HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 March 1982

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

PETITION: HACKNEY HOTEL

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to either accept or reject the recommendations of the inter-departmental report into noise associated with places of public entertainment and introduce legislation without delay to adequately control the noise and associated problems with licensed premises, especially the Hackney Hotel, was presented by Mr Crafter.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard:* Questions on the Notice Paper Nos 337, 365, 368, 376, 378, 379, 384, 387, 388, 393, 398, 399, 402, 405, 406, 410, 413, 418, 423, 426, 432, 437, 441, 442, and 454.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Business Names Act, 1963-1981—Regulations—Fees.
Legal Practitioners Act, 1981—Regulations—
II. Professional Indemnity Insurance.
III. General Regulations.

By the Minister of Marine (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—Ardrossan Zoning.

By the Minister of Agriculture, on behalf of the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. City of Port Augusta—By-law No. 89—Weight Limit on Streets.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

I. Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report, 1979-80.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a 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): We seem to be continuing an impasse on this matter. My position is not the same, and I assure honourable members that, unless or until there is some alteration in the arrangements for Ministerial statements, and that means either a change of heart by the Labor Party and the Liberal Party, I will continue to oppose the giving of leave. The Leader of the Opposition does not look very well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: I know that he always resents my doing this, because it shows up his weakness.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to remain within the subject matter currently before the House.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, but that is pretty difficult to do—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: —when the Leader looks as he does. I have some concern for him, but I will say no more about that.

The SPEAKER: Order! One more transgression from the honourable member for Mitcham and he will be named.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Well, I certainly will not transgress again on that subject; he is not worth it. But let me say that my position is unchanged and it will not change so long as I am in the Chamber when permission is sought to make a Ministerial statement: unless the arrangements are altered and, subsequently, the Standing Orders, I will continue to do as I am doing now, and that is to oppose the giving of leave, and then to oppose what has become this farce of suspending Standing Orders to allow it.

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: MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I wish to inform the House of a number of significant developments in regard to the Government's continuing efforts to have the Murray River system managed in a way which adequately reflects the critical importance of this national resource to the future of South Australia.

Honourable members will recall that at a meeting in Melbourne, in October of last year, between the Prime Minister, the Minister for National Development and Energy, and the Premiers and Water Resources Ministers of New South Wales, South Australia, and Victoria, agreements were arrived at which had far-reaching implications for the future management of the Murray River.

Essentially, amendments to the River Murray Waters Act, agreed to at that meeting, will enable the River Murray Commission to assess the impact of proposed Murray River developments on water quality and formulate water quality objectives and standards for the river, which will include an acceptable water quality standard to protect all Murray River users in South Australia. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that significant progress has been made since that meeting.

In respect of a new River Murray Waters Agreement, it should be possible to put before Parliament, in June, a new agreement which will give formal authority to the River Murray Commission to take account of water quality in its investigations and operations.

The meeting in Melbourne accepted, in principle, the provisions of the new agreement, and the detailed clauses are now in the hands of the policy and legal officers of the four Governments, to reach a consensus on final wording.

My latest advice is that the one outstanding matter is a review by legal officers of the new water distribution and accounting clauses as prepared by a working party of the River Murray Commission. These are technical clauses only, which have been accepted by the four parties, but they have to be framed to be consistent with the body of the agreement. It is not expected that there will be any undue delay in obtaining their clearance from the four Governments. The next step requires the agreement to be signed by the four heads of Government, and then complementary approving legislation can be introduced into the four Parliaments.

Although the commission had previously been given authority to assume its water quality role prior to the acceptance of the new draft agreement, it is now able to act more positively. It proposes to increase its staff to enable the water quality activities to be handled with less need to rely on the water authorities of the three States, especially in regard to investigations and planning.

On the matter of water quality, which is of vital importance to South Australia, the River Murray Commission has begun a major consulting study to develop a computer-based water quality model of the river to link up with the existing South Australian model. This model will be used to investigate the salinity causes and effects of existing and proposed developments in the Murray-Darling system, and provide the information necessary to propose realistic salinity standards and objectives and identify the works and measures required to achieve them. The consultants, Maunsell and Partners, in association with Binnie and Partners and Dwyer Leslie, have already started work on the study which will take two years.

