

STATE LIBRARY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

J.D. SOMERVILLE ORAL HISTORY COLLECTION

Full transcript of
an interview with:

**Ted Byrt, Adrian
Graves & Simon Nuttall**

Conducted on:

9 July 2019

Interviewer:

Allison Murchie

Transcribed by:

Deborah Gard

For:

The **Don Dunstan Foundation**

20th Anniversary Oral History Project

1999–2019 celebrating 20 years of action for a fairer world



DON DUNSTAN FOUNDATION 20th Anniversary **ORAL HISTORY** PROJECT

NOTES TO THE TRANSCRIPT

This transcript was created, proofread and donated by Deborah Gard, SA State Library volunteer. It conforms to the Somerville Collection's policies for transcription which are explained below.

Readers of this oral history transcript should bear in mind that it is a record of the spoken word and reflects the informal, conversational style that is inherent in such historical sources. The State Library is not responsible for the factual accuracy of the interview, nor for the views expressed therein. As with any historical source, these are for the reader to judge.

It is the Somerville Collection's policy to produce a transcript that is, so far as possible, a verbatim transcript that preserves the interviewee's manner of speaking and the conversational style of the interview. Certain conventions of transcription have been applied (ie. the omission of meaningless noises, false starts and a percentage of the interviewee's crutch words). Where the interviewee has had the opportunity to read the transcript, their suggested alterations have been incorporated in the text (see below). On the whole, the document can be regarded as a raw transcript.

Abbreviations: The interviewee's alterations may be identified by their initials in insertions in the transcript.

Punctuation: Square brackets [] indicate material in the transcript that does not occur on the original tape recording. This material includes words, phrases or sentences which the interviewee has inserted to clarify or correct meaning. These additions are not necessarily differentiated from insertions by the interviewer or by the transcriber, which are either minor (a linking word for clarification) or clearly editorial. Relatively insignificant word substitutions or additions by the interviewee, as well as minor deletions of words or phrases, are often addressed in the interest of readability. Extensive additional material supplied by the interviewee (or transcriber) is placed in footnotes at the bottom of the relevant page rather than in square brackets within the text.

A series of dots, indicates an untranscribable word or phrase.

A dash, – indicates a pause or a digression as occurs in informal conversation.

Sentences that were left unfinished in the normal manner of conversation are shown ending in three dashes, - - -

Spelling: Wherever possible the spelling of proper names and unusual terms has been verified. A parenthesised question mark (?) indicates a word that has not been possible to verify to date.

Typeface: The interviewer's questions are shown in **bold print**.

Discrepancies between transcript and tape: This proofread transcript represents the authoritative version of this oral history interview. Researchers using the original tape recording of the interview are cautioned to check the transcript for corrections, additions or deletions which have been made by the interviewer or interviewee but which will not occur on the tape (see the punctuation section above). Minor discrepancies of grammar and sentence structure made in the interest of readability can be ignored but significant changes such as deletion of information or correction of fact should be, respectively, duplicated or acknowledged when the tape recorded version of this interview is used for broadcast or any other form of audio publication.

This is part of the 20th anniversary oral history project for the Don Dunstan Foundation. It is Allison Murchie at the State Library on 9th July 2019. The main person speaking initially will be Ted Byrt. We also have Simon Nuttall and Adrian Graves who were all involved, so feel free to contribute whenever you want. I'll ask the question to Ted but if the answer is more appropriate to one of the others please just interrupt. We're here to talk about the trust deed, the constitution, and how it all came about. Do you want to set the scene for us Ted?

TB: Yes, the starting point for me is in late 1998. I was approached by Susan Graebner from the University of Adelaide.

Sorry, what was the surname?

TB: Graebner (G-R-A-E-B-N-E-R). She was the head of a division within the vice-chancellor's office that was responsible for the legal services provided to the university. My law firm, Norman Waterhouse, had recently been appointed by the university to provide legal services. That was a new appointment of which we were very proud and pleased. I think that this was the first job that we were given. We were asked to prepare a document to establish a foundation that we knew Don Dunstan wanted for his legacy. As with most things in legal firms I went to find the best person to do the job, because it wasn't me - - -

You were the one who was approached though.

TB: Yes, I was the partner responsible for the new relationship with the university. I asked Simon Nuttall would he kindly take on that task. I don't think Simon knew who Don was at the time, being a recent immigrant from the United Kingdom.

