, I say congratulations.

We need to remember that it will illustrate the good sense of shifting one institution—if we believe in larger institutions being more efficient and economic—into another to form what will be, or is believed to be, a more efficient institution. We are not debating that now. We have had imposed upon us, by one means or another, the distinct judgment that bigger is more beautiful. So be it. Accepting that, we have done extremely well in this merger. We find that it illustrates for us that the pharmacy school, from the South Australian Institute of Technology where it has been for a decade or more, ought now and can now become part of a larger school in the University of Adelaide through the example of this merger between the Roseworthy campus, the agricultural technology training and natural resources course training work, and the oenology course training work, which has been undertaken by the Roseworthy college up to this point.

Making that point compels me to place on the record my sincere belief that it would be quite wrong of the new University of Adelaide council to dictate greater homogeneity in the new degree or degrees in agricultural science to be offered by the new university. There must continue to be two distinct streams of qualification obtained through that larger institution in the faculty of agricultural and natural resource science.

Mr OSWALD: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr LEWIS: The faculty of agricultural and natural resource science must continue to offer the diverse course material that has been offered and is presently offered by both institutions under their separate identities. We, as a State and as a nation, will be the poorer if other faculties exert their parochial interest on that new faculty and compel it to do its job with fewer resources. We will lose the great

advantage we achieve by this merger if we allow that to happen.

As a member of the Council of the University of Adelaide and as a diplomate graduate of Roseworthy Agricultural College, I make that plea not so much to this House but, more particularly, to the new institution so that in its deliberations it will not seek to obtain the benefits of the funds in consequence of the merger and disburse them unwisely against the future interests of the State and of the institution itself across other faculties. We still need a stream in agricultural technology training at undergraduate and post graduate level; we still need a stream at undergraduate and post graduate level in training in natural resources science; and we also need to retain what has been unique to South Australia and what has contributed enormously to this State's and this nation's standing in the world, that is, an internationally recognised premier courses in oenology.

Having made plain my opinion about what should be the result, let me say that I believe that in clause 9, under Part II, as well as elsewhere, looking at the awards to be given by the new institution—in this instance, the University of Adelaide as it will become—and the other new institutions as described in subsequent parts III and IV, a clearer definition of what that really means is required. I know that everyone who has been involved in the process sincerely believes that they understand what the words mean. Yet, when they are talking to me about their understanding of the meaning of the words contained in, for instance, clause 9, or elsewhere in the Bill, I discover that they are telling me their understanding is different from that of other people. I find that unfortunate. It is not the fault of anyone who has been lobbying me but, more particularly, it is a difficulty in eliminating ambiguity from the provisions of the legislation so that common understanding of the meaning of the words is more easily obtained.

The last point I want to make tonight is that I very much regret the recent and ill-advised practice of the merging institutions to appoint tenured staff to more senior positions than they would otherwise have obtained had they needed to compete with all comers for that level of remuneration and that standing in the new institution.

To put it in simple terms: those institutions, prior to the merger, have allowed their senior staff to promote themselves unwisely and, in some instances, perhaps beyond the level of their competence and at a cost to the new institution which is unwarranted and which will cause it embarrassment at least in the short run for more than five years, and perhaps for a decade or so in some instances.

It is a pity that the industrial relations atmosphere in this country has built the social psyche in such a fashion as makes it possible for people to do that, and justify it, once they have done it, on the grounds that nobody should be sacked or denied their job. I note that the legislation provides that nobody can be paid at a lesser rate or suffer any disadvantage once they become (as they must become under the legislation) a member of the staff of the new institution. It is on those grounds, of course, that this albeit sociologically understandable behaviour has been secured. It is, in my judgment, unforgivable because of the way in which it demeans what is intended to be the fashion in which those institutions construct their tenured academic staff for the purpose of providing benefit to the generations of students who will pass through them and not benefit individual members of the staff by promoting and paying them beyond the level of what would otherwise have been needed had only the research needs and student's needs been considered.

I hope that is well understood. I do not want anyone to misunderstand it. I speak plainly because I do not see

anyone else willing to make that observation. It is my belief that we nonetheless should have it shown in the record that members of this Parliament are concerned about what has happened in that respect. If I were to have the time over again, from the outset I would suggest that all staff positions seniority and salary from the date of the merger be frozen and subject to review by a panel comprised of the proposed merging institutions; this could be done in order to avoid this institutionalised inefficiency which has been in the parochial interest of staff and to the detriment of the students of the institutions, in the short run at least.

I support the measure, but I believe, that a parliamentary committee—at least one, if not more—ought to oversee what happens in the merger process as it proceeds (from the date on which the Bill is ultimately proclaimed) to ensure that nothing is done by any of the institutions that is not in the public interest. As I have said, I define the 'public interest' in the main as involving the provision of a stable learning environment for the students and an adequate, appropriately well equipped environment for research and the pursuit of excellence in discovering the truth, turning back the frontiers of ignorance, and expanding the realms of our knowledge about ourselves and the world we live in in all its forms of which we are an essential part, and our future.

Without that approach, we in this State and this nation will go the same way as Eastern Europe. Just because a majority of people, or those in power, wish it or think it, the truth cannot be distorted for ever. To their cost, Eastern Europe and the USSR have discovered that fact. In training the next generation and in their learning institutions, they have put politics and policies ahead of the pursuit of knowledge and truth. We should not make that mistake, and I sincerely hope that we will not do so.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): I indicate quite unashamedly an interest in the measure that is currently before the House. I do that after a long association with Roseworthy Agricultural College both as a graduate, as the brother of a graduate, as the father and uncle of graduates, as well as having given service in a professional sense to the college over a period of time, having been a lecturer, a member of council and having enjoyed the confidence of members of council to be its President for some years now.

The set of circumstances which come to fruition tonight in this Bill has actually taken place through the good services of three Ministers of this Government in about as many years—the current Minister, the Hon. Kym Mayes and the Hon. Lynn Arnold—all of whom have been supportive of discussions and the length of discussions that have been necessary to bring this whole issue to fruition. Let me say at the outset that big is not necessarily beautiful, and what is contemplated in this Bill and the companion Bill which was passed earlier this evening has still to be proven in the field.

During the period of the discussions which have taken place, there has been a great deal of goodwill and a very determined effort in a spirit of cooperation by members of the various organisations involved. Whilst fears have been expressed and indeed some fears still remain in some quarters, I am hopeful that the combination of events which have taken place and which are brought to reality in this

measure will augur well for tertiary education in South Australia.

I said that there has been a great deal of discussion. That discussion has taken place between the five tertiary institutions at different times. The ultimate outcome is rather different from that which appeared in the earlier days to be possible. I pay tribute to those people who have been involved in the discussions that have taken place. Those whom I will mention are not the only ones who have played a significant role. Dame Roma Mitchell, as Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, and Vice-Chancellor Kevin Marjoribanks, who will be very much involved with the Roseworthy aspect of the merger, even when it appeared that Roseworthy might not want to merge with them, were mindful of the reasons involved and supportive of additional discussion taking place; they bore no recrimination when the discussion turned back again towards Roseworthy's becoming part of Adelaide University.

Sister Deidre Jordan and Professor John Lovering of Flinders University were also in close contact, and it looked at one stage, along with the South Australian Institute of Technology and Roseworthy, as though they would form a combination which would have seen Roseworthy's contribution as the agricultural faculty of such a combination; but in reality, after various other aspects were determined, it was decided that the funding from the Commonwealth would almost certainly go in one direction only for agriculture and it became an impossibility for those discussions to continue. Even so, Sister Deidre Jordan and Professor Lovering were mindful of the reality of the matter and have been supportive, ever since the discussions that took place, of the other arrangements which exist.

Mr John McDonald, President of the SACAE council, along with Dr Robert Seigal, who was the CEO and officer in charge of the operation at the appropriate time, again were in close discussion and have been with others of the tertiary education units. I pay tribute to them for the understanding role that they took in the issue, as I do, Mr Lou Barrett, who was and still is the President of the South Australian Institute of Technology, and Professor Alan Meade, the senior executive officer. I also pay tribute to Dr Barrie Thistlethwayle, the executive officer of Roseworthy Agricultural College. Each of those people, along with senior officers, students and members of the supportive unions and a whole host of discussion groups which have been established, has played a significant role in regard to this Bill.

When the amalgamation takes place, as from 1 January 1991, it is sincerely hoped by all concerned that South Australia will benefit in the longer run as a result of the decisions which have been taken. We would be foolish to believe that we have got all the problems sorted out. I do not want to open particular aspects of health sciences which might be better positioned in another direction of law which, in turn, might be better positioned in one place.

So far as agriculture is concerned and those matters which fringe on agriculture, it is all happening in one place, and it is hoped that the activities which will be based on Waite Agricultural Institute campus and Roseworthy Agriculture College campus, with some elements at North Terrace, at Adelaide University, will provide a major centre for agricultural pursuits into the future. In fact, the combination of these two organisations already makes it the largest agricultural unit anywhere in the southern hemisphere.

I believe that South Australia and the new agricultural unit have been most fortunate in procuring the services of Professor Woolhouse, the Dean-elect, who came here as the Director of Waite at a time when Waite was reeling some-

what from a report which, although we will not discuss it tonight, picked up a number of vital changes necessary within that organisation. Professor Woolhouse has been able to draw together the best of all the units at his disposal and it is a feature of the University of Adelaide and of Roseworthy Agricultural College that, for some months now, a pro-faculty has been in existence. The officers of that pro-faculty have been meeting, as if they were a legitimate faculty, with the assistance, where necessary, of the Council of the Adelaide University and the Council of Roseworthy Agricultural College. On day one, whenever that happens to be, I believe that most of the matters at issue will have been predetermined and be in place.

The Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resource Sciences, which is created by this amalgamation, already has a great deal of tradition. Adelaide University's agricultural activities and Waite's agricultural activities are included. Roseworthy Agricultural College has been in existence 107 years and its pre-eminent position in relation to oenology and practical theory agriculture as opposed to science driven agriculture is well regarded the world over. I look forward to the end result, which will be reached in close conjunction with the Department of Agriculture, leading to an integration of effort to get a better dollar value for money spent on research, allowing South Australia to retain that pre-eminent position and to contribute satisfactorily in the world.