At the October meeting of heads of Government, South Australia put a strong case for Commonwealth financial assistance for improved irrigation practices, as part of this State's proposal for a permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem. The meeting agreed that improved irrigation practices must be an important element in any strategy to improve Murray River water quality. Accordingly, it established a Commonwealth-State working group to review the proposal by the Premier that Commonwealth financial assistance, in the form of low interest loans, be provided to farmers for the purchase and installation of equipment for improved irrigation practices. The working group has already met and is making good progress, and I expect that it will report, on schedule, by the end of this month.

Finally, honourable members will be aware that this Government has pursued, since late 1979, a policy of objecting to the granting of additional licence applications from irrigators for water diversions from the Darling River and other tributaries in New South Wales. We have done this through the mechanism of the New South Wales legal system.

The reasons why the Government embarked on this course of action have been well documented in this place, and outside it, so I will not take up the time of the House by repeating it again at length. I would say only that the Government acted quite properly in the knowledge that the decision to grant these additional diversions had been made without adequate investigation of their impact on the Murray River system.

This action has not been taken lightly, because the South Australian Government was not, and is not, opposed in principle to the development in New South Wales. However, the Government does have an overriding responsibility to the people of South Australia to protect their rights, as Australians, to an acceptable quality of water. This action was not seen as a long-term solution, but it did have one very positive benefit—it aroused national awareness of this national problem.

In the spirit of goodwill in evidence at the heads of Government meeting, I wrote to the New South Wales Minister of Water Resources, Mr Landa, on 2 December last year seeking to confirm verbal communications I had with him in regard to the granting of further licences. Subsequent to this, I am now in a position to advise the House that I have received positive and co-operative written assurances from the New South Wales Government, through Mr Landa, advising me that:

(1) Current and future applications for water diversion licences will be referred to the River Murray Commission for assessment of the effects the proposals would have on the flow and quality of water in the Murray River.

Mr Millhouse: Leaving it all to New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The assurances continue:

(2) Proposals for any future storages will be referred to the River Murray Commission at the planning stage.

(3) In addition, all applications will be subject to proper environmental evaluation in accordance with the requirements of the New South Wales Environmental Planning and Assessment Act.

Mr Landa has also advised me that the New South Wales Water Resources Commission is nearing completion of a major study into irrigation development in the unregulated sections of the Barwon and Darling Rivers, between Mungundi and the Menindee Lakes storages, and the results of that study will be submitted to the River Murray Commission shortly. Furthermore, an environmental impact statement is also being prepared for the group of current applications relating to the Darling River, downstream of the Menindee Lakes which have also caused concern.

Mr Landa also pointed out that the New South Wales Water Act requires that every application be advertised, but that it does not mean that the Water Resources Commission will necessarily grant a licence. These developments follow many years of negotiations and legal contention at local land board inquiries and in the Land and Environment Courts of New South Wales, where South Australia has argued that assessments, such as are now proposed, are vital to the continued well-being of the Murray River system.

The October meeting in Melbourne, between the States and the Commonwealth laid the foundations for a more co-operative approach to the river's problems, and it is now apparent that this is coming to fruition. With these very positive assurances from the New South Wales Minister, I am able to advise the House that the South Australian Government will withdraw its objections to current applications for further water diversions in New South Wales. I am confident that this paves the way for a spirit of co-operation and constructive management, as far as the future of the Murray River is concerned, and the Government looks foward to an early completion of the investigations and environmental assessments to be carried out by the New South Wales Government.

MILTABURRA AREA SCHOOL

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

Miltaburra Area School (Report No. 2).

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I indicate that any questions to the Minister of Environment and Planning will be taken by the Minister of Agriculture.

PUBLIC SERVICE STRIKE

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier explain why the Public Service Board has asked Government departments for lists of names of all those who participated in last Friday's Public Service strike, and will the Premier give his personal assurance that lists of names will not be given to Ministers, political advisers and permanent heads for their scrutiny?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite surprised at the publicity that was generated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition regarding this matter in the afternoon's newspaper. If I recall correctly, the term used was 'witch-hunt': the Government was accused of conducting a witch-hunt throughout the Public Service, with some inference that public servants would be disadvantaged, persecuted or in some other way pursued with some idea of vengeance by the Government.

