

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 24 February 1982

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

PETITION: FIRE STATION

A petition signed by 311 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain a fire station on the LeFevre Peninsula was presented by Mr Peterson.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

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

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Ministers to make statements.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Yesterday I thought that the Government might have learned some sense. There were no attempts to make Ministerial statements, and the Deputy Premier even made a conciliatory noise in my direction about the matter. I thought perhaps the Government had been influenced by the Gallup poll results which were published yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will come back to the motion before the Chair.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. I had better—

Mr Slater: It was 21 per cent for the Democrats.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, 21 per cent for the Democrats—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE:—confirmed by the A.L.P. private poll of 18 per cent for the Democrats.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is coming very close to being named.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I will redeem myself by referring to the letter which you wrote to me and which I got today, Sir, which brings it right up to date, and I hope that will be all right. In the letter which you wrote to me today, in answer to the one I had written to you making the suggestion about getting over the unhappy problem which had arisen over Ministerial statements, you said that that letter, together with the one which I wrote you many months ago on a number of other procedural matters, would be put before the Standing Orders Committee, and that you hoped there would be some recommendations during (I think you put it) the April-June-July recess. I devoutly hope that that will be so, and I hope that my recommendation will be accepted but, of course, we could, if the Government were so minded and if the Opposition Labor Party were not in its pocket, come to some arrangement with regard to Ministerial statements now.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Come to some arrangement—you would keep quiet—

Mr MILLHOUSE: Oh, yes, they hate being lined up with the Liberals all the time.

An honourable member: What about the member for Flinders?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: I will not answer that, in view of your call to order, Sir. We could come to some arrangement on this now for the rest of this session but, until the Government is prepared to do something and the Labor Party is prepared to get out of its pockets, I shall continue to oppose the giving of leave.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'.

Mr Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: I hear a dissentient voice. A division is necessary. Ring the bells.

While the division was being held:

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

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ACTING CHIEF FIRE OFFICER

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): A story which appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* claiming that the Acting Chief Fire Officer, Mr Colin Morphett, had resigned is incorrect. I take this opportunity to assure members of this House, the public and particularly the media generally that Mr Morpett has not resigned. It is regrettable that such a story should appear without the reporter's seeking actual confirmation from a second source. Had he done so, he would have found his information to be incorrect.

Such stories can only do harm, and Mr Morphett has every right to be indignant. Those who started the rumour know that it is incorrect and have displayed little care for Mr Morphett's personal feelings. Mr Morphett has acquitted himself very well in our fire service and has the respect and admiration of his fellow fire fighters. I believe that he will continue to give his utmost to the service in future. Mr Morphett will return to work when he is allowed to do so by his doctor, and I look forward to continuing the excellent working relationship that we have enjoyed in the past.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: NORTH-SOUTH TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I wish to inform the House of decisions that the Government has made concerning the north-south transportation corridor and its future use. I have indicated to Parliament on other occasions the problems that this Government inherited in regard to the corridor, with the uncertainty and lack of decision inherent in the idea of a moratorium on freeway development in the corridor.

This has led to quite serious planning blight in the areas affected, since both residents and business people have been left uncertain about the future of their areas, and have not known whether to develop their properties or not. As well, the existence of the corridor has meant that the Highways Department has been obliged to purchase many properties on a hardship and owner-approach basis, and this property holding has tied up substantial sums of money which could otherwise have been used in building roads. On coming to office, this Government saw the vital importance of getting to grips with this issue and making decisions which remove the sense of uncertainty that prevails over the corridor at the moment. Therefore, the Government has decided that the 40-kilometre tract of land formerly designated for a freeway from Dry Creek to Noarlunga will be cut by half in width and truncated south of Darlington.

In more detail, the Government has made the following decisions. The high-speed freeway originally proposed by the MATS plan for the north-south corridor is deleted. Design work will commence immediately with a view to subsequent construction of an arterial by-pass road around Morphett Vale, on an alignment to be determined. The north-south corridor from Reynella to Darlington will be reserved for possible future use as a northward extension of the Morphett Vale by-pass road.

The remainder of the corridor, from Darlington to Dry Creek, will be retained as a concept, pending consideration of a redesigned narrower road in the corridor. Such redesign will include financial and economic analysis (including cost benefit analysis, family impact statement and environmental impact statement). Surplus land in the corridor will be disposed of immediately, after consultation with local government and other State Government departments. The widening of South Road between Daws Road and Torrens Road will be an urgent priority, including the construction of over-passes where necessary.

The programme for the widening of South Road will be co-ordinated with the construction of the direct link between Adam Street, Hindmarsh, and Park Terrace, Bowden, to complete a western by-pass of the city. The reconstruction of the Hilton Bridge and the Bakewell Bridge will become a top priority. A detailed expenditure programme will be prepared for the improvement of the existing arterial roads serving the southern suburbs. I should add as well that these road-related measures will be complemented by continuing improvements to the public transport network serving the southern suburbs.

The modified role for the corridor, based on providing a by-pass for cross-city traffic, will lead to a significant reduction in land requirements, environmental impact, and cost, while still retaining a future transport option. The Highways Department will be able to start disposing of unwanted land straight away, and as further design work is done, more land will be freed for sale. A preliminary study of a four-lane facility between Anzac Highway and Torrens Road indicates that only about 50 per cent of the original MATS corridor is needed. Similar studies on the other sections will be undertaken immediately. The Morphett Vale by-pass is urgently needed, and its construction will be a real benefit for the motoring public.

The final decision on whether a modified freeway should be constructed is something that the State Government will have to make well into the future, taking into account the planning work that is now to be done, and in particular taking into account whether it is able to fund the project, which has an estimated cost of over \$200 000 000 (in 1982 prices).

To the residents in the corridor, and particularly to the many people who live in the section between Darlington and Anzac Highway, I want to say that they should realise that, if a freeway was to be constructed eventually, that section would be the last to be built, and that would be many years from now. I believe that the decisions that the Government has taken will be a major step forward in clarifying the future of the north-south corridor and in allowing sound planning for future transport developments for the western and southern suburbs.

QUESTION TIME

NATURAL GAS

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier take action to ensure that there is no repetition of the unfortunate scare campaign undertaken by his deputy that suggested that the future of

natural gas supplies in South Australia was in some doubt because of some imagined neglect by previous Governments, a scare campaign that may well have been partly the cause of the huge dip in projected overseas investment in South Australia that was revealed yesterday in this House?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: On numerous occasions the Deputy Premier has attacked the previous Government over the contracts for the sale of gas to Sydney. He strongly suggested that South Australia's supply position after 1987 was jeopardised by these contracts. The Minister was questioned last October by the member for Mitchell, because in that month the South Australian Gas Company had been forced to issue a public statement denying that there would be a shortage of gas. In that statement the company's General Manager said that, although 1987 was the date on which the present supply contracts had to be renegotiated, the end of 1987 did not spell the end of Cooper Basin gas to Adelaide.

Last Friday (and I would suggest that the Premier concentrate on this), at an economics seminar sponsored by the *Advertiser* Group and the accounting bodies joint committee, the Chairman of Sagasco (Sir Bruce Macklin) said that there was already enough gas to last until 1995 and that further supplies equivalent to 30 year's supplies were identified, and he stated that he had no reason to doubt that there would be further discoveries. He further stated that, regrettably, too much had been made of the actual contracts. It has been put to me that, as a result of the publicity given to the Deputy Premier's views, potential investors in South Australia had expressed great concern about the future of our power and energy supplies and that that concern had been conveyed directly to the Premier, ETSA and the South Australian Gas Company, and that is why the question was asked.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition referring to scare campaigns, particularly in view of the malicious, irresponsible and mischievous scare campaign in which he has been indulging today in regard to building society home loans. I find it absolutely incredible that he should have the nerve to stand in this House and talk about scare campaigns, having just been involved in such widespread and misleading publicity. There has been no notification of any increases to the advisory committee or to the Government by any building society and no indication of any imminent approach, and I would say that the building societies themselves have received a large number of calls from their members who are greatly distressed because of the disgraceful scaremongering tactics of the Leader. With all due credit to the former Premier, he adopted a totally different attitude and did the best he could to reassure members of building societies, whereas the present Leader of the Party seems intent on stirring up unnecessary alarm to building society home buyers. It is, in fact, quite disgraceful and in my view inexcusable.

Having said that, let me say that the Leader of the Opposition in his scare campaigns is once again twisting the facts. He seems to be becoming quite adept at twisting the facts; maybe he has inherited some skills from his predecessors. The 1987 contract which South Australia has for the supply of gas is well known; that deadline is very well known to members, as is the 2006 contract, which was written by a former Government with A.G.L. The statement made by Sir Bruce Macklin, Chairman of the Gas Company, that there are sufficient supplies until 1995 would, in fact, be perfectly accurate if the contracts were broken and if the gas was shared between the Sydney and Adelaide markets. That is the correct position, and I suspect that the

Leader of the Opposition knows it very well. He is once again distorting the facts for some form of political gain, although I do not know why he should do this. There is no doubt at all that at present there are not enough resources and reserves to find to supply both markets not only up until 1987 but beyond 1987 to 2006, and that the commitment to A.G.L. to supply gas to Sydney to the year 2006 will seriously disadvantage South Australia unless further supplies are found.

A considerable amount of money and time is being put into further exploration by SAOG and by the producers in that area to find more liquids and gas. More deposits and more reserves are being identified, and the Deputy Premier, as Minister of Mines and Energy, is also taking steps to make sure that other supplies will be available and that we will have access to supplies in the Queensland part of the Cooper Basin and possibly from elsewhere. Those negotiations have been going on for something over 12 months now, and I am quite certain that we will be able to maintain our supply in South Australia, given the energetic efforts now being put in by the Deputy Premier. However, there is no question at all that we should treat the matter quite seriously so that we can continue to put in the efforts being put in now. If the Leader does not believe for some reason, as his question seems to imply, that there is not a problem and that there is no need to put additional effort into finding the gas that we need to honour the contracts that we were forced into—I see no reason why we should dishonour them—or if, in fact, we—

Mr Bannon: How were we forced into contracts?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr Dunstan himself took great credit for this. A former Government, indeed, was only too anxious to take the contract up.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Don't leave Steele Hall out of it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr Dunstan has been assiduous in the past in this Chamber in claiming credit for that contract with A.G.L. If the Leader does not believe that it is necessary to exert that effort, I would like him to explain to the House how he believes those contracts can be honoured with sufficient supplies. The attitude that the Opposition is now expressing is that it could not care less, that it is not going to put the money into exploration or maintain its efforts to ensure the integrity of the gas supply to South Australia well into the next century. If that is the Opposition's attitude, it may keep it, but that is not the attitude of this Government, and we will continue to make every possible effort to ensure that those gas supplies will exist and that South Australia, will not be disadvantaged in any way.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier say what is the overall significance to the South Australian economy of the latest investment figures for South Australia? It was reported yesterday that the latest Foreign Investment Review Board figures indicated a drop in overseas investment approvals in South Australia. It has been said that these figures quoted on investment in this State have grave implications for our economy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked this question, because it gives me an opportunity to follow further on the questions so kindly asked by the Leader of the Opposition earlier. The Opposition Leader, in his task of spreading doom and gloom, which he seems to be doing with renewed vigour in recent times, yesterday talked about the lower levels recorded in this year's F.I.R.B. figures and about the effect on the

economy in South Australia, which he thereupon concluded was in a serious condition.

I think it is important to remember that South Australia is receiving record levels of investment and proposed investment still, as it has continued to do ever since this Government came to office. There is a growing confidence in our development potential, and that applies right across the board, not only in mining resource development but also in industrial development—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And tourism.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As the Minister would well know, I regard tourism as an important part of our development programme. In fact, the figures that have been coming through have given us great hope. The F.I.R.B. figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday are a narrowly-based set of figures: they do not tell anywhere near the full story, and they are subject to misinterpretation if they are taken in isolation year by year. I find it quite amusing that a Leader of the Labor Party, which is so concerned about foreign investment coming into Australia, should be so concerned about what he calls the lower level of foreign investment coming in now. I would have thought that he might be opposed to foreign ownership but, there again, he is more interested in making debating points than he is in sticking to the truth.

The figures quoted referred to new capital expenditures in the proposals accepted by the Foreign Investment Review Board. They include new projects by enterprises already in Australia, where they have large elements of foreign ownership, and sensitive areas, including mining, where the activities need to go to the Foreign Investment Review Board again. The Roxby Downs figure for capital expenditure shown in 1979-80, as I said yesterday, can only be included once in the year in which it is lodged. Mining projects, of course, are very lumpy, and there is no smooth trend from year to year, and it is necessary to add years together to get a fair picture.

The F.I.R.B. figures are not an accurate guide on a single-year basis. The current level of investment activity since the planned new investment expenditure—the money that is spent—is usually spread over at least two years, and usually more. If we take the 1979-80 and 1980-81 planned new capital expenditure figures together, we obtain something like \$1.193 billion in South Australia, representing 15.2 per cent of the Australian approved planned new expenditure totals for the two years: in other words, well above our population share of 8.8 per cent. I repeat that the F.I.R.B. figures are narrowly based indeed, and they do not take into account the vast majority of investment in South Australia. It is just as important to get investment from other parts of Australia, and that is what these figures represent.

Recently, the Minister of Industrial Affairs announced that there has been a big boost in investment in South Australia's manufacturing and processing industry in the last 30 months, with \$1.606 billion being committed, which is an enormous sum. These figures have been compiled by the Department of Trade and Industry. Whilst the list is extensive, it is certainly not exhaustive, but it has shown that during that time under review 81 companies had announced 107 projects, and of these 95 have already been completed or were committed. Additionally, 12 feasibility studies are under way for projects worth \$1.341 billion.

To obtain a more accurate picture of total future investment in South Australia, we should look to the Commonwealth Department of Industry and Commerce survey, and that survey indicates quite clearly that in October 1979 major manufacturing and mining projects committed or at final feasibility stage for South Australia were set at

\$300 000 000. In June 1981, the latest figures available, that figure stood at \$2.91 billion.

The Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts can put whatever interpretation they like on figures that come from the F.I.R.B. to support their tale of woe for South Australia, but the overall figures, taking into account all factors, certainly show a huge increase in investment attracted by this Government since it came to office.

AMATA

Mr ABBOTT: Is the Minister of Health satisfied with the health services and facilities operating at Amata, and will she say why the South Australian Youth Remand and Assessment Centre is being used as a health rehabilitation centre for young Aborigines, particularly those coming from Amata?

I have received representations about a number of disturbing matters dealing with SAYRAC and in particular with the use of that facility as a health rehabilitation centre for young Aborigines, particularly those coming from Amata, and not so much as a remand and assessment centre. I understand that some Aboriginal youths have been kept at SAYRAC for up to seven months and that the stays are getting longer and longer. Some Aboriginal youths are suffering from chronic ear infections, head ulcers, and the effects of petrol sniffing, and so on, with their general health condition being very bad.

There is also a language problem with interpreting the Pitjantjatjara language, making it difficult for the staff to offer help and treatment while these youths are on remand for lengthy periods. There is also the difficulty of getting them to return to their own communities after experiencing a different environment for so long, for example, watching colour television, eating better meals, and so on. I am told that this is having an adverse effect on the staff at SAYRAC and also on the Aboriginal children themselves, in the sense that they are not basically in need of institutional rehabilitation and whilst at SAYRAC they mix with a different class of young offender and are often negatively influenced by them.

Out of all this comes the most serious problem, namely, the health and welfare of young Aborigines at Amata. I am told that there is a substantial breakdown in the provision of services to the Amata community and that the maintenance of the facilities there are quite unsatisfactory and rundown.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have not been advised by the Health Commission of any specific problems such as the one to which the honourable member has referred at Amata. However, I know that the general difficulties confronting the Aboriginal Health Organisation, which is newly incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission, are considerable. The commission realises those difficulties and is trying to ensure that the organisation is given the financial and physical resources that it needs to carry out its policy role in accordance with the Government's policy of ensuring that Aborigines are, as far as possible, responsible for determining their own health policy and being responsive to those needs.

I will certainly investigate the matters which the honourable member has raised and which I regard with gravity. I agree that young Aborigines who are institutionalised in the metropolitan area would find it increasingly difficult to return to their own communities, and the longer the institutionalisation the greater the difficulty. As I said, I will certainly investigate the situation that the honourable member has raised and, if possible, I will provide him with details about it.

However, none of us under-estimates the difficulties that confront any public health authority in Australia in trying to come to terms with the problems of Aboriginal health. We in South Australia believe that we have been trail blazers in the health and land rights areas in putting the decision-making powers in the hands of an Aboriginal management organisation, which has not been done anywhere else in Australia.

GAS SUPPLIES

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House on what initiatives this Government has taken in relation to South Australia's gas supplies?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition would be forgiven for thinking that the surprising question asked by the Leader of the Opposition has led the member for Fisher to ask a question such as this.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That you sent back.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I cease to be amazed at the irresponsibility of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: He got up and walked out.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He has left the Chamber, because perhaps the truth hurts. The first question that the Leader asked shows just how completely irresponsible members opposite are, because if they do not believe that we face a problem in relation to gas supplies, they are either completely hypocritical or completely ill informed. They would be hopeless managers. If we are to infer from what the Leader said that he, in Government, would sit down and do nothing and that we do not have a problem, we would be in trouble in the ensuing years. We are facing trouble. I am confident that, as a result of some vigorous and continued activity, we will overcome the problem. We would certainly not overcome the problem if we took the attitude expressed so clearly by the Leader when he asked his question. He does not believe that we have a problem.

Let me put the comments of Sir Bruce Macklin, the Chairman of the Gas Company, into context. Members will notice that in his statement Sir Bruce Macklin refers to the Government and Government initiatives in several regards, although in one or two instances this has not been acknowledged. I quote from the source from which the Leader of the Opposition quoted—the Annual Report of the Gas Company. Speaking about contracts, Sir Bruce Macklin stated:

The first priority is the fulfilment of a contract for the supply of gas to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia until 31 December 1987. The second priority is a contract with the Australian Gas Light Company of Sydney which extends to the year 2006. Thirdly, a future agreements contract to supply P.A.S.A. until the turn of the century.

The supply of gas for the first priority is assured—

and that refers to South Australia until 1987—

and proving of gas to supply the other contracts is being actively pursued.

I have pointed out that there has been no increase in the reserves of the Cooper Basin from the time this contract was written by the Dunstan Government, spearheaded by the former Premier, in 1973-74. That is the current situation. The report further states:

The exploration levy paid by all gas users and State Government grants has enabled the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation to increase exploration. The other producers are also stepping up exploration activity and the deficit in reserves to meet the A.G.L. contract is diminishing significantly. Also negotiations with A.G.L. with the aim of sharing reserves are proceeding.

That is a Government initiative. If remedial action is not successfully prosecuted, South Australia will have a crisis on its hands. I am not putting it too high, because I believe

that we will solve the problem. However, if people adopt the attitude of the Opposition that we do not have a problem, this State will be in dire peril. The report continues:

The State Governments of Queensland and South Australia are negotiating on the opening up of the prospective Queensland section of the Cooper Basin and exploration has commenced in such areas as the Pedirka Basin.

Sir Bruce Macklin acknowledged one of the initiatives taken by this Government.

Mr Becker: That was where the Jackson well was found, wasn't it?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. No action was taken by the previous Government and none was contemplated. The report continues:

Of course the board is concerned about natural gas supplies for the future and will continue to be until these supplies are completely assured. We are taking an active interest in developments and participating in them through our involvement in both the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Pty Ltd and the State Natural Gas Reserves Committee of which the General Manager is a member.

As Minister, I set up that committee. If members opposite do not believe that we face a problem, and that the problem is of their making, they are more stupid than I thought. I will settle for their being completely hypocritical and irresponsible.

The Government recognises that this is a major problem, but one that I believe is capable of solution, although not if we embark on the sort of nonsense in which the Leader indulged when he visited Queensland recently. As I pointed out, the Leader was a year late: the Premier and I waited on the Queensland Premier and the Minister, Mr Gibbs, to open up negotiations, and Sir Bruce Macklin acknowledged that in the Gas Company report, of which a snippet was quoted by the Leader. We agreed to continue negotiations with a view to rationalising supplies in the whole of the Cooper Basin, including the Queensland section. The Leader of the Opposition recently loaded up his entourage and went to Queensland, where he was let in to see the Queensland Minister on the pretext that he was paying a courtesy call. However, the Queensland Government was quite astonished by the lack of courtesy of the Leader in turning that into some political point scoring exercise. This is the Leader of the Opposition who says that we have not got a problem; this is the Leader who asks one of the most irresponsible questions I have ever heard in this place, suggesting that we do not have a problem. In Queensland he said:

I am surprised that Premier Tonkin has not got his act together to talk tough with the Queensland Government.

What hope would one give the Leader of the Opposition against Joh Bjelke-Petersen? Imagine the Leader saying to him, 'I have come up here to talk tough to you, Joh, you have got to give your oil and gas to us.' How stupid! Here is the Leader telling the Premier to go up and talk tough to Joh, when he said today, 'We have not got a problem.' The Leader also said (and how is this for gobbledegook of the first order?):

I hope my talks this afternoon will be the start of a series of negotiations with the Queensland Government.

No wonder Mr Gibbs and Premier Joh wondered whether their visitor was a penny short of two bob.

Until the Opposition comes to grips with the fact that we have a problem, there is no hope for South Australia. I believe that, with the initiatives which this Government has instituted, and which are acknowledged by Sir Bruce, we will solve that problem, but anyone who says there is an easy solution is deluding himself. I have had discussions, with the Premier, with the Queensland Government, and they are continuing. During the break in the Parliamentary sitting I will be again going to the Northern Territory for further discussions in relation to supplies from that area. I

have had discussions with Senator Carrick and with the Victorians, as has the Gas Company, in relation to gas which is going from Bass Strait into the New South Wales system and which will give a pay-back to the Gas Company here. If anyone suggests, as the Leader does, that we can sit on our behinds and do nothing, and that we do not have a problem, Lord help us!