Although it is unknown in some areas but lauded in third world countries, for 15 years Roseworthy Agricultural College has been involved in training third world postgraduate agricultural students, giving them an insight to South Australia's dry land farming procedures, allowing them to take that information back to their own country. It is not uncommon for the name of the Roseworthy Agricultural College to be found in reports from many of those third world countries through the World Health Organisation and the FAO, where a number of officers have received basic training. That is one of the reasons why three years ago Roseworthy was successful in becoming the centre of excellence for dry land farming, a position which it has fostered with a great deal of vigour and which has been responsible for obtaining a large amount of corporate and other research funding.

I am pleased to note that the Minister has accepted a number of amendments. The matter is such that interpretations and counter-interpretations seem to be coming in on a daily basis. A spirit of goodwill which prevailed among the universities is now apparent with the Minister, the officers supporting him and Parliamentary Counsel. When this matter goes to the other place, it may well be that a form of words will be inserted giving a clear guarantee to those who will be students and staff members of the new university.

The issue which concerns students involved with the Adelaide University and Roseworthy College merger is how they will receive their parchment at the end of their studies. Will students who started at Roseworthy receive a parchment which indicates that they were Roseworthy students? While it is simple enough to accommodate the circumstances for those who will have graduated, in effect, before 31 December 1990, one must also give consideration to those who might have supplementary examinations or those who are part way through their course and want to retain that direct link with Roseworthy when they graduate.

The university and Roseworthy are mindful of the possibilities of providing for a parchment which recognises the two organisations but which gives due emphasis to the format on which the original Roseworthy degree was granted. I am pleased that those matters are being addressed. At one

stage the student body felt that it was out on the edge and not being heard, and the students will now be satisfied with the effort being made on their behalf.

I finish pretty much as I started: we would be fools to believe that big is necessarily beautiful and that the advantage that Dawkins and others have seen for this merger will necessarily fall into place. I am certain that those who have assisted the various tertiary organisations in the past, albeit that some of them will not have a part to play from this point on, will nonetheless be there seeking to assist by suggestion those who will have the direct and legislative role to play in the future, so that the best interests of all the organisations can be melded into the tertiary education units which we have in this State and which play a vital role not only for South Australia but for many other parts of the world.

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I am pleased to speak to this Bill. I believe that this Bill is enabling legislation for an historic occasion. It repeals the Roseworthy Agricultural College Act, the South Australian Institute of Technology Act, the South Australian College of Advanced Education Act and provides for the formation of the new university. I speak with enthusiasm on the subject of a university education. Having been lucky enough to have gone to university I know the benefits of a university education and that, I hasten to say, is not solely on the basis of what I am or anyone else is able to learn on an intellectual score but on an overall rounding education in the true sense.

I am pleased to see this enabling legislation. Members of this House can only guess at the benefits that will flow to academia by the formation of this new university. I am delighted to see that those in the academic community with whom I have spoken have a real general goodwill towards this new university after, it must be said, some initial difficulties. I think that that has all been overcome, and I am pleased about that. This enabling legislation gives us a unique opportunity to look at the way in which a number of faculties and educations are provided to people who will undertake university education in South Australia in particular.

Tonight I would like to concentrate on my shadow health portfolio area because I think we are, by the formation of this new university, perhaps able to alter things for the better in the health area. It was previously mooted by the Deputy Leader that amendments would be moved to set up a select committee whereby the provisions for health science and its education could be looked at. That presents us, as I said before, with a unique opportunity because, unfortunately, professional jealousies arise—and I have experienced those myself—where often there is a complete misunderstanding between the professions which does no-one any good. Most of these jealousies are quite petty. However, once the various professional bodies get together and find out each other's difficulties they usually see that there is no problem with working through these jealousies and ending up with the best possible situation.

One of the reasons why I am particularly in favour of looking at the integrated provision of health education is that, with the great advances in technology that we see today, it is particularly difficult to keep up with the advances in one's own faculty, let alone in others which impinge on patient care in a more general sense than in one's own area. I know from first-hand experience that where one actually comes face to face with new technologies in different professions one actually sees the benefits of them and immediately takes those technologies into one's own provision of health care, to the benefit of the patients. As well as seeing the

advances in technology being shared, there is the straight out benefit of the camaraderie that develops from having health education all in the one area.

I believe that the great advantage to the community of having camaraderie, shared technology and general goodwill in the health education area is such as to allow real improvements in health care delivery to the whole community. After all, it is the community for whom we are legislating, and I believe that improved service delivery and better outcomes will follow from the potential integration of health education in general. What I find particularly interesting in the situation with which we are now faced is that there is such broad consensus in the health educative areas that this should happen. I am struck by examples where there may well be people from vastly different faculties who are just as supportive of the proposal we may be looking at through the select committee to merge these various health education areas, thus leading to better outcomes.

Some of these faculties are pharmacy, medicine, dentistry, clinical and experimental pharmacology, anaesthetics and intensive care, obstetrics and gynaecology, the four branches of the pharmacy area: the Pharmaceutical Society, Pharmacy Board, the Society of Hospital Pharmacists of Australia and the Pharmacy Guild. The pharmaceutical companies are interested in this, and the University of Adelaide is enthusiastic for such a proposition. The idea of a select committee to look at the overall provision of health care, in particular, but the other divisions and faculties within the new university and the best provision of services to provide a better outcome for the community of South Australia, offers a unique and exciting opportunity, one that we as legislators ought to grasp with both hands.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): It is important to me that this evening we have the opportunity to support this very significant change that is occurring in higher education in our State. It has been a very long drawn out decision, not without its problems, but it has been handled very well and very sincerely by the Minister concerned. We on this side of the House recognise that much work has been done to attempt to bring together a very different and separate group of people into what we hope will be a very important institution, the University of South Australia.

I should like to spend most of my time this evening talking about an area in which I have a particular interest, that is, the problems and concerns of the pharmacists of our State and, in particular, the pharmacy academics of our State. As members before me have clearly stated, whilst the pharmacists are very concerned about their future within this new university, many other groups have also expressed concern at the possibility of being locked into an institution for the long term and, perhaps, locked into a very difficult future.

As well as representing the concerns of pharmacy, the group includes physiotherapy, occupational therapy, radiography and nursing; drama, which is now at Flinders University; engineering, which is now at the institute and which could be moved to one of the other universities; and the Elton Mayo School of Management which is also at the institute but which might be interested in moving to the University of Adelaide. A graduate diploma in legal practice is now provided at the institute, and it seems to me and many other people that it would be more logically placed at the University of Adelaide or Flinders University.

We thus have a whole range of professional groups who believe that with this change and the setting up of the new university we should be making some direct changes before the new university is set up. I support that argument strongly.

Once these professions come together under the new university structure, they will have difficulty in encouraging the new council to let go of one of the groups because it will be seen as an important link to the new university. Pharmacy has been arguing since about 1986 for a return to the University of Adelaide so that it can be part of a health sciences group. However, it is only in the past two or three years that the University of Adelaide itself, through the Dean of Medicine and the Dean of Dentistry, has developed a sincere attitude towards setting up the health sciences group.

Pharmacy is an important part of the new university but the profession immediately wants to say, 'It is in our best interests and the best interests of our students, the academics and health sciences in this State that the pharmacy faculty shift and become part of the University of Adelaide.' I understand the difficulty confronting the Minister because, if one group splinters off, many others to whom I have earlier referred will also want to go at the same time. As the Minister would be aware, I have been widely lobbied as the Minister has by pharmacy groups, including Robert Challen, Chairman of the South Australian Chief Pharmacists Conference which comprises of pharmacists who manage and organise hospital pharmacies.

I have received important submissions from the Combined Pharmacy Advisory Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology, of which Professor Christie, Trevor Chaney and Bruce Hayter are the three individual spokespersons. They have advanced a strong argument suggesting that pharmacy should be returned to the University of Adelaide. Professor Christie has written to me on behalf of the school, and I will read some of the comments shortly from Professor Lloyd Sansom, who is also in the pharmacy school, as well as comments from Jim Matthews, who was a colleague of mine when I was National Vice President of the Pharmacy Guild. He is now President of the Guild and he has written a strong message with a national perspective in respect of pharmacy.

Representations have been received from Dr Geoff Dahlenburg, Dean of the faculty of medicine at the University of Adelaide and from Kevin Marjoribanks, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, as well as from the Managing Director of Fauldings, who has also put forward a strong argument that the pharmacy school should be included as soon as possible in a health sciences group. We have a whole range of academic, professional and practical people directly involved in pharmacy practice advancing the strong argument to the Minister that it would be in the best interests of the community and the profession if there was a significant and urgent shift from this new structure.

I will briefly quote from a letter to me written by Professor Sansom, because I think it puts together most of the argument that has been put forward by all the pharmacy groups. He says:

As the basis for improvements in the quality and efficiency of health care delivery, it is essential that the major providers be educated within a single institution in order that effective integration of both didactic and clinical experience can occur. The proposal to establish a centre for health sciences in the University of Adelaide, with faculties of medicine, dentistry and pharmacy will enable this full integration to be achieved. It is only with the establishment of such a centre that the internationally-supported concept of a primary health care team can be developed.

Further, as has been strongly supported by F.H. Faulding and Co. Ltd, the integration will enable significant development in medical and drug research to occur and will provide for an internationally acknowledged centre to be established, which will complement the multifunction polis.

The proposal has strong support from both the medical and pharmacy professions. Everyone concerned with medicine and pharmacy believes it is essential that the centre be established if

we are to tackle the significant problems of health and related drug therapy in the 21st Century.

That letter really brings together, in a very lucid way, most of the comments that have been made to me, and in a better way than I could put them to the House tonight.

Another letter, which I believe is also important in the overall context of where pharmacy is going, was sent to me from Ms Dundon, President of the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia (South Australian branch). She says:

In Australia, the schools of pharmacy in Queensland, New South Wales and Tasmania are already located in universities which contain medical schools. In Victoria, the school of pharmacy is in the process of being relocated into the Medical Faculty of Melbourne University, a logical consequence of the restructuring of tertiary education occurring in that State.

It goes on to say that the South Australian branch clearly supports this move to bring together the health professions into a very important health science centre at the Adelaide University.