I find that particularly surprising since, in 1979, when exactly the same situation occurred, names were taken by departments under a former Government of which the Deputy Leader was a member. The Leader may well know (I am sure that he does know, but perhaps the Deputy Leader has forgotten) that there has since then been a change in the Act and, from the point of view of pay and, indeed, of ensuring that those people who chose to go to work (and there was a goodly number of them—indeed, far more than the Public Service Association tried to imply in its public statement) received the pay to which they were entitled for that day's work, names must be obtained. I believe that that is why this action was taken previously in 1979. I would have been surprised if the Deputy Leader thought anything else, unless perhaps it was in his case a witch-hunt.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Does he deny that the departments collected the names then?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That may be so. However, I do not think he would deny that the departments collected the names. That is the reason for it. This course of action was followed previously, and I suggest that the Leader take a little more advice and not take witch-hunt stories from his Deputy Leader quite so avidly and willingly.

The Leader has asked me for an assurance. The thing is that if some public servants are entitled to pay they will receive it and, if others are not entitled to pay, they will not receive it. For the Deputy Leader to say that the State Government is conducting a witch-hunt is absolutely ridiculous. He said, 'The move smacked of Big Brother tactics.' All I can say is that if the Deputy Leader's criticism reflects his own attitude at the time of the last 1979 stoppage, I can assure him (and indeed I give that assurance clearly) that that does not represent our attitude, even though it may have reflected his attitude at the time.

COUNTRY CABINET MEETINGS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Premier tell the House of the benefits to the State of country Cabinet meetings?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: Yesterday, Cabinet met at Renmark, and before Christmas it met at Whyalla. As these meetings are now becoming regular events, I should be interested to hear from the Premier the benefits to South Australia that can be gained from these country meetings.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find the amusement and the very vocal and loud criticism that is being thrown across the Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition and his friends quite remarkable in the circumstances.

Mr Millhouse: I criticised them, too.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would, in fact, have expected the member for Mitcham to ask such a question, not the originators of this idea of country Cabinet meetings, namely, members of the Labor Party. I must say that I have come to the conclusion that the former Premier, the member for Hartley, was entirely right in his assessment that country Cabinet meetings are of great benefit indeed not only to country people but also to South Australians generally.

Country people in South Australia, being so far away from the centre of government, tend to feel neglected and isolated from the processes of government. I can say quite categorically, having now been to the Iron Triangle and the Riverland, that the movement of Cabinet out to the people is one which is appreciated by local communities very much indeed. I am never afraid, when I find some initiative which has been taken up by the former Government (although it does not happen very often) and which has merit, to adopt it and take it up further. The hilarity and reaction, which I find quite surprising and about which I am rather sorry, from Opposition members would indicate that they are not going to continue with country meetings by the shadow Cabinet. I believe that the Opposition has had shadow Cabinet meetings away from the centre of Adelaide also. Members opposite cannot have it both ways.

In regard to advantages, I have dealt with the matter of bringing the Government closer to the people in allowing Cabinet members to meet with public leaders in local government and to discuss on an informal basis the problems which concern them from day to day. There is also the ability for Ministers to look at various projects in the area and to have further on-the-spot discussions. Those discussions can be of very much value compared with the usual correspondence, where it is very difficult indeed to get a true understanding in many cases of all the facts that apply. It seems that the question that has been asked about how we can justify the expense of country Cabinet meetings should in fact be reversed. In the interests of open government and better communication with country areas and people in the community, the question should be: how can we possibly afford not to have Cabinet meetings in the country from time to time? I would like to put on record my appreciation of the far-sighted attitude shown by the member for Hartley and his supporters at that time. That obviously does not include all the honourable gentlemen opposite now. However, I congratulate the honourable member and his supporters at that time on an initiative that is well worth following through.

PUBLIC SERVICE STRIKE

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier insist that the Minister of Industrial Affairs refrain from constantly meddling in the Public Service Board's handling of the current wage claim by the Public Service Association, in the interests of avoiding a further worsening of industrial relations in this State? I have been told that the Public Service Board has been frustrated by the constant interference of the Minister in its handling of the current dispute, and by his inflammatory and deliberately inaccurate statements on the media, which, as the House would know, resulted in a writ being served.