THEBARTON HIGH SCHOOL

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Education say when it is proposed to proceed with the major upgrading of the Thebarton High School, and what excuse does he put forward concerning the appalling delays with which that community has had to contend until now?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The upgrading of the Thebarton High School has been the subject of some debate. I believe the honourable member raised this question probably last year. He might also recall that the upgrading of the Thebarton High School was really predicated upon 650 students being in attendance there, and that the then figure which was being quoted to the former Government and to this Government was somewhere in the vicinity of \$5 000 000 to \$5 500 000. I think the Public Accounts Committee, the Public Works Standing Committee, and others have expressed great interest in this area, not the least of the reasons for that being that there has been quite a considerable student decline, not only at Thebarton but along the whole of that corridor.

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Let me finish my comments about student decline first. There has been a decline not only at Thebarton, but way down the corridor to Brighton. One of the suggestions made in an inter-departmental report, which I believe was from Dr John Cusack, was that consideration might be given to the possible amalgamation of at least some of the courses or, in the longer term, the closure of one of the schools involved. I mentioned to the honourable member last time he raised the issue that this matter was under review by the Education Department. I can advise him that as recently as last week, I received comment from the department indicating that were Thebarton High School (or indeed any other of those five high schools on that transport corridor) to be closed down, then there would quite possibly simply be a transference of a population problem to another of the schools. In other words, if one of the schools is not used, some further reconstruction would be needed.

So, currently we are pretty firmly of the opinion that the Thebarton project should go ahead. I am awaiting a final report, which should be on my desk within a matter of days, with regard to the final extent of the redevelopment and the final cost. The honourable member will realise that money has been allocated during the current financial year for the commencement of that project. We have the final statistical figures which indicate that not 650 but about 350 students will be attending Thebarton.

We also have the Public Works Standing Committee recommendation that the school should not be completely rebuilt, as was originally intended, but that the solid core, the solid building structure, which had originally been intended to be demolished, should in fact be retained. The Public Works Standing Committee pointed out, quite rightly, that the cost of walls is a major cost in reconstruction and suggested that, rather than remove the existing very substantial buildings, consideration should be given to utilising those buildings, altering the roof structure, and things of that order.

So, we have been doing that at departmental level. We will have an alternative reconstruction programme put forward, and I think I can assure the honourable member that he will be hearing something favourable in the very near future.

TRESPASSING

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Attorney-General whether he is aware of the concern being expressed by the United Farmers and Stockowners and other landholders in relation to the current operation of the law relating to trespassing? I wish to briefly explain my question by quoting from an article which appeared in the *Farmer and Stockowner* in February and in which the Chairman of the Land Use Committee, Mr Pfitzner, was quoted, as follows:

'Advice given to us is that a landowner might be held responsible if a trespasser was injured on a property,' he said. According to legal advice, 'an occupier of land or premises owes a duty of care to persons who enter upon those premises. Strict rules of law govern the duty of care owed by the occupier to an entrant upon the land and the burden of the duty depends on the category of the entrant. For instance, a lesser duty of care is owed to a trespasser than to a licensee or invitee of the occupier.'

The report continues:

'We do not believe,' Mr Pfitzner said, 'that a landowner should be held responsible for injuries a person might sustain if that person enters a property without permission.'

Will the Minister have his colleagues examine this as a matter of urgency?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: From the comments of the member for Eyre, it is quite obvious there are serious implications in that statement for landholders who may be responsible for quite heavy damages, even though they are unaware of the circumstances behind that situation. I will be very pleased to obtain a report from the Attorney-General, and see that the honourable member gets a carefully considered answer.

FREEWAYS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Subsequent to the Ministerial statement made in the House earlier today, will the Minister of Transport assure me and the House that those arrangements which presently apply for the purchase of homes from persons who live in declared and defined areas outlined for freeways will still apply should they wish to sell? I have carefully perused the Ministerial statement, and there is no mention, as far as I can see, of the continuation of that arrangement which applied, certainly under the previous Government, and which I understand has continued under the current Government. The Minister in that Ministerial statement said:

To the residents in the corridor, and particularly to the many who live in the section between Darlington and Anzac Highway, I want to say that they should realise that if a freeway was to be constructed eventually, that section would be the last to be built, and that would be many years from now.

Many people will be interested in the statement and the revival of interest in what has become known as the MATS plan, in short, over many years. I would appreciate the Minister's giving that assurance, also his assuring the House that the funds will be available, if necessary, to make those purchases.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reason for my not mentioning it in the Ministerial statement is that there will be no change in the present practice. Of course, the Highways Department will continue to negotiate with people who approach it on the basis of hardship, and that is as it

should be. The great advantage for the honourable member's constituents will be that many of them will be relieved of the burden of knowing that they are in a transport corridor, and they will then be able to go on with whatever plans they had for their own dwellings, and the like.

The reason I put in the statement the other section to which the honourable member referred was to let people in the honourable member's district and indeed other districts know that they should not regard it as immediate by any means and that it will be many years before we ever get to that section, depending on a decision taken by any future Government.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I promise you that you won't be in Government then.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Indeed, I look forward to helping the Government make the decision at that stage.

FISHERIES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Fisheries say what consultation, if any, the Government had with the Australian Fishing Industry Council before the proclamation last Thursday dealing with fishing restrictions in Upper Spencer Gulf? Yesterday I received a letter from Mr David Gill, the scale fish delegate on the Australian Fishing Industry Council, and I understand that all members have received a similar letter, expressing some concern at the announcement of this proposal. The letter states:

This piece of oppressive and archaic legislation has been thrust upon professional net fishermen working in Upper Spencer Gulf. It will severely jeopardise the chances of fishermen being able to catch garfish, because of the ridiculously short length of net. After consultation and negotiation through the Australian Fishing Industry Council with the Department of Fisheries, it was agreed that fishermen should be able to use 600 metres of 3 cm net although they have been restricted to ring shooting this net, instead of power-hauling it.

The Government realises and acknowledges that there is a viable garfish fishery in Upper Spencer Gulf, but with the 'newly defined version of the ring shot', it virtually excludes net fishermen from harvesting that stock. The issue that concerns our industry is that this new version of the 'ring shot' has been imposed upon fishermen and gazetted without any consultation whatsoever. All the channels are provided for debating such issues, and it concerns me greatly as the scale fish representative to the Australian Fishing Industry Council, that no discussion was sought or asked for on this piece of legislation, before it was proclaimed.

I am sure that if negotiation had been sought the Government would have found fishermen once again willing to compromise to a net somewhere between 300 metres and 600 metres long. Once again I cannot stress too strongly how important the length of net is in the catching of garfish. I ask all members to consider whether they want net fishermen put back into the era of the horse and cart, or whether you will allow them to have some standing in the community, and grant them enough net with which to earn a reasonable living.

I have also been contacted by a number of other representatives of the fishing industry who have expressed concern that the handling of the Upper Spencer Gulf problem could jeopardise the goodwill and consultation that has been developing between the Government and the industry over a considerable time. I think the point is well made that the greatest concern is about the position in which other industries stand when such a proclamation has been made without consultation.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I invite the honourable member to tell Mr Gill that some other people went a bit further than referring to horse and buggy. I think a series of five messages came in, and some referred to the plough as well. Consultation did take place on this matter involving people in the area of the Upper Spencer Gulf who are represented by the member for Stuart. The Premier and I met a deputation—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Was the member for Stuart a member of that deputation?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: No.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You said he represented them.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: He represents the people. Great concern was expressed by Mayor Baluch and her people about the said resources in Upper Spencer Gulf. We had long discussions with those people and received petitions on the matter. We also met with AFIC. One group wanted the fishermen all out, and the fishermen want to be all in. There are problems in this area. We had consultation with the industry, and the industry wanted to have considered the matters to which the honourable member has referred. In consultation with the department, the Government examined the position, and a decision was taken involving an area from Port Paterson down to beacon 9, bounded by beacon 5 on the south and Mount Grainger. Those conditions will apply, that is, permitting 300 metres of net and use of the ring shot for garfish.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Was this a political decision?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: If the Deputy Leader will listen he will find out what sort of decision it is, as the fishermen found out. The decision was taken by the Government to look after a resource, bearing in mind the interest of the people concerned in this fishery in the northern Spencer Gulf. The honourable member has been loud in his representations to us about preserving the fishery in this area.

The decision has been taken by the Government to preserve the fishery. The professional fishermen are kicking up all hell about it, but the Government has made that decision, involving a limited area in which fishing can be carried out. The fishermen have not been kicked out altogether. They will be able to use a ring shot, but there will be no power hauling, and there will be no throwing off shots which are the matters causing problems.

I went to Port Augusta last weekend and tried to contact the members for Stuart and Whyalla. I received many protestations from the public of Port Augusta. It was claimed that large volumes of razor fish are being washed up on the eastern shore. I was also told that 13.5 tonnes of undersized schnapper was dumped on the western side of the gulf, and I have asked the senior fisheries officer to look at those allegations. It is not without good reason that this decision has been taken. AFIC met the Premier and me, and we had discussions about the problem with that organisation and also with Mayor Baluch and representatives from Port Augusta. The decision has been taken by the Government. The honourable member will have to tell Mr Gill that, horse, plough or cart, that decision will have to stand, and it will be reviewed in 12 months.

MARRYATVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr CRAFTER: Will the Minister of Education say why he has not provided me with an answer to a question I asked in the House last year and in earlier correspondence to him on a matter, as well as by way of deputation to the Director-General's Department, when such information is being made available freely to the Liberal Party for use purely for political purposes in my district? On 4 November 1981, I wrote to the Minister about a number of matters relating to Marryatville Primary School. As I had received no answer, I raised this matter by way of question in the House on 8 December last year, and in particular sought an assurance that there were no plans in hand to close down the school. The Minister wrote to me on other matters on 18 January this year but did not provide me with the information I sought on the proposed future of the school.

In the *Burnside News Review* of this week I note that the Liberal Party has made a statement that the school will not be closed, that assurance having come from the Minister of Education.

The Minister is quoted in the newspaper as saying that claims about the future of the school are false and mischievous. It has been put to me by parents of children at that school that their concern over this matter has been increased by the Minister's failure to reply to my question asked in this House, the proper and ethical exercise under presumably responsible government in this State. Further, I waited on the Director-General of Education in late December with a deputation of parents from the school to discuss this matter and other matters. However, I was refused admission to Mr Steinle's office and was told that my presence was regarded as an insult to the Minister of Education. I spoke to the Minister in the corridor before being told this on that day by Mr Steinle, but the Minister chose not to inform me of his direction in this matter. I believe that my electors are owed an explanation for this denial of information to an elected member.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am not really sure what we responded to in the newspaper; I am not familiar with the article. However, I can assure the honourable member that it is possible that coming through to my office are all sorts of rumours, allegations, letters from school councils and individual parents, and that sort of correspondence, not all of which is automatically linked up with alternative correspondence such as deputations, delegations and questions in the House.

Mr Trainer: That shows the priority that you give them, doesn't it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, it does not. It simply means that, if we respond in a spontaneous manner to something that comes through the press (and we often do that), matters may be missed. It is quite possible that the response that the honourable member saw in the newspaper was in relation to something that came through spontaneously to the department. I was personally unaware that there was any aspect of the correspondence which had previously been addressed to the honourable member and which had not been answered.

However, I am quite sure that members would not have to read any newspapers to realise that twice or three times in the past three months there has been talk of schools closing down. One report, for example, related to the Blair Athol Primary School, in the electorate of the Leader of the Opposition, where a decision was made quite spontaneously by the Education Department, and that was accompanied by a press release at the time stating that the department had no intention of entering into a general campaign to close primary schools or, for that matter, any other schools.

There are, of course, other categories of schools such as those in Eyre District, where four very small rural schools are being closed down simply because they are being amalgamated as one in the new Miltaburra Area School. As a general principle, the recommendations from the Education Department, from the Keeves Committee of Inquiry and from others which we administer and which are Education Department property are, in a sane, sound and sensible manner, acceded to, but not to the stage where we have decided to close individual schools. We are committed not to close schools unless there is a lengthy period of consultation.

So, any concern that the honourable member's delegation might have expressed to the Director-General himself or to him can be allayed with the reassurance that there will be no closures unless lengthy consultation occurs. In the meantime, I am sure that the news that Marryatville Primary

School is not to close will come as no real surprise, and the honourable member is making a little more of it than he really needs to have done.

INTERNATIONAL TOURISTS

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Tourism tell the House of any new developments or arrangements in regard to the development of international facilities at the Adelaide Airport and what effect this will have for South Australia? I understand that at least two major international airlines are very interested in using the facilities at Adelaide Airport once they are completed later this year, and, like all members, I would be interested to know what effect these new flights into Adelaide will have for South Australia and, indeed, for all South Australians.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Department of Tourism was advised this week that British Airlines and Qantas have confirmed that their flights will come into Adelaide after the opening of the new airport in October. In the case of Qantas, one flight will come between London and Adelaide and another will fly between Auckland and Adelaide. In the case of British Airways, there will be a flight between London and Adelaide. I was able to confirm this when I opened the Airlines of South Australia 1982 package holiday tours this morning.

There is a very close relationship between the confirmation of the international flights and the further development of package tours in South Australia, as the international passenger who wants to see as much of the Australian outback as possible will be lining up for these package tours. It is very interesting to learn that, if each of those flights were to bring only 100 tourists to South Australia (and of course they will bring many more than that) and if those 100 tourists were to stay a mere seven days in this State, the direct expenditure that would benefit tourism here would be over \$3 000 000, and that the indirect expenditure as a result of the multiplier effect from those flights would be more than \$8 500 000. That is referring to tourism only and not to the other export and commercial benefits that will result from those flights.

That expenditure will mean more tables in restaurants, more beds in hospitals, more rented cars, and more scheduled flights being used; in other words, it will mean more jobs for South Australians, particularly for unskilled women and young people. That is only the tip of the iceberg. It is directly related to tourism and does not take into account the export benefits from which firms like Safcol, for example, will benefit.

At the same time, the House will be aware that Singapore Airlines has been given approval by the Commonwealth Government, although it has not yet announced scheduled flights. I feel sure that, when the Premier leads the South Australian Government delegation to South-East Asia in order to sell South Australian trade and tourism and investment opportunities, the package tours that are available in this State will be very much to the forefront of his thinking and selling to the cities of Tokyo, Singapore and Hong Kong.

Mr Millhouse: Do you think it will do much good?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I think that it will do a great deal of good. Adelaide is unique, in so far as it is the only capital that has quick and easy access to the outback. Certainly in the case of the international tourist who wants to see Australian wildlife—

Mr Trainer: He could come into this House.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I suppose you could say the bearded politician—Australiana politicana! I am not sure how we would describe him.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The naked Democrat, perhaps. It depends where the visitor would choose to go to see the Democrat—whether clothed or in his natural state.

Mr Millhouse: Would you come down, too?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: One of these days I might just be tempted to do so.

Mr Millhouse: Well, I'm making progress, albeit slowly.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Slow progress from a fast worker! The international traveller who wants to see Australian wildlife in its native state can see it not only on North Terrace but also within half an hour of the General Post Office by going to the Cleland Wildlife reserve or, if the tourist wants to see Australian flora, there is Black Hill Park and Weetunga Botanic Garden. There is no other city in Australia that has such quick and easy access to the attractions and destinations that are of particular interest to the international visitor, especially visitors from South-East Asia. All in all, international flights will be a huge economic, social and cultural benefit to South Australia, and I am pleased that the day is not long off when they will be coming to Adelaide.

FIRE BRIGADE SERVICES

Mr PETERSON: Will the Chief Secretary inform the House of the progress and projected completion date of the working party which was recommended in the Cox Report and which was to prepare a plan for the allocation of fire-fighting resources in the metropolitan area? The Cox Report was prepared in June 1981, and on page 53 there is a recommendation (No. 5) that a working party of selected Fire Brigade officers, representatives of officers' and fire-fighters' associations and a planning consultant be appointed to prepare a comprehensively phased programme for regrouping resources.

My particular interest is in the future of the fire protection services on LeFevre Peninsula, as the Cox Report suggested the closure of the Semaphore fire station. The peninsula has the largest accumulation of flammable liquids in the State, and all residents are most concerned about their protection in the future. Petitions are still being received in my office and, in fact, a petition was presented to Parliament today bearing 311 signatures, making a total of nearly 5 500 signatures presented to the House. As it is now some nine months since this matter was raised in the Cox Report, and as my letters requesting information have remained unanswered, will the Chief Secretary tell the House whether any progress has been made?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member's persistence is to be admired. The report has not been completed, but what he has he has not lost. I assured the honourable member previously that what he has he may never lose, so he should hang on to everything that is close to him. By that I refer to the people he represents. The new Chief Officer will take up his position on 22 March, and plans are moving ahead to start the building of the new headquarters. Mr Chris Wevill of the Public Buildings Department has been asked to take part in examining these matters.

The point the honourable member has raised is very valid. I have previously given the honourable member assurances regarding LeFevre Peninsula. I have had discussions with Mr Cox about this matter. Mr Cox made the point that his report was prepared with the specific purpose of realigning stations and that his committee acknowledged the situation. There has been no firm report, and the honourable member has not lost a station—it is still there. The matter

has been discussed, and I will ensure that the honourable member's question is added to the matters for discussion concerning this area. We have not lost sight of the urgency and the dangers that may exist in that area on the other side of the Port River. I hope that that reassures the honourable member. Firm decisions have yet to be crystallised.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 20 August. Page 505.)

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): On 20 August 1981 a Bill was introduced into the House to provide that the committee that gives advice to the Chief Secretary in relation to the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act should be abolished. On reading the Bill, I believed that it was not a contentious issue and one to which the Opposition should give its ready support, but here we are five months later, and this item is still on the Notice Paper. In the interim, I became somewhat suspicious of my earlier assessment and researched the whole matter again on several occasions. Having done that, however, I now find myself supporting my original assessment, which is that the Bill is not earth shattering. One therefore wonders why it needed to stay on the Notice Paper for five months when it could have been disposed of in August last year within five minutes.

The Bill seeks to abolish the advisory committee, and my research shows that that advisory committee, which meets about twice a year and the members of which receive no payment, is made up of a Chairman, who is the Lord Mayor of Adelaide; Sir Thomas Eastick (as you, Mr Speaker, would well know); a business man who has been retired for 15 or 16 years; a Deputy Auditor-General, who retired some 16 years ago; and the present Auditor-General. I understand that those gentlemen are quite happy to have the committee abolished.

The role of the committee was to advise on whether or not a licence that would be valid under this Act should in fact be given. Luckily, South Australia has had relatively little problem with organisations which could be regarded as suspect. In fact, an officer of the Chief Secretary's department does all the ground work and provides the information to the committee for it to make its recommendations. It was decided by the Chief Secretary that obviously there was no real need to go through this procedure, to bring these gentleman together to support a decision which by and large had already been made. One aspect of the

Chief Secretary's second reading explanation did rather amuse me. He said:

The Government's policy is to abolish statutory authorities where no substantial justification for their continued existence can be demonstrated.

The Opposition does not disagree with such a policy. I would not have thought that the abolition of this advisory committee would be a significant contributor to the Government's policy in this regard. In fact, it would seem to me that, if the Government was anxious to abolish committees that serve no useful purpose, this piece of legislation should not have been left for five months before being debated. The Opposition supports the measure on the basis of the arguments expressed during the second reading debate and of information ascertained by the research that we have done. However, we simply want to express our surprise that it has taken so long for us to have the opportunity to give that support.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): The Bill has been on the Notice Paper for some time. I think it was to be debated on several occasions, but it so happened that some of the measures preceding it attracted such attention from the honourable member and his colleagues that we were here until the early hours of the morning and so poor old charitable purposes, being what they are, took a back seat. The Bill was then put in the queue again, and this occurred on three occasions. The honourable member knows that it is not easy to get difficult legislation through, and that it is even harder to get easy legislation through, especially when it is in the 'rats and mice' category, although I do not say that in a derogatory way. However, I take note of the honourable member's comments, and I am pleased to hear that the matter has received the Opposition's support.

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

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 February. Page 2983.)

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): The Opposition supports the second reading but gives notice that it intends to move numerous amendments in Committee to make it what we think will be a better Bill. I apologise to members of the House that as yet the amendments are not ready for circulation, but we will try to get them to members as soon as possible. I think it would be fair to say that this Bill can only be seen as a complete vindication of myself and the member for Mitcham on the stand that we took in 1980 concerning the I.M.V.S. In the Minister's second reading explanation she tried, I must say in a vindictive way, to place the blame for the mess in which the I.M.V.S. found itself in the 1970s entirely on the previous Labor Administration.

To be frank, the Labor Government should have moved more quickly in this area, but let us not be fooled and led to believe that the setting up of the Badger Committee of Inquiry was the result of actions taken by this Government. The machinery to set up the Badger Committee of Inquiry was introduced in mid-1979 by the previous Minister of Health, my colleague the member for Elizabeth. The Health Commission had received allegations of impropriety within the I.M.V.S., and my colleague had already spoken to Professor Badger and asked him to chair an inquiry. So, that lays to rest any claim that it was the present Government's initiative.

I refer to the report of two other committees of inquiry, namely, the Wells Report and the Bede Morris Report. I give full credit to the member for Mitcham for the Bede Morris Report, and I think that we both share the honours for the Wells Report. If it had not been for the fact that the Opposition, continually in this House and through the media, drew attention to what was going on at the I.M.V.S. we would not have a Bill before us today dealing with the restructuring of that organisation, and certainly there would never have been a Bede Morris Report dealing with cruelty to animals, or the Wells Committee Report dealing with the functions of the I.M.V.S. No-one would deny that during the 1970s there was a dramatic growth in the use of the I.M.V.S. for pathology tests, and as the Minister said in her second reading explanation, when quoting from the Badger Committee Report:

More and more doctors came to rely on the laboratory to augment and in some cases replace clinical judgment.