I will also quote from a very important valedictory lecture by Professor De La Lande, who was the head of the clinical and experimental pharmacology group when I was at university and who recently retired from the University of Adelaide. The lecture is entitled 'Reflections on Good and Bad at Adelaide University'. In the first part of the lecture he talks about the good developments that occurred when he was the Professor of clinical and experimental pharmacology, and then he talks about one bad decision in particular. He says:

I'll return now to the theme implied in the title of this address. During my period here it has been mainly 'good', and the only 'bad' I'll refer to are past mistakes in which I have participated. One example of the latter was my acceptance of the two-tier tertiary institute system in the 1960s, which saw the Department of Pharmacy removed from this campus to the SAIT. At the time there was sufficient evidence to suggest that academic pharmacy would eventually play an important role in the newly-emerging disciplines of pharmacokinetics and drug metabolism. I believe now that, if I had done my homework properly, I would have foreseen such development and would have fought to retain this discipline within the campus. As it is, the current attempts to achieve the logical association of pharmacy with the medical faculty to form part of a Centre for Health Sciences now face formidable problems of a political nature. I certainly hope that these can be overcome, and that such a centre will eventually emerge.

Professor De La Lande was a member of the original committee that recommended that pharmacy be cut off from the University of Adelaide. He is now saying clearly that that was one of the bad decisions in which he participated. He also clearly points out in his presentation that we are in a position of political decision. There is no doubt about that. Whilst I will take up that political argument and say that it is up to us as a Parliament to make the decision as to whether pharmacy or other groups shift out of this area of the new University of South Australia, the reality is that the professions will have to go through the political process of argument within this new university to have it shifted.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: I take up the comment of the member for Henley Beach because I think that we do have an opportunity, when setting up a new university, to actually make some very significant changes in relation to what I believe that we, as politicians and as members of Parliament, have to stand up and be counted on. It is very difficult to ask academics who will come together as part of this new council to make decisions to hive off any group, when such action may mean a significant disadvantage to the new university. I do not believe they will do it and I think it is up to Parliament to ensure that that occurs if it believes it is important to higher education in our State. In Committee the Liberal Party intends to move for the establishment of

a standing committee of the Parliament to look continuously at this possibility.

Members interjecting:

Mr INGERSON: Again, I am fascinated at the comments from members opposite, because continuing committees were set up to monitor both the Pitjantjatjara and the Maralinga lands legislation. Those committees are doing the same exercise that we will be proposing in Committee. Since those committees were recommended and supported very strongly by members opposite, I find it ironical that they are now saying that we, as a Parliament, should not at least have a look at that type of committee structure. It would be a monitoring committee and would be there to ensure that the will of Parliament—as it is the Parliament which does decide on these sorts of issues—is met. Things such as the shifting of the Pharmacy School and the Elton Mayo School of Management, and the settling down of the university itself should be very much part of these considerations.

I support that argument very strongly because I believe that it would form an intermediary stage between the Parliament's saying that a university should be free-standing and do what it likes and our stepping in and saying that this is what it should do. A select committee takes the intermediate position and I hope that the House will consider that option.

Finally, I will outline some of the advantages that have been put to me by the School of Pharmacy, the Dean of Medicine and the Dean of Dentistry, in summing up how they see the advantages of the School of Pharmacy going to the University of Adelaide. They mentioned in their proposal to me that the shifting of pharmacy into the University of Adelaide and, importantly, into the new health sciences centre, is supported, as I said earlier, by the faculties of dentistry and medicine, the School of Pharmacy and Medical Laboratory Sciences of SAIT, the Pharmacy Guild, the Pharmaceutical Society of Australia—at both national and State levels—the Pharmacy Board, which is a statutory body of this Parliament, the Pharmacy Advisory Committee of SAIT, the Society of Hospital Pharmacists and, of course, Fauldings in South Australia. Of course, we all know of the marvellous work that Fauldings is doing in this research area, carried out until recently under the chairmanship of Bill Scammell.

Basically, they argue that this new concept of setting up a health sciences centre would allow multi-disciplinary teaching of a broad range of health sciences by facilitating liaison in curriculum planning. It would improve the career prospects of students in the medical laboratory sciences. Having graduated from Adelaide University as a pharmacist some 30 years ago—it seems like only yesterday—I know that the opportunities for young pharmacists to be part of and working with the medical profession are significantly different from when I graduated, when we were treated and seen only as retail operators. It is a totally different situation today. There is no doubt that a significant health centre will have a greater impact on overseas students coming to Australia; there is no doubt that it will enhance and enable existing new research projects to be taken up at a much greater level.

That is not in any way denigrating the excellent work being done now in the School of Pharmacy and in the School of Pharmacology of the Adelaide University. It seems far more logical to bring these faculties together resulting in a magnificent health science centre in Adelaide. It is all part of this new technology and science push and the recognition in this State that high qualifications and high skills are a very important part of our future. If our State can

make this sort of concept work, we will be able to push the multifunction polis concept much further and much more quickly down the road.

Mr Ferguson: Do you support it now?

Mr INGERSON: I always have. If the honourable member read my speeches, he would find that out. The post-graduate studies will give higher degree opportunities, as I said, the development and testing of new drugs, research facilities and generally a significant benefit for students and academics. Administratively, there is no doubt that it would bring a totally new faculty to the University of Adelaide. It would establish this new health sciences centre. It would, however, retain an individual identity for the three professions within that structure and it would be cost neutral to the State, which I believe is a very important factor.

I suggest that the Minister support the concept of a select committee running in conjunction with the establishment of the new university. I support very strongly the moves the Liberal Party is taking, and I hope that the Minister will consider favourably the comments I have made tonight.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This is an enabling Bill and puts into effect the matters referred to in the Bill which we debated earlier and which sets up the South Australian University. I can see the benefit of having health services established to a greater degree within our universities, and I can understand why some members would support multiple disciplines being taught in the one university in the health sciences area. However, I have a deep concern which I mentioned in the earlier debate, and that is in respect of Flinders University.

The new university is guaranteed at this stage at least 13 000 students. Adelaide University has approximately 10 000 students but Flinders University is struggling to get its 8 000 students. Federal Minister Dawkins has set a criterion for the universities of about 8 000 students. As much as I respect the comments of my colleagues about the pharmaceutical sections being passed over to Adelaide University, if we are not careful all the considerations will be towards the new baby—and a big baby at that—and Adelaide University, the oldest university in the State. That university is serviced to a great degree by all public transport services whereas Flinders University finds itself in a more difficult situation.

The argument has been put that there would be a greater opportunity to obtain research grants if the pharmaceutical section is placed at Adelaide University. There has been talk of other sections, including the School of Management, being swapped between the South Australian University and Adelaide University. If the grants go more towards the new university and Adelaide University, as I indicated earlier, Flinders University will end up in a very serious situation. We need to be conscious of that.

If Flinders drops back in numbers, the Federal criteria will prevail and it could be placed in a position that I do not believe Parliament intended. For that reason, I am not a supporter of transferring anything at this stage that the new university collects from the six campuses. I would not agree with that, whether to Adelaide or anywhere else. I believe that we need a settling down period. I took the opportunity to seek the views of a senior person at Flinders University, and it was a view that that person expressed. They were not anti anything going to Adelaide or any swap over; they thought that there was a need for a settling down period and then to make the assessments.

On that basis, I am happy to have a select committee look at all the propositions, because it will probably take 12 months or more before it can come up with any sensible

findings in such a complicated area. I hope that, whatever we do, we stop and think seriously, because it took Flinders University a long while, being on the fringe of the city and with the lack of public transport, to get established to some degree. It is a good university—it is not in my electorate—which has had great successes in teaching and in research, and I plead its case strongly.

More specifically, coming back to the Bill, there is one point that I want to make. The Minister need not answer this; indeed, I am not sure that he can. We are transferring staff from the six campuses to the new South Australian University through this Bill. We are saying that their salaries will be the same, any perks that they get will be the same and any entitlements will be the same. I accept that. However, I have a feeling in my heart that there will be a move by some to have their qualifications recognised to a higher standard, if not in monetary terms at least in name.

Although there will be nothing that we can do about it once we pass this Bill and the previous piece of legislation, we need to be conscious that certain people, for egotism or for some shorter or longer term gain as regards pay, will say that their qualifications, experience or term of service that they have given entitles them to be recognised as professors or some other entitlement up the ladder beyond their present level. They will say, 'We are no longer employed by a college of advanced education or the Institute of Technology, or whatever; we are now employed by a university. Joe Bloggs does not have much on me as far as qualifications go at another institution which is called a university and he is recognised as a professor.' I appreciate that it is not as simple as that, but the gate is wide open for that kind of operation.

I hope that, if the new institution feels that it needs professors, it will not necessarily look at changing the titles of people there, but will advertise and seek others with better qualifications to carry out the role that it has in mind. I do not know any of the people involved, so I am not reflecting on their capacity. However, I believe that the gate will open for that sort of push because, amongst all of us, politicians, or whatever our profession or job—and a job is usually a journey of boredom—there is a tendency to want to gain a bit of kudos, especially at a time of change.

If there is a push by a good many colleagues to do the same thing, it is possible some of the rules will be changed or weakened, or they will be a little different from those of other institutions. I hope that, with the creation of this third university, we do not bring about a mediocrity that was never intended.

I hope that the Minister will support a select committee. If there is a move by Parliament to swap over any of the faculties whether between the campuses of Adelaide University or from one to the other without a settling down period, I will oppose it. I have grave fears about what will happen to Flinders University if too many moves are made which weaken its bargaining power at the Commonwealth table for finances or in the community to attract students to its courses. Flinders has a great record in medical science and works well in conjunction with nurse training with the Flinders Medical Centre. It could easily qualify for some of the considerations about which my colleagues have spoken, except that it does not have the School of Dentistry.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): This Bill brings into effect the various agreements negotiated over the past nine months between the universities; in other words, the Sturt campus of SACAE joining with Flinders, Roseworthy joining with Adelaide, Adelaide SACAE joining with Adelaide University and the

other three campuses of SACAE merging with the South Australian Institute of Technology. I assure members that there has been extensive negotiation to the nth degree through that process. I wanted to be able to come to Parliament with agreement from all the institutions. It has not been achieved easily, but I believe that we have done so.

On the question of the School of Pharmacy, my view is that there may well be a case for pharmacy to be part of a health sciences centre. I have never argued that point. What I have taken into account is that the various executives of each of the institutions meeting in SAGE, which is the chief executives forum within the university sector, all agreed that it would be inappropriate to bring about changes before the legislation had been passed. It is not our job as a Parliament or a Government to say that one university will offer Maths I but will not offer Accounting I. It is not our job to interfere with each of the universities and suggest that we do not like the way the University of Adelaide conducts its French history course. That is not our job: that is the job of these autonomous institutions.