I am told that the Minister's statement that the P.S.A. has refused to negotiate is quite false, as the P.S.A. has been negotiating with it continually during the six months since the claim was lodged. I am also told that the Minister's claim on *Nationwide* that the majority of P.S.A. members have received an average 10.5 per cent wage offer was false and deliberately misleading. I am further informed that only 20 per cent of P.S.A. members have received offers of more than 10.5 per cent, 30 per cent have had no offers at all, and the remaining 50 per cent, which includes clerical officers, are still receiving offers of under 10.5 per cent and, in the case of juniors, far less.

I understand that on the same *Nationwide* programme the Minister claimed that the P.S.A. wanted a double-barrelled settlement—13 per cent plus the c.p.i. for the June and September quarters. I am further informed that this was also wrong, as the P.S.A. has asked for 10.5 per cent, based on a catch-up for the period 1975 to March 1981, plus the right to argue for the c.p.i. in the Industrial Commission. I am sure the Premier is aware that the Government has made an across-the-board offer of 9.5 per cent in addition to an earlier increase of $6.30 for the June and September c.p.i. increases.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not quite sure where the Deputy Leader has obtained his information. I am quite certain that no-one in the Public Service Board would in any way call the constant communications and consultations which have been taking place with the Minister of Industrial Affairs and his department in relation to the matters surrounding the Public Service Association's recent activities 'constantly meddling' unless, of course, it might have been Mr Kym Mayes, who is the endorsed Labor candidate for Unley.

Mr Langley: And he'll win Unley, too—no need to worry.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that a good deal of concern is already being expressed throughout the District of Unley because of one of the publications of the Public Service Association relating to rights to strike and rather inciting such activities. Time will tell whether or not the electors of Unley support someone who is supporting such high-handed actions which have caused very responsible and, shall we say, senior members of the P.S.A. a great deal of concern. There is no question at all that the P.S.A. has not acted in the best interests of its members in this dispute. The very way in which the motion was first put to the meeting—that the pay offer that had been made should be rejected and that a general strike should be called, without giving anyone the opportunity of splitting those two motions—was in itself irresponsible. It has given rise to a great deal of resentment, concern and alarm among many members (and I suspect the great majority of the members) of the P.S.A.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It was reflected in the number that went to work.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It was indeed reflected in the number who came to work last Friday.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Three out of every four.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I know that these are not the figures that were given by the P.S.A. Indeed, I read a report from the P.S.A. which suggested that 90 per cent of the Public Service had gone out on strike. That was not so. It was nowhere near the figure, which is much closer to one in four being on strike, rather than 90 per cent, as the P.S.A. would have us believe.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You've already looked at the list, have you?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can only say from my experience that there was no-one who did not come to work in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and I think that estimate can be made by most other Ministers and even the honourable member, who was a Minister for some time, although apparently he went around with his eyes closed, and that probably would explain some of the decisions that came out of his department. I think that even he would have been able to determine whether or not his people were at work on a particular day—or perhaps he would not: I do not know. I am not prepared to make any further comment about the honourable member.

There has been consultation with the Minister of Industrial Affairs and members of his staff, and that will continue to take place. The Public Service Board is perfectly capable of managing affairs, as it has been doing, and I can only say that, where the board chooses to take the advice of the Minister, the Minister is only too pleased to give it.

MINING EXPLORATION

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy inform the House about current exploration activity in the Cooper Basin? It has been put to me that the present Government has spent all of its time encouraging development at Roxby Downs at the expense of other mining and exploration developments. The Cooper Basin is, of course, an extremely important resource in South Australia, and I believe that any information the Minister can provide on development in that basin—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member well knows that he is required to give factual information, and not to comment.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I was saying that it has been put to me that this is the situation, and I believe that information on the Cooper Basin will throw additional light on South Australian Government developments in that area.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, what the member for Todd has said is perfectly true. The Leader of the Opposition was on record last year as suggesting that the Government was neglecting the Cooper Basin and was intent on one development only. If the Leader did not know then he knows now that that was patently false, because at the end of last year we presented to the House the excellent Stony Point (Liquids Project) Ratification Bill, which involves a most significant development in relation to the State and its resources. I believe that the information made available recently indicates some of the immediate benefits that will accrue as a result of that liquids ratification Bill having passed this House.