I could be uncharitable and say that such a practice was just another rip-off by the medical profession under Medibank.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Who introduced Medibank?

Mr HEMMINGS: The point is that certain unscrupulous doctors, when they saw that there was money to be made out of Medibank, made their fortunes to the full. Medibank produced a new breed of doctor, the millionaire pathologist. The I.M.V.S. over the years has built up a unique reputation throughout the Commonwealth as a provider of medical and veterinary pathological services of which it can be justifiably proud. However, during 1978-80 there developed, within the council of the I.M.V.S. and with various heads of departments, empire-building exercises. In fact, it was put to me, when I first started to probe the functions of the I.M.V.S., that there was something rotten in the state of Denmark.

The Minister, when announcing the Wells Committee and the subsequent Bede Morris Committee, accused the member for Mitcham and me of doing irreparable harm to the I.M.V.S. I refute that, and maintain that it was the Minister who did the harm. Time and time again the Minister brushed aside the allegations made in the Parliament. She lectured me about not knowing what I was talking about (and we all know what the Minister thinks of the member for Mitcham, so I will not go into what she called him), and she castigated us for making allegations which she said were completely unfounded and, in fact, treated the whole business in a cavalier fashion.

This is the irony of it. Those people in the I.M.V.S. who were being accused in this Parliament of irregularities were being asked by this Minister to supply the answers. Of course, the answers, suitably coloured, came back accordingly. That was the height of stupidity because, there was no way that the answers the member for Mitcham and I were seeking would come back if the accused people were providing the answers. As I said earlier, the Wells and Bede Morris Reports vindicated the member for Mitcham and me. If the Minister had had any sense and had listened to the allegations, because there were far too many for them to be drummed up by some disgruntled ex-employee of the I.M.V.S., this Bill could have been introduced in 1980 and the cloud that has hung over the I.M.V.S. since early 1980 need never have happened.

Matters came to a head at the I.M.V.S. in early 1980, when Dr John Coulter was operating a mutagen testing laboratory, which was closed down. That was the catalyst, and it highlighted the bureaucratic and unbending attitude of the Director, Deputy Director, and the council. As early as 10 June 1980, I offered the Minister confidential information about irregularities at the I.M.V.S., and I was ignored. On 17 September I was forced, in an effort to

establish a public inquiry into the I.M.V.S., to move a private member's motion in this House. I think it is pertinent that I quote that motion now, because it was relevant to the Wells committee report, on which this Bill is supposedly being based. On 17 September I moved the following motion:

That in the opinion of the House the Government should, in order to restore the credibility and independence of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, establish a public inquiry into the affairs of the institute with particular reference to:

- (a) the circumstances surrounding the closure of the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit run by Dr John Coulter and the value of reopening and maintaining such a unit at the institute;
- (b) whether, as an independent statutory body, the I.M.V.S. has always facilitated the free and open flow of information on health hazards to its own employees and to the public of South Australia;
- (c) whether any undue influence has been brought to bear on the I.M.V.S. by chemical and drug companies to have unfavourable reports on their products suppressed or the names of the companies concerned deleted;
- (d) whether reports have been suppressed or names have been withheld by the threat of companies concerned withholding financial assistance to the institute or conversely by providing assistance to prevent unfavourable reports;
- (e) whether pressure from outside organisations, including Government departments, has ever produced a restrictive interpretation of regulations by I.M.V.S. senior management which has led to interference with information on actual or potential health hazards to the public of South Australia; and,
- (f) whether the I.M.V.S. and its senior officers have always served the best health interests of the people of South Australia.

In formulating that motion, I and other members on this side of the House seriously weighed up the use of the privileges of members of this House. I refer particularly to the fact that members can use this place to make accusations under privilege about other people and organisations. I took that matter very seriously. That was why, in June, I was prepared to give the Minister confidential information without disclosing it in the House. The Government refused even to debate the motion and, perhaps like all private members' motions, it tended to get further and further down the line and eventually, at the end of the session, it went into oblivion.

Bearing in mind all these allegations and the fact that the Minister, as a result of what the member for Mitcham and I were saying in this House, must have already decided to appoint the Wells Committee of Inquiry, and subsequently (two or three weeks later) widened the scope of the inquiry to deal with cruelty to animals, I cannot understand why the Minister could not have chosen that vehicle to clear the name of the I.M.V.S. The fact that she remained silent and that no Government back-bencher bothered to enter into the debate confirmed what the member for Mitcham and I were saying all along: there was real substance in the allegations.

At long last, we have the Bill before us. Despite statements in the *Advertiser* and by the Minister when the Wells Report and the Bede Morris Report were released that the I.M.V.S. legislation would be structured along recommendations by those two committees, there seems to have been little input from either the Badger Report, the Wells Report or the Bede Morris Report in the Bill before us.

Let us look at our first major objection. We on this side oppose the hiving off of the veterinary and forensic aspects to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Services and Supply, respectively. Let me make myself clear on this. I hope the Minister is listening, because that is the view of the veterinary people outside, if she has not got the information so far. If that happens, the unique character of the I.M.V.S., will be destroyed, and, more importantly, it is completely inconsistent with the Badger Committee and the Wells Committee recommendations regarding veterinary

pathology. For some time, Mr Pat Harvey, a representative from the Department of Agriculture, has tried to have the Department of Agriculture take over the veterinary pathology services from the I.M.V.S., and it seems that, in this Minister, he has found a willing listener. In fact, one can come to the conclusion only that the Minister actively encouraged him. In a letter to the Badger Committee dated 21 November 1979, the Minister said, in part:

However, in view of the proposal to transfer the veterinary service from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science to the Department of Agriculture, the Badger Committee was to request submissions from the Department of Agriculture, the I.M.V.S. and private veterinarians on this issue.

Previous Ministers have resisted attempts by the Department of Agriculture to take the big 'V' out of the I.M.V.S. and bring it under the control of the Department of Agriculture. That has been resisted by at least three Ministers of Health and Agriculture in the previous Labor Administrations, but since the change of Government a committee of inquiry has been set up which the Minister instructed to seek submissions from the department regarding the hiving off of the veterinary pathology services.

I think it is important to know what was said by the Badger Committee of Inquiry and the Wells Committee of Inquiry. At page 54, the Badger Committee Report, in dealing with the institute and veterinary pathology, said:

6.68 The committee understands that there has been a proposal, of some three years' standing, that the Division of Veterinary Sciences within the institute should be transferred to the aegis of the Department of Agriculture. This would not necessarily involve the construction of a new laboratory as it has been suggested that the officers and other staff concerned could continue to conduct their work within the institute building.

6.69 The main advantage of the proposed transfer was claimed by the Department of Agriculture to be an improvement in its ability to ensure and safeguard the health of the stock in South Australia.

6.70 The committee of inquiry does not support the transfer of the Division of Veterinary Sciences of the institute to the department. There are several reasons:

These are the important reasons. They are reasons given by people in submissions to the Badger Committee, people who were using the pathology services of the institute. The reasons were as follows:

The great majority of the submissions on veterinary pathology (including that by the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Inc.) expressed satisfaction with the existing arrangements; many submissions were made for the sole purpose of praising these arrangements; no submission complained about the quality of the present service and there was no support for the proposal to transfer veterinary pathology to the Department of Agriculture; many expressed concern that the quality of the service might be compromised if it were placed under the control of the department.

Country veterinary practitioners expressed a wish to continue to send specimens to the institute's laboratory attached to their local hospital and to seek advice from its staff.

A high proportion of the veterinary pathology work relates to animals other than livestock and in which the Department of Agriculture has no direct interest.

I will deal with that point later. The report continues:

Research rarely flourishes in a Public Service environment and the present high standard might not long continue if the service were transferred.

Research scientist classifications are desirable and these would be difficult to achieve under a departmental structure.

The separation would undoubtedly lead to increased costs to the Government even if it did not do so immediately.

Many infectious diseases of animals can affect humans so a close association between veterinary and medical microbiologists is of advantage in the public health field.

The association of medical and veterinary scientists has significant advantages; an example of this was cited in a C.S.I.R.O. submission which stated:

Moreover the expertise available in the Medical Division complemented that in the Veterinary Section and valuable discussions were held which often led to published work having greater breadth and depth.

The Badger Committee clearly laid it on the line that, as far as it was concerned, there should be no transfer of the veterinary services to the Minister of Agriculture.

The Wells Committee was given wide-ranging terms of reference, whereas the Badger Committee had to look at only the pathology services. The Wells Committee had to look at the whole aspect of the I.M.V.S., its performance from top to bottom. The Wells Committee completely endorsed what the Badger Committee had come up with; in fact it was even more explicit. Its recommendation was:

(1) the Division of Veterinary Sciences within the institute remain a division of the institute and that the status of the division should be lifted to restore relativity with the Medical Divisions;

It went one step further and said that the Veterinary Science Division should be placed on the same level as that of the medical side, yet this Bill will downgrade veterinary pathology by giving it to the Department of Agriculture. At page 59 the Wells Committee, dealing with veterinary services, said:

12.2.1 The Committee of Inquiry believes there are substantial reasons for the retention of the veterinary services within the institute as opposed to their transfer to the Department of Agriculture. In coming to this view the committee felt that the following points were relevant in maintaining an association that had already demonstrated its effectiveness in all areas:

(1) The technology of medical and veterinary services is essentially the same and in recognition of this, there is a world-wide trend to integrate medical and veterinary laboratory medicine.

(2) As a result of continued close liaison with seven disciplines (Bacteriology, Biochemistry, Haematology, Immunology, Morphological Pathology, Parasitology, Virology) of the medical sciences, there is a high order of sophistication of veterinary technology rarely seen elsewhere in this country, although some areas could be improved.

The Wells Committee was saying that, despite the fact that it had been downgraded in the past, mainly due I think to the efforts of Mr Harvey, and that it needed to be upgraded, it was still superior to many other laboratories in this country and in the world. Yet the Bill will take it out of that unique situation and put it under the control of the Minister of Agriculture. The Wells Report continues:

(3) All the original submissions with the exception of the Department of Agriculture and one other, supported continued medical and veterinary integration and the high quality and effectiveness of the existing services. On the other hand, there were many expressions of concern at the possible loss of this quality and a depression of effective research if the services were moved to Agriculture. Comments included those from country veterinary practitioners and the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Inc.

It goes on and supports the retention of the veterinary pathology unit within the institute. The report talked about 'continued integration produces standards of experience, reliability, and quality control, unlikely to be affordable in the Department of Agriculture alone. It states that, 'Integration provides better career prospects for scientific and technological science.'

It goes on to talk about costs. There, we have one committee whose report was delivered in 1980 and another committee whose report was delivered in December of that year. Each time that those two committees sought submissions from interested persons, we saw the answer: those persons were prepared to make submissions to both committees and, with the exception of the Department of Agriculture and one other submission, everyone was in favour of integration between the Department of Veterinary Pathology and the medical disciplines.

I refer now to the forensic aspect. I state at the outset that the Opposition supports what the Wells Committee said in this respect and what the Minister said in her second reading explanation, namely, that the physical relocation of the Forensic Pathology Unit to Divett Place is a worthwhile move, which the Opposition supports. The Minister made

great play of that in her second reading explanation, and the Opposition supports that concept. However, we do not see any value in the administration of that unit coming under the Department of Services and Supply. There should be a close relationship between forensic pathology and the Adelaide University's Department of Pathology, and that close relationship would remain if those two sections were still integrated within the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

I draw members' attention to the Wells Report. When she released that report, the Minister said that the new Bill would draw heavily on the report in relation to the running of the I.M.V.S. I sometimes get the impression that, when this Bill was being drafted, someone conveniently forgot where the Wells Report was filed, because only in certain areas can one barely pick up its recommendations. However, I did glean that most of the Minister's second reading explanation was extracted from the Wells Report, which indeed was a good report. I do not hold that against the Minister because, after all, when one is being offered good sense, why should not one use it? However, the Minister did not use good sense when she forgot to look at the recommendations but looked merely at the summary. Page 69 of the Wells Report, which deals with the arrangement of forensic services, states:

The present committee of inquiry considers that good enough reasons have not been given to justify transfer of the institute's present forensic pathology services to the control of any other administration, although the committee does agree that the institute's forensic pathology staff and their equipment should be accommodated in the Divett Place Forensic Science Centre. This committee's objections to the transfer of control are as follows:

They are very important reasons. In fact, they are almost as important as the reasons that I gave for the retention of veterinary pathology within the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. The report continues:

(1) any other authority would have less expertise in the general area of pathology and this would produce proper concern about and challenge to its authority and standing in matters concerning pathology;

(2) any future administration of the Forensic Science Centre divorced from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science could not expect the full support of that institute in covering the inevitable absences of forensic pathologists employed by the centre or in providing other valuable consultant advice and special investigations; and

(3) any future administration of the Forensic Science Centre without strong ties with the University of Adelaide Department of Pathology, which in turn is closely linked with the Institute Division of Tissue Pathology, would reduce the mutual advantages of collaboration in under-graduate medical education, post-graduate training in pathology, research, and academic recognition.

So, what I have told the House shows that every expert who is concerned about veterinary and forensic pathology, except the Department of Agriculture, states that those two areas should remain within the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

What reason has the Minister given for this move? She has often told me that I do not understand medical matters, so perhaps she can give me a medical reason for it. Is the reason that, because the Health Commission deals with medical matters, it should not therefore deal with matters of veterinary pathology or forensic pathology? Is that the reason, when one considers that the evidence shows that the whole thing is tied up together? The Opposition is completely opposed to that provision.

I turn now to clause 7, which deals with the membership of the council. The Opposition intends in Committee to move an amendment which will provide for the membership of the council to be increased from 10 persons to 11 persons, including a staff member. If one looks at the contributions that have been made in this House regarding the problems experienced at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary

Science in the past, one sees that it came through time and time again that the staff was not informed of anything, that it was frightened of what was happening, and that there was no compatibility between what the council was thinking and what the staff wanted. The Opposition considers that a simple amendment, which will increase the membership of the council from 10 members to 11 members, including a staff member, will tend to solve any problem that may occur in the future. I sincerely hope that we do not get a repeat of what happened between 1978 and 1980. There are a few other amendments which the Opposition wants to move in relation to this clause and to which I will refer in Committee.

I now refer to clause 10 of the Bill. I will not say that I have looked through every Bill that has been passed recently in this Parliament, although I have made a fair search of them. Clause 10 (1) (a) contains a rather interesting qualification for removal from office of council members. It provides as follows:

The Governor may remove an appointed member of the council from office on the ground of—

(a) any breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of his appointment;

I have never seen that provision in any other Bill that has come before this House, but I may be wrong. Will the Minister say why this provision is included? We accept that, because of mental or physical incapacity to carry out the duties of his office, dishonourable conduct or neglect of duty, a person may be removed from office, but what does the Minister mean by "any breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of his appointment"? Will guidelines be laid down for council members to sign and agree to abide by? This reminds me of the time when I worked at the Weapons Research Institute and I had to sign the Official Secrets Act. Because it was spelt out, I knew what I could or could not do. I could never admit that I had a strong admiration for the Russian nation: I had to keep that bottled up.

In this clause the Minister says that any breach of or non-compliance with his conditions of appointment is sufficient to remove a member of the council from office. When the Minister replies, I hope that she will say a little more about that aspect. The Minister may think that we are nitpicking, but we intend to split clause 14 (1) (c) from the rest of the clause. We are perfectly happy with paragraphs (a) and (b), but we are not happy about paragraph (c). The proposed amendments have not been circulated, so I can tell the Minister that the amendment will split the clause as follows:

To provide or maintain such veterinary pathology services, facilities or research as the Minister of Agriculture may require.

That will be followed by:

To provide a veterinary pathology service for veterinary surgeons in private practice.

We believe that the provision may be in contradiction of clause 14 (1) (b), with which we are perfectly happy, and which states:

To provide, to such extent as the institute thinks fit, a medical pathology service for medical practitioners in private practice;

That is all very well, because there is an abundance of private pathology companies in this State.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There is not really an abundance.

Mr HEMMINGS: There are sufficient companies. However, in the veterinary area, apart from one company that has recently taken on a veterinary pathologist, there is no such service for veterinary surgeons. I believe that the Minister, after talking with her officers, would understand the logic of this. Clause 14 (1) (c) states, in part:

... research provided or carried out by that department, as the Minister of Agriculture may require;

I would see the Department of Agriculture dealing mainly with farm animals or areas where people keep animals and livestock for a living. But the department would have no interest in the social and companion type animal, such as a dog, a cat, or a racehorse, because those animals are not needed, whereas farmers need livestock to make a living and we need livestock to keep us going.

If a clear direction is not given that the I.M.V.S. is to provide a facility for veterinary surgeons, there will be chaos, or possibly some enterprising private company could step in, take all of the lucrative pathology work from the surgeons, and farm off the costly and lengthy work to the I.M.V.S. That is why we will move to amend this clause.

Clause 16 deals with the Director of the institute. I accept that the Minister, in the second reading explanation, said that the new Director, when appointed, will be under contract. That is in line with the Wells Committee Report, which stated that there should be a five-year contract with the right of renewal. We believe that that should be spelt out in the Bill. One of the problems has been that the previous Director, not the acting Director (and I say this in all fairness and very seriously, and what the Minister said in her second reading explanation was very true), in his early days built up the institute until it was the envy of the other States.

However, if a Director is appointed and continues in that position until the normal retiring age, a situation can arise in which the Director may lose touch and enthusiasm and may become embroiled in the in-fighting that takes place. This happened in the I.M.V.S. in relation to the previous Director. Perhaps he was not to blame, but in effect he reached that stage when he was due to retire (and we all do this at times—anything for an easy life). A five-year contract appointment would ensure that we always get the best out of the Director of the I.M.V.S.

The Opposition is concerned about clause 27 (2), which states:

For the purpose of any proceedings or any industrial agreement under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981, the Health Commission shall be regarded as the employer of all officers and employees of the institute.

Why is the Health Commission being treated as the employer? Clause 27 (4) states:

The institute is not entitled:

(a) to institute proceedings before the Industrial Court of South Australia or the Industrial Commission of South Australia;

(b) to enter into any industrial agreement;

or

(c) to be represented in any proceedings before the Industrial Court or the Industrial Commission,

without the consent of the Health Commission.

It seems rather strange that the I.M.V.S. is being made a body corporate and given wide-ranging powers, yet when it comes to dealing with industrial matters the Bill provides that the Minister is the employer.

Is it designed so that we will not have a repetition of Dr John Coulter's application through the Industrial Court? That is something the Opposition would like to know, and I think the Minister should at least give us an answer in her reply to this debate so that we can possibly move further amendments if we feel that something needs to be done in that area. I refer now to the additional amendments that we intend to move to augment this Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he may speak in general terms as to how the Bill might be improved, but in no way can be canvass any detail of any proposed amendments to the Bill at this time.

Mr HEMMINGS: All right, Sir, I will be very careful. There were four areas on which the Wells Committee made recommendations to the Government, strong recommendations, good recommendations, but these have been completely ignored. Waffling statements were made by the Minister during her second reading explanation to the effect that something could be done at some later stage, but the Opposition intends to do something about it now. On page 7, recommendation 2.4.10, which deals with the downgrading of the division of veterinary science within the I.M.V.S., states:

A position of Senior Director, division of veterinary science be established with the same salary and status as the heads of other professional divisions.

At the same time, the Wells Committee Report recommended that the inter-departmental (that is, the Department of Agriculture and the institute) committee should be wound down. That is one of the most important recommendations that the Wells Committee came up with, allied to the fact that the veterinary pathology division should be integrated. It was spelt out quite clearly that there should be a position of Senior Director with the same status and salary as those of other heads of divisions. That is important if this new deal that we are to have as a result of this Bill is to work, that is, in effect, to bring the level of Senior Director up to that of his other colleagues. It is a measure that is sadly lacking in this Bill. The other area I refer to concerns a matter that the member for Mitcham previously canvassed more so than I did, namely, the cruelty to animals both in holding and breeding and in the actual operation. Some of the stories that resulted from the investigations prompted by the member for Mitcham were quite horrendous, and you, Mr Speaker, as a former veterinary surgeon would well be aware—

Mr Millhouse: He still is a veterinary surgeon.

Mr HEMMINGS: I am talking about a practising veterinary surgeon.

Mr Lewis: With the number of animals that he has to attend to here, I think he still is.

Mr HEMMINGS: The way in which animals are treated is taken quite seriously by members of the public. One of the recommendations of the Bede Morris Report was quite clear in relation to this. Referring to the Animal Ethics Committee at the institute, the recommendation states:

That the Animal Ethics Committee of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science:

(1) reviews its charter and develops a statement of its responsibilities;

(2) promulgates this charter widely throughout the institute and to other users of the institute's facilities; and

(3) instructs all users of the animal operating theatre and experimental animals of their responsibilities.

Further comment is made about the importance of the Animal Ethics Committee. One would have thought that, following that recommendation in the report and the fact that the institute had set up an Animal Ethics Committee as an interim measure, this provision would be included in the Bill, clearly setting out the functions of that committee, because it is important. The committee met only 10 times, I think, in 1981. Perhaps that is many meetings as far as that committee is concerned but, from what the member for Mitcham found out about the place, one would have thought that it was working full time, after he uncovered things that were going on there. It should be clearly spelt out in the Bill that there should be an Animal Ethics Committee and that there should be an officer designated to operate it. The matter is important, because it seems that in many cases we are going to have to rely on the Minister's vague statements made in her second reading explanation, that is, that something will be done. I now deal with the problem of funding for trips overseas by staff of

the I.M.V.S. The Wells Committee Report included the following recommendation:

Procedures for approving overseas travel should be revised to ensure that travel funded by a specific research grant is referred to the overseas travel committee for approval and the institute should cease receiving financial assistance from suppliers of equipment for travel, either interstate or overseas, for the purpose of viewing or testing equipment.