My view is that it would be quite improper for me as Minister to tell the University of South Australia that I have decided to give pharmacy to the University of Adelaide, just as it would be quite improper for me to move the University of Adelaide's engineering school to Flinders or to merge its political science section with the Magill campus. That is not what university education is about in this country. It might be like that in the former eastern bloc countries; it might be like that in some other countries. I hope it will never be the case in South Australia.

If in February, March or April, I had advised that I had received a letter from a pharmacist in Unley who wanted these things to happen and that they should be done, every other component part of those institutions would have requested a move to Adelaide or Flinders. These mergers would not have come about. We would still be debating them in the year 2000. There has been an enormous amount of consultation but someone had to have the guts to suggest that we get on with these mergers and this legislation. I am pleased with the positive contribution of members opposite and I congratulate all the various merger negotiation teams on their hard work.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—'Transfer of students and courses.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 3—

Line 31—After 'college' insert 'or, if the student so elects, in the name of the university and the college'.

Line 39—After 'university' insert ', in the name of the university and the college'.

Subclause (4) applies only to students who complete their degrees this year. The Roseworthy/Adelaide agreement provided that such students may elect to take a degree from the university in the name of the college or from the university in the name of the university and the college. The matter has been approved by the University of Adelaide and it will be addressed at its next graduation ceremony. Clause 9 (4) will cease to have any effect when those sitting for their examinations this week and next have completed them. The member for Light has outlined the importance of this provision.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It is one of the vexing questions, as the Minister would be aware, that has taxed the minds of many people, including the Liberal Opposition. I have a view that may be a little contrary to the one that is expressed in the Bill, but I also know that there is some currency for the Minister's amendment, which actually tidies up this provi-

sion. Under the circumstances, it is acceptable to the Opposition.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 10—'Preservation of statutes and by-laws.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: What time frame is operating with respect to the obvious changes that will have to take place with the amalgamations? When can we expect the consolidated statutes and by-laws and the necessary legislative amendments so that the two entities can become one and operate under the same rules and guidelines?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As the honourable member could have seen from the previous Bill, we inserted a whole range of statute provisions regarding what the interim council may or may not do. This clause provides that particular provisions relating to individual campuses and colleges will stand. It is basically up to the individual councils. Obviously, it will take some months for each council to work out. This is just a holding action, and we hope that they will proceed expeditiously. As the honourable member knows, in the previous legislation there was a move to ask councils to report within 18 months. We certainly hope that they will have their by-laws worked out long before then.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I refer to the Roseworthy Agricultural College and the University of Adelaide which will become one institution. Because of the Minister's actions, there shall be a capacity to provide degrees in either the name of the university or the name of the university and the college. What remaining signatory will prevail under those circumstances?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Basically, it is envisaged that the parchment which the graduating student will receive and which will be conferred by the University of Adelaide, will recognise that work has been completed at the Roseworthy college, since at that stage there will be no such entity, President or Chancellor. So, it will be issued by the University of Adelaide, recognising the Roseworthy component.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Vesting provision.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 5, line 19—After 'South Australia' insert 'in such shares as the universities agree between them.'

This amendment, which is a tidying up of the legislation, is designed to ensure that the vesting provisions survive. Whilst there has been some agreement, some matters of property distribution are still outstanding. This amendment simply makes clear that the universities have the right to operate the properties that are common to all three institutions in the shares that are agreed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am happy to accept that amendment, although it is basically unnecessary, since, dealing with the division of jointly held property and liabilities between the universities, clause 43 provides:

The universities may enter into arrangements to divide between them any property, rights, interests or liabilities jointly vested in them pursuant to this Act.

The Government is, however, prepared to accept this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 17—'Transfer of staff.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: We are well aware that on the combining of these institutions there will be an excess of staff. Clause 17 (1) (c) provides:

A person who was, immediately before the commencement day, an employee of the college engaged in the general admission of the college and who is assigned by the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to the university.

Will the Minister explain that provision?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I stress that we are putting into effect the merger agreements. I will not be directly interfering. We are getting a list from SACAE on the general administration. It will involve the same process and provide me with a list of the allocations following negotiations, which have been extensive. We will just put that into effect, basically enabling their merging agreements that have been negotiated with unions, staff associations and various other bodies to come into force.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Will the Minister confirm that he is only a post box for that process?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, I am essentially an animated post box.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 and 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Preservation of statutes and by-laws.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 7—

Line 32—After 'college' (first occurring) insert 'or to a course conducted at any of those campuses'.

Line 36—After 'university' insert 'and to those courses'.

This is a matter of tidying up to ensure that the provision applies to everything associated with those campuses.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—'Vesting provision.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 9, line 10—After 'South Australia' insert 'in such shares as the universities agree between them'.

This amendment was agreed to previously by the Minister. Clause 43 enables future agreements. Some agreements are in place. Because of our concerns, this amendment tidies up the provision and is consistent with the previous amendment accepted by the Minister.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 27 to 29 passed.

Clause 30—'Preservation of statutes and by-laws.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 11—

Line 8—After 'college' insert 'or to any course conducted at that campus'.

Line 12—After 'university' insert 'and to those courses'.

The amendments are similar to an earlier amendment moved to clause 20.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government accepts the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 31 to 33 passed.

Clause 34—'Vesting provision.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 12, line 10—After 'South Australia' insert 'in such shares as the universities agree between them'.

This is another vesting measure that we have now dealt with.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government accepts the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 35 to 37 passed.

Clause 38—'Preservation of statutes and by-laws.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 14—

Line 6—after 'college' insert 'or to any course conducted at that campus'.

Line 10—after 'University' insert 'and to those courses'.

I move these amendments for the reasons mentioned previously.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Government accepts the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 39 passed.

Clause 40—'Implementation of agreement.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move.

Page 14, line 36—Leave out '7 June' and insert '3 July'.

This was a typographical error in the documentation supplied by the signatories in the merger negotiations.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Opposition is delighted to accept the amendment if it means that it is the correct agreement to which the legislation refers.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 41 to 44 passed.

New clause 44a—'Parliamentary committee.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: I move:

Page 15—After clause 44 insert new clause as follows:

44a (1) The Universities Parliamentary Review Committee is established.

(2) The duties of the Committee are—

(a) to monitor the progress of the various mergers of institutions to which this Act relates;

(b) to evaluate the effect those mergers have had on the delivery of higher education in this State;

(c) generally to review the delivery of higher education services by the universities in this State;

and

(d) to make such recommendations, whether for legislative change or otherwise, as the Committee thinks fit in relation to the delivery of those services.

(3) The Committee consists of six members of Parliament, three being appointed by the House of Assembly and three by the Legislative Council.

(4) Of the three members appointed by either House, at least one must be from the group led by the Leader of the Government and at least one must be from the group led by the Leader of the Opposition, but a Minister of the Crown is not eligible for appointment.

(5) The Committee must first be appointed as soon as practicable after the commencement of this Act and thereafter at the commencement of every Parliament.

(6) Subject to subsection (7), the members of the Committee hold office until new appointments are made under subsection (5), but a member is eligible for reappointment.

(7) The office of a member becomes vacant—

(a) if the member dies;

(b) if the member resigns by notice in writing addressed—

(i) in the case of a member who is a member of the House of Assembly—to the Speaker of that House or, if the office of Speaker is vacant, to the Clerk of that House;

(ii) in the case of a member who is a member of the Legislative Council—to the President of the Council or, if the office of President is vacant, to the Clerk of that House;

(c) if the member ceases to be a Member of Parliament (except pursuant to expiry of his or her term of office as such or on dissolution or expiry of the term of the House of which he or she is a member);

(d) if the member becomes a Minister of the Crown;

or

(e) if the member is removed from office by resolution of the House of which he or she is a member, on the ground—

(i) that he or she is incompetent to discharge the duties of office of a member of the Committee;

(ii) that he or she has been neglectful of those duties;

or

(iii) that he or she is otherwise not a fit and proper person to continue as a member of the Committee.

(8) A casual vacancy may be filled by appointment in accordance with this section by the appropriate House of Parliament.

(9) The Committee may appoint one of its members to preside at meetings of the Committee.

(10) Four members of the Committee constitute a quorum, and no business may be transacted at a meeting of the Committee unless a quorum is present.

(11) All questions to be decided by the Committee at a meeting will be decided by a majority of the votes cast by the members present and voting.

(12) The Committee has the powers of a royal commission under the Royal Commission Act, 1917, and that Act applies accordingly, with such modifications as may be necessary.

(13) The Committee must, no later than 30 September in each year, furnish both Houses of Parliament with a report on the work of the Committee carried out during the financial year ending on the preceding 30 June.

(14) The Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council will, between them, provide such secretarial assistance to the Committee as may reasonably be required for the purpose of carrying out its functions.

(15) This section expires on the third anniversary of the commencement of this Act.

This very important amendment is put forward by the Opposition as a constructive contribution to this very vexed question of how to deal with change within the university when the system does not allow that change to occur. The Parliament has been informed by a number of speakers tonight of the demands for South Australian higher education facilities to embrace, for example, the Centre for Health Sciences, as part of the University of Adelaide campus. There has been a drive for at least five years that I am aware of, and some people have suggested that it has been around for 10 or 20 years, for a change in the arrangements to allow facilities with complementary expertise to combine and work together for the common benefit of the State and to form a powerful union, within the capacity of this State, not only to educate its people but also to lead the way in research and, indeed, to compete on the interstate and international front.

So, for all those reasons, we on this side believe that it is absolutely vital that there be some ice breaking mechanism within the legislation that will allow good sense to prevail. My colleague the member for Davenport has concerns about the possible impact on Flinders University of a change of the nature suggested by a number of members on this side. So, obviously, the question is not clear cut. If it were clear cut, this would have happened years ago. We are not here to prevaricate on these matters; they must be seriously considered. I point out to the Minister, that currently the onus is on him, because it is through him that the legislation is changed.

If he does not have some mechanism for breaking the ice once all the forces on one side who would like change are hit head on with the forces on the other side who wish to resist change, the Minister is in that unenviable position of having to make decisions. The fair body of opinion says that perhaps the Minister is not making the right decisions in respect of pharmacy. The point is taken that some people have a concern that right now may not be the best time to do it. Other people suggest that it is a brilliant time to get it over and done with.