The A.L.P. did not quite know where to jump when that Bill was introduced. It had to be passed by 31 December so that the project could meet a fast schedule, but the A.L.P. complained about the speed with which we progressed. That is an excellent indenture which will not cost the taxpayers one cent and which will have very significant benefits, some of which are accruing at present in relation to very greatly increased exploration efforts.

At present, a record number of drilling rigs is operating in the basin—12 in all, which is five more than the previous highest number, and eight more than at the same time last year. Santos alone is spending more than $19 000 000 on exploration this year. With the contribution of the other producers, the total exploration expenditure this year will be about $61 000 000. More than 500 people are employed on the drilling operations. Santos plans to drill about 70 exploratory and development wells in the Cooper Basin this year.

Further, the production of gas and liquids from the Cooper Basin will require a significant drilling programme in the next few years. Seven oil fields will be developed, requiring

the drilling of 35 additional oil wells; 23 gas fields will be progressively developed to maintain gas supplies, requiring the drilling of 168 new gas wells. Therefore, I believe that even the Opposition, and the Leader in particular, will understand that the Government has not underplayed the importance of the Cooper Basin. The Government is intent on developing all of this State's natural resources to the benefit of the whole population.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, a point I could well mention is the fact that the vast bulk of this development money, whether in relation to this or other developments that we are prosecuting with some vigor, is spent within South Australia.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How many Americans and Canadians are involved?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: For the honourable member's benefit, I point out that there were not resident in Australia people with the expertise to operate some of these new rigs, and there were some discussions—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I suppose that is why—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will explain to the honourable member that I had some discussions with the operating companies and Santos in relation to the Government's attitude to bringing in Canadians and later some Americans to train Australian personnel in the operation of these rigs.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: And in South Australia.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: In South Australia, yes. It would have been stupid if we had suggested that we did not want people to come here to train Australians in the use of these rigs. If the honourable member had made further inquiries, he would understand that there is no question of Australian workers being displaced from jobs that are otherwise available to them. These people have come here for the sole purpose of training Australians in the use of this equipment. The Government is intent on a development programme; there is tangible evidence that it is being successful, indeed, and achieving a degree of success not noticed in South Australia for at least the last 10 to 12 years.

CORRESPONDENCE SCHOOL PRINTERY

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education say why the Government has moved and merged the Correspondence School printery with the Government Printer, and what guarantee will there be that the education of children in isolated learning situations will not be disadvantaged by the move? Honourable members will be aware that in recent times the Correspondence School has moved from its former site at Pennington Terrace to the Education Department, a move that was inadequate compared with the original request and the original anticipations, and at the same time the printery has been divorced from the Correspondence School and moved to the Government Printer.

It has been put to me by various people connected with correspondence education that this will result in greater delays in material being printed. It has further been put to me that this is highly significant within the Correspondence School situation as that method of education relies heavily upon the print media, and any delays in that regard could have an early impact on the quality of education unless guarantees are given. In the context of that being put to me, it was also mentioned that education costs per pupil at the Correspondence School are hundreds of dollars cheaper than are education costs in other learning situations throughout the State, and that the Government could have easily maintained the printery at the Correspondence School without exceeding normal student costs.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Apart from anything else, this is one of the issues that the department has been looking at for all Government operations; that is, the question of rationalising the present diversity of operations that occurs within the various arms of government. One of the recommendations that came out of the Public Accounts Committee findings when it was looking into education was that there be some consideration of rationalisation between education, further education, and other education branches.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Does that mean all school printeries will go?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No, of course it does not, but one of the obvious inferences to be drawn is that this is one of the first schools or colleges to be moved in any way, and I hope the honourable member is not suggesting that the move from North Adelaide to the Education Centre is also going to adversely affect the Correspondence School operations.