SN: I knew a little bit of South Australian history, but he was not someone who meant as much to me as he would to a native-born South Australian. However, I was flattered to be asked.

TB: My understanding is that Simon liaised initially directly with Dr Adrian Graves who, incidentally, is an old school friend of mine and we go back to the early 1950s.

Are you that old! Let me interrupt here – I normally do an introduction where I get your background. I know you are all lawyers but we should at least put on the record your dates of birth and where you were born. Maybe if I can do that now and start with you, Ted.

TB: I was born on 28th July 1949 and spent all of my life at Cheltenham, and Adrian - - -

AG: I was born on 9th September 1949. I'm younger than Ted! I was brought up in Pennington as well. You were brought up in Cheltenham?

TB: We were across the road, Adrian – we were the upper side of Torrens Road!

That’s a pretty long relationship, isn’t it?

AG: Yes, being the same age at school our first days were on the same day then we subsequently went to a school across town as well.

TB: Sacred Heart College. I was delighted when I discovered that Adrian was the contact for this new brief – and Simon?

SN: It was just a coincidence, it wasn’t actually the connection that brought this work to Norman Waterhouse.

TB: No.

OK, Simon?

SN: I was born in England in October 1945 and I lived in England for the next 40 years.

Whereabouts in England?

SN: London or thereabouts. I migrated in 1986.

So you are a newcomer. We’ll forgive you for not knowing the history of Don.

SN: It’s 30 something years now but I guess that would still be a newcomer to some.

No, after 30 years you’d certainly be accepted by Adelaide. You made the point that you didn’t know the times that we all lived through with Don as our premier.

SN: That is right.

OK.

TB: Yes, having asked Simon to take on the job my role was pretty limited because Simon did all the hard work. He liaised directly with Adrian at the university, and I must say for the record I didn’t know until three weeks ago that Simon had liaised with Adrian. I knew of Adrian being at the university and, of course, our friendship was obvious but you were not directly involved in the legal side of things.

AG: No.

TB: Susan Graebner had invited Adrian or somebody else at the university - - -

AG: The vice-chancellor.

TB: Who was Mary?

Mary O’Kane, yes.

TB: Mary O’Kane, and it’s just pure coincidence that I waited until 2019 to find out that you were connected with this project!

Don never stops bringing people together. That’s just staggering after all those years.

TB: Yes, up until two weeks ago I thought that Simon went to visit Don at his home to get the instructions to document the trust, but I’ve now learned that it was Adrian. Perhaps you might fill us in on how that came about.

AG: Yes, when it became apparent – actually, Mary O’Kane was a neighbour of Don’s at the time and obviously there had been discussions about the most appropriate vehicle, if you like, to continue to promote and encourage the political principles which Don was so famous for. I think there was a strong encouragement to Don to do this through the mechanism of a foundation, which would have a close relationship with the university and ultimately, perhaps, with the universities in South Australia. So in order to get progress moving on the establishment of the legal instrument to establish the trust I was privileged to go and meet with Don and spent a happy several hours with him as he outlined in very careful language and very thoroughly what he expected the foundation to achieve. Having revisited the deed or, as it now is called, the constitution, I am completely refreshed in the fact that actually the objects and functions of the foundation haven’t really changed very much over time. It’s more the organisation arrangements that have changed.

That’s been my understanding from reading it too. The aims and objectives have not changed a word from what I’ve been able to read.

AG: I would hope so because that is fundamental.

They were very clearly laid out and that was his legacy [see attached link].

https://dunstan.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/DDF_2018_Constitution...

AG: Don, for the avoidance of doubt and with his characteristic attention to detail, went to the trouble of drafting these objectives and certainly the broad aims of the foundation. It was established as a trust in a sense. It is still a trust technically speaking, I believe, but the document is now called a constitution. He was also, as a practising lawyer, very much across the structure of such a document and Simon was able, I think, to put shape into the document and to cover off many of the details required of such an instrument. Essentially we

managed to get this document together quite quickly for the approval of Don and also subsequently of his family. Then, of course, the great pressure to finalise the foundation and the board occurred on the sad occasion of Don's death because it was agreed that the new foundation would be launched at his memorial service, which was held at the Festival Theatre.

TB: Simon, from a lawyer's perspective, you liaised obviously, with Adrian to receive those instructions and you then documented.

SN: Yes, I remember quite a few visits in your office along the road here. I think it went through quite a few drafts as I recall.

AG: It did.