Taking all these matters into consideration, and remembering it is not only pharmacy that we are discussing here but the whole concept of facilitating change which is so vital to the educational future of this State, we have put forward this proposition for a Universities Parliamentary Review Committee. This amendment is a positive, dynamic and important step. I believe that the Parliament has the elements of intelligence and the capacity to stand away from the system, leaving vested interests aside, to come up with what will be fairly constructive changes when there are pressures on both sides to either change or not change the system. This amendment will be a very positive addition to the armoury available to us to facilitate positive change in this State.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I oppose this amendment. I am pleased that the member for Bragg is present because,

when he referred earlier to the permanent standing committee he likened it to the two permanent committees that we have dealing with the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga people. There is no comparison whatsoever, and the member for Bragg knows that. He is well aware of why those two permanent committees were set up. In the first instance, the Government accepted the amendment dealing with the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation and, subsequently, the Minister included that amendment with respect to the Maralinga lands. Those permanent committees are set up to take into account the views of the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga people and to bring those views back into the Parliament so that it can enact possible further amendments that will satisfy the people in the Pitjantjatjara and Maralinga lands.

In relation to the universities, the university council is well aware and quite capable of doing the kinds of things the member for Bragg and the Deputy Leader referred to. In moving this amendment, members of the Liberal Party want a permanent standover committee which can meddle and interfere with the running of higher education in this State. They tried to dress it around to suit their own purposes, but I am pleased to say that I am not the only member aware of what they are up to; I am sure that the Minister is well aware also. Do not interfere with the running of education in this State. When one considers the amendment, it is a classic case of the Parliament getting into higher education in this State and wanting to be there permanently.

I sincerely hope that this Committee will reject the amendment and will treat it in the way that it deserves.

Mr INGERSON: I find the comments made by the member for Napier somewhat disappointing. We have suggested that this Parliament in the next three years should be looking at the ongoing differences which will occur between the faculties and the ongoing supervision that may or may not be required in making sure that this new amalgamation works smoothly. Our comment has been no more and no less than that. We believe that it is an option in preference to the Parliament saying that the Elton Mayo school should be hived off and pharmacy should move when it occurs. I did not say that in my speech, even though I believe this Parliament should stand up and make some of those decisions.

What we have said in this amendment and what I said clearly in my speech is that there will be many areas that need to be monitored and looked at by an ongoing committee. In the end, the Parliament will have the report from the Committee and will make a decision as a Parliament whether it accepts or rejects it. Surely that is the way it ought to be. That is not interference in any way with the running of the university; it is purely and simply enabling this Parliament to be an intermediary and to be able to look and ensure that the wish of Parliament, which is to set up a first class university, is achieved. I wish that the Minister would review his position.

Mr S.G. EVANS: I support the amendment. In recent times I have used a figure that I should not have used. I suggested that Flinders University had 8 000 students. I believe that it has only 6 500 with Sturt College. I also said that Federal Minister Dawkins put on a limit of 8 000, but I believe now that criterion has been dropped. I support the amendment because I see hope in it. If such a committee looks at the situation, Flinders might get better recognition than it has had so far. I plug the cause of Flinders University.

Mr FERGUSON: I must put forward my point of view on this amendment. I agree with the member for Napier

that I could not think of anything worse than a permanent committee from this House of Parliament and from the other place overseeing or, as I understand the sentiments of the member for Bragg, trying to act as arbitrators in any decision about what might happen to the Elton Mayo school or to any part of a faculty at the university. It would finish up as nothing more than a star chamber.

We would have to look at the qualifications of the parliamentarians who were appointed to the committee. How could a part-time committee, made up of parliamentarians who are supposed to be looking after their own electorates, bring down decisions which will affect the university, as against the full-time educators who are now making those decisions for the university council?

Mr Hamilton: We are talking about people's education.

Mr FERGUSON: We are indeed. I realise that interjections should not be countenanced, but the member for Albert Park has said that we are talking about people's education. Our students in the university are entitled to get the best administration that is available in this State. There is no way in which a committee made up of people who can contribute only on a part-time basis should be allowed to make decisions in this very important area.

Mr LEWIS: I have heard some drivel in my time, but, when I was working in my office and heard the member for Napier's contribution followed by that of the member for Henley Beach, I felt it appropriate to place on record my perceptions of what they are really saying.

Mr Ingerson: It is codswallop.

Mr LEWIS: It is not only codswallop, it is illogical, and it does not follow. Regardless of the qualifications of members of Parliament, and whether they are adequate or inadequate to make such deliberations and consider such matters—I do not know whether members opposite agree with what the member for Henley Beach and the member for Napier said—it is more important that the wider interest of the South Australian community as can be represented by a committee of the Parliament of South Australia (which is democratically elected by that wider community) can be seen to be served rather than leaving it to the narrow, parochial, institutional interests of any of the three universities.

If we cannot accept responsibility for all the jobs that we are elected to do in this place, none of us, member by member, ought to be here. It is not that we consider other people elsewhere to be less adequate than we are to do that job—it is quite simply that it is necessary for someone to do it. At present, there is no panel, group or body in place to do it. One cannot expect institutions to do it themselves for the very good reasons pointed out by the Deputy Leader and the member for Bragg. In the first instance, people belonging to any organisation seek to protect their position in that organisation and, more particularly, to protect the collective interests of the group of which that organisation is comprised. That is, what they see as the interests of the organisation.

It does not matter whether it is a darts club, a group of people who informally play cards together, a professional organisation such as the Australian Institute of Management or a university. By definition, they will seek to preserve the *status quo* of how it is comprised and the cohesion which contributes to achieving its group's goals, without detracting from any individual's interests. That is axiomatic. It is fundamental sociology.

For the member for Napier and the member for Henley Beach to say that this is some clandestine plot of members of the Liberal Party to impose on three universities of South Australia some overriding control of what they will do in

the governance of themselves is nonsense: it is simply to ensure that the wider interest which none of those institutions on their own can be expected to contemplate will nonetheless be given due consideration in the first three years of their existence. If we, as members of Parliament, cannot understand that concept and accept the necessity for it to be incorporated in a small representative body of members selected from both Chambers of Parliament, we ought to give up altogether. Maybe Steve Condous does have a point after all.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think we have to get a few things clear. All members would agree that there has been an extraordinary amount of conciliation and arbitration in respect of deliberations on this Bill over recent weeks and months. I think that that has been important because the result of those negotiations and arbitration will produce the best Bill of its kind in Australia. There is no doubt about that, and members opposite have referred to this process this evening.

Now, this major policy change has been dropped on us tonight. I think it would be quite improper to not have discussions with some of the universities, because they would be most interested to look at what is proposed. I think that their feedback is important in this process before this legislation goes to the Upper House. I think there needs to be discussions between me and the Leader of the Opposition in another place, and we have had discussions on other points.

I think there is a great deal of difficulty in many of the things that are proposed here. The member for Henley Beach and the member for Napier raised some very valid points about it being seen as some kind of star chamber. There are also some inaccuracies by members opposite in trying to relate this to the Maralinga and Pitjantjatjara committees. They are quite different: in fact, they are fundamentally different, because the Maralinga committee and the Pitjantjatjara land rights committee are chaired by me as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Mr Ingerson interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, it is deliberate—a Minister of the Crown is not eligible for appointment. I might be a new Minister, but I did not come down in the latest shower, even on a hot day. I think the Opposition has had a fairly good run tonight. I think there are some points that we can talk about in the coming weeks, but there is no way that, dropped on us late on a Tuesday night, we can go ahead and endorse this new clause. At this point the Government will reject it.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am not surprised by the Minister's response. However, I believe it is important to respond to the member for Napier, the member for Henley Beach and indeed the Minister. We have heard extraordinary statements such as, 'We don't want to interfere with education.' Every time a Federal Minister says that there is not enough money available, we interfere with the process. The process we are going through now is dollars and cents, as members would realise if they had any understanding of the debate that has been raging across Australia for the past three years. This non-interference with education really fascinates me and in principle I am rather interested that Governments are not allowed to interfere in education, but they produce dramatic change just by cutting off the dollars. This standing committee to oversee, bulldoze and bully—this Liberal plot that has been talked about—

Mr Hamilton: The bully-boys.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Yes, the Liberal bully-boys and the Liberal bully-girls. It is a flight of fancy on the part of members opposite. They simply cannot understand that we

are trying to get this thing off the ground. We set a sunset clause of three years, not until the turn of the century. The parliamentary committee has three years in which to report to the Parliament. Why should the Minister be on the committee? Why should there not be an independent report? That would give strength to the arm—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister says that we have compared it to the Maralinga and Pitjantjatjara committees. Quite rightly so, too. An oversight committee was appointed to make sure it all worked rather well.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Chaired by the Minister.

Mr S.J. BAKER: It might have been chaired by the Minister; it might have been chaired by the head of the department. There could have been different reasons for chairmanship, the content or whatever. The fact is that Parliament said in principle that it wanted oversight, that it wanted to make sure that it was successful and that it wanted it to work. What we are saying here is that we want it to be successful and we want it to work.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: You want to exclude the Minister.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am not sure that that is not a non-negotiable point, to be quite frank. What we have said is that in principle we would like a committee that is unfettered by ministerial responsibility. But, if Parliament feels as a matter of principle that the Minister should play a key role in this committee and be a listener and a learner as well as a doer, then sure I do not think there is anything overly incompatible about that proposition. I remind members opposite that when people on the streets have a difference of opinion they go to the courts for a judge to sort things out. That is the process that is followed in this State and in most democratic countries. So, you have an independent person who does not intimately know the people involved and who can actually look at the case studies.

The tribunals we have established over time are there to achieve a result when there is a difference of opinion. We even have the Ombudsman in this State, who is there to kick things along. I do not care what terminology we use, whether we are talking about an ombudsman, a tribunal or a judge; it is someone who has the capacity to draw together all the threads and say, 'We believe that it will be a positive advantage to the State, to the educational output of the State, to the pharmacy faculty or to scientific research for these changes to take place.'

That will of necessity involve bipartisanship. Remarkably, on most of our select committees we reach general consensus. Let us not have any more rubbish from the other side of the House. I appreciate the position of the Minister in regard to this measure. It is relatively late in the day to consider it, but if I have the Minister's undertaking to pursue this matter seriously between now and when it goes to the other place, I will be content.

New clause negatived.

New clause 44a—'Short title.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 15—after line 39—Insert new clause as follows:

44a. The Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 is referred to in this Part as 'the principal Act'.

In relation to the new clause, we have sought advice from the universities on the definition of 'graduate' and a number of other areas. Both the University of Adelaide and the Flinders University have asked that a definition of 'graduate' be inserted into the legislation. Neither presently has a definition, and that which is proposed is fairly straightforward and in accordance with their wishes. The agreements provide that those who have received awards from Roseworthy and the city campus of SACAE will be alumni of the University of Adelaide.