Mr Lynn Arnold: They did not get as much space as they were initially told they would get.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They will not need as much space, because the Government Printer is now absorbing the printery staff; they are not being retrenched. Apart from that, I hope the honourable member would realise that the Government Printer's having absorbed the existing equipment, some of which is quite antiquated, and having offered the Correspondence School a far wider range of printing opportunities, should in fact improve the quality although not necessarily the quantity of material going out, because that will depend entirely on the Correspondence School staff.

I was going to take up one of the other points that the honourable member raised. He keeps saying, 'It is reported to me,' or 'It is suggested to me.' I suggest that he ignore a lot of those suggestions which are very little more than that. One of the first questions I asked the Correspondence School staff, when they kindly moved to the thirteenth and fourteenth floors of the Education Centre, in their own time over the week-end a couple of week-ends ago, so that they would not have to clutter up the eight lifts in the Education Centre with the vast quantities of equipment, was, 'How will you be affected by the removal of the printery?' and they said, 'Well, Minister, we are having a look at that; we are optimistic about the wide range of opportunities which will be presented, and if we do have any problems we will report them to you.' Therefore, I suggest that the honourable member has some advance information which, so far, is not based on fact, because the Correspondence School itself has only just been established over the last few days, and I will be visiting them with the Director-General, personally, tomorrow morning to see how operations are going.

Another issue, of course, is that in the existing premises, where the Correspondence School was located in North Adelaide, there was already quite a dire problem. On that upstairs floor where the printery was located, there were very few main bearers on the floor beneath, yet we had very heavy printing equipment located upstairs, on the first floor, which, to my way of thinking, presented grave danger. One of the first questions I asked was this: if the Correspondence School moves anywhere, including to the Education Department, are the floor bearers on any of the upper storey floors sufficiently strong to carry that quite heavy and massive printing equipment? We were not sure, so one possible location was in the basement. I think all members will recognise that a far more sensible approach was to absorb the printery within the Government Printing sector, which is not overloaded and where at present the

only problem that we have relates to working to time; there is no overtime.

I hope that is a short-term event. I see it as a short-term problem, certainly not a long-term one. The honourable member could keep it well in mind that we are aware of the problems, that there were problems in North Adelaide, problems of antiquated equipment, and of a relative shortage of varieties of printing media for the Correspondence School. I am optimistic about the change, and I think that already the Correspondence School staff have responded in a bright, cheerful and very co-operative manner to the new environment that they find themselves in and to the new challenges ahead of them.

RAILWAY LINE FIRES

Mr OLSEN: Will the Minister of Agriculture request of the General Manager of Australian National that the commission reintroduce burning off on railway land abutting railway lines prior to each summer period? It has been reported to me that, since the implementation of that policy, the number of fires starting on railway lines and spreading to abutting agricultural land has increased. I am advised that some 12 fires have started along the Gladstone-Jamestown line this summer. Country Fires Service officers have said that the conversion to diesel locomotives has not prevented fires from being started by diesel motors. In fact, the Indian-Pacific recently started a fire from a faulty diesel motor. In addition, constituents have complained that locomotive drivers still use brakes, rather than the braking power of the motor, against regulations, with the result that fires are started therefrom. The Country Fire Service has advised that it has compiled photos as evidence of its claims. Constituents have expressed the view that public relations between landholders and Australian National is at a low ebb, because of the high risk to property, stock and lives, aggravated by the refusal on one occasion by railway workers to assist to fight a fire.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes.

POLICE PATROL ACCIDENTS

Mr ABBOTT: Is the Chief Secretary satisfied with the training programmes for police patrol officers who are required to drive at high speeds vehicles with power steering, and will he say what those training programmes are? The parents of a young police constable, who was attached to the patrol division, made representations to me expressing grave concern at the lack of adequate training for young police officers who are required to drive and handle at high speeds patrol cars with power steering. The parents referred to the patrol cars involved in fatal accidents recently when two young officers lost their lives in separate accidents, one on South Road, Thebarton, and the other on Diagonal Road, Sturt. They believe that proper training programmes are essential, particularly for young officers, to acquire the necessary experience and driving skills when in pursuit of other speeding vehicles.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is seeking technical information and I will be pleased to get him a report. I will be pleased to arrange for him to have an expert tell him of the training given to our police officers.