It also states later in the report that, whilst the committee could find no irregularities, the institute clearly held itself open to some criticism. I do not think the member for Mitcham has ever received a reply about Dr Edwards.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Oh, come off it! Don't you read my Ministerial statements?

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Mitcham may have received a reply, but at the time when the Minister was making those Ministerial statements the accused were giving her the information—a point that I made earlier.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Who are the accused? Is this a court?

Mr HEMMINGS: The member for Mitcham and I were always accused of irresponsibility, of larrikinism and of doing harm to the good name of the I.M.V.S. In fact, the Minister did not only accuse us of this earlier, but she lectured us and castigated us.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You deserved it.

Mr HEMMINGS: I did not. I received 50 per cent of the reward for getting the Wells inquiry instituted, and the member for Mitcham the other 50 per cent. I think it should be clearly spelt out in the Act that the Minister should be the person to give the ultimate approval.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: What for?

Mr HEMMINGS: For overseas trips concerning the selection and testing of new equipment. I am sure that the Minister can delegate the task to one of her officers, but the ultimate responsibility should be with the Minister.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It always goes to Cabinet, anyway. Didn't you realise that?

Mr HEMMINGS: When Dr Edwards went to Basle, in Switzerland, you gave Ministerial approval.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Not only I, but your colleagues—

Mr HEMMINGS: You gave Ministerial approval for him to go.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Cabinet approves overseas trips.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HEMMINGS: That is not the way the Wells Report gives it; it was only when members of the council went overseas, but we will deal with that in Committee. As Government members are supporters of free enterprise, I am sure that they would have picked up the following statement at page 42 of the Badger Report:

That Government-funded laboratories, and particularly the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, engage in active competition with private pathology laboratories.

That is very commendable, because up until then the private pathology institutions were taking the cream off the cake and leaving the hard, complex and costly work to the I.M.V.S. The Minister should have accepted the challenge and incorporated in this legislation a provision whereby someone could promote the I.M.V.S. as against private enterprise. It is a profitable market and the Badger Report clearly states that there is an area where the I.M.V.S. can get involved and possibly reduce the need for the \$17 000 000 budget that it received last year. Having canvassed the more important areas, I will deal with the matters arriving from amendments in the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I agree with the main thrust of this Bill, which is that the I.M.V.S. should come under Ministerial control and, through that, under the control, practically, of the Health Commission. This is something that I suggested some time ago. I do not know how I ever got involved in I.M.V.S. matters, because I am not a scientist and I do not know anything about these things, although a few years ago I did. Certainly, from my visits down there and from my discussions with officers of the I.M.V.S., I came to the conclusion that it was quite inappropriate that it should be an independent body, as it is under the present Act. I came to the conclusion that it should be under Ministerial control, which, as I have said, means the control of the Health Commission. That is the main thrust, as I see it, of this Bill. So I accept that. However, to me, there are two controversial proposals in the Bill with which I do not agree. Listening to the member for Napier, I gather that there are quite a lot of other things that the Labor Party do not like. We will think about them in due course.

As far as I am concerned, the two matters of controversy in the Bill are the idea of hiving off the division of veterinary sciences to the Department of Agriculture and the forensic sciences—whatever the technical name of that body is—within the I.M.V.S. now to the Department of Services and Supply. Quite frankly, I do not agree with either of those proposals. The member for Napier referred many times in the course of his speech to the Wells Committee Report, and quite appropriately no doubt. It is perfectly clear, looking at that report that these proposals are completely contrary to the recommendations in it. I do not propose to go through them all. In the summary and recommendations on page 3 of the volume it says this at 2.1.3:

Whilst recognising the need for the institute to retain some independence, the committee has concluded that the institute should be incorporated under the Health Commission Act and that veterinary sciences and forensic pathology should remain in the institute. This will place the institute within the umbrella of other State health services but still allow it to retain its capacity to provide the veterinary and forensic services to non-health users.

That is the summary.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Why do you think that situation applies here and nowhere else in Australia?

Mr MILLHOUSE: It may be historical accident; I do not know. It has been put to me that it is historical accident, and I recognise the special interest which the Minister of Agriculture has in this matter because if he can build his considerable empire a bit bigger no doubt he will. I guess he is very happy at the thought of getting veterinary sciences within the department, but I am afraid I am not. If we are going to have, as we did have, a committee of inquiry, such as the Wells Committee, which at the time was lauded as an excellent committee—and its report was lauded as an excellent report—then we damn well ought to follow it. I suggest that the Minister (no doubt he has done it, but he had better do it again) have a look at the section in chapter 12 on veterinary services in the Wells Committee Report, where a case is argued for the retention of veterinary sciences within the I.M.V.S. Incidentally, I notice that there is not a suggestion that the name of the organisation should be changed; it will be a complete misnomer if the I.M.V.S. remains the I.M.V.S.—Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—because veterinary people will have been taken out of it. That does not matter two hoots, I suppose, but it is something that I observe.

However, whether the Minister likes it or not, my mind on this matter is made up; it is made up on the basis of the Wells Committee Report, and it is also reinforced by discussions I have had since the Bill was introduced with those concerned, or at least with one person who is concerned, on this particular matter. Let me add one more thing, this may be mere laymen's prejudice. Almost by coincidence I

have started to read in the last few days the book called *Animal Liberation. Towards an end to man's inhumanity to animals* by Peter Singer. It is a wellknown book, and I have not read it all, but I must say that what I have read has impressed me, and it has given me very grave doubts about the way in which we treat animals. With great respect to the Department of Agriculture, compared with the people at the I.M.V.S., I think that there is more chance of animals which are used in experimentation, and so on, getting a fair go under the umbrella of the I.M.V.S. than under the Department of Agriculture.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That's quite a turn up for you to say that after your allegations last year.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I thought we had cleared all that up and things were better now.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Things are different now; they weren't the same.

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is strange to hear this coming from the Minister. Anyway, that may be a mere uninformed layman's view based on prejudice and emotion and nothing else. I do not rely on it as my sole argument, but I do put it and say that it is one of the arguments. I think that there is more chance—and the member for Napier got on to this, although not at great length—that there will not be malpractices if these experiments are within the supervision and purview of the I.M.V.S. than the Department of Agriculture. I take it no further than that, and I may be quite wrong. I do rely—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What gives you the grounds to make those allegations?

Mr MILLHOUSE: I have already said that it may be mere prejudice on my part, but it is a feeling that I have. I wish you were not in the Chair, Mr Speaker; I wish you could get out of the Chair and say what you think about these things. From conversation with you, I may say that I found your views pretty sound on these things, and I say that with respect. You cannot speak on the matter, but after the debate is over I would like to hear what you think about it. However, my main reason for opposing the splitting of the veterinary sciences from the I.M.V.S. is contained in chapter 12 of the Wells Committee Report.

Now, the Minister of Agriculture can go back to sleep because I am going to speak about forensic pathology in which I do not suppose he has much interest. Chapter 14 of the Wells Committee Report states all the arguments canvassed there for and against the hiving off of forensic pathology to someone else. What chapter 14 suggests—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Back we go to the history books!

Mr MILLHOUSE: Well, I hope *Hansard* got that interjection of the Minister of Agriculture—'Back we go to the history books.' He is talking about a report produced in December 1980 which was commissioned by this Government and upon which his colleague the Minister of Health in her second reading explanation has said she relies, and he with contempt says, 'Back to the history books.' If that is the standard of debate from the Minister of Agriculture and the standard of his outlook, I am not going to take any more notice of his silly interjections at all; they are not worth answering. Let me now get on to what the Wells Committee suggested with regard to forensic pathology. At 14.5.2 the report states:

The committee recommends that forensic anatomical and histological pathology services in Adelaide should be administered by a semi-autonomous institution—

The committee gives seven criteria. In the next subparagraph it says:

The committee considers that the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science exactly fills the above requirements and that no other institution in South Australia does. The committee therefore

recommends that the forensic pathology services needed should therefore continue to be provided by the institute.

I base my opposition to the splitting off of forensic pathology very strongly on that. I have in the last week spoken to a forensic pathologist who is of the same view and who does not want to be separated from his professional brethren by being put in the Department of Services and Supply. It is rather ironic that one of the members of the Wells Committee was this chap Burdett, who is apparently the head of the Department of Services and Supply. He does not seem to have made any dissent from that. He obviously does not want to have in his department forensic pathology. He recommended against it; now the Government is trying to make him take it. I do not believe that forensic pathology should be split off from the I.M.V.S. both because of what is set out in the Wells Committee Report and also from my discussions with one of those concerned.

I do not know whether or not the other matters which the member for Napier canvassed as lacunae in the Bill are important; we shall see about that in due course. To me the fundamentals are, first of all, Ministerial control and Health Commission control, and I agree with that and therefore I support the second reading of the Bill. Secondly, there is the suggestion to hive off these two present parts of the I.M.V.S. to other bodies and I do not agree with that. I shall oppose that. Having said as much and made my position on this matter clear, I think that I have said enough.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture):

In supporting the Minister of Health in her presentation of this Bill, I obtained from officers of my department, officers who have been directly involved in the planning of the Bill, some notes that I think are relevant to this debate. The Minister of Health has already outlined the provisions of this Bill in some detail and she has made clear the proposed changes that arise from the Government's commitment to improving the accountability and the management of pathology services in South Australia. The Government's decision to transfer responsibility for the delivery of veterinary laboratory services to the Ministry of Agriculture has followed directly from that commitment given by the Government. I already have the responsibility for other matters relating to animal health and the animal industry, despite the rather scathing remarks by the member for Mitcham.

The Department of Agriculture has existing divisions concerned with animal health and animal production. Indeed, it has the facilities and officers who are sincere in their application to the job with respect to animal protection, also another matter to which the member for Mitcham referred. The transfer of the division of veterinary sciences to the Department of Agriculture will bring related animal matters together under the single Ministerial control. I believe that the closeness, the direct association between animal health, animal production, animal protection and animal science, as well as the research that is associated with animal science and currently within the ambit of the I.M.V.S., are all together and ought to be regarded as such in relation to assisting the animal industry of this State.

The transfer of the division will strengthen my department's ability to provide services to the department, to other animal owners and to private veterinarians. As a result of the transfer, I believe that my officers, who have already demonstrated their capacity to assist those various sections of the community with their animal husbandry, their animal protection and their animal science over a period, are well equipped to take on the responsibility proposed within this Bill.

The transfer of the division of veterinary sciences will reinforce this approach. I appreciate the continuing need

for veterinary pathology services and recognise that the division of veterinary sciences has achieved high standards in professional work and service delivery. I intend that this work shall continue and that those levels of standard shall continue, if not be improved, as a result of the transfer. The staff in the division of veterinary sciences can be assured that their new administrative environment as proposed within this Bill will be sensitive to the needs of science and scientists. The Department of Agriculture maintains good relations with the national authorities, the C.S.I.R.O., the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and other Commonwealth research institutions. Within South Australia the department has co-operated extensively with the Waite Institute and with Roseworthy Agricultural College. A further development of work within the division of veterinary sciences will take place, therefore, within a favourable context and I believe within a receptive, favourable and harmonious climate.

I accept that the transfer of the division of veterinary sciences will entail an expansion of the role of the Department of Agriculture, thereby including the responsibility for laboratory animals and increasing responsibility for laboratory work associated with pets, animals in zoos, animals used in sport including racing, and some aspects of diseases common to both humans and animals. It is intended that the department maintain a central animal breeding facility which can supply laboratory animals of a quality and of a quantity consistent with the existing requirements and standards. The standards achieved by the animal breeding facility at Gilles Plains are fully recognised and will be maintained. I am committed to practical efforts to enable veterinary services in South Australia to keep pace with those in other States. I believe that is a commitment that is appropriate to make during this debate to assure not only members of this place of the objective that we have in agriculture, pending the acceptance of this transfer, but also those who are directly involved in the work under the ambit of veterinary science.

I am particularly keen to see the veterinary laboratory at Struan, in the South-East, put to its most effective use. We have tremendous facilities installed at the Struan farm. It could be that members opposite would not be aware of those facilities generally. However, I am certain that the member for Hartley, for example, would recognise and support my remarks regarding the standard of facilities that have been, and more especially are being, installed at that site. I am pleased to state that staffing of the veterinary laboratory at Struan will be strengthened with the additional scientific and technical staff.

Provision for these five appointments is incorporated in the Bill, and this will enable an improved service to be provided to stock owners in this all-important animal production region of the State. I make quite clear that all salaries, wages and leave rights of all employees of the Division of Veterinary Science who are transferred to the Department of Agriculture will be protected.

It is specifically provided that the transfer of an employee (and I quote from an insert in the material that has been provided to me for this purpose) 'shall be effected without reduction of his salary or wage and without prejudice to or interruption of his existing and accruing rights in respect of recreation leave, sick leave and long service leave arising out of his previous service with the institute'. So, all this waffle that we have heard from the member for Mitcham is really and clearly in that category. He spoke about the transfer of the activities of the institute to the Department of Agriculture.

However, the activities will remain within the existing premises. The people directly associated with that service will remain in their own house. There is to be no physical

relocation in the foreseeable future for that institute or for any part of it as it relates to the transfer of veterinary services from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science under the Health Commission to the ambit of the Department of Agriculture. Despite the efforts of the member for Mitcham and, to a lesser extent, I am pleased to say, the member for Napier to cultivate problems and to try to dig up from documents, historical and otherwise, references to support the cultivation of dissent and problems in this situation, I can assure members that a tremendous amount of homework has been done by officers of my colleague, the Minister of Health, and officers of the Department of Agriculture to ensure that there is a smooth transfer of policy making and administrative control of this division. Very deliberate efforts have been made by those officers collectively to ensure that the welfare of the people involved is not unduly or improperly disturbed. Indeed, to the contrary, it is against the objective of retaining the work force that we have in order to work harmoniously with people of their own kind, people who are directly associated with animal welfare and production, and the animal industry generally in this State in the one administrative house. The premise of activity, as I indicated before, for veterinary science work is to remain at the institute level. I know of no ground, and certainly of no money for or of any plan, to relocate those people at this time.

On completion of the transfer, working arrangements will involve a sharing of administrative work between the Department of Agriculture and the I.M.V.S. administration. As a result of that transfer, I will have the responsibility of determining policy on the provision of veterinary laboratory services and the conduct of associated research. Naturally, the budgeting and staffing will be arranged through my department. However, as staff in the Division of Veterinary Services will continue to be located in their present work areas, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science will provide some day-to-day administrative support. The services of this kind to be provided by the I.M.V.S. will be set out in an agreement between my colleague, the Minister of Health, and myself. Details of that proposed agreement are presently being worked out so that, on the passage of the Bill, the transfer can proceed promptly and, as I indicated earlier, hopefully smoothly.

I assure the House that staff of the Division of Veterinary Sciences is being consulted about the items to be included in those arrangements. I also assure the House that in matters of budgeting, staffing and other resources the Department of Agriculture will make all efforts to maintain and improve the facilities of the division.

On that note, I state that under the present Cabinet, and with the support of the Party in Government, the role of agriculture in this State has been well and fairly recognised from a financial budgeting point of view. We in South Australia understand the importance of agriculture as an industry for South Australian primary producers, and we understand the benefits to the State that are derived from the export of its production. It is against that background, and with the benefit of that knowledge and appreciation of the role of primary producers in this State, that this Government has clearly and appropriately funded the Department of Agriculture to enable it do its part and to provide its share of services to the community that it purports to represent.

On matters of policy regarding veterinary laboratory services, I recognise the need for a source of authoritative advice. Therefore, without the necessary personal experience in this field, I propose to set up a Veterinary Laboratory Services Advisory Committee, which will have six members. One member (its Chairman) will be the Director-General of Agriculture. Another person will be an executive member

with responsibility for veterinary matters in the Department of Agriculture. We have a number of officers who could well qualify for that position. They are long-term, well-respected officers serving in that or a like capacity at present. The committee will also comprise a stockowners' representative appointed in consultation with the United Farmers and Stockowners Association of South Australia, and a representative of owners of sport and companion animals. Another member of the council will represent private veterinary surgeons, and the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science will also be a member. The heads of the Veterinary Services Division and the Animal Health Division in the Department of Agriculture will also attend meetings and participate fully in discussions.

I believe that the Veterinary Laboratory Services Advisory Committee will have an important role to play in achieving an orderly transfer of responsibility to the Department of Agriculture on the passage of this Bill and the charting of a path forward that will further enhance the reputation of the Division of Veterinary Sciences as a provider of laboratory services of high professionalism. Members opposite, and indeed members generally, would be aware of my caution in appointing committees, be they to service divisions of my department or to service me, in particular, as Minister.

I have set out very deliberately, since coming to office, to reduce the number of committees servicing my portfolios and more especially the several parts of the role of agriculture. As a result of those efforts, there has been a substantial reduction in the number of committees serving in an advisory capacity of one form or another. There have been considerable financial savings and time savings of individuals as a result of that effort.

I believe that there is a need in this instance for such an advisory committee. I am the first to concede that I have not had the personal experience that I believe is essential in circumstances of this kind when one sets out to take over the responsibilities of an all important office such as that proposed, and therefore, without that personal expertise, we have carefully and deliberately incorporated in the Bill an advisory committee of the kind outlined.

I am not in a position (in case members are wondering about the permanency or otherwise of this committee) to say whether the committee will be there for ever and a day. I would hope that, having already demonstrated a very close interest in the welfare of the animal industry and animal production in South Australia, I can achieve and acquire sufficient understanding of the role in the future (but I do not know how distant) to be able to operate on the advice and with the assistance of my departmental officers, who will advise as part of their ordinary duties, so that ultimately the advisory committee referred to can be dissolved. Whether the period will be six months, a year, 18 months, or two years is yet to be determined.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In 18 months you will not be there.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I will be here all right. The honourable member should not throw in interjections of that kind. There was a time after we came to government when I wondered how we would go, but in the past 18 months to two years it has become patently clear and progressively clearer that the State of South Australia will support the present Government in office. Let us not mix a delicate, albeit important, industrial matter with petty Party politics of the kind promoted by members opposite. There is no room in this situation for petty Party politics. I am disappointed that the honourable member has ventured into that field while we are discussing a matter of such importance.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I do, and I delight in doing so in the right place. In this instance, that is the last form of interjection and conversation that we need in relation to the smooth passage of this Bill. The personal, long term, dedicated, professional interests of many people are involved in this subject, and because of that we hope that members on both sides, and in both Houses, will show the sort of concern and respect for the delicacy of this Bill that it deserves and will allow it to go through without undue or certainly irrelevant interruption.

I propose, in the remaining minutes available to me, to refer to a paper that was produced to assist my senior officer, Jim McColl, to brief the several parties associated with this subject before the Minister of Health introduced the Bill into Parliament. Members would appreciate that, despite the limited time available for that purpose, consultations were held with all of the parties who will be or may be affected by legislative change. That was an undertaking of policy commitment by our Government. In this instance, my Director-General, Jim McColl, was responsible for part of it. Mr McColl said that the department has an extensive record in applied research in regard to most of the agricultural industries in Australia.

Mr McColl made that statement at a time when he was seeking to convey to the parties to whom I have referred, particularly those directly associated with the present I.M.V.S. structure, that their attention to research would not deteriorate upon the transfer of the activities to the Department of Agriculture. Mr McColl stated that the department maintains good relations with the C.S.I.R.O., the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and other Commonwealth research institutions within the State, and that the department has co-operated extensively with the other colleges, particularly Waite Institute and the Roseworthy Agricultural College. I referred to that earlier in the debate. He further stated:

In 1980-81, the department spent \$6 400 000 on agricultural research; \$1 570 000 of this was provided from approximately 31 rural industry research funds and special commonwealth grants. The remainder came from State revenue.

That portion of the report demonstrates yet again the attitude of the department towards the research needs within the field and the attitude of the Government of the day with respect to the provision of the finance necessary to carry out that research work. He further stated:

Research is conducted by 121 graduate research officers and supported by 244 other staff. Thirty-seven research officers are working on research related to animals. Similar levels of commitment are made by other State Departments of Agriculture. Altogether, State departments and C.S.I.R.O. are responsible for about 85 per cent of agricultural research resources in Australia.

The department has emphasised the importance of effective research administration. I personally chair the Research Policy Advisory Committee, which was set up in 1979 (and includes representatives from C.S.I.R.O. and the University of Adelaide) to provide objective advice on research policy. I also chair the department's Research Management Committee, which is responsible for the internal co-ordination of research programmes. This committee consists of the principal research officers in each division and region who are responsible for the day-to-day management of research teams. All research is carried out on a project basis with identifiable objectives, project supervisors and budgets. Considerable importance is attached to maintaining and extending the level of support from industry research funds and other outside sources.

Having referred to the matters drawn to my attention by officers of the department, I believe that those matters should be drawn to the attention of the House, not only for the purpose of boasting about the objectives, the level and standard of administration that applies within the Ministry of Agriculture but to demonstrate more especially to this Parliament and to honourable members that we in agriculture we appreciate the need for research in a whole host of fields, not the least of which is the field of animal research,

that we are practised in that regard, and that we welcome the opportunity to simply expand that role to embrace that portion of present I.M.V.S. activities that is proposed for transfer.

It is with pride that I draw to the attention of the Parliament, given this opportunity, the achievements, the standards and levels of dedication that apply within our department in order to show that we are confident and look forward to the new responsibility proposed in this Bill. In conclusion, I hope that the tone of acceptance at professional and grower level within the broad community of this State continues, that the tone of co-operation that has so far come from those to whom I have spoken in relation to this overall transition continues, and that in the longer term, in the company of that level of co-operation, we can, where possible, improve the standard of facilities and service to the growers in this community and, finally, the standard of administration and accountability within the whole operation, so that good value for the money spent in this direction can be reflected and so that South Australians generally, and members of this House in particular, can be satisfied that the job is being done, and being done well.