SN: That's not surprising because there were quite a lot of different inputs. We got it signed just before Don died, didn't we? In fact, I think there was some question – do you remember, had all the trustees signed at that point? I'm not quite sure.

The signatures are there right at the beginning.

AG: Yes, but I don't think so. My recollection is that at the first meeting of the trustees those who hadn't signed it, particularly those who came from interstate – Phillip Adams and others – signed it on that occasion.

SN: And I think we took council's advice about whether the trust was completely constituted at the date of Don's death which, happily, the answer was yes.

AG: I remember, in fact, that it was after Don died that the very, very final touches were put to the document, because I can remember driving from the university to a family home in St Peters where the family was gathered to give them the trust deed. I guess the kind of dotting of the i's and the crossing of the t's occurred in fact, but the document was unquestionably very, very strongly informed by Don himself.

SN: Yes.

TB: Yes, and as the partner responsible I remember several conversations with Simon about how is this document going; how is the project going. You reflected to me, I recall, the input of not only Don fundamentally but also the wishes of his family.

SN: The first trustees would have had a say in it, wouldn't they?

TB: Certainly I think Greg Crafter and - - -

AG: Greg, unquestionably took something of a leadership role – an old friend and political comrade of Don's. He took a very significant leadership role in ensuring the development of the trust deed and helping to identify – Don had some views about who should be the early trustees.

Who were some of his suggestions – can you remember?

AG: Phillip Adams. I think he wanted, if you like, trustees who reflected Don's national reputation. So although it had a very strong representation from South Australia, including Greg Crafter and Mary O'Kane - - -

TB: And there was Dame Roma [Mitchell] of course.

AG: Dame Roma, absolutely; David Combe, certainly was involved. I see Greg Mackie may have been involved although that is Robyn Archer's picture.¹

Yes.

AG: Yes, Robyn Archer, and very interestingly I see that Bronwen [Dohnt, daughter of Don Dunstan] was on. Barry Jones was involved from the beginning as well. Anne Levy was an old friend [of Don's]. Hugh Stretton played an important role in it and was a personal friend of Don's as well. Jane Lomax-Smith was close to Don and, indeed, actually was at the house quite a lot around the time of his death. I'm very pleased to be reminded that Bronwen was on the trustees' board as well.

That's certainly an incredible list of leading figures throughout Australia and they all reflected Don's views and that's why he picked them, isn't it?

AG: Correct, from politics, the Arts and from the academia as well. Sue Richardson who was a very distinguished economist is a member of the board. Carmel O'Loughlin, who played a very, very important role in the early days in the establishment of the Office for the Status of Women. Norm Pearson, a very distinguished Aboriginal lawyer, was on the early board as well.

TB: Yes, the original group of trustees was smaller in number but quickly expanded. I think there were about five original trustees. At the very first meeting after Don's passing we gathered at the Festival Centre and a special meeting room had been set up – it was quite a large area. My recollection is that Dame Roma chaired the meeting, being the most pre-eminent persona there. Everyone sort of acknowledged that she was the most appropriate person to take the initial chair at that meeting. After welcoming everyone and everyone

¹ Documents and photographs relevant to the foundation were made available at the interview.

introducing themselves to the extent that it might be necessary – and it wasn't terribly necessary – she turned to me and she said, 'Mr Byrt, I understand you were responsible for the trust document.' I said, 'Yes, Dame Roma, my firm, and I was the partner responsible.' She said, 'Mr Byrt, this document isn't up to the standard that I thought it would be coming from you.' I said, 'Dame Roma, the only thing I can say is that Don drafted the document; he had a significant hand in it and it was not for us to change his words.' With that she took her seat back and said, 'Thank you.' (laughter) That killed off the conversation about the quality of the document and I think it's fair to say that when I reread the document in the clear light of day there were improvements that could have been made but not to the essential structure or purpose or stated purpose, which was Don's wording. That has survived to today. I live out on the anecdote occasionally. This time I saved it because neither Adrian nor Simon knew of that.

SN: Dame Roma did make some specific suggestions, didn't she, about amending the document?

TB: Yes, she did, and I can't remember the specifics but she, of course, was a great jurist and probably a mentor of mine in the sense that she gave me my first doc brief in the Supreme Court on a criminal matter one year and was, I suppose, a sponsor of me as a young lawyer. Anyway, here we are today. Subsequent to that first meeting yes, the document was amended but not immediately. Simon, do you recall being involved in any amendment of the document?