VIRGINIA-TWO WELLS BY-PASS

Mr RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Transport say what stage has been reached in the construction of the Virginia-Two Wells by-pass on the Port Wakefield Road, and when it is proposed to complete this work?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am very pleased to say that the western carriageway will be opened in about two or three weeks, and I will be pleased to see that the honourable member gets an invitation to that opening. I am also pleased to say that the—

Mr Lynn Arnold: Like the former Minister of Transport got an invitation to the opening of the Cavan bridge!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member is also welcome to an invitation if he wishes. I should also state that the eastern carriageway will be completed in 12 months, and I look forward to that date, because by then I will be able to transfer the excess funds to the Stuart Highway project.

S.A.J.C. LOTTERY

Mr SLATER: Did the Minister of Recreation and Sport authorise or give approval for the Totalizator Agency Board to act as selling agent in the Australasian Oaks S.A.J.C. lottery? To my knowledge, this is the first occasion that the T.A.B. has acted as selling agent for any sporting body or organisation. It was an unprecedented step. Large colour posters appeared at T.A.B. agencies throughout the State, and tickets could be purchased through any agency. However, public response to the lottery was not forthcoming, despite this extensive campaign advertising. I have been asked to ascertain just how many tickets were sold by the T.A.B. agencies. Will the Minister explain why the T.A.B. was involved in the lottery, and what authorisation he, as Minister, gave for the T.A.B. involvement?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The answer to the honourable member's question is 'No'.

STONY POINT

Mr BLACKER: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy in a position to provide further information in reply to a question that I asked last week regarding the committee that is being established to examine the marine ecology adjacent to Stony Point? The Minister would be aware that the Select Committee reported that a committee should be established comprising representatives of the Department of Fisheries in conjunction with the producers and the Australian Fisheries Council to undertake an immediate detailed assessment of the marine ecology in order to provide a data base on which further monitoring will be based.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have some further information for the honourable member, who was a member of the Select Committee. The environmental committee that has been established held its first meeting on 8 February. I think the honourable member asked who was on the committee. It consists of Messrs D. Benson, B. Brooks and A. Sann, representing Santos; R. Stevens, Director, Department of Fisheries; C. Whitaker, Department of Environment and Planning; N. Carr, Department of Marine and Harbors; M. Harvey, Department of Mines and Energy; and P. Reeves of the Environment Protection Council.

The terms of reference for the group are still being finalised. In broad terms, however, the group will act as a medium for the exchange of information between the parties with a responsibility for environmental management at Stony Point. A major function of the group will be to overview the development of an environmental monitoring programme to establish the consequences of any discharges to the gulf. Santos has undertaken to develop a continuing programme in this report. So, I think the honourable member will be

reassured that the committee has been established and that its work has started.

WINDANA NURSING HOME

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Health assure the House that the lengthy waiting list for elderly and senile persons seeking admission to Windana Nursing Home at Glandore will be reduced to negligible proportions by the Government's proposal to transfer patients to Windana from Magill Home?

I have raised the issue of Windana on numerous previous occasions, because it is in my electorate of Ascot Park, and I have received a steady stream of complaints from relatives of elderly people who are desperate to see it opened so that their problems can be alleviated. There are over 100 people on the waiting list for intensive care at Windana. On 29 October I was advised by the Chairman of the Southern Cross Homes Board, Mr Peter Taylor, that there were 130 on the waiting list, 97 of whom needed immediate nursing home care. These 100 or more people have been waiting for the 90 beds at Windana which have remained unoccupied for two years. Indeed, during that time elderly people awaiting admission have died, while others have been added to the list. Similar waiting lists apply elsewhere, I understand.