I will not have opportunity to answer questions that may be raised during the Committee stage and, in the absence of that opportunity, I think it is appropriate to put on the record a matter of investigation that I personally have undertaken in relation to recent publicity on the subject. I attended a veterinary surgeons' dinner, the annual dinner of the association on Saturday evening last, at which the retiring President, Dr Rick Humphris, in his concluding address to that gathering, spoke at some length about the subject we are debating today. On previous occasions, in fact, on Wednesday 17 February, he had been a party to consultation with officers of our respective departments in relation to this Bill.

Dr Humphris spoke at some length at that professional gathering which I was privileged to attend, together with grower representatives from the general community. There was not a note within his remarks that indicated anything other than support for this Bill; accordingly, I was very disappointed to read an article which appeared on page 14 of the *Advertiser* of Tuesday of this week, which, in the words of the journalist, Barry Hailstone, was a summary of discussions that he had had with Dr Humphris. In that summary it was reported that the South Australian veterinary surgeons opposed the Government's plan to restructure the I.M.V.S. I have spoken with Dr Humphris, and he has since written to me confirming the conversation I had with him on that subject, and confirming that that journalist's summary of the interview was inaccurate. It is my understanding that there is no opposition to the proposal anywhere in the field as was reflected in Barry Hailstone's article on page 14 of the *Advertiser* of Tuesday of this week. I look forward to—

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

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I heartily concur with the comments made by the member for Napier earlier this afternoon, and I will be interested to hear the response of the Minister to the various areas that the member for Napier highlighted. I want to touch further on some of the points raised by the member for Napier, but first I refer to an area that has concerned me in the drafting of the Bill presently before the House. It is obvious that there is a change of emphasis in the functions of the institute in the Bill before the House compared with the legislation that the Bill seeks to amend.

The change of emphasis, as I interpret it, is that the primary aim of the institute is to be a service organisation

and that only as a secondary capacity is research to play a part, whereas the parent legislation, which will be amended, rather puts research and service on a tandem, on a level with each other; in other words, they are both equal aims of the institute. Section 17 (1) of the parent legislation states:

It shall be the duty of the council to establish and maintain an Institute of Medical Science for the following purposes, namely—

I ask that this be noted carefully—

- (a) research into the diseases of human beings and animals and into problems connected with such diseases.

It goes on to list other equally important objectives, but that first one clearly is a research capacity, a research capacity that is not made subject to any other section; yet we have in the Bill before us a complete reordering of the objectives as they appear. Others are now put in. I am not objecting to some of the others that are being put in—they take account of realities; however, proposed new section 14 (2) states in part:

The institute may—

- (a) conduct research into fields of science related to the services provided by the institute.

Clearly, research is related to service; it is subsidiary to service. Therefore, there has been a constricting of the research capacity of the institute. Also, I might point out that it is dependent upon the interpretation of how research can be connected with service. It could in one sense lead to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science becoming a very pedestrian facility compared to the type of facility that it presently is with its research capacity which is acknowledged in many quarters.

I did some research into this matter to determine whether or not this was part of the recommendations of the various committees that have met to discuss the matter of the I.M.V.S. I suppose that my findings there are somewhat equivocal, and the Minister could usefully clarify this matter later. I find that the report of the committee of inquiry into the I.M.V.S. mentions the aims of the institute and highlights the importance of research work. Paragraph 3.3.7 of the report states:

A much increased level of basic biological research and general facilities for research will be required at the institute to:

- (1) keep staff professionally satisfied, keen, and at the cutting edge of knowledge;

That is a general area, not an area subsidiary to service provision. It further states:

- (2) to recruit excellent staff in competition with other hospitals, laboratories, universities and research institutions;

Again, the capacity of the institution to develop its stature will be dependent on the extent to which those who are to be attracted to its employment can see their role as being into the general area of research. It further states:

- (3) develop a self-sustaining level of academic excellence able to compete successfully for external research funding;

Again, we are getting well beyond research just limited to service provision. It further states:

- (4) investigate medical and veterinary problems of special importance in the institute and South Australia;

That also is beyond the area of mere service provision. One can almost say that that should be an anticipatory research capacity that will try to venture research into areas that are not yet a problem but which some prognoses could indicate might be a problem later on. Finally paragraph (5), which is clearly service related, states:

- (5) provide a secure scientific basis for the institute's routine services.

So, one of those objectives relates to the Bill that we have before us, but the other four do not; they are left out of that. I mentioned that it is somewhat equivocal, however, because, while putting that statement in the text, the rec-

ommendation at the end of that chapter is not quite so clear cut. It states:

The committee of inquiry recommends the continuation of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science as a joint medical and veterinary organisation—

I repeat that point, following on the comments of the member for Napier and the member for Mitcham—

with the following functions:

Seven functions are listed, but the fifth is the relevant one, which is as follows:

Research incidental to or necessary for the effective performance of functions 1 to 4 [being service provisions] inclusive.

I do think it would be a grave pity for the stature of the institute and for its capacity to attract staff of a high calibre in the research field and to promote work in research in medical and veterinary areas in the years ahead, if we were to limit that facility just to repeat research in the fields of science and related services provided by the institute. In other words, such pathology services, as they do, in a wide range, will be the determining factor of what can be studied by that staff.

If one feels, or if members feel that that may already be the case, it seems to me from reading the annual reports of the I.M.V.S. that a great deal of research takes place there that is beyond that limitation. The Minister shakes her head, but I would be interested to know exactly how some of these papers that have been listed as published do relate clearly to the services actually provided. I might read some of them.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Which annual report is that?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: For 1979. There are three papers by Mr R. A. J. Conyers: 'Cancer: A Self-inflicted Metabolic Disease'; 'Nutrition of Cancer.'; 'Cancer—Ketones and Parental Nutrition.' There is another interesting paper by Mr R. J. Baker: 'Hospital Production of Radio Pharmaceuticals,' and another paper by Mr R. J. Coulter: 'Nuclear Energy and the Future of Man.' These are wider research areas. I cannot immediately see how they directly impinge upon the services provided at a hospital, and I will be interested in the Minister's comments in this regard.

Nevertheless, I think the Minister must entertain the fact that there are research areas that will have more to benefit for the State at large that may not immediately impinge upon services provided at the institute because no services may yet have been designed for the new area of research. It could be embarking upon a new area of scientific investigation, which to us as yet is unknown and, therefore, for which we make no service provision. This Bill will attempt to limit us in that regard. It will attempt to close off that area of research. I cannot for the life of me see that there is any justification for such a move.

I might remind the House that, when the parent Act was first introduced to this House in November 1937, much was made by the members who then spoke of developing an institute that would have a research capacity. Indeed, very laudatory comments were made from all sides of the House. It was a Bill which at that stage received bipartisan support. One of the comments of the then Premier, Mr Butler, was this:

The establishment of this institute is without precedent in Australia, and marks a great step forward in its encouragement of medical and veterinary scientists in their fight against disease. By its action this State has once more taken the lead, as so often in the past, in a movement which seems likely to benefit not only our own people, but possibly others throughout the world.

Such grand vision and such grand imagination of course is now curtailed to the pedestrian in this legislation. I hope that the Minister would see fit to give an indication to this House that the institute is still being sought after as an institute of research imagination.

The other point I wish to make is that the aim of the parent legislation, clearly, when talking about the function states:

Research into the diseases of human beings and animals and into problems connected with such diseases.

The focal point of that aim is the word 'diseases', not 'human beings' or 'animals'. In other words, it attempts to say 'Let us find a problem which affects living organisms and address ourselves to that problem.' In that sense it is entirely logical for all the committees that have reported to date to believe or to state that they believe the veterinary, medical and forensic functions of the institute should be kept in one arena, one institute.

I believe that the comments made by the member for Napier and the member for Mitcham in this regard need to be carefully considered by the Minister, because we are looking at a research facility that is trying to investigate areas of disease or of related matters, and these sometimes can cover a widespread area that not only confines itself to the human animal but also goes to other animals. Some of the papers published by the institute are in recognition of that.

In 1979 there was a paper published by a Mr Ford that deliberately looked at the subject of coccidia of man and companion animals. In other words, it was not something that could have been hived off to the Department of Agriculture to satisfy the Minister of Agriculture, where the paper would have to have been the coccidia of companion animals, and then a fellow researching at the I.M.V.S. into the coccidia of man, and then the two of them hopefully getting together at some stage and linking their papers and making episode one and episode two of the same paper. That clearly would have been quite ludicrous.

That is one area, but there are a number of other areas of some considerable importance that deserve to be looked at from the total living organism viewpoint, not just man *versus* animal.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Ringworm, the member for Mitchell says. What is suggested? Is it that off in the Department of Agriculture empire there will be somebody studying ringworm, who will have to liaise with somebody in the I.M.V.S. studying ringworm? Hydatids is a very serious disease that is not taken seriously enough in this country. Hydatids, can kill human beings and can also have a serious effect on animals and is not something that limits itself. It does not departmentalise itself into one category of living organisms; it does indeed spread and covers man.

I refer to the diseases suffered by some people who work at the abattoirs over a wide range. They result from contact with animals at the abattoirs, and yet we are now being told that one area can look after it to the exclusion of one aspect of it while another area looks after another aspect of it. I think seriously it is more logical for us to develop and maintain a research facility that seeks to cover the ambit of all those areas.

I was intrigued to read a statement, referring back to when the Bill was introduced. I am sorry the Minister of Agriculture is not here; he does hate history and this might have irked his ire somewhat. It was said by the then Premier:

We all appreciate how difficult it is for an institute of research to be established on a satisfactory basis if there are two or three controlling bodies, or if it is compelled to adopt the usual routine of ordinary Government offices.

I suppose the then Premier, Mr Butler, must now be rotating in his interment because that is precisely what is now happening. We find that it is now proposed that the research of this institute will be established under two or three controlling bodies and—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I think that must have been the case. Even if, as the Minister of Agriculture said, and I acknowledged that he is speaking truly, the actual research will still be done at the I.M.V.S., we then have the situation of the many-headed hydra, where we have the body, the people doing the work; we previously had one head, the I.M.V.S., but now the Minister has chopped that head off and created two in its place: one, the Department of Agriculture and, one, what is left of the I.M.V.S. A third head is the Department of Services and Supply. I think we should bear in mind the comments of Mr Butler all those years ago. In the absence of any serious criticism to the contrary as to why that cannot work it needs to be thoroughly explained why any change should be made.

I do not believe that the Minister's second reading explanation explained that, and the answers given today by the Minister of Agriculture did not explain it, either. I look forward with anticipation to finding out the way in which the Minister of Health says that it will take place.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: All the Minister said is that he would like to have it.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: He is a very possessive fellow and likes to increase his Ministerial empire. The Minister of Agriculture knows that he does not have much longer, and he obviously would like to see his Ministerial empire as big as it can get before he goes. The point must be repeated. It is true that many areas of the I.M.V.S. needed close investigation and examination. Full credit must go to the member for Napier, and to the member for Mitcham who assisted, for the way in which they highlighted those issues in the first days of this Parliament. Those issues needed to be raised and needed urgent attention. One can make all the comments one likes about whether it was too late or whether it should have been done years before; that is beside the point. Finally, somebody got down to doing something about it.

I do not dispute that the change is necessary and that we would have had to have some amending legislation before the Parliament to which it could address itself on those issues that it was proposed to change. When there is criticism of a body and then there is investigation of that criticism to try to substantiate or otherwise the allegations that are made, and then recommendations are made, the automatic implication is that one gives consideration to adopting those recommendations as legislation or provide substantive reasons why one does not. In the event, a number of recommendations are not being accepted in this Bill, and that does need ample clarification which, to date, it has not had.

The question that was also raised by the Minister of Agriculture, when he supported the attempt to bring part of the I.M.V.S. under the Department of Agriculture, involves some interesting possibilities. Are we to take that line of thought further? Are we to extend it and be logical? What would then happen to the C.S.I.R.O. under that situation? The Minister referred to the valuable work of the C.S.I.R.O. and the assistance it gives to agriculture. It does very valuable work. Surely the Minister of Agriculture is not suggesting, 'Quick give me a bit of it, let me have some of it, it is doing the work of my department, it would be another nice little pillar for my empire.' Yet, that is the logical consequence of what he is suggesting here.

Let us go further. The Waite Institute, that magnificent facility which is part of the University of Adelaide and is world renowned for the work it is doing, is clearly focused on agriculture. Are we to expect the tentacles of the Minister to reach out to try to clutch that to his bosom?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: What a shocking fate.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It would, indeed, be a shocking fate. The very thought of that would be causing agitation at Urrbrae. What we have is recognition by the parent Act that diseases can cause problems and can indeed be addressed in an attempt to find solutions to those problems. The problems created by those diseases do not compartmentalise themselves into Ministeries. We do not find in anatomical studies that one can see the Minister of Health related diseases, the Minister of Education related diseases and the Minister of Agriculture related diseases; virus, bacteria and all the other little beasts that go bump in the night do not go that way.

The Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science recognises that by carrying it under one umbrella and providing a service function to the variety of Ministeries that may have cause to use it, such as the law enforcement Ministeries, the agriculture Ministry, and the health Ministry. Somewhere in that process one of the Ministeries had to be the parent Ministry; and the Ministry of Health is that, and I fully support that.

I spoke on this when the I.M.V.S. matter was raised in the House in 1980. Many of the questions raised by the member for Napier at that time and by myself have not been fully answered. I hope that during the committee stage some of those problems will be addressed. In opposing the move to hive off the administration of the veterinary research capacity to the Department of Agriculture, I do not in any way want to undermine or speak ill of the work of those facilities within the Department of Agriculture which do research work for various areas of agriculture. It addresses itself on a commodity basis to certain topics. Indeed, I have one in my own electorate, the Parafield Plant Introduction Centre and the Parafield Poultry Research Centre, and when it has open days when one can get in to see that place—which in my case is officially never I find that the work it does is admirable and worthy of commendation. I do not want to undermine—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't tell me you went without an invitation.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I went as a member of the public, but now it is closed to the public. It goes to all ends to stop me from getting in there. That is unfair, though the Minister of Agriculture has apologised to me in this regard, and I accept his apology. I know that the Hon. Mr Chatterton will correct that when the next fair is held.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It wasn't that they didn't mean it, they hated to be caught meaning it.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I believe that the Minister was genuinely chagrined. Very good work goes on in the research centres of the Department of Agriculture, but by and large they are commodity based and have an immediate commodity economic sector base, whereas one cannot, I believe, limit the research capacity of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. In that sense one can say that the type of research that is going on at those commodity-based research centres is of a secondary nature and is immediately feeding into the economy.

The primary source of research upon which it can draw is that which takes place at such places as the Waite Institute, the University of Adelaide and the I.M.V.S.; therefore you have two strata of research, a primary one and a secondary one; let us not confuse those. Yet this Bill would attempt to confuse those by pulling out of the primary sector the veterinary functions of the I.M.V.S. and placing them alongside the secondary sector, strata. I do not believe that that will advance the general research aims of that facility. The Minister has been paying close attention. I am pleased about that and look forward to hearing her remarks. I hope that she addresses herself to all the issues involved, because they are important, and are not to be wiped off

lightly for any political advantage. I hope that this House can reach again the same bipartisan spirit that it had in 1937 when the first legislation went through. The Opposition is eager for that to happen, and I hope that the Minister prevails and makes circumstances suitable for it to happen in 1982.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health):

I am happy to pursue the note upon which the member for Salisbury ended his contribution to the debate. It would, indeed, be good for the institute and for South Australia if Parliament could approach this Bill in a bipartisan spirit and with the intent of maintaining, preserving and improving an institute which has served South Australia very well since its inception. I congratulate the member for Salisbury for doing his homework in a fashion that is characteristic of him, for going back to look at the foundations of the institute and for taking the trouble to study annual reports to which I will refer later when talking about research.

Nevertheless, I am disappointed in the Opposition approach generally because it seems to me that members of the Labor Party have missed the point of the Bill, particularly in their stated opposition to the transfer of the staff of the veterinary science division of the institute to the Department of Agriculture.

One would think that the Government was picking up these people bodily, physically separating them from the institute and isolating veterinary sciences from the institute. However, that is not going to happen, and the whole purpose of this Bill is to preserve the relationship which has existed between medical and veterinary science at the institute, for which it was indeed founded and to which Sir Richard Butler referred in his speech on the original legislation.

Both Labor Party and Australian Democrat members referred to the Wells and Badger Reports and implied that the Government had ignored both those reports. However, that is not the case. Both those reports were carefully studied, and I was intrigued by the suggestion made by the member for Napier that the Badger Committee of Inquiry was a creature of the previous Government. I vividly remember setting up that committee. It was not set up when the Liberal Government came to office. To my knowledge, Professor Badger had not been approached. When I approached him, I got the impression that that was the first breath that he had heard of it. So, I am at a loss to understand the Opposition's taking the credit for the establishment of that committee.

Having carefully studied the Badger and Wells Reports, and accepted the general thrust of the Wells Report, the Government found a paradox in the very first sentence of Wells's first recommendation, which was as follows:

Whilst recognising the need for the institute to retain some independence, the committee has concluded that the institute should be incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act and that veterinary sciences should remain in the institute.

That is to say, Wells recommended incorporation, including the veterinary division. As anyone who is familiar with the Health Commission Act would know, it is not legally possible to incorporate a function under the Health Commission Act that does not deal with human health. The ambit of the Health Commission Act covers services in the human health field, but it does not extend beyond that: it does not extend to veterinary services or agricultural services. So, it would not have been possible legally for the Government to do what Wells, in good faith, recommended.

Mr Lynn Arnold: How do you handle the borderline cases when diseases go across the borderline between animals and humans?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will come to the borderline matter, particularly when we talk about the

research and service division. Neither the Government nor the council of the institute had ever varied from the premise that the veterinary division is best served if it functions in association with the institute's medical division. Indeed, this Bill preserves that joint status of medical and veterinary sciences. We agree that it is imperative that the veterinary scientists are able to relate professionally with their counterparts in the field of medical science, particularly where those fields overlap, as they do so often in zoonoses and areas of public health.

On the other hand, the Government recognised that it could not incorporate the institute's veterinary division with the medical sciences division under the Health Commission Act, as this would have required the health care field to be responsible for policy and budgeting in an area that was the responsibility of another Minister, namely, the Minister of Agriculture. It would have been a quite unworkable situation and, indeed, in legislative terms Wells's suggestion that the Health Commission Act be amended in Parliament rather than through the normal processes of incorporating a body under the Constitution would have distorted the Health Commission Act and given quite undue emphasis within it to a single health authority. It would probably have meant pages and pages of the Health Commission Act relating to the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and that would not have been possible.

Again, I stress that it is not possible for the human health field and the health authority that administers that field to be responsible for animal health and other matters relating to stock husbandry, and companion and sporting animals. So, if one looks at the Wells recommendation as an option, whatever its philosophical merits, one sees that it simply was not a practical possibility.

Of course, that brought the Government to the other alternative that had been advocated by the Badger Committee, namely, that of leaving the institute as a statutory authority under its own Act. Professor Badger recognised, although it was not his brief to conduct an inquiry into the I.M.V.S. (his brief was to conduct an inquiry into pathology services in South Australia), albeit in passing, that there needs to be much greater control of the institute by the health authority in South Australia. I believe he thought that that control could be exerted by placing a Commissioner of the Health Commission on the council.

That seemed to me to be as far as he went, and it was not nearly far enough, as the Wells inquiry found. So, in setting up a statutory authority, the Government sustains Wells's main thrust, namely, to bring the medical division of the institute under the control and direction of the Minister and the Health Commission. At the same time, we recognise that the institute must and should be maintained as a statutory authority.

So, I cannot under-estimate the importance of the maintenance of the statutory authority, the bringing of the medical sciences division under the Health Commission and the importance of keeping veterinary science linked with medical science. When one takes those three propositions, one is left with no alternative but to do what the Government has done in this Bill.

Again, I stress that veterinary science will not be separated from medical science; there is to be no physical isolation. We are going to maintain the relationships that have always existed, but we are, through this Bill, going to bring some more rational approach from the veterinary science point of view. In that regard, I expect that veterinary science in South Australia will benefit enormously from the Government's decision to introduce this Bill.

It is worth stressing when we look at veterinary science that all the funds required to provide a veterinary pathology service in South Australia would have to come from the

Department of Agriculture and not from the Health Commission. It is just not reasonable to expect that a human health authority responsible for a budget of \$400 000 000-odd and for placing emphasis on the human health field could be expected to give priority to the developing needs of veterinary science that must be given if veterinary science is effectively to serve agriculture and its component parts in relation to animal husbandry in South Australia.

So, there has never been any doubt in the Government's mind that the six sections of the institute's medical division should be responsible to the Minister of Health. We are ensuring that the veterinary division will be responsible to the Minister of Agriculture, and it is appropriate that at the same time the veterinary division will remain in the full professional sense within the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. If someone says to a veterinary science worker at the institute, 'Who employs you?', the answer will be, 'I am employed by the Minister of Agriculture, and I work at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science' That means that administrative and financial responsibility for veterinary science lies with the Minister of Agriculture and not the Health Commission.

It should be noted that these proposals imply an expansion of the role of the Department of Agriculture to include responsibility for laboratory animals and laboratory work associated with companion animals, which is a developing field, animals in zoological institutions, animals used in sport, including racing, and some aspects of disease common to humans and animals. I should also stress, as I stressed in the second reading explanation, that it has been made clear to the Minister of Agriculture that users of laboratory animals will require guarantees regarding the quality and quantity of animals available for science in general and for medical science in particular. So the advantages that accrue from this Bill mean that veterinary matters, and particularly policy, will be disentangled from the Health Commission and that veterinary science will become acceptable and directly related to that section of the community which it serves. That is the justification for and the basis of this Bill.