SN: Not really. I guess it's worth mentioning that the trust deed would give the trustees power to make amendments by - - -

TB: Yes, a subsequent deed.

SN: I don't know whether that being unanimous or by a majority. I think that was actually one of the changes that was made.

I think it was by majority, if I remember it correctly.

SN: Yes, it may have been. So it was relatively easily inbuilt that changes could be made and changes *were* made, but probably just to the nuts and bolts of it – as we previously agreed, not to the basics. I don't remember handling any of the amendments. I think that came your way, Ted.

TB: Well, I recall being asked to - - -

There are dates of amendments there [Allison provides relevant document].

TB: Yes, in fact the record indicates the first deed of variation was in April 1999, two months after the original deed, and then subsequent amendments in 2003, 2004, 2007 and 2014. There have probably been many since then but as Adrian reflected earlier, none of the core principles were ever changed. The rationale for the foundation has remained; the structural arrangements have changed. A big one that I recall was creating state chapters and the necessity of having state chapters rather than one in a single entity.

Do you know much about the state chapters?

TB: No, I don't. George Lewkowicz and others would have a better idea. There has been a sequence of executive officers.

I know Kym Mayes was heavily involved in the Brisbane branch but I haven't heard much about the other states. I think they started and sort of fizzled reasonably quickly, whereas the Brisbane, Queensland one continued for a while and made a lot of money and was important as a support.

TB: I'm not across the actual record or history of those chapters.

I presume they probably reported back to the board here on what they were doing.

TB: Yes, Greg Crafter would know.

Yes, I'm about to interview him in a bit more detail.

TB: I think the thing that struck me was the strength of respect and support that Don had from right around the country. It was not just a South Australian profile. The notable people who came onto the first board, and early trustees, was a reflection of the support and respect with which he was held.

And that has been reflected ongoingly in the annual Lowitja O'Donoghue Orations that they have. There was a Don Dunstan Oration for many years and, again, they were all prominent people who gave those speeches. He is still to this day held in awe by most people in the state and so many wish we had someone like that now.

TB: Yes, we do. In those early days there was great support from the state government and terrific support from the University of Adelaide. In subsequent years Flinders University became involved. The nature of the support from the state government changed and I think David Pearson is probably the first of the government appointees to the position that began the change of the functioning of the foundation – the responsibility for the Thinkers in Residence program, for example. I thought that was a brilliant move.

And it still continues.

TB: Yes, moving that from DPC [Department of the Premier and Cabinet] to the foundation. The only other thing that I do recall that I want to put on the record because my firm did this: there was quite a significant legal bill for the establishment of this foundation. I remember a discussion with Susan Graebner about that and she had no hesitation in us rendering a bill but asked us if we could be somewhat generous. I went to the partners with a proposition that if we render the bill in full, will you make an equivalent cash contribution to the foundation? So the university paid for the lawyer but we put the equivalent amount in as a donation. It was in the order of \$10,000 I think. I'm pleased to say that I had unanimous support from the partners to do that but it also required the support of the university in allowing us to create that situation whereby they paid our fees but we made a donation – of course, that helped the foundation to get going. I wanted to record that for posterity.

That's a very substantial donation in that time. I was recently interviewing John Spoehr and one of his jobs in those early days was to go around and beg, borrow or steal donations, in kind support, whatever. One of the first people he approached was Elliott Johnston and he said yes, and wrote out a \$20,000 cheque on the spot. I think people need to appreciate the legal support that the foundation received in those early days, what actually established it and kick-started it to where it is today.

TB: There's no doubt it wouldn't have been possible without the financial and other material support of the university.

It wasn't just that, it was the provision of facilities, and the government provided a staff member and paid for the staff member and things like that. What I find interesting is that regardless of which government was in power that payment was always continued. I can't imagine a Liberal government doing that for any other politician so, again, that's the esteem and respect that he was held in.

AG: The parallel of course is the cross-party memorialising of Bob Hawke. Where there is a great leader who emerges in this country it generally has the overwhelming support of both parties.

Can I go back to that early conversation that you had at Don's home, those few hours that you spent with him? He was in reasonable health at that stage I think, wasn't he?