Most of these people would have received diplomas or associate diplomas, and it would be unfair to have subdegree holders of these two institutions as alumni of the University of Adelaide whilst not allowing subdegree holders from Adelaide equivalent status. The University of Adelaide Act has had no definition of 'graduate', which surprised me, so the university proposed that a definition covering diploma and associate diploma holders be developed. This would then allow such persons to become members of the graduate body and participate fully. From discussions with Flinders University, it appears that it wants to follow suit.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have had only a quick look at the amendments, and it would not be proper for me to say yes or no, since we have not had the opportunity to consider them. We have said that there is a problem, and that is recognised, that the graduate organisations from these bodies may feel a little under threat from people coming in from other institutions with lesser qualifications than they demand of their existing members. I am sure that the matter will be sorted out. There has been a long tradition in these graduate organisations mentioned by the Minister, so we are concerned that the Act would place these organisations in a difficult position. From my first quick reading of these amendments, it appears that they are suitable. However, I would not like to endorse them on behalf of the Opposition as we have not really had the opportunity to study them. At this stage, I formally accept this amendment and all the other consequential amendments, with that reservation.

New clause inserted.

New clause 44b—'Interpretation.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

44b. Section 2 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the definition of 'general staff' the following definition:

'graduate' of the university means a person who has been awarded by the university a degree, diploma or any other award prescribed by the statutes of the university for the purposes of this definition.

New clause inserted.

New clause 44c—'Convocation.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

44c. Section 17 of the principal Act is amended by striking out paragraph (a) from subsection (1) and substituting the following paragraph:

(a) of all graduates of the university;

New clause inserted.

New clause 44d—'Power to make statutes, regulations, etc.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

44d. Section 20 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from paragraph (v) of subsection (1) 'or honours' and substituting 'honours, diplomas or other awards';

(b) by striking out from paragraph (vi) of subsection (1) 'or degree' and substituting ', degree, diploma or other award';

and

(c) by inserting in paragraph (ix) of subsection (1) 'diploma or other award' after 'degree'.

New clause inserted.

Clause 45—'Jurisdiction of Industrial Commission.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 15, line 41—Leave out 'The Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966,' and insert 'principal Act'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 46 to 52 passed.

New clause 52a—'Short title.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

52a. The University of Adelaide Act 1971, is referred to in this Part as 'the principal Act'.

New clause inserted.

New clause 52b—'Interpretation.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

52b. Section 3 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting before the definition of 'parliamentary member' the following definition: 'graduate' of the university means a person who has been awarded by the university a degree, diploma, or any other award prescribed by the statutes of the university for the purposes of this definition;

and

(b) by inserting ', a diploma or other award prescribed by the statutes of the university for the purposes of this definition' after 'bachelor's degree' in the definition of 'undergraduate of the university'.

New clause inserted.

New clause 52c—'Power to confer awards.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Insert new clause as follows:

52c. Section 6 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting in subsection (1) ', diplomas or other awards' after 'such degrees';

and

(b) by inserting in subsection (3) ', diploma or other award' after 'degree'.

New clause inserted.

Clause 53—'Jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission.'

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I move:

Page 17, line 4—Leave out 'The University of Adelaide Act 1971' and insert 'the principal Act'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I will be brief. I have been remiss during the debate not to mention the efforts of the shadow Minister of Education (the Leader of the Opposition in another place) in dealing with the vast amount of material and submissions that were made on behalf of the education institutions, graduate societies and hundreds of people involved in this process. I am sure that the Minister is grateful, because he has expressed his gratitude for the level of consultation that has taken place not only between the various people who have made contributions but between the two Parties in reaching what we believe to be a very satisfactory conclusion.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Minister of Employment and Further Education): I would like to thank every member of the House for the constructive contributions to both debates before the House tonight. Obviously debate in another place still has to proceed but, if the same spirit prevails, I believe that we will be embarking on the threshold of not only the largest and greatest changes in terms of the structure of higher education in South Australia—without any doubt—but also we are putting those institutions onto a firm footing right from the start. There has been a measure of cooperation and consultation that has not been seen for some time and I hope that it will continue. We are talking about education, about broadening access and equity, about a new university that will be reaching out to areas of the disadvantaged and to rural areas.

It is clear that in Australia today education remains the shortest distance between two points in terms of the difference between getting ahead and being left out and left behind. So, I really do thank members for their constructive contribution tonight.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 7 November at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 6 November 1990

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

FREE MEDICATION

124. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health: Will State hospitals continue to provide free medication to pensioners, war veterans, the chronically sick and the disabled and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: Until 1 November 1990, pensioners, veterans, the chronically sick and the disabled who are entitled to one of the following benefit cards issued by the Department of Social Security received free medication through the South Australian public hospitals system:

- Pensioner Health Benefits Card
- Health Benefits Card
- Health Care Card

However, following release of the Federal Treasurer's Budget Statement on 21 August, Cabinet has now reluctantly approved the introduction of a small charge for items dispensed through public hospital outpatient departments in line with the \$2.50 levy for medicines dispensed through community-based pharmacies. Without this action there would have been a shift in demand for pharmaceuticals from community-based pharmacies to the State public hospital system, which would have a marked effect on hospital budgets.

The State Government will continue with its 'safety net scheme' whereby patients suffering from a chronic or long-term illness pay for the first three prescribed medications in any month and receive subsequent items free of charge. The new charges apply only to outpatients. Medications for inpatients in public hospitals will remain free of charge.

NEEDLES FOR DIABETICS

133. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Health:

1. How much funding was provided by the Government toward provision of free or subsidised needles for diabetics in 1989-90, to whom were these funds provided and, how many diabetics were assisted by the scheme(s)?

2. What age or financial status limitations were applied to entitlement to free or subsidised needles?

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

1. In 1989-90 the major metropolitan hospitals scheme assisted 1 037 diabetics. The funding provided was \$98 585. The country hospitals scheme assisted 579 diabetics. The funding provided was \$43 612. A total of 1 616 diabetics have been assisted at a cost of \$142 197.

2. Needles are supplied according to the South Australian Health Commission Administrative Circular No. 1.2, pertaining to purchase and dispensing of pharmaceuticals, food supplements, syringes, needles and swabs. The supply of syringes, needles and swabs to holders of entitlement cards are considered as one prescription item and charged at the following rates:

- Free to pensioners with health care card, health benefit card or pensioner health benefit card; or
- subsidised for patients with a pharmaceutical card.

TAFE ADULT MATRICULATION CLASSES

191. **Mr BECKER (Hanson)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: What was the cost of running Technical and Further Education Department adult matriculation classes in 1989 and 1990?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Calendar year information cannot be provided for 1990 at this stage. The following data is provided:

Calendar year 1989	\$'000
Indirect Costs	2 081
Direct Costs	2 663
Total	4 744
Financial year 1988-89	
Indirect Costs	2 119
Direct Costs	2 547
Total	4 666
Financial year 1989-90	
Indirect Costs	2 040
Direct Costs	2 874
Total	4 914

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE

193. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs:

1. Will the Office of Aboriginal Affairs implement, in conjunction with the Aboriginal Heritage Branch, a confidential register of sacred sites and traditional boundaries complete with the nominated traditional owner/leadership; if not, why not; what means of conflict resolution is the Office of Aboriginal Affairs proposing as an alternative; and what evidence is there that this will work?

2. Has the Office of Aboriginal Affairs made representations to the Federal Government calling its attention to the problems likely to be caused by the boundaries gazetted in connection with the introduction of the new ATSIC system and, if not, why not?

3. Will the Government give an assurance that it will back the continued operation of the Wami Kata Aboriginal old people's facilities at Port Augusta and coordinate negotiations with State health and welfare authorities so as to avoid difficulties that could arise between bureaucracies?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The replies are as follows:

1. A confidential register of Aboriginal sacred sites and objects is held by the Aboriginal Heritage Branch pursuant to section 9 of the Aboriginal Heritage Act, 1988. It is therefore not necessary for State Aboriginal Affairs to be involved in the identification and recording of sacred sites.

The issue of suitable arbitration mechanisms to decide rights to land is currently being considered by State Aboriginal Affairs, and the Aboriginal Heritage Branch. The Minister is keen to ensure arbitration processes are developed to the satisfaction of all parties.

I would like to add that the honourable member asked a similar question of my colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning during the Estimates Committee debates on 12 September 1990. Her reply on this matter is in the *Hansard* of that date.

2. No. The question of boundaries was discussed and debated at great length in the consultation process. ATSIC is purely an administrative body and the ATSIC regional boundaries have been determined for administrative purposes, including access to a suitable location for administrative headquarters.

3. Yes. A major function of State Aboriginal Affairs is to provide advice and assistance to Aboriginal organisations and to coordinate Government activities. It will intervene as required at the request of and in consultation with the organisation concerned.

ACCESS CABS

194. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Why does it take six weeks to process an application for the use of access cabs?
2. What is being done to reduce the delay and is the Government aware of the embarrassment caused to applicants by the delay?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The majority of applications for membership of the transport subsidy scheme are processed within three weeks. However, occasional delays can and do occur when:

- (1) applications are borderline, and a need exists for the Government Medical Officer to consult with the applicant's general practitioner;
- (2) insufficient initial information is provided in the application and the Government Medical Officer may need to arrange a suitable convenient time to examine the applicant; and
- (3) photographs which are supplied by the applicant are either incorrectly verified or delayed.

OSBORNE DRY BULK TERMINAL

213. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Marine:

1. Is the Department of Marine and Harbors planning to review the future of the Osborne dry bulk terminal?
2. In the event of possible closure of the terminal, will the 32 employees be redeployed and, if not, why not?
3. What is the condition of equipment at the terminal?
4. What is the productivity level of the terminal?

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Marine and Harbors is reviewing the future of Osborne BHP.
2. If the closure of the plant occurred the employees would be either redeployed elsewhere in the department or other agencies, retrained or offered voluntary separation options which may be available at that time.
3. The condition of the equipment is adequate for the duty required.
4. The productivity of the facility is acceptable given the relatively low throughput and nature of the technology available.