I now refer to the remarks made by Opposition speakers. The member for Napier claimed that his Government was responsible for the Badger Committee, an assertion that I reject. He also said that he and the member for Mitcham were jointly responsible for the Wells and Morris Reports. He certainly overlooked the fact that the deficiencies in the administration of animal experimentation that were uncovered as a result of Parliamentary questioning took place while his Party was in Government. It has never been acknowledged by the Opposition that all those deficiencies that took place occurred before the present Government came to office.

Obviously, there was no awareness at Ministerial or Health Commission level that these actions were taking place, and it is curious to note that the Labor Party has been very quiet about the fact that it was in 1978 that these deficiencies occurred. It is to the Government of the day that responsibility for those deficiencies must be attributed. Of course, when I appointed Professor Morris, an eminent veterinary scientist, to examine those matters, he laid the responsibility fairly and squarely at the feet of those who were responsible—the council of the day, which was answerable, albeit in a general sense, to the Minister of the day, namely the Labor Minister of Health.

The member for Napier suggested that Medibank had produced the millionaire pathologist, and somehow or other pathologists were to blame for this situation. I refer the member for Napier and other members of the House to page 13 of the Badger Report, and I would like to quote what I consider to be a memorable indictment of the

Federal Labor Government's Medibank proposals, because what is written on page 13 really exposes the complete inadequacies of Medibank, the lack of accountability inherent in it, and the fact that Australians have paid dearly for what was an ill thought out scheme that was open to, designed for, invited and motivated abuse. While I do not in any way condone the abuses that occur in pathology, I believe that the system that the Federal Labor Government designed more or less ensured that those abuses would occur. On page 13, the report states:

Under Medibank which began on 1 July 1975 no accounts could be rendered for any pathology tests done for patients in Government hospitals; with a few exceptions, Medibank paid the accounts for all other patients. Patients had nothing to pay. There was no formal constraint on the tests any doctor wished to have done; indeed, the practitioner could himself perform any test and claim the fee listed in the Medical Benefits Schedule. There was no check to ensure that a test was properly performed, nor if it was performed at all. If the doctor bulk-billed Medibank the patient did not see an account and had no real knowledge of what had or had not occurred.

And the Opposition said that pathologists grew rich and abused the system! The system was designed for abuse: no system could have been better designed for abuse than was the Medibank system of 1975. The report continues:

If doctors performed tests on their own patients there was no requirement to provide a written report, so there was no evidence that a test for which a benefit was claimed had, in fact, been carried out. There was nothing to prevent the unscrupulous from producing a written report and claiming a fee without having examined or tested a specimen. There was no check on whether any tests were necessary, or even indicated, or whether the tests performed were appropriate to the patient's condition or far in excess of what might be indicated. These matters were left to the discretion of the person ordering or performing the tests. All this inevitably produced an explosive growth of pathology testing and an expansion of private laboratories to collect their share of the bonanza.

The Opposition has the gall to say that somehow or other all this is the fault of the present Government when it, as a State Government, must have and should have recognised what was happening at the institute during that period. It did nothing. If there were suggestions by the Health Commission towards the end of the 1970s that there should have been an inquiry into pathology services in South Australia, they were very belated, and that inquiry was not set up until this Government came to office.

The member for Napier then referred to the allegations that were made in the House by members of the Labor Party last year. Again, I refer the members who made those allegations to the answers which were given and which vindicated the institute in every circumstance. The member for Napier alleged that the answers were suitably coloured by the people who provided them to the Minister. I reject absolutely the insinuation implicit in that remark that somehow or other there was an intent on the part of any officer of the institute to mislead me or the Parliament. I reject those assertions absolutely, and I believe that the answers to those assertions are probably best summed up in a Ministerial statement that I delivered to Parliament on 6 November 1980, having asked the Auditor-General to investigate some of the allegations that were of a serious nature. In that statement I said:

The assurance by the Auditor-General that the requirements of the Supply and Tender Board in respect of the purchase of equipment—

and that was a matter about which the member for Salisbury made much, if I recall correctly—

have been adhered to by the institute and that the controls over overseas travel—

another matter that the member for Salisbury and the member for Napier raised—

are and have been satisfactory, refutes allegations and insinuations which have been made in this Parliament and in the media in recent weeks.

It is on the record that those allegations were without foundation. The suggestions about overseas travel and the suggestion that the Minister should in future approve overseas travel demonstrate an ignorance of the procedures of government. I can forgive the member for Napier, because he has not served in a Government, but surely his colleagues would have told him that the Cabinet approves overseas travel for officers whose salaries are funded by the Government. The overseas travel that was undertaken by the Deputy Director of the institute over the years preceding this Government's coming to office was in fact approved by the Cabinet of the honourable member's Government. I do not know whether the honourable member is casting aspersions belatedly on the decisions of that Cabinet. All of the proper procedures were followed in respect of overseas travel and tendering, and the proof of that is on record in the Auditor-General's Report. That Labor Party members stand here this afternoon and have the gall to raise again allegations that have been demonstrated to be false shows that the spirit inherent in the closing remarks made by the member for Salisbury was very much missing in the speech made by the member for Napier. It does little credit to members opposite to drag up again their pusillanimous attacks on the institute which caused extreme distress to the officers concerned and the Director and which took up untold hours of time and taxpayers' money in meticulous searching of records to ensure that every piece of evidence was uncovered and that in no way was either the Minister or the Parliament misled in the answers.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Surely the right of Parliament is to investigate, is it not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not dispute for one minute the right of Parliament to investigate, but I suggest that the allegations were motivated outside this place, in many cases by malice or for reasons best known to the people communicating with members of the Opposition. The allegations were pursued with relentless vigour, and it seems that despite the fact that they have been laid to rest in this place they are still being pursued by the Opposition.

The member for Napier claimed that there had been little input into the Bill by Badger, Wells or Morris. I have, I believe, already refuted that statement by going through, step by step, the principal recommendations of the two principal reports, that is, the Badger Report and the Wells Report and explained how their recommendations were taken into account by the Government in order that they be incorporated in the Bill.

The hiving off of veterinary sciences to the Department of Agriculture and the transferring of the forensic services to the Department of Services and Supply is opposed by the Opposition for reasons which, to my mind, have no substance. I repeat that we are not separating the veterinary officers from the institute. They will still be working at the institute; they will still have that professional relationship with the institute, but for reasons which I have outlined and which are valid they will be employed by the Minister of Agriculture. In that regard the unique character of the institute, far from being destroyed, as the member for Napier suggested, will be enhanced and there is nothing inconsistent with either the Badger Report or the Wells Report in this Bill when the justification and the logical progression of the Government's decisions are taken into account, when the second reading explanation is carefully studied (and I doubt that it was), and when my remarks earlier today are studied.

The suggestion that the Director, Dr Pat Harvey, of the Department of Agriculture, was somehow behind this is absolutely ludicrous and does no credit whatsoever to the member for Napier: the Government has made this decision.

In fact, when, as the Minister of Health, I put proposals to Cabinet, the Minister of Agriculture had to seriously consider them. There was no push on his part in any way whatsoever to assume control of the veterinary officers of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. I also reject the member for Napier's comments about the Director of the I.M.V.S. (the immediate past Director, Dr Bonnin) as having lost his touch and his enthusiasm. Anyone who has known Jim Bonnin knows that his enthusiasm for the institute, for pathology, and, indeed, for life has never diminished and I believe never will be diminished. He certainly suffered cruelly at the hands of the Opposition in the attacks that they made on the institute that he built to a level of pre-eminence.

I regret very much that his final months at the institute were dogged by those cowardly attacks which caused extreme distress to him and his officers. I repeat my tribute to Dr Bonnin as being the architect of the institute's pre-eminence. I regret very much, also, that at the time the institute was under attack the medical and scientific establishment of Adelaide, which came so enthusiastically to pay tribute to Dr Bonnin upon his retirement, did not see fit to defend him.

The member for Napier referred to clause 27. The Government will deal with that in more detail in Committee. The honourable member queried why employees of the institute, for industrial purposes, should be employees of the Health Commission. I invite the member for Napier to study the Health Commission Act, which was introduced by his own Party when in Government and which has a similar provision designed to ensure that the State's health authority acts on industrial matters for all people employed in the health field. There is a very important reason for that, recognised by the Labor Government, namely, that it is important that all employees in the health industry, as one could call it, be considered within the context of that industry and not in isolation.

The institute, of course, employs scientists, microbiologists, clinical biologists, and people who have very strong relationships with officers and other classifications working in hospitals, health clinics, and in the commission itself. It is essential that their industrial issues be dealt with in the framework of industrial issues affecting all other staff working in the health services, and that is the reason for clause 27. Indeed, clause 27 is integral to the Bill and to the whole concept of control by the Health Commission and by the Minister of Health. There is nothing sinister whatever about that clause. I hope that in Committee the member for Napier will come to agree with the logic and sense of that.

Mr Hemmings: When you agree with the logic and sense of our amendment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: We will see in Committee. The question of research was raised by the member for Napier, and it was also dealt with at greater length by the member for Salisbury. I want to stress to both those members and to other members of the House that there will be no constriction of the research capacity of the institute. We would expect that the research functions of the institute will continue in the future as they have in the past, with the added hope that they might improve because of the improved relationship with the universities, as recommended by Wells, account of which was taken in preparation of this Bill, and administratively by the commission, and also due to the improved opportunities which will result from the greater involvement of the Department of Agriculture.

It should be understood (and I am not sure whether the member for Salisbury appreciates the fact) that research is not controlled or directed by Government departments. It is funded by departments, but it is generated from the

minds of research workers. I would be the first to recognise that a climate which encourages research can be established by legislation just as it can be destroyed by legislation. I believe that this Bill seeks to create a climate that will encourage research.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That was the intent in the parent legislation, but the amending legislation does not provide for quite the same in that regard.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I reject that. I believe that the amending legislation does provide that, albeit in different words, and probably with a slightly different emphasis. It must be remembered that we are, after all, 30 or 40 years on from when the original Act was proclaimed.

Mr Lynn Arnold: But look at those words carefully.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As the member for Salisbury would know, research is funded through many resources, including Government departments, granting-giving bodies and industry. It is interesting and perhaps ironic that the member for Salisbury, who was so critical of the acceptance of research funds from industry which financed overseas trips for the Deputy Director of the institute, should now be saying that he is worried about the future research functions of the institute, because the future research functions of the institute will only be able to be maintained if industry as well as Government continues its support in the future, as they have done in the past.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before the dinner adjournment I was referring to the Opposition's comments about the alleged downgrading of the research function of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science under this new Bill. I was making clear to the House that the fears that the Opposition has expressed that research will be downgraded are not justified and that will certainly not occur. The member for Salisbury referred to research, as identified in the annual report of the institute for 1979, conducted by Dr Conyers. That research is directed towards disturbances in the metabolism and how these relate to human disease, for example, renal stone formation; in other words, a direct relationship between research and service provisions.

The research also deals with the relation of metabolism of nutrients to malignancy, for example, Ketosis and its effect on cancer cell growth. Again, that is research that is directly related to service provision. It is important to recognise that the ways of applying this information to the diagnosis and management of human disease is very much directed to the services that the institute provides.

The member for Salisbury may not be aware (indeed, the House may not be aware) of the breadth of pathology services which the institute provides, and it is worth identifying the functions of the various divisions of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in order to explain that breadth of service provision which is linked with a similar breadth of research capability.

There are six medical divisions. The Division of Clinical Chemistry is concerned with a diverse range of biochemical tests on body fluids, chiefly blood and urine. Many disease processes affecting the body are reflected by biochemical changes in blood and urine. The chemical data can assist in or confirm a diagnosis, determine the course of a disease, or assist in therapy to control a disease. Certain chemical tests have application in public health and industrial medicine, for example, tests for insecticide poisoning and management of blood lead. That is a service provision function of that division. I am sure the honourable member can envisage the enormous potential for research that is embodied in that service provision function.

The Division of Clinical Microbiology is concerned with services for the diagnosis of bacterial and parasitological infections in humans. The division undertakes investigations of notifiable infections which are a risk to the community. These investigations may involve the testing of specimens from infected individuals, food, water or other materials as necessary. The division provides a number of highly specialised services for the State. These include the Salmonella Reference Laboratory, which has an important public health role and indeed is recognised nationally and internationally; the Food Hygiene Laboratory, which investigates the bacterial qualities of food; the Media Section, which prepares on a commercial scale materials to assist in the growth and identification of bacteria; and the Phage Typing and Infection Control Laboratory which is involved in the identification and control of nosocomial infections within hospitals and enclosed communities—again, a massive field of potential for research.

The Division of Haematology is concerned with the diagnosis of disorders of the blood cells and the coagulation system. The staff are also involved in the diagnosis and management of a large number of disease states, including specific conditions, such as the anaemias and leukaemias. The Division of Tissue Pathology is concerned with providing a variety of pathological services which are predominantly concerned with the examination of human tissue samples obtained by minor or major surgical procedures, or at autopsy. This division has a major involvement in undergraduate and postgraduate medical education through its association with the University of Adelaide. It also has supervised the forensic pathology and biology services which are sections of this division. It has a number of highly specialised departments, some of which provide unique services for South Australia. Shortly I will refer to the forensic pathology issues in this Bill and the relationship between the new structure for forensic pathology and the universities. Suffice to say that the breadth of range of research that is pursued by the Tissue Pathology Division is considerable.

Nuclear medicine, which I think the member for Salisbury referred to, is an interdisciplinary speciality involving medicine, physics and chemistry in the utilisation of radioisotopes for diagnostic purposes. This division has a radiopharmacy production area which supplies isotopes for diagnostic purposes to other South Australian hospitals. The Division of Medical Virology is concerned with the diagnosis of viral diseases of all systems of the body. There are areas of specific interest and knowledge which involve hepatitis, respiratory infections (including Q Fever), German measles and other congenital infections. It has an important role in patient management, public and industrial health.

The Division of Veterinary Sciences provides a wide range of veterinary pathology services, with sections dealing with veterinary bacteriology, parasitology (which I think was also mentioned by the member for Salisbury), haematology, biochemistry, virology, morphological pathology and immunology. It provides the laboratory services for the Department of Agriculture, and for veterinarians practising within the State, Government and industry.

That summary of the functions of the various divisions of the institute, I believe, satisfactorily answers the questions in the mind of the member for Salisbury about the alleged limiting effect of the new Bill in respect of clause 14 (2) on the research functions of the institute. Clause 14 (2) says in part:

The institute may—

(a) conduct research into fields of science related to the services provided by the institute;

I hope that, by identifying those services, I have reassured the House that the institute's research role is in no way

diminished by this Bill. It certainly would not be the intention of the Government in any way to curtail or restrain research functions in the institute.

At the same time it must be recognised that it is only responsible resource management to link service provision with research; they are interdependent anyway, and in teaching hospitals it is virtually impossible to separate financially a research and service provision, because the two are mutually dependent; they are being conducted at the same time and often for the same reason, and the fact that the institute's role in service provision is so broad means that its role in research would also be broad.

I should also say that, by linking research to service provision, the institute council is empowered, and the Health Commission, through its overseeing role, is empowered to ensure that research scientists do not go off rocketing into outer space, as one might say, on projects which are unrelated and never could be related to the function of the institute.

Mr Lynn Arnold: The council of the institute can determine whether something is irrelevant and unnecessary; it does not have to be linked to a service provision. The council of the institute is a responsible body, so it could determine whether something is irrelevant and flippant.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, it could and indeed it has. This clause makes provision for that research to be conducted. The second part of clause 14 (2) states:

the Institute may—

(a) . . .

(b) provide the University of Adelaide, the Flinders University, or any other authority or person approved by the institute, with facilities for conducting research of the kind referred to in paragraph (a);

That also should be a reassurance to the honourable member that the continuing role of the universities and the vigorous pursuit by the universities of research functions is inextricably inter-linked with the institute through this field, and virtually guarantees that there will be continuing demand by both universities for access to the institute's facilities in order to pursue research. The final paragraph of that clause states:

The institute may—

(c) provide assistance to tertiary education authorities in teaching in fields of science related to the services provided by the institute.

That recognises the realities of the 1980s, and it is different from the expression of 'function' as laid down in the 1937 legislation. It broadens the research functions of the institute to take account of work that may be being done, for example, at the South Australian Institute of Technology, or any other tertiary institution. I have gone into this research matter in some detail, because I recognise its importance, and I want to reassure the House that neither the Parliament nor the South Australian community need have any fear that the research functions of the I.M.V.S. will be in any way diminished by this Bill.

The Minister of Agriculture, when he spoke, dealt at some length with the importance of agricultural research by quoting the speech which his Director-General gave to employees of his department, and indeed foresaw the possibility of enlarged research functions for agriculture. As I said earlier, when limited funds are being distributed by a health body, namely the Health Commission, for human health, the possibility that veterinary research could somehow be given a lower priority is real. The way this Bill is structured will ensure that the real priorities of veterinary science will be given due regard and that is likely to lead to an expansion rather than a reduction of veterinary research.

The next issue which the Opposition dealt with, albeit not at great length, and which the member for Mitcham dealt with, was the question of forensic services. Whilst the

concept of a co-ordinated and integrated body was supported, there was opposition to the administration of the new forensic division by the Department of Services and Supply. The member for Napier said there should be a close relationship between forensic pathology and the University of Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of audible comment is embarrassing to the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Mitcham made some reference to the possibility that forensic pathologists would be separated from their professional brethren. I think that was the expression he used. This will not be the case. I think members may be under the misapprehension that forensic pathology is currently conducted within the confines of the institute. It is not. Forensic pathology services are provided in Divett Place, where forensic pathology and biology have their facilities, and where the Department of Services and Supply has its forensic chemistry division. The proposal under this Bill is that those three sections shall be integrated into a single division, and that of course is right in line with Wells, who said on page 68 of his report:

It is highly desirable that there be justifiable public confidence in the impartiality, professional integrity and expertise of the forensic medical, biological and scientific services.

Wells makes the very sound point that it becomes more difficult to believe in the impartiality of such forensic services if they are administered solely by or very closely in association with the law enforcement agencies. He goes on to say:

To safeguard the impartiality of the forensic medical services it is therefore important that they be administered by authorities seen to be unlikely to be directly influenced by or to have the same priorities as the law enforcement agencies, and to maintain the objectivity of the forensic medical staff it is important that they have frequent working contacts with their peers in closely related fields of non forensic expertise.

Further down in paragraph 14.1.4, Wells says:

When considering the balance of advantages of options for administering forensic medical services, a prime concern must therefore be to avoid professional isolation of the forensic pathology staff.

That is exactly what this Bill ensures. The three sections (forensic pathology, biology and chemistry) will be linked together by being part of an integrated and co-ordinated division which is administered quite separately from any law enforcement or law agency.

It would not have been appropriate to transfer forensic chemistry from the Department of Services and Supply into the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, but it is appropriate, in the belief of the Government, to transfer pathology and biology into the Department of Services and Supply to ensure that they are operated in a co-ordinated manner. The Government regards this decision in regard to a forensic division as being absolutely critical to the effective pursuit of justice at a time when advancing technology means that the law must be equipped, both through defence and prosecution, to meet those new technologies. It may well be that this division which is being established under this Bill ultimately could become an institute in its own right. That is certainly something for the future and something for a future Government to determine, but at least the foundations for that are being laid in this Bill.

As far as the relationship with professional peers goes, the House perhaps needs to be assured that the Government recognises that it is necessary, for the purposes of maintaining a high standard training programme for forensic pathologists and to ensure that there is continuing education and peer review, to maintain this through the universities. That is what is proposed. Arrangements have been made for training programmes to be conducted with the support of Flinders University, the University of Adelaide, and the I.M.V.S.,

so the House can be assured that the relationship that forensic pathologists, biologists and chemists should have with their professional peers will be maintained.

I think it was the Badger Report which identified, in very sensitive fashion, the way in which people working in the forensic field can become isolated from their peers. It is a difficult field in which to work; it is often a brutal field in which to work. It tends not to attract practitioners in large numbers. If we are to ensure that the people working in the forensic field have access to their peers and maintain a balanced approach to their profession, we need to make certain that their work is carried out in consultation with academic people and those who are working in normal service provision.

I want to refer the House to what Professor Badger and his committee said about forensic work, because it certainly bears repeating. Anyone who reads the Badger Report will find good sound sense talked about forensic services. The understanding shown by Professor Badger and his committee has, I believe, been reflected in the Government's decision in regard to this Bill.

The member for Mitcham expressed some reservations about animal welfare as it might be considered by the Department of Agriculture as distinct from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. It is ironical that the member for Mitcham should raise that point because, had he referred to page 18 of the Morris Committee Report, he would have noted that the unauthorised use of the operating theatres about which he complained in Parliament and the experimentation conducted on dogs was done by visiting surgeons; in other words, it was done by medical people.

Professor Morris refers to the failure of these surgeons to provide adequate post-operative care and supervision of the animals that had been subjected to surgery. So, I think that it is scarcely appropriate to hold up medicos as the prime example of people who will exercise care and all the necessary moral scruples in the treatment of animals because, unhappily, experience does not demonstrate that this is the case. What is required is an overall ethic pervading the use of animals for medical and scientific purposes, and Professor Morris stresses time and again that the people who understand and promote that ethic are veterinary scientists. They are the people who are trained and who have a commitment to the well-being of animals.

It is worth noting on page 21 of his report Professor Morris's comment that the ethical level of animal experimentation and the care of animals at the institute by 1979-80 was, in his judgment, as high as that at any research institute in Australia. He went on to say, 'It is higher still today.'

Again, I must emphasise that animal experimentation is conducted primarily by medical scientists for medical purposes, and that will continue to be the case. It will still be conducted at the institute by medical scientists, but the direct supervision of the animal operating theatres will be covered by a veterinary scientist. That is what Professor Morris recommended, and that is the way in which the Government believes that it should be. We have every confidence in the Department of Agriculture and its employees to ensure that the ethics of animal experimentation are pursued with great vigour not only at the institute but also wherever else that animal experimentation is carried out.