AG: He was. He was very capable of being hospitable. He made sure that those of us who were present had something to drink and some nibbles on the table. It was very busy. I can imagine that the house always was, actually, with people coming in and out during the course of the meeting. I can remember sitting at the dining table which was adjacent to his legendary kitchen where he literally held court. I looked for my notes of the time but I couldn't find them – of course, it was some time ago, but I can remember spending quite a

lot of time writing. At the end of the discussion he said, 'Don't worry, I'll capture this in a document for you,' which he did. It was a very friendly meeting but very businesslike, very much to the point. I just came away from the meeting feeling a sense of terrific honour of being involved in what was, I thought, a historical moment.

Well it was.

AG: Yes.

Did he stress how he wanted his – I know it's in the different way he said, by supporting students, talks, things like that – did he give any particular emphasis on how he wanted his memory to come out through that foundation? There is a list there and I wouldn't mind if you talked through some of those. He was quite specific in the areas where he wanted work done. He wanted his legacy to be a living document.

AG: Correct. In fact, looking at the general aims of the trust that are here I am pretty sure these are just as he specified. The first broad aim was achieving social and economic equity, the appropriate use of government intervention to secure socially just outcomes. It's interesting that the third one was the ability of individuals substantially to control their own lives. It's interesting because that is, if you like, the pre-eminence of the individual as something you don't always associate with social democracy, shall I say, but then, democratic and inclusive forms of government, bearing in mind that Don was the person who overcame the gerrymander in this state and established one vote one value. Cultural and ethnic diversity, which was a subject he was hugely passionate about. Tolerance and respect for fundamental human rights and the rights of minorities suffering discrimination – another incredible principle of his own political activism and his political administration, really. Respect for and protection of the rights of indigenous people – Don Dunstan's governments were really the first in Australia to introduce concepts of land rights, for example. For that, he was highly esteemed by the Australian Aboriginal community.

TB: In fact, in South Australia they established the Aboriginal Land Trust as the vehicle into which ownership of lands would be placed well before the Native Title regime which gave title to Aboriginal communities or nations.

AG: I'm sure that was an innovation which proved necessary in order to guarantee the movement of land rights towards Aboriginals constitutionally.

TB: Politically correct, and Greg Crafter was the minister and, again, he had a prominent role in the establishment of the progress of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, which continues today.

AG: The last one here is the remediation of the global maldistribution of wealth and income speaks to Don Dunstan as the internationalist. Again, when he stepped down from the premiership he became actively involved in international organisations which had a focus on the redistribution of wealth and income internationally. That was something he was very, very passionate about. That covers the relevant areas that he was involved in. He then established 11 specific objects and functions of the foundation which really broadly expanded upon all of those relevant areas. It's interesting that the first one was that he saw the universities promoting the development of the foundation. I guess that was because he believed that universities were instruments of social change and also had the neutral principles to ensure the sustaining of the foundation. To award scholarships, trusts and donations, endowments and gifts – again, that underlines the importance of the universities in this partnership. Academic projects and, indeed, subsequently the foundation has exercised enormous influence through academic projects. One can think of the work of John Spoehr, for example, and others as well, and the establishment ultimately of the great Thinkers program within the foundation as part of that objective. To publish and subsidise publications – that is a very, very important part of the function of the foundation which still goes on. Disseminate and subsidise dissemination of education materials – I think Don was hugely committed to the role of education transforming society and this is very, very important. On it goes: commission, promote or subsidise academic studies; convene, organise and conduct seminars; solicit gifts. Of course, practically, the foundation depended on the largesse of supporters from both government and from organisations and individuals to carry on its functions. To advertise and all such other acts – reading through this I'm struck by how important education is in all of these objects and functions as elaborated. I think, actually, the foundation has been terrifically successful both in encapsulating the objects and functions which are the kind of mechanism through which the broad areas outlined earlier have been delivered. Equally, I can't think of one area where there has not been an appropriate reference in the work of the foundation. The wards, I think, have been very faithful to Don's wishes in the way in which the foundation has operated over the last 20 years.

It would be interesting if we could look back – if Don's up there, if there is such a thing as looking down on us, what he would think of how the foundation has handled his legacy. I think what you have just said, he would be pretty proud of it.

AG: I think he would be pleased although I suspect that Don, if he is in another sacred place, is too busy organising something.

Yes, he would be organising wherever he is. That is an absolutely valid point. He wouldn't have time to be looking, he'd just take it as a given we'd be doing

the right thing down here. You mentioned in your discussions of how this was being set up, the family's role and their wishes being taken into account. Is that something that you were involved with, because you knew the family quite well?