STA DRIVERS

219. Mr MATTHEW (Bright), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What 'driver refresher programs' are conducted for STA drivers, what is the nature of these courses and how frequent are they?
2. What proficiency checks are conducted on STA drivers, what is the nature of these checks and at what intervals are they conducted?
3. How many accidents have been reported in the past 12 months involving STA vehicles and, of these, in how many were the STA drivers deemed to be responsible?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The replies are as follows:

1. Refresher training for experienced bus operators is conducted on a needs basis. Once a training need relating to either driving or customer relations skills is identified from a person's accident record, passenger complaints or a report by an inspector, the bus operator undertakes refresher training. On completion of the program a written report

concerning the participant's progress during the program is forwarded to the appropriate depot manager for action.

On transferring from one bus depot to another, bus operators undertake a two or three day depot training program. The program consists of route familiarisation training, Busway training and testing (for St Agnes operators), hills training (for Aldgate and Morphettville operators) and depot familiarisation.

2. Performance reviews are conducted at varying intervals depending upon the classification of the bus operator. A Class 5 operator has his/her performance reviewed by the depot management (this includes bus operator assessment by inspectorial staff, normal field reports by inspectors, reports by depot clerk, passenger and staff commendations, passenger and staff complaints) on at least six occasions per annum. A Class 6 operator has his/her performance reviewed by depot management on at least three occasions per annum and a Class 7 operator has his/her performance reviewed by depot management on at least two occasions per annum.

3. 1 561 accidents involving STA vehicles were reported in the past 12 months. Of these accidents:

- 39.5 per cent were determined as the fault of STA employees;
- 52 per cent were determined as the fault of other parties; and
- 8.5 per cent were determined to be the fault of both parties and were settled on a 50-50 basis.

GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

224. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: Was the Government vehicle registered UQQ 065, a Nissan Urvan operated by the Department of Family and Community Services, carrying out Government business at Falls Creek on 3 October 1990 and, if so, what was the nature of the business, who authorised the visit, how much did the visit cost and is such a visit within Government guidelines?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Government vehicle UQQ 065, a 12-seater Nissan Urvan bus from the Department for Family and Community Services Marion Youth Project Centre, was carrying out Government business on 3 October 1990 at Falls Creek. The bus was used to transport eight Duke of Edinburgh's Award participants and two leaders to the Bogong High Plains for a cross country skiing expedition in the activities program. Because there were 10 participants, the awards scheme's 8-seater Tarago had been exchanged for the Marion Youth Project Centre's 12-seater Nissan for this period.

The visit was authorised by the Chief Executive Officer of the Department for Family and Community Services in accordance with Government guidelines. The cost of the visit was largely paid for by participants and leaders. \$783 was funded jointly between the Department and the Friends of the Award Scheme.

SECURING THE FUTURE

234. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'establish a Textile, Clothing and Footwear Resource Centre in conjunction with the Federal Government and industry, to provide assistance with the application of the latest technologies and training to boost enterprise productivity and performance'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Textile, Clothing and Footwear Skills and Resource Centre of South Australia Inc., was established in 1989 and has been fully operational since the middle of this year. The South Australian Government received Commonwealth assistance with its establishment through a grant from the Textile, Clothing and Footwear Development Authority. The centre is managed by a tripartite committee chaired by Mr John Cambridge, Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Centre for Manufacturing. Since its incorporation as an association in October 1989, the centre has aimed to provide an industry focus and first point of call for TCF businesses seeking advice or assistance.

Offices have been established at Fullarton Road, Dulwich, staff recruited and a corporate plan developed. The TCF centre's mission is 'to assist the TCF industry to become world competitive by the introduction and use of advance manufacturing technologies and work practices, and to deliver, in conjunction with other agencies, responsive training programs'. The centre is now actively involved in developing and conducting training programs, arranging seminars, providing an information and referral service and consultancy services, and is establishing a reputation in South Australia as a focal point for advice and assistance to the TCF industries.

235. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition),** on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'establish the Workplace Resource Centre with the Federal Government to provide expert advice to companies seeking assistance with award restructuring matters'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Workplace Resource Centre commenced operations in late 1989 and was officially opened in February 1990. Its role is to facilitate enterprise and award restructuring and to improve consultative practices. It has worked with a number of public agencies and companies and is providing a valuable contribution in assisting changes to workplace culture. The centre is controlled by a tripartite board and aims at helping firms to become more internationally competitive.

236. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition),** on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'extend and upgrade the range of practical training courses and workshops offered directly by the Centre for Manufacturing and, in particular, extend the training program to shop floor training'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: During the financial year ended 30 June 1990, the centre conducted 49 training courses and seminars with 587 people attending. This compares very favourably with the industry specific courses offered by the centre in 1989 when some 35 training courses were delivered by the centre to industry. In all but very few cases the training courses and workshops offered by the centre are practical and very relevant and in most cases specifically designed to assist enterprises with basic factory layout, scheduling, quality, supervisory skills, planning and work force restructuring matters.

The centre has established a reputation for providing very good basic shop floor level training involving unique skills such as storyboarding and vision setting workshops as well as work force participation and involvement processes. In addition, the centre has been awarded a contract by the Federal Government to develop a specific course to be known as 'Improvement Through People' (ITP), specifically

targeted to work and improve the skills at the shop floor level, managerially, supervisorily and technically.

237. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition),** on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'jointly fund a Professor of Manufacturing Engineering at the South Australian Institute of Technology to increase and improve the quality of engineering graduates entering the South Australian manufacturing industry'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The South Australian Centre for Manufacturing, together with the South Australian Institute of Technology, has in the last two years advertised publicly worldwide for suitable candidates to fill the position of Professor of Manufacturing Engineering, a joint position which was established between our two organisations. Despite extensive effort and recruitment activity throughout this two-year period, no suitable candidate was obtained. The SACFM had set aside \$15 000 per annum for three years in addition to the professorial salary provided by the SAIT.

As a result of the two-year unsuccessful activity the matter was reviewed earlier this year (1990) and it was decided to slightly modify the original proposal and establish two joint positions between the centre and the institute. These two positions are:

The joint position of Professor of Mechanical Engineering (SAIT) and Professor of Manufacturing Engineering (SACFM) with the institute undertaking a more specific and targeted recruitment campaign. Recent indications as a result of this campaign are that an appointment will be made.

The second position which has been established as a result of this review is the joint position known as Professor of Metallurgy (SAIT) and Director of Materials Research (SACFM), and Professor Ken Strafford, the Professor of Metallurgy at the institute, has been appointed to this position.

As a result of this modification the SACFM has agreed to a total financial provision of \$20 000 spread evenly as \$10 000 between each position for three years. It is anticipated that these two new positions will provide major impetus in upgrading the quality and relevance of engineering graduates entering the South Australian industry.

238. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition),** on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'conduct a major skills audit of the defence and aerospace sector in South Australia to define future skill requirements and ensure that the State's training system is geared to meeting the growing need for skilled specialists and technicians' and if the audit has been undertaken, when and, who by and, if not, why not and, when will it be?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology initiated a skills audit of the defence and aerospace sector, together with the automobile sector, in late 1989. Preliminary discussions were held with TAFE and union and employer representatives. A project methodology and timetable were established. However, major changes were and are taking place in the industrial relations environment, involving negotiations to implement significant award restructuring and multi-skilling. Consequently, the employer groups felt that their companies would not be in a position to commit to an intensive audit process at the

time. Also the analysis would have been based on a standard occupational classification system (called ASCO) which would not be relevant to future employment classifications or demand patterns. For these reasons, it was decided to defer the study.

The Department of Industry, Trade and Technology remains committed to closer linkages between economic development priorities and the State's training system. Discussions are continuing with the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education to ensure that the State's training activities reflect future needs. Consistent links are also maintained with educational institutions. The State Government has also commissioned the Centre for South Australian Economic Studies to undertake a detailed forecast of future labour market requirements. The study is being coordinated through the Department of Employment and Technical and Further Education.

239. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology: What specific action has been taken to implement the commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* that the Government would 'support the establishment of a Chair in Experimental Physics (modern optics) at the University of Adelaide and further develop South Australia's optical industry'?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The Government's commitment made in the October 1989 document *Securing the Future* to support the establishment of a Chair in Experimental Physics (modern optics) at the University of Adelaide has been fulfilled by the grant of \$250 000 for joint university/industry research projects in modern optics. The purpose of the grant is to ensure there will be technology transfer to the South Australian optical industry.

Additionally, the Department of Industry, Trade and Technology working with industry and the Technology Development Corporation is proceeding to establish the South Australian Centre for Optics and Vision along the lines of the successful Australian Centre for Medical Laser Technology. The Centre for Optics and Vision will be located at Science Park and is expected to be operational in the first half of 1991. Its purpose will be to establish joint ventures and partnerships between small local companies, national and international companies and to facilitate technology transfer to South Australia's manufacturing optical industry. This centre is intended to become progressively self-funding.

ROAD SEALING

261. **Mr GUNN (Eyre)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: How much does the Department of Road Transport intend spending in 1990-91 on sealing of the Port Kenny to Pygery and the Orroroo to Hawker Roads, respectively?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The Department of Road Transport anticipates spending \$200 000 on construction and sealing work on the Orroroo to Hawker Road in 1990-91. The Federal Minister for Land Transport and I recently announced an allocation of \$200 000 in Federal local road funding for construction and sealing work on the Port Kenny to Pygery Road in 1990-91. The Department of Road Transport is not involved in that project as the road is the responsibility of the District Councils of Elliston and Le Hunte.

SATECH GENERAL MANAGER

263. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Before his appointment as General Manager of SATECH, was the incumbent a public servant and, if he was, on whose authority did he act as a business consultant earning \$16 200 p.a. and did he have the appropriate approval?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Prior to his appointment as General Manager, SATECH, the incumbent was on leave without pay from the Public Service. This leave was approved by the Principal of Regency College of TAFE under an appropriate delegation of authority.

266. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education: Is the General Manager of SATECH provided with a vehicle which bears Government number plates and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The General Manager of SATECH is employed under a contract which provides for a motor vehicle for both business and private use. The vehicle therefore carries private plates.

267. **Mr BRINDAL (Hayward)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Employment and Further Education:

1. Is the superannuation provision for the General Manager of SATECH separate from the salary paid?

2. What contributions are payable by the Government in respect of this provision and what benefits accrue for the employee?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The provision of superannuation and associated benefits for the General Manager, SATECH, are in no way different from the provision of superannuation for public sector employees. The superannuation fund is the State Superannuation Scheme. SATECH pays the employer contribution and the General Manager pays the employee contribution. The employer contribution is separate from the salary paid and is currently \$5 742. SATECH also pays \$1 740 to Treasury being the employer's contribution to the Public Sector Employees Superannuation Scheme for the General Manager.