That is the very reason why veterinary scientists are being appointed to the Animal Ethics Committee of the other hospitals in South Australia that conduct animal experimentation. In this respect, I refer to the Flinders Medical Centre, the Children's Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In order to reassure the member for Mitcham—

Mr Gunn: Of course, as usual, he's not here.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member has chosen to miss the rest of the debate after his rather cursory contribution earlier this afternoon.

An honourable member: He's home in bed.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am not sure where he is. However, the honourable member should speak to veterinary scientists and recognise that it is their insight into the needs of animals that needs to be brought to bear in relation to animal experimentation. Therefore, the Government's move is to be applauded, because it is consistent with the recognition of the expertise that veterinary scientists have in this area.

To conclude and to reiterate the statements that I have made earlier in this speech, the Bill ensures that the Wells recommendations in respect of the need for accountability by the institute to the Minister of Health and to the Health Commission is guaranteed. At the same time, the Bill ensures that the affinity between veterinary science and medical science, which has been the unique character of the institute since its foundation, will continue.

I can understand that, although the Government has had the benefit of reaching decisions about this Bill over a period of considering all options, whereas the Opposition has simply had a matter of days to consider it, it is probably a new, and is possibly seen as a radical, thought. However, the Government believes that it is absolutely consistent with the original ideals embodied in the foundation of the institute. It is absolutely consistent with modern-day requirements for the highest possible degree of accountability, which certainly did not occur during the 1970s but which must occur in future. It is absolutely consistent also with the need to ensure continuing high standards of both service provision and research, and in all its aspects the Bill strengthens the concept of an independent institute established to provide medical and veterinary service to South Australia.

I feel quite sure that, when the Opposition has considered in depth the outcome of these proposals, and when it realises that veterinary science, medical science and service provision can only benefit, it will continue, as it has done to this date, to support the Bill and to ensure that that by bipartisan approach to which the member for Salisbury referred is carried on not only through this Committee but also in the Upper House and that the new institute (as we might call it) faces the future with confidence, as I am certain it will do and is well justified in doing.

This is in many ways an historic debate because, when one looks at the institute's history, its uncertain beginnings, its interruptions as a result of the war years, its expansion and development under the guidance of Dr Bonnin, and its tensions, pressures and traumas over the past couple of years, I believe that we are now seeing the institute emerging on a new foundation which perhaps in decades to come will be recognised as having been right for the times.

I do not say that it will always be right, because times change. In years to come there will need to be further adjustments but, for the times as they stand, the Government believes that this Bill provides the answer to the challenges facing the institute, and I am sure that the institute will meet those challenges successfully.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Transitional provisions.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I think it can be rightly said that this is the key clause to the view of the Government and the Opposition on this Bill. The Minister, in reply to my contribution and that of the member for Mitcham and the member for Salisbury, has certainly failed to understand

clause 5. The Minister said that all it really means is that there will be a transfer of officers from the veterinary and forensic areas of the I.M.V.S. We do not see it that way, and we believe that we have the overwhelming weight of professional opinion in our favour.

The Minister of Agriculture read at length from a paper prepared by one of his officers dealing with the situation that would apply under clause 5. What we have to offer to the House is the overwhelming weight of professional opinion that was given in submissions to the Badger Committee and the Wells Committee. Without being repetitious (because I believe that I covered that area quite fully in the second reading stage), perhaps I can say that both committees received overwhelming evidence that the veterinary and forensic areas of the I.M.V.S. should not be taken away from the operations of that centre. We are not talking about whether salaried officers should suddenly come under the Public Service Act, or anything else. That comes into it: there is no doubt that the Minister has made no mention of that, and I have not mentioned it to date, but there is dissension and concern among those people presently employed by the institute, not in relation to the fact that conditions of employment, salary, leave entitlements and all of the other benefits of their office will be preserved, but because they believe that they will be moved under the restrictions of the Public Service. That point came out time and time again from the Wells Committee and the Badger Committee.

The Minister said that we fail to understand the Bill, that the people employed under those provisions will be satisfactorily catered for, and so there is no need to worry. However, there is a lot of concern, and, on reflection, after reading the reports over and over again, and after listening to the contributions of members on this side, the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Agriculture, I believe that perhaps the best way in which we could have approached the matter, bearing in mind the plea of the member for Salisbury for a bipartisan approach and the Minister's concurrence, would be to set up a Select Committee. As I said, there is overwhelming evidence from two different committees and from entirely different groups of people who received submissions from all those concerned in the field that this area should not be hived off to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Services and Supply.

We believe that this is the key clause in the Bill, although other areas should be considered. We oppose the clause quite strongly, and I hope that, when I move my amendment, the Minister can give a better explanation than she gave in reply to the second reading debate. It is not a question of the Opposition's misunderstanding this clause, despite the fact that the Minister believes that we do not understand these matters and has gone to great lengths to spell that out. We do understand, but the difference between the viewpoint of the Opposition and that of the Government is that we are prepared to listen to professional opinion and not the opinion put forward by the Minister of Agriculture, which was prepared by an officer of his department, and who, obviously, would be biased.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: He was a professional.

Mr HEMMINGS: He was a professional, but it was biased. It has been the long-term aim of the Department of Agriculture to get the veterinary science area out of the I.M.V.S. and into that department. That is a proven fact, and it was stated in the Badger Report as well as in the Wells Report. Despite the Minister's castigating me for referring to Mr Pat Harvey, I point out that that has been Mr Harvey's course of action over the past three or four years within the institute. The result of the institute's deliberations bears out that the department of veterinary science has been downgraded, and the Minister cannot deny that.

I will leave it at that. I believe I canvassed the argument fully in the second reading stage. I move:

Page 2, lines 8 to 22—Leave out subclauses (3) and (4).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes the amendment. As the member for Napier said, this clause is central to the Bill. The purpose of the Bill is to maintain an integrated institute, to bring the medical functions of it under the control of the Minister of Health and the Health Commission, and to ensure continuation of a high standard of veterinary services. This clause is the backbone (if you like) of the Bill. Without it, the Bill, the institute, and the recognition of the need for accountability to the Health Commission are swept out the window. There is no way the Government can accept this amendment. The member for Napier bases his arguments very strongly on the Wells Report.

Mr Hemmings: And on the Badger Report.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I would like to refer to those reports and to place the statements made in those reports in the context of this Bill, bearing in mind that neither Wells nor Badger envisaged the continuation of an institute that was answerable, through its medical functions, to the Minister of Health and the Health Commission and, through its veterinary functions, to the Department of Agriculture. I suggest that that was an imaginative and sensible concept, which was not canvassed by either of those reports, yet I venture to say that it is a concept of which both committees could have approved.

The question of veterinary services is dealt with on page 59 of the Wells Report. Wells makes a number of statements about veterinary services that the member for Napier may well quote in support of his argument to oppose the transfer of veterinary officers to the Department of Agriculture. However, when one looks at those arguments of Wells, one sees that they are taken account of in this Bill. For example, paragraph 12.2.1. dealing with the integration of veterinary services with the medical structure of the institute, states:

As a result of continued close liaison with seven disciplines (Bacteriology, Biochemistry, Haematology, Immunology, Morphological Pathology, Parasitology, Virology) of the medical sciences, there is a high order of sophistication of veterinary technology rarely seen elsewhere in this country . . .

That is true, and this Bill ensures that that situation will continue. We are not picking up the veterinary division and removing it from the institute—degutting the institute so to speak—and transferring the whole thing to Gilles Plains or Urrbrae or wherever else one might like to suggest, but those veterinary services are left in the institute, albeit administered by the Department of Agriculture. Wells goes on to say:

There were many expressions of concern at the possible loss of this quality and a depression of effective research if the services were moved to agriculture. Comments included those from country veterinary practitioners and the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated.

Again, because the Bill preserves that relationship, the arguments of the Opposition are negated. In fact, the Minister of Agriculture has advised me that the United Farmers and Stockowners of South Australia Incorporated has indicated its support for the proposition because it can see under the new structure that its needs are likely to be responded to in a more sensitive and prompt fashion because the 'user pays' principle, the 'client is king' principle, is going to be more effectively established and maintained under the proposed new arrangements than under the existing arrangements. At page 60 of the report Wells goes on to say:

The epidemiological aspects of disease control and prevention are of great significance in veterinary medicine and directly relate to the prevention of disease in humans. The laboratory procedures are identical.

That is true, and those aspects and benefits outlined by Wells are being maintained by the Government's proposal as embodied in this Bill. Again, in subparagraph 5 on page 60 of the report it is stated:

Continued integration produces standards of experience, reliability and quality control unlikely to be affordable in a Department of Agriculture alone.

The Government recognises this; that is why it is doing what this Bill ensures, namely, providing for a continued integration. The veterinary scientists currently working at a laboratory bench next to medical scientists will, after this Bill is passed, continue to work at the same stations next to the same medical scientists, and the relationship between the two will be maintained, and these, of course, are the principal points with which Wells dealt, which the Government has recognised and which are being incorporated in this Bill. At paragraph 8 Wells goes on to say:

A close physical relationship is essential for some of the joint investigations and procedures which transfer would eliminate or render them more difficult to perform.

Presumably, Wells envisaged a physical transfer. That is not going to happen, and the close physical relationship will be maintained. Wells goes on to talk about conjoint reference centres for disease surveillance, for example, for salmonella, arbovirus and trace elements. Wells refers to public health and medical procedures requiring animal expertise; he talks about the interrelationships of human and veterinary medicines, and he talks about the critical role of veterinarians in the oversight of animal laboratory facilities.

Virtually all the points that Wells made in support of retaining the veterinary science division within the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science are sustained, maintained and reinforced by this Bill. That is one aspect of the argument. The other aspect of the argument, which I agree is a very important one, concerns the issue of what the member for Napier describes as the 'transfer' of I.M.V.S. veterinary staff to the Public Service with all the 'restrictions', which I think was the word he used, that that implies, particularly in regard to opportunities for advancement. I want to assure the member for Napier and the Opposition generally that the opportunity for advancement of ancillary staff is assured—and I take it that the honourable member is talking about ancillary staff, because the opportunities for advancement of professional veterinary staff will be no different. The relevant clause in the Bill guarantees portability between the Public Service Act, the I.M.V.S. Act, and the Health Commission Act without any loss of accrued leave rights.

Therefore, if any officer currently employed at the I.M.V.S. has the appropriate qualifications, he or she will be able to apply for the relevant promotional position, whether it be in the medical or in the veterinary area; there will be no constraints whatsoever on the opportunity for career advancement between medical and veterinary science. The officers concerned will have access to the notices advertising promotional positions; any perceived barrier to career advancement is psychological rather than actual. In the future the opportunities for advancement will be no different from what they have been in the past.

Mr HEMMINGS: What the Minister has just said is the most selective piece of extraction from a report that I have ever seen in this place. The Minister was correct in what she quoted from the report, but she continually said that Wells talked about this, that, and every other thing. However, there is no getting away from the fact that the final recommendation is that:

The division of veterinary science within the institute remain a division of the institute and that the status of the division should be lifted to restore relativity with the medical divisions.

The Minister mentioned people working alongside other people in the veterinary field and people in the medical field working alongside others and she said that everything was to remain the same. Nowhere in the Bill, apart from in the amendment that the Opposition intends to move later, is the lifting of the status of the veterinary area mentioned. The Minister chooses to ignore that. We are concerned about the fact that two very competent committees came forward with a firm recommendation. In fact, if one looks at the recommendations in the Badger Report and the Wells Report it can be seen that they are almost identical.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They are not, you know. They are in conflict on a lot of matters.

Mr HEMMINGS: They are in conflict on some small areas, but with regard to the main recommendations of the Government of the day, they are almost identical. The Minister said how well the veterinary side could work under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture, which is what it is all about; it is not about people working within the Public Service—they are working under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture. If one looks at the figures concerning the percentage of work carried out for the Department of Agriculture, contained in Appendix G of the Wells Committee of Inquiry Report, it can be seen that just 18.8 per cent of work was done for the department as opposed to 54 per cent for private veterinarians.

The member for Salisbury covered this quite adequately in his second reading speech. If the veterinary pathology services goes away from the director of the I.M.V.S. to the Department of Agriculture then that unique reputation that I talked about earlier on will be lost. For the life of me, the Minister has not been able to explain it nor has the Minister of Agriculture, and we still stand by the fact that if this takes place there will be problems accruing in the years to come.

Mr EVANS: I cannot support the amendment. The honourable member is concerned that a change is being made and that people will be placed under the Public Service Act. What would be his reaction if that has always been the case? It is only by accident that the Parliament originally decided to take the course that it took in respect of the original Act. There has been much complaint from the Opposition about its operations in recent times, and they continually have attacked personnel within the organisation as well as Ministers of this Government. When changes are made, which a Government and others who advise them believe are important, they start nit-picking because some individuals believe they might be disadvantaged. I do not believe that that attitude is justified.

I advise members opposite that, as much as they want to have a showdown on this clause, they should stop and think about it, because I have never heard them say that any other section or group of people who work in Government areas should not come under the Public Service. Of course, there are many who do not, but I have never heard them argue that point before. As the Minister has said, the professional people are covered; they have the opportunity to manoeuvre. So do those who one might consider are the technical support staff; they can still move from one section to the other. They do not lose any of the advantages.

As much as statements in a report from one group might suggest that they do not like that idea, it does not mean that it is wrong. I support the Bill as it stands and I ask the Opposition to stop and think seriously about it and not use it for a political ploy because a few people have made a guarantee to them. Members opposite should stop and think of the overall benefit in the long term. I am sure that if they were in the Government's position they would do so, but for political expedience they argue the other cause.

Mr HEMMINGS: I think the member for Fisher should have kept out of this debate. We are not talking about a few people who feel they might be disadvantaged; we are talking about professional bodies that have made detailed submissions to two committees of inquiry set up by this Government. They are professionals; they are not the people working in the laboratories, but they are not a small group of people. They are people who have come to value the services provided by the I.M.V.S. We are not talking about some clerical officers who may lose some benefits, or some ancillary staff: we are talking about the people who use the facilities of the I.M.V.S. They are saying that they will be disadvantaged. If the member for Fisher says that the only reason we are opposed to clause 5 is that we hope to make some political capital out of it, he should have been in the Chamber this afternoon and listened to the debate. I suggest that he go out and have a crash reading course of the Wells Report and the Badger Report to see exactly what the experts say. We are not talking about public servants; we are talking about the experts, those people who use the facilities. These people are saying that if that service is hived off to the Department of Agriculture it will suffer and ultimately the cost will rise, and that is indicated quite clearly in those two reports.

If the member for Fisher thinks that the reason we are doing this is to get some political mileage out of it, he is mistaken, because I very much doubt whether any of the people who have made submissions to the Badger Committee of Inquiry or the Wells Committee of Inquiry would be Labor Supporters; in fact, in the main they would be Government supporters.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This clause is fundamental to the Bill, and the Government certainly cannot support and accept the Opposition's amendment. The suggestion by the member for Napier that maybe there should be a Select Committee also defies belief. There would scarcely be a body that is subjected to more committees in the past 12 or so months than the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. We had the Badger Committee, the Wells Committee and the Morris Committee, and I think that the Government having had the benefit of the advice of those committees is well qualified to implement that advice in the form of this Bill, which it has done. To suggest a Select Committee would be quite ludicrous on top of all the examination that has already taken place.

The member for Napier quoted the Wells recommendations that veterinary services remain at the institute. Again, I stress that the veterinary services particularly those involving professionals, will maintain their longstanding relationship with the medical sciences in the institute, but it would be impossible, as I have already demonstrated in my reply to the second reading, to implement that recommendation concerning veterinary services while at the same time implementing the principal Wells recommendation, namely, that the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science should continue as a joint medical and veterinary organisation and should be incorporated under the South Australian Health Commission Act by specific legislative amendment. It is not possible to bring a veterinary function under the auspices of an authority which is responsible for human health; you have a paradox which I referred to—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: You cannot have the Health Commission telling the Minister of Agriculture what he should do. It would be a quite untenable situation, and yet everyone in this Chamber recognises that it is absolutely essential for the institute, through its human health services, to be responsible and accountable to the South Australian Health Commission and to the Minister of Health. The member for Napier has referred to the professional organ-

isations and occupational organisations which use the services of the I.M.V.S. and to the submissions which they made to the Wells Committee.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Health Commission does not determine policy for the Department of Mines and Energy, nor does it handle that department's budget. The United Farmers and Stockowners and the Australian Veterinary Association wanted to see the maintenance of the close relationship between veterinary and medical science: this Bill preserves that relationship. The United Farmers and Stockowners (just to reassure the member for Napier)—the users of the services of institute—have indicated their support for this legislation, so that knocks out that argument. I have before me a statement by the State President of the South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association which says:

The article on page 14 of the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 23 February 1982 has quoted Dr Humphris out of context, particularly in relation to the inferred lack of support by veterinarians in South Australia for the change. The association has had some reservations on staff conditions, the quality and scope of service, and these have been resolved in the second reading speech where assurances have been provided. These assurances have been conveyed to individual members of the association. Although the association has not yet formally considered the proposal (as an association) the initial reactions from individual members clearly indicate that there is a considerable measure of support. I hope that the support of the United Farmers and Stockowners and the Australian Veterinary Association (South Australian Division) is sufficient reassurance to the member for Napier that this Bill is supported by the users of veterinary services.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, M. J. Brown, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Hoptgood, Keneally, Langley, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Becker, Evans, Lewis, Olsen, and Schmidt.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—'The council.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 3—

Line 2—Leave out 'ten' and insert 'eleven'.

Line 7—After 'Hospital' insert ', at least one of whom must be a medical practitioner'.

Line 9—After 'Adelaide' insert ', both of whom must be employed in the Faculty of Medicine of that university'.

Line 13—Leave out 'an' and insert 'a veterinary'.

Line 14—Leave out 'Minister of Agriculture' and insert 'South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association'.

After line 17, insert new paragraph as follows:

(ab) one member shall be a member of the staff of the Institute elected by the staff in the prescribed manner.

After line 24, insert new subclause as follows:

(3a) An elected member of the council shall be elected to office for a term of two years.

Line 32—After 'an appointed' insert 'or elected'.

Line 33—After 're-appointment' insert ', or re-election, as the case may require'.

The first and perhaps most important amendment to this clause relates to a staff member being elected to the new council. Many of the problems experienced in the I.M.V.S. over the past two to three years occurred because staff members were not party to any decisions. This caused a lot of unnecessary unrest, and there was no real feedback to the staff. In line with other legislation which the Government

has passed, I am sure there should be no opposition from the Government to a staff member being elected. We say the term of office should be two years, as opposed to four years for the other members of the council. It would show the Government's good faith if it accepted the fact that staff members of the I.M.V.S. should have a voice in the running of the affairs of the council.

The reason for the amendment to line 7 accords with the philosophy behind this legislation as advanced by the Government and with the Opposition's thinking that there should be a predominance of people from the medical fraternity. Too often councils or boards get overloaded with public servants or bureaucrats. We feel in this case that there should be at least someone from the Royal Adelaide Hospital who shall be a medical practitioner.

The amendment to line 9 is in line with what I said about the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I am sure that those people who advise the Minister on this particular Bill will impress upon her that there has to be a predominance of medical people on the council.

Line 13 relates to a person from the Department of Agriculture nominated by the Minister of Agriculture. The original Bill provides that one person shall be an officer of the department, but the Opposition considers that this should be spelt out clearly. I am certain that the nominated person will be a veterinary officer, but the Opposition is merely trying to spell out that it should be a veterinary officer.

Realising the importance of his new role in running the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, the Minister took the trouble (and I say this seriously) to enter into this debate and to read out a paper prepared for him by a competent officer of his department. The Minister may say that he is sure that the person involved will be a veterinary officer, but the Opposition wants the classification to be spelt out.

The amendment to line 14 will result in the words 'Minister of Agriculture' being struck out and 'South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association' being inserted in lieu thereof. The Opposition considers that what has happened in the past in relation to other legislation should happen in this instance. In other legislation, the Government has (and in lots of cases I have applauded the decision) spelt out that a certain organisation shall nominate a person. One of the first organisations that springs to my mind relates to local government, which is another area of my responsibility. This Government, in many Bills that it has introduced, has always included the stipulation regarding the nomination of a person by the Local Government Association. The Opposition considers that in this case the same thing should apply. We consider that a veterinary surgeon in private practice should be nominated by the South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association.

Bearing in mind the document that the Minister produced when we were dealing with clause 5, where the South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association gave qualified support to this measure, the least the Government can do is allow the amendment to pass.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes this amendment, and I will work through the specific suggestions that the honourable member has made and explain why we oppose it. In the first instance, the Government does not propose that a staff member should be elected to the council of the institute. As the honourable member will realise, the Director shall be a member *ex officio*, and that is a new development. That is not the case with the existing council and Director.

The honourable member may or may not be aware that it has been the institute's practice for at least the past 12 months to invite staff observers to attend council meetings. That procedure has worked very well indeed. The Govern-

ment believes that the council as it is constituted in this Bill is the most appropriate body to administer the institute's affairs, and it does not propose to accept any alteration to that position.

Regarding the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the requirement that one of the nominees should be a medical practitioner is unduly restrictive. The Government believes that the Royal Adelaide Hospital board should have the right to nominate two people of its choice, and it does not believe that Parliament should determine the occupation of any one of those two persons. It may well be that there are on the board two people who are not medical practitioners and who could make an extremely important contribution to the council. It is appropriate that the Royal Adelaide Hospital should be the body to determine who those two people should be.

It should be borne in mind that the council is a management body; it is certainly not a medical body. There has never been any shortage of medical people on the council, and I do not foresee that there will be any such shortage in future. Certainly, it is not necessary to constrain the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the manner suggested by the Opposition.