AG: I certainly knew Bronwen. We were, in fact, students together at the University of Adelaide during the tumultuous late '60s and early '70s. I knew her reasonably well and I knew Don's first wife [Gretel] because she taught in the Department of Economics and I was a student of hers at one point. My degree was, broadly speaking, Economics and History.

Gretel was quite involved at the Adelaide University lecturing.

AG: She was in the Economics Department. She, I think, had the title tutor at the university -
--

But it was more than that.

AG: It was more than that. Indeed, I think probably had she not been the premier's wife she might well have had a post more suited to her great intellectual gifts. Don also made it quite clear in our early discussions that the family was very important. In his absence the family's ownership and sense of affiliation with the work of the foundation he considered to be quite central.

SN: They have a special status, don't they, in the deed right from the start?

AG: Correct. It makes reference to the founder's children and so on.

And their children as well.

AG: Yes, their children.

Did he have in mind a specific role? Certainly, Bronwen would be heavily involved from the start and was involved for many years. Do you know if he told her what the expectation was or was she - - -?

AG: I don't know but I have to say when I was discussing it with the children there was an extraordinary harmony between them all about this. There was at one level an immense respect for what their father wanted to achieve out of the foundation but also a sense that they personally endorsed it and identified with the document and with - - -

How old would they have been when Don died?

AG: I can't remember how old they were. I can't remember how old the youngest son [Paul] was.

TB: Well, you were 50 or thereabouts.

AG: Yes, so Bronwen would have been 50. The older son [Andrew] was a little younger than Bronwen.

So she was the eldest. There was a lot of responsibility on her because, whether she wanted it or not, she was now becoming a public figure. She was Don's memory, her face, to the public – a very hard job.

AG: Correct. She pursued a political career in her own right, didn't she? It's not that she didn't have very strong political views or anything like that, but I think she confined herself to her own profession, basically.

What else can I ask you? What else can you tell me?

TB: I'm sure things will come to our minds after we leave.

That's all right. Simon, from a legal point of view how difficult was it? You were under time restrictions. I think Adrian mentioned earlier that Don went down quite quickly towards the end so there was that extra pressure to get things done.

SN: I certainly remember the pressure of time and Adrian cracking the whip, but as was necessary. I think that if Don had been well the whole process would have taken longer. This is what we all felt. I would say that it went through quite quickly considering the various interests that - - -

AG: Yes, there was a significant number of stakeholders to this document, weren't there, particularly Greg Crafter and the vice-chancellor, Mary O'Kane? There were others as well, and Sue Graeber was involved who was a lawyer as well, so there were a number of people as well as the family who needed to have input. That led to a number of amendments over time – nothing, in my view, radical, but in detail.

Tidying up things.

AG: Yes, to get it right.

It reads really well – I have no legal understanding but it reads well as a document – you are saying, yes, this is what Don wanted. That is how you read it and even in the amended versions they've expanded a lot but, as you said, the guts of it is the same – it's what Don wanted.

AG: Actually, it is as close to plain English as you can possibly get, which is a great credit - - -

When I started looking at this I thought, I'm going to have to get a legal person to explain it but I sat down and read it and it really was a credit, so congratulations.

TB: Well, the credit goes to Don and Simon for that because Simon was the actual creator of the document adopting what Don had written as what he wanted.

SN: I must admit I was quite pleased with it.

TB: So notwithstanding Dame Roma's reservations, which I felt were fair, it was not often that one had an answer.

I think you can dine out on the Dame Roma story for quite a few years. Do any of the three of you have any involvement with the foundation at all or go to any of their functions now?

SN: Not me, but Ted does.

I know Ted does because I saw him at Dunstan 101.

TB: I'm a great fan of the foundation. I don't know whether I'm a member or what I am, but David Pearson regularly keeps me informed. I love the film nights and I particularly enjoyed the Dunstan 101 episode.

Talk about that to people who are listening.

TB: I said earlier that there was a young professor – I can't remember the man's name [Dr Paul Sendziuk] who was the guest of the podcasters.

Yes you can actually look at it; you can go to the foundation website and look at the podcast, and it's quite funny.