BTR NYLEX

260. **Mr ATKINSON (Spence)**, on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Since the introduction of the Clean Air Act, has the BTR Nylex foundry complied with the Act and its environmental obligations?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: To my knowledge, the BTR Nylex foundry has always complied with the requirements of the Clean Air Act and, indeed, when requests have been made by officers of the Air Quality Branch for improvements to airborne emissions beyond the requirements of the Act, BTR Nylex has made every effort to comply with those requests. It is also a matter of record that there have been no prosecutions of BTR Nylex for non-compliance and, indeed, there has never been a need even to threaten BTR Nylex with prosecution. However, the fact that BTR Nylex is a responsible and law-abiding corporate citizen does not make it an ideal neighbour, and I can sympathise with people who live at the interface of areas zoned for industrial development such as the industrial area at Bowden in which BTR Nylex is situated. The expectations of those people are always likely to be greater than what can be achieved, due to the general presence of intense activity associated with industry, commerce and transport.

Despite the quite obvious and genuine concerns of these residents, there is no legal or moral justification for relo-

cating BTR Nylex from an industrial site which it has occupied for approximately 30 years. Throughout that time, the foundry management has maintained a constructive and caring attitude toward the surrounding community and has made every effort to ensure that airborne emissions are kept significantly below the levels allowed by statute.

Since the introduction of the Clean Air Act in 1972, the foundry management has progressively improved emissions by installing the best available technology and adopting operating practices which have reduced emissions considerably. Neither should it be forgotten that the company is a significant local employer with 90 skilled and semi-skilled workers on its payroll. It is also a significant contributor to the local and State economy, with annual sales in the region of \$15 million and exports totalling around 20 per cent of its production.

NEIGHBOURHOOD WATCH

271. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister of Emergency Services: Is the Administrator of the Neighbourhood Watch program paid from public moneys or by sponsorship?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Administrator of the Neighbourhood Watch program is paid by the S.A. Police Department.

WILDLIFE PROTECTION BRANCH

272. Mr BECKER (Hanson), on notice, asked the Minister for Environment and Planning: Further to the answers to Questions on Notice Nos 16 and 17:

(a) are the Wildlife Protection Branch and its Manager, Mr David Barrington, permitted to interview people in their homes, or anywhere else, and take notes of conversations for later use in any legal proceedings against those persons;

(b) is the Minister aware of allegations that branch staff have refused requests made by persons interviewed to read and sign such notes, saying it is unnecessary and, if so, what action does the Minister propose to take;

(c) has Mr Barrington prevented his colleague (attending interviews with him) from reading and signing the record of interview until some time later (even six months later) when the document is required for use in court;

(d) has Mr Barrington altered his record of interview when giving evidence at a retrial and, if so, why;

(e) are birds or animals taken from persons or their premises to be used in evidence individually identified before their removal from the premises and, if not, why not, and has some identification of confiscated animals not been carried out for up to eight days after removal;

(f) is Mr Hutchins a bird expert employed by the National Parks and Wildlife Service and, if so, does he keep notes on a secure, numbered notepad and, if not, why not; and

(g) are the procedures followed by staff adequate to protect persons suspected of offences under the Act and are they adequate to unquestionably support statements made by staff?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: The replies are as follows:

(a) Officers of the Wildlife Protection Branch have been appointed as wardens. Wardens are provided with the power to:

(1) Enter and search premises connected with an offence or to enter and inspect premises on which protected animals are kept or on which any other activity is carried out in pursuance of a permit.

(2) Wardens are authorised to request the name and address and to ask other questions as the person interviewed may wish to answer.

(b) I am unaware of any instance when any staff member of the Wildlife Protection Branch has refused a request to read and sign notes. Any such allegations are completely unsubstantiated.

(c) Two interviews were carried out with Mr Head in his home by officers Barrington and Evans. During these interviews Mr Head made a number of admissions. At the time he was tearful and emotional. As a result of those admissions and volunteering of them, it was difficult at the time to see how statements could be retracted.

Mr Barrington did not offer the notes to Mr Head to read and was not asked by Mr Head to do so. There was no conversation regarding this subject. He also did not request Mr Evans to countersign the notes at the time.

These factors contributed to the magistrate rejecting the record of interview. Mr Evans, whilst he cannot remember the exact words during these interviews, can support any statements Mr Barrington made. Mr Evans was able to read and sign the notes at any time if he had so requested.

(d) Mr Barrington has not changed a written record of interview. He has provided verbal information to a retrial which was challenged as varying from information given at an earlier trial.

(e) All items including birds seized by National Parks and Wildlife Service wardens are identified for use as evidence.

The method varies. Initially boxes containing birds are labelled. Where the individual identification of each bird is critical to future evidence given to a court, stainless steel rings individually numbered are used to identify each bird.

Officers seizing birds or any other item are required to establish to the satisfaction of the court that the chain of evidence remains intact.

The integrity of the chain of evidence is facilitated by the Monarto Fauna Complex which allows for caging of individual birds or lots of birds until a closer assessment or banding, if required, takes place. Banding is not carried out at the time of seizure but labelling of boxes occurs immediately thereafter.

(f) Mr Barry Hutchins is a well respected aviculturist, ornithologist and author. He was used as an expert witness to give an opinion of birds seized from a person to whom Mr Head had sold birds and others connected with this matter.

Mr Hutchins was paid a consultation fee for his assistance and kept his own notes on a pad which he used as a reference in court. Mr Hutchins is presently unavailable to determine if his notebook is numbered. However it is the responsibility of the court to determine whether it will or will not accept notes recorded by a witness. In Mr Hutchins' case, the court accepted use of his notes.

(g) Procedures followed by staff when investigating offences are always available to the scrutiny of the legal system. Procedures are upgraded when and if required.

SCHOOLCHILDREN'S FREE TRAVEL

275. Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition), on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: How many additional employees have been appointed to survey free travel by schoolchildren (Annual Report of the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, page 43) and what is the estimated cost of this additional staff in 1990-91?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: No additional employees have been appointed to survey free travel by schoolchildren. Therefore no additional cost has been incurred. The Annual Report of the Department of Personnel and Industrial Relations, page 43, has incorrectly shown casuals working on survey work were employed for surveying free travel rather than the Adelaide Public Transport Network Study (APTRANS) as shown below. The APTRANS project is being undertaken to establish a computerised model of the public transport system in Adelaide for the purpose of assessing the impact of various possible alternative forms of service.

1. Actual Staffing Numbers			
30 June 1990	3 456.9	(Full-time Equivalent)	
30 June 1989	3 372.4	(Full-time Equivalent)	
Variation +	84.5	(Full-time Equivalent)	
2. Reasons for Increase in Numbers			
Reduction in vacancies—Salaried	19.6		
—Daily Paid	2.5	22.1	
Additional employees to allow for Transit Ambassador training		22.0	
Additional positions for			
—Direct Employment	3.0		
—Security	3.0		
—Concession Pass Office	2.0	8.0	
Increase due to rehabilitation Casuals (Survey Work—Adelaide Public Transport Network Study)		22.0	
		14.4	
		84.5	

PERSONNEL PRACTICES

278. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction, representing the Minister for the Arts: In what agencies were the 'shortcomings in personnel practices in relation to selection practices and providing specialist support for managers' (Department for the Arts Annual Report, page 69) and what was the specific nature of the 'shortcomings'?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: The replies are as follows:

1. The agency referred to was the Department for the Arts.

2. The 'shortcomings' referred to were:

(1) Some people successfully applying for Australian Research Council grants were employed by the department without all the usual Public Service personnel practices being strictly adhered to. Selection on merit basis was considered inappropriate, given that the people were employed to undertake the specific research project for which they had applied and obtained the research grant.

(2) Initially the process for re-employing some contract employees (employees on negotiated conditions) was administratively time consuming and necessitated an amended approach to simplify the process.

HEALTH AND SAFETY POSTERS

279. **Mr D.S. BAKER (Leader of the Opposition)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Housing and Construction, representing the Minister for the Arts: What posters and promotional material did CoMedia produce for the United Trades and Labor Council last financial year and what was the cost of this material?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: In November 1989-90 CoMedia was commissioned by the United Trades and Labor Council

to produce a series of three posters for the health and safety campaign 'Stop Dangerous Work'. The total number of posters produced was 1 500 at a cost of \$1 571. This amount included design, layout and printing.

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY

306. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What was the cost of rectifying vandalism to STA property during each of the periods 1 July to 31 December 1989 and 1 January to 30 June 1990 and what do these costs include?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In recent years, graffiti attacks on State Transport Authority (STA) vehicles and property has increased significantly. Early in 1989, the STA began establishing an accounting system to record costs involved in rectifying vandalism. However, the account did not include cleaning and painting costs formerly part of normal maintenance activities which would not have to be undertaken so regularly if graffiti did not occur. Therefore, action has recently been taken to record the cost of all maintenance and capital costs incurred due to graffiti attacks. Although the STA will not be able to provide the information requested by the member at this time, a full year's details will be available in September 1991.

307. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice asked the Minister of Transport: Which STA depots have had security fencing constructed around them in the past two years, when was the fencing constructed and how much did the fencing of each area cost?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The State Transport Authority has installed security fencing during the last two years at the following depots:

- Gawler station yard—
completed in July 1989
cost \$31 000.
- Adelaide station yard—
completed in August 1989
cost \$48 000.

308. **Mr MATTHEW (Bright)**, on notice, asked the Minister of Transport: What was the total cost of cleaning and painting STA vehicles during the periods 1 January to 30 June and 1 July to 31 December 1989 and 1 January to 30 June 1990 and how many cleaners and maintenance staff involved in painting, respectively, were employed by STA during each period?

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The State Transport Authority (STA) does not record separately the cost of cleaning nor the cost of painting vehicles and therefore I am unable to directly answer the questions relating to costs. The number of staff involved in cleaning and painting is difficult to provide accurately as both of these functions are carried out in many cases by staff who are multi-skilled. However, the number of people employed under each category is relatively stable and is shown in the following table:

	1.1.89 to 30.6.89	1.7.89 to 31.12.89	1.1.90 to 30.6.90
Cleaners	46	43.5*	46
Painters	9	9	9
Total	55	52.5*	55

* The reduced numbers for period 1.7.89 to 31.12.89 were due to vacancies awaiting appointment.