The same arguments go for the University of Adelaide, whose council should not be constrained by Parliament in its choice of nominees. In its wisdom, the council should be able to choose whomever it believes can fulfil the role most effectively and responsibly. I certainly could not accept that we should tell the University of Adelaide what occupational groups should be appointed to the institute's council.

Regarding an officer of the Department of Agriculture being a veterinary scientist, again I do not believe that we should constrain the Minister of Agriculture in respect of a specific occupation. The Minister and the department believe that the officer who is nominated should be a person who is responsible in the department for animal health. That could well be, and might often be, a veterinary scientist, but it need not necessarily be a veterinary scientist. It would be an unacceptable constraint on the department and the Minister if a veterinary scientist was prescribed in this clause.

Regarding subclause (6) providing that one person shall be a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice nominated by the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister has indicated that he will select that person from a panel of three veterinary scientists or surgeons nominated by the Australian Veterinary Association, South Australian Division. So, what the honourable member is seeking to achieve will be achieved, although not in the manner that he is suggesting in his amendment. The Government believes that the composition of the council as laid down in the Bill is appropriate, and therefore opposes the amendment.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 23 February. Page 3042.)

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3—'Registrar to be the officer of court by whom functions related to practising certificates are to be exercised.'

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Playford raised the question in regard to the Government's intention about payment of practising certificates for officers of the Crown. I have had a response from the Attorney-General, who said that it is not the Government's intention to abandon that long-standing practice of meeting the cost of practising

certificates for those Crown officers who are required by virtue of their classification and job specification to appear in court as a legal practitioner.

We understand that the fees of a number of other officers who are not in that category have traditionally been paid, and during the day we have been trying to contact a number of other Government departments to ascertain the practices that they adopt. We did not contact all of them. The Attorney-General has assured me that, although we have not had time to contact all departments, there is no reason at all to vary the long-standing practice, whatever that practice has been, in sectors of Government other than the Attorney-General's Department.

Mr McRAE: The only other matter about which I ask the Minister to supply me with information, obviously at a later date, is whether or not the Government will consider carefully, in view of the various steep increases in charges, a sliding scale of payments, taking into account in the private sector the profit of a practitioner in a particular year or over a span of years, or in the public sector the salary of that practitioner. In relation to the private sector, my request needs no explanation, I believe; in relation to the public sector, when one compares the clerical scales and, for instance, the trade scales, one finds that legal practitioners are worse off.

As I stated to the honourable gentlemen last night, it is quite foolish for someone who has acquired a practising certificate to lose it. It is absolutely appropriate (and I support the Government on this) that those who are making a reasonable living from the profession should pay the full tote odds for the work that is done by the registry in relation to their practising certificate.

I have no objection to that at all. However, I believe there is room for a bit of moderation in relation to those people employed by Government departments on the basis that they have legal knowledge but who do not appear in courts of law. I do not know how the practices in different departments have varied over the years. The Opposition will support this clause and the remainder of the Bill, but it would very much appreciate some advice in due course from the Attorney-General as to the points I have raised.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his support of the Bill, and most certainly I will undertake to obtain from the Attorney-General some expression of consideration of the points raised. I personally had considered this matter and related it not only to the legal practice but also to other practices of which I am aware. There are two payments that members of professions make: one is for a certificate to practise, whether for teaching or, as in this case, the law; and the other is for membership of a professional association, a union, or institute, where very often a sliding scale is implemented. Of course, essentially there is a difference. The first payment referred to is essential for a person to become a practitioner, and the other payment involves voluntary membership. I will convey the honourable member's wishes to the Attorney-General and ensure that he gets some reply.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I wish to draw the attention of the House to the matters which were raised this afternoon in Question Time and which I believe would put paid to the statements that have been bandied by the Opposition in relation to the activity of the Government regarding gas and oil exploration in South Australia. We had the exhibition some weeks ago, as reported in the Labor Party newspaper, the *Herald* of 18 February 1982, as follows:

One of the whipped-up displays of activity came after John Bannon spoke to the Queensland Mines Minister Gibbs about the future of oil discovered on the Queensland side of the Cooper Basin. Gibbs responded reasonably, without giving any undertakings. But South Australia's own Premier 'apologised' for the Labor leader's intrusion. Dr Tonkin apologised to Bjelke-Petersen because Bannon dared stand up for South Australia!

Tonkin said there was no need for Labor to intervene because Mr Goldsworthy had been talking to the Queenslanders about the oil for more than 12 months.

Tonkin's advisers boomed again: the issue was the future of Jackson oil, made only six weeks before! When Tonkin is told to talk big (as he did notably in May last year when he was going to cut off Sydney's natural gas) he invariably makes an even bigger buffoon of himself. But then he is a politician...

That article endeavours to perpetuate the myth being created by the Opposition that the Leader was the first to do something to ensure that any discoveries in the Queensland side of the Cooper Basin would come to South Australia rather than Queensland.

Mr Randall: Which Opposition? There is no-one sitting on the other side.

Mr BECKER: The member for Henley Beach is quite right. Only one person is sitting on the Opposition benches at present, and that is the member for Semaphore. Full credit to the member for Semaphore, who pays diligent attention to his electorate and the sittings of the House, whereas not one member of the Labor Party is present. Obviously, the Labor Party is having further meetings and there is trouble within Opposition ranks; we have been aware within the last week or so that some dispute is going on. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition has a lot of trouble trying to keep the troops in some orderly fashion.

Mr Mathwin: Do you think there is a Caucus meeting going on?

Mr BECKER: There is more than a Caucus meeting, obviously there is a shadow Cabinet meeting, as well.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The member for Hanson is now commenting.

Mr BECKER: The split that is imminent could eventuate. The credibility of the Leader of the Opposition probably took the worst nosedive of all time when the Premier and the Deputy Premier dealt with him in answer to a question today about gas supplies. The annual report of the South Australian Gas Company for the financial year ended 30 June 1981 stated:

The State Governments of Queensland and South Australia are negotiating on the opening up of the prospective Queensland section of the Cooper Basin and exploration has commenced in such areas as the Pedirka Basin.

That, of course, is where the Jackson well was discovered, and the discovery was announced in the *Advertiser* of 24 November under the heading, 'New oil discovery upgrades Cooper Basin potential', as follows:

Delhi said the Jackson No. 1 exploration well, being drilled about 230 kilometres east of the Moomba gas plant, flowed oil to the surface at a daily rate of about 350 barrels.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: South Australia laughs its way to the bank.

Mr BECKER: The Minister of Agriculture is quite right—we are about to laugh all the way to the bank. If the people of South Australia are patient and continue to have faith in the Government, the member for Semaphore, and the member for Flinders, in three years time there is no doubt that we will be able to conclusively prove the benefits to South Australia of the royalties that will flow. There are several areas in the Queensland sector and the report states:

Before the report of yesterday's oil flow, the basin partners had found only traces of oil in the Queensland sector. However, there have been several large and promising gas flows from the Queensland region, including a 215 200 cubic metres a day flow from the Tartulla No. 1 exploration well in August. That find, about 200 kilometres north-east of Moomba, was near the sites of four other wells completed as gas producers.

Therefore, it is now known, and was known on 24 November, and certainly the Government and the South Australian Gas Company knew, that wells had been completed in this basin as prospective gas producing wells. A flow of 215 000 cubic metres a day is a significant gas flow. What the Opposition was going on about today, I fail to see. Certainly, I believe it pulled the biggest boo-boo of all time. It is all very well to say in the Labor journal that the Premier pulled a boo-boo, but there is no way at all that that is true. That is conclusive proof, in my opinion, of how the Opposition Leader and his team are misleading the people of South Australia.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Attempting to.

Mr BECKER: Not only that they are attempting to, but if you throw enough mud a little bit will stick eventually. Probably they are basing their tactics on that theory. The attack is similar to those that we have come to experience from the Labor Party when it is in trouble, as it is at present. Still there is not one member of the Labor Party on the front benches, and I have been talking now for seven minutes.

The Federal member for Hindmarsh, following in the steps of his State colleagues, on 17 February in the Federal Parliament pulled his usual clanger. This time he did not faint, as he did on a previous occasion, when he made reference to the upgrading of the facilities at the Adelaide Airport and mentioned my name as well as those of other members of Parliament. I can assure the member for Hindmarsh that, for 12 years now, as the member for Boothby has pointed out to him, I have been the member who has represented most of the airport area. Mr Steele Hall and I on many occasions have had long discussions on the Adelaide Airport. In the Parliament Mr Steele Hall said:

The member of the State Parliament who the honourable member for Hindmarsh refers to has been most assiduous in giving attention to this problem over the years before the honourable member for Hindmarsh thought of leaving his cosy union job to come into the House of Representatives.

Nothing could be a more accurate description of what is going on. It is the first time that we have had a member for Hindmarsh representing the area who has suddenly recognised that perhaps he can do something as far as the Adelaide Airport is concerned. The member for Hindmarsh wrote to the Premier of South Australia some months ago and reminded him that the airport issue was a Federal matter, implying that State politicians should keep their noses out of it, that the Federal Parliament would look after the issue, and here is the Federal member trying to resolve all the problems! As Steele Hall rightly pointed out, the member for Hindmarsh is a member of the Opposition, without any authority at all, and unable to do anything at all.

What Steele Hall failed to point out was that the committee set up under the Dunstan and Whitlam Labor Governments considered all the implications of the Adelaide Airport, and considered that the facilities were satisfactory

to meet the needs of the people of Adelaide to at least the year 2000. So, there we have it, one Federal Labor member of Parliament obviously at odds with all his other colleagues. No doubt he would be absolutely delighted to see the total absence of Labor Party members during this grievance debate this evening. Even the member for Mitcham went home early to catch up on some sleep, and the only member of the Opposition benches present is the member for Semaphore, who is doing an excellent job, and who, I trust will be returned at the next election, and it is he who will now participate in this debate.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I refer to a matter raised during Question Time concerning blatant discrimination in the provision of effective education facilities in this State. I refer to the Minister of Education's decision depriving the students of the Port Adelaide Adult Matriculation school the services of a student counsellor. As I said, it is a matter of discrimination, as the Port Adelaide school is the only adult Matriculation school in South Australia to be denied absolutely counselling services on site. All other such schools have retained their counsellors; thus it is obvious that these services are considered necessary at all other centres, but not at Port Adelaide.

The Minister's actions are made all the more reprehensible by the fact that, while all other schools have maintained their full-time student counsellors, the counsellor at Port Adelaide was only a half-time counsellor, and now has been completely removed. That action flies right in the face of the Minister's previous comments. He said in this House on 11 February:

The counsellor of the Port Adelaide Adult Education Centre is responsible for counselling people all along the seaboard from Port Adelaide southwards.

That means that no-one studying in that area will have access to a student counsellor. It raises the question of why these cuts have been made at Port Adelaide. Is it a political decision? Is it because the Liberal Party feels that there are no political points to be won, or is it that they wish the end result to be the closure of the school?

The fact cannot be ignored that in July last year a serious attempt was made by the Minister to close down this school. He said at the time that, because of declining enrolments and the disappointing results, the school should be closed, and that anyone from Port Adelaide or from the general area who wished to attend this type of school could go to Kensington. This year the enrolments have increased again, and if he was seriously concerned about the results, surely a responsible Minister would consider it his duty to do his utmost to provide student counselling services for students at these schools.

It is interesting to note that this Government has progressively decreased counselling services of the school at Port Adelaide. From 1976 to 1979 there was a full-time counsellor; in 1980, this Government decided to give the school a half-time counsellor, and now it has taken away the position of counsellor altogether. The Minister has informed me in a letter that the Government has received an amount of \$244 000 from the Commonwealth Government for counselling services, but that needs in the counselling area do not include the requirements of Port Adelaide this year and that counselling at Port Adelaide will be undertaken by existing lecturing staff. I do not know whether the Minister has spoken to the staff at the school, but I can tell him that that idea is certainly not within their thoughts on the matter.

The Education Department has raised several reports on the value of counselling. This decision flies directly in the face of those reports. The report of the committee of inquiry into year 12 examinations in South Australia states:

While 'interviewing' is not seen as a reliable method to be used in selection processes, it may, however, have a role to play in other areas of concern to the committee; the more general notion of 'counselling'.

It says further that it highlights the need to enhance a system of providing students with the information and assistance needed in their decision-making. This has been removed absolutely from the students. A submission to that same committee of inquiry was raised by the Department of Further Education and that report, on page 9, under 'Adult Matriculation' states:

A strong feature of the adult Matriculation provision has been the extensive counselling given to prospective adult students in order to enhance the effectiveness and appropriateness of their study programmes.

That claim is completely unsupported at Port Adelaide. It does not stand up and it has been ignored by the Minister. There are other reports. There was a survey done in September 1981, which, as far as I can see, is about when the decision to deprive us of the student counsellor was made. That survey was by the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia, headed 'A survey of Adult Matriculation Students in South Australia', and it was made by Rosemary Osman and Tim Jones in September 1981. It makes the following clear statement in relation to adult students:

In addition, problems related to lack of time for mature age students raise policy questions concerning the provision of part-time study, evening and weekend classes, courses of different durations or structures, and so on, as well as the issue of counselling on time allocation and subject choice. Problems related to lack of knowledge about the required standards and about self-confidence raise questions concerning the provision of 'bridging courses' in areas such as study skills, mathematics, and so on, as well as adequate counselling and information services.

That again has been absolutely ignored by the Minister. The value of the counselling is reflected in this letter by Mrs Sue Browne, a student of the school. It says:

As a student of 1981, the student counsellor came to my aid on many occasions throughout the year. Whether it be study, relaxation or social problems, she was the proverbial 'shoulder to cry on.' Without her constant reassurance my confidence would have ebbed long before the mid-year exams. The service of a student counsellor, who may I remind you, was only employed on a part-time basis, is a necessity. I find this situation deplorable, and without this service the school's numbers will drop radically.

That is typical of the response that I received. I also have a letter from a group calling themselves 'Friends of the adult Matriculation School, Port Adelaide,' and it states:

Dear Mr Peterson,

I am writing to you on behalf of the Friends, to seek your influence in redressing an injustice perpetrated by the South Australian Government against the people of the Western metropolitan district.

The Government has seen fit to deprive the Port Adelaide Community College of its only counselling service, provided last year by a half-time contract appointee, Miss Linda Aire, whose esteemed services are presently being provided, without remuneration.

A part of her work is involved in the specific area of vocational counselling but the most valued contribution to students' well being, is in the area of personal counselling and the development of study skills. It is especially important that her services be maintained because the people of this district are culturally deprived and their need for assistance and support is greater than it would be in more fortunate districts. I wish to lay heavy emphasis on the fact that despite this, the Port Adelaide Adult Matriculation School is uniquely disadvantaged, being the only one which can offer no specialist counsellor skills. The Minister of Education's most recent ludicrous statement, that Port Adelaide students can go to the D.F.E. information centre to get counselling, is a shining example either of his abysmal ignorance of the role of a counsellor, or a callous disregard of his responsibilities to provide equitable distribution of the State's educational resources.

This glaring injustice is made the more culpable when it is recognised that the Government sought Federal funding for ten counsellors, but provided only eight. Where is the rest of the money and why is Port Adelaide being singled out again for the discriminatory treatment which has long been its historic legacy?

202

I call upon you to use your influence to redress this injustice which any government claiming to be democratic, would be ashamed to acknowledge.

It is sad to note that the first appointment of a counsellor to Port Adelaide was made only after other Adult Matriculation schools had been enjoying the benefits of counselling services...

Time is running out, so I will not quote the rest of the letter.

There is one point I want to raise. There is a campaign that has now been raised by the Friends of the Adult Matriculation School and they have notified the Premier and Minister of this by telegram. A letter from them, under the heading, 'No half counsellor, no Randall, no Government', states:

The Friends of the Adult Matriculation School, Port Adelaide, are understandably incensed at the injustice perpetrated against local men and women by a Government which is reputedly but seemingly hypocritically so staunch an upholder of the high morality of Christian tradition. Members of the group have pledged themselves to unseat their local member for Henley Beach...

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

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): If I could, I would move an extension of time so that I could listen to what the member for Semaphore has to say, but can I assure him that I am well aware of the subject matter which he is quoting and, like him, I have a great interest in it. After all, when one gets a campaign named after oneself one has to take an interest to see what is going on. I can assure the students of Port Adelaide that, regardless of the issues and the resolution of this counsellor's position, there will be Randall after the next election and there will be a Tonkin Government.

Of course, in that respect one would hope that, given the facts that are available, we can aim to achieve the restoration of a student counsellor at Port Adelaide. Of course, there are financial limitations, and I hope at a later stage to explore that area and put on record my impressions.

I stand here as the last speaker for the evening, and it is now 21 minutes since the grievance debate started. I am amazed that we have no Opposition sitting across on the other side of the House, and when one makes points and one is debating I find it incredible and an insult, and I am sure that it is an insult to Her Majesty's Government that there is no one performing the role of the Opposition in South Australia tonight. That should be noted, and one could rightly ask what is the role of the Opposition. Are they performing that role? As we have seen it at this stage, the answer is definitely 'No', because they are nowhere to be seen. I am not too sure whether Standing Orders contain material relating to this matter—

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member raising a point of order?

Mr RANDALL: No, Sir, but I would like to research it later to find out whether it is proper practice to have an Opposition member present, even only one person, or at least somebody should hear the points we are making. I would like to move to another area.

Mr Chapman: Do you think they deliberately walked out on us?

Mr RANDALL: No. I do not think that. I think they may be having a Caucus meeting. The member for Hanson was talking earlier about the Federal member, Mr Scott, and I believe that it is important that we put on record some of his activities, but in such a way that it is a balanced approach to the situation. He has from time to time made headlines on the front page of the papers. On one recent occasion in December, around Christmas time, when people were winding up ready for Christmas celebrations, he came out with some strong statements against Amdel, along the

lines that there had been a spillage of dust on some workers. Mr Scott feared for the health of these men, and he made a statement saying that the Government and the community should be forced to provide protection for these workers. He said pressure should be brought on the Government to move AMDEL out of the metropolitan area. He said that the action reinforced his belief that this area is not safe for residents. That received front page headlines, and put a scare amongst residents in the western region. That is still a much talked about topic in the region of Thebarton. People wonder whether it is safe to live there.

I want to point out to Mr Scott an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* in 1976, which was headed 'Radioactive waste buried at Thebarton dump, says Hudson.' The radioactive waste was buried 23 years ago. The then Minister for Mines and Energy, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, pointed this out to residents of West Thebarton, Ballantyne Street, Osman Street and Brown Street. The report states:

Mr Hudson also revealed that radio-active waste from the University at Adelaide was buried at Maralinga on 29 October 1960.

The Thebarton clay pit holding the radioactive waste is a large overgrown area in the centre of the Amdel establishment.

An Amdel executive said yesterday radiation levels in the area were no different from normal background radiation.

I do not have time tonight to put on record this whole article, but I would say to those who listened to Mr Scott and who may be a little upset about what he is saying to do some research and see what the experts and former Ministers have had to say. If they are not happy that a Liberal Minister is able to reassure people, perhaps they need to refer to a past Labor Government and see what former Ministers have said, because they have also been satisfied that there is no radio-active problem at Thebarton. The sooner Mr Scott gets that message into his thick head, the sooner he will stop scaring people in the area of West Thebarton. Mr Scott has developed this unfortunate tactic, which I believe is gaining him no support.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Didn't he do the same with the airport?

Mr RANDALL: The Minister is quite right. Yes, he is using scare tactics and he did this with G.M.H. just before Christmas. He said that G.M.H. was going to close at Woodville, thus throwing into jeopardy thousands of jobs. Thousands of workers employed at Woodville who live in my electorate and in the electorates of the member for Hanson and the member for Albert Park were upset and worried about their future because a prominent person in the community, John Scott M.H.R. for Hindmarsh, made such a statement. Because they come from a person who is supposed to have a reputation in the community, those sorts

of statements are printed on the front page of newspapers, and it takes some days before the true facts can be revealed.

Take, for example, the uranium case and those men who were supposed to be contaminated by radio-activity. We find three days later, after the tests and scientific analysis have been carried out, that the Minister of Health is able quite clearly to assure those men and members of the community that there was no danger. A report in the *Advertiser* of 23 December 1981 states:

Mrs Adamson said last night the results of the tests showed Labor Party allegations were 'simply scaremongering and politicking which have caused unnecessary stress to the men concerned and their families'.

Our problem in the community is a lack of understanding of radio-activity. Before members of the community begin to get too uptight about radio-activity, we need to go back to some square one basics and look to see what radio-activity is all about. All too often is this evident at local council level, because both the Thebarton and West Torrens councils are also having debates within their own ranks. When one listens to those debates, one finds many of them emotional, based on wrong information, and generally the community at large needs to have a wider education programme.

Mr Scott has turned his attack through CANE, the anti-nuclear group, to Comlabs. Through a report in the *West Side* the Minister was able to quite clearly demonstrate to people that the activities of Comlabs are completely safe. I quote from an article in that newspaper on 22 December 1981 as follows:

Accusations that the firm had been careless in its operation were made recently by Hindmarsh M.H.R. John Scott. A report from the commission's principal health officer Keith Wilson said the radiation control section was satisfied there were no radiation hazards to employees or the public from the present handling of samples at Comlabs.

'Comlabs is an analytical laboratory in which mineral samples are analysed,' he said. Various methods of sample preparation and analysis are used and the range is described in its list of services and prices. Since the samples handled sometimes include radioactive ores and since one of the analytical methods uses a special X-ray machine, the Radioactive Substances and Irradiating Apparatus Regulations (Health Act) apply.

The premises are inspected by officers of the radiation control section of the Health Commission.

Roxby Downs ore is not crushed on the premises. All core preparation including crushing and grinding, is done at Roxby Downs before the sample is sent to Adelaide. Dust-laden air is filtered before being exhausted from the premises.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 25 February at 2 p.m.