TB: Yes, the audience must have been over 200 people. It was a blend of elderly and youth. I was in the former category and I suspect that the younger people were mostly students from Flinders and other universities who have an interest in the role that Don played. I felt it was a great night and it was a great presentation but I took with me a close friend, Taffy Horwood, who was sitting next to me and halfway through the podcast he nudged me and he said, 'These guys weren't alive when Don was around, were they?' The nuance and the intimacy of events was not – they understood the history because they had read it but they hadn't lived it. I felt that it was good and that was the only limitation, although the questions that the audience asked, and there were several of them, helped to elucidate some of that meatier and emotional material that we recalled as individuals living in Adelaide at the time.

I spoke to the lads [Tom and Dan] before the presentation because I knew what it was going to be about. They've done many podcasts of history of Adelaide – they did one on the drowning of Professor Duncan. Being young people, they did it actually very well because they were picking out highlights of South Australian history. I said, 'I was alive then and living all of that as it was happening. This is the era that we grew up in and we thought that all politicians

were like Don Dunstan because that's what we were living.' They were quite taken aback that the oldies in the audience had actually lived through the Dunstan experience. I think they felt quite jealous because all they've seen is trashy politics. That's why they called it Dunstan 101, to get through to that university element, and the students loved it. They really got that appreciation but, again, the main historian who was there had written a history of South Australia with a fairly detailed chapter on Don. I think he is an academic at Adelaide Uni.

TB: Flinders. For me there have been two stand-out incidents involving Don. The first was after his election when he stood on the steps of Parliament and announced that from this day forward the state is going to be run from the House behind me, not the house across the road, which was the Adelaide Club. The second thing was – and I'm sure it was 1971 or thereabouts when we were heavily demonstrating against the Vietnam War – the time had come when the leaders of the students, Rob Durbridge and [Peter] O'Brien, decided we had to have a big march from the university on a Friday afternoon and cause havoc and disruption, in terms of traffic disruption, to get the message across. It was at about the time that the mothers were starting to get behind the demonstrators. It was not just the long-haired university students, we had broad support. I can recall Don making a public statement to the students to the effect that he supported as a person our right to march but we had to understand that we had to respect the law and that if we broke the law then we would face the consequences. Anyway, on that very afternoon of the big march the police were present in great numbers and a number of the students were arrested including a few of my law school mates one of whom, now deceased, Stuart Main, who was the least provocative individual one could ever meet and an absolute gentleman. He was marching in principle but he and others got arrested. He was arrested because he went to a police officer and asked why they were tackling another student friend of his, so he was quickly taken into custody. Another mutual friend was on the news that night as a result of which his father evicted him from home because he was unaware – I won't mention his name; I'll allow him to tell the story.

I'll give you a positive story because I was there as well. Lynn Arnold was arrested and taken to the watch-house overnight. A police officer rocked up at Lynn's home – he was still at home at that stage – and said to his mother, 'Your son has just been arrested.' She said, 'Yes, I expected that, that's fine thanks!' Adrian, you must have a Don story for me.

AG: I do. I have to say that after the trust deed was approved and the trust was established and working I went abroad and stayed abroad for many, many years so my day to day involvement with the foundation was very limited as a result of that, working from the United Kingdom as I was. I've only just returned to Adelaide really to residence in the last

year, but I have kept in touch with those involved in the foundation and feel that in retrospect it was one of a number of things I did in my career that was very worthwhile. I have lots of stories about Don as any person who was young in South Australia and inclined to progressive politics would have because he and significant members of his team were fantastic role models for how to achieve quite significant progressive change in a hostile political environment. The fact that Don operated within the Labor Party and within his government on the basis of consensus speaks to his enormous capacity for persuasion in my view. There would have been a number of members of his government not entirely comfortable with some of the changes which he brought in but he did have around him younger members of the government who were strongly avant-garde and for progressive change as well.

Peter Duncan.

AG: Peter Duncan was probably the most prominent, but Len King also. That was an inspired choice and he went on to be the chief justice and continued his leadership role.

He made it quite clear that he wanted Len King and he was going to get him and he was going to put him in that job.

AG: As attorney-general he played a very, very important role. Don obviously wanted one of the best lawyers in the state to assist in the drafting of this progressive legislation, and to make argument for it. It was inspired.

TB: Yes, Len was the most significant reformer and as attorney-general he did an outstanding job and continued as an outstanding person as chief justice.

AG: Well, being responsible for the administration of justice in this state.

Thank you. Do you have a particular memory Simon?

SN: No, I don't think so.

Because you hadn't lived through that time.

SN: No.

But you were heavily involved in something that was quite inspiring for the state, so I thank all three of you – thank you very much. It's been very, very interesting.

TB: Thank you.