The Minister's proposal announced on 27 October last year is for 72 hostel residents to be transferred from Magill, although press reports indicate that many (perhaps most) are less than eager to be transplanted and they will be transferred from Magill into 72 of the 90 intensive care beds at Windana. It had been suggested that the number of transfers from Magill might be less than the figure of 72 originally proposed by the Minister. However, if the original proposition is put into effect it would leave 18 beds for the 100 or so people on the Windana waiting list. That figure is a conservative estimate, as I pointed out earlier in my explanation. The Minister has stated that some of those seeking admission to Windana have also applied to other nursing homes. However, even if that is so, can the Minister still assure the House that the 18 beds (if that figure is correct) to be funded at Windana can absorb the 100 or so people on the waiting list?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: When Windana is opened, quite obviously the waiting list will be reduced progressively. The reference to in excess of 100 people on the waiting list needs to be seen in the context of the suitability of those people for admission to a nursing home. As I have stressed in this House on many occasions, there must be an effective assessment procedure for admission to nursing homes. This will occur in the case of Windana, and assessments will be conducted under the auspices of a group comprising representatives from the geriatric assessment team at Flinders Medical Centre, Southern Domiciliary Care and other relevant organisations.

Simply because a family places the name of a relative on the waiting list does not in any way indicate that that person is necessarily suitable for admission to a nursing home. That has to be a professional assessment, and it would be interesting and instructive to the honourable member if people on that waiting list could be assessed for suitability for admission and if, following that assessment, an accurate indication of people who could be admitted were to be gained. Quite clearly, the opening of Windana will progressively assist people in that area. To some extent, the availability of beds is still dependent upon negotiations between the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government, and those negotiations are not yet finalised.

BINGO

Mr BECKER: Is the Minister of Recreation and Sport aware of an anomaly in the regulations concerning the conduct of bingo sessions? I understand that many organisations, including schools, sporting clubs and service organisations, conduct bingo sessions. I also believe that the competition, particularly among football clubs, is so keen for people to attend these sessions that it is not uncommon for the normal cost for 30 bingo game sessions, which has been $3.20, to be reduced to $2.20 or even $1.50. I understand the reason for this is that, whilst there is a maximum limit to be charged, there is no minimum limit. I further understand that one large sporting organisation makes available State Transport Authority buses to take customers to bingo sessions.

As to the reason for the keen competition among organisers of bingo games, I understand that the desire is to attract 300 or 400 people to any one session so that good prize-money can be offered for a cheap outlay. This has made it extremely difficult for the charitable organisations to enter this field. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will be prepared to look at the regulations to see what can be done to control charges in relation to bingo sessions.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is no question that bingo is a popular form of fund raising, and there is also no question that there is a great deal of competition between various organisations in raising money through bingo. I shall be happy to have a look at the problem that the honourable member has mentioned and bring down a report.

POLICE INQUIRY

Mr MILLHOUSE: I would like to ask a question, which I think should be addressed to the Premier. Normally it would go to the Chief Secretary, but it involves a matter on which he has not been anxious to speak. Why has the report of the inquiry into allegations of corruption against the police, begun in September last year and then expected to take only a few weeks, not yet been made public? It is widely believed in the community that the inquiry, which was ordered after revelations of the most serious kind and articles in the *Advertiser* last August, has already been completed. When the inquiry was announced the Attorney-General said that it would take a fortnight. Later he resiled from that and said that he had always expected that it would take longer. Later still, on 10 December, he said that the report would be made 'early next year'. We are now into March, the third month of the year, and it is still not public. It has been suggested that, despite a most adverse report in the course of the inquiry from the Federal police who have taken part in it, the result is to be a whitewash—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: —of the police in this State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows that he is required to deal with facts and not comment.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. I am not commenting; I am recounting, hoping that it will encourage the Government to bring the report out quickly, what is being said in the community. They are facts—what is being said is a fact, although whether or not it is right is another thing. It is also being said, Sir (and I hope you will not regard this as comment), that the Government is now deliberately delaying publication of the report until after Parliament finishes early in April so as to minimise any outcry.

Mr Speaker, you know as well as I do that that is a ploy of all Governments, Liberal and Labor alike—to wait until

Parliament is not sitting to bring out something that may be controversial.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is amazing—there is one thing that both Liberal and Labor agree on—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham will continue with his explanation.

Mr MILLHOUSE: May I then go on? The Attorney-General has said that the report cannot be released until after several trials this month in which persons who have given information are concerned, but there are, as I understand it, yet others who are likely to appear in court later, so that that is an excuse that could go on indefinitely. Such are the stories that are going around, and if they are inaccurate the sooner the report is published the better. After all this delay and after all the stories that have gone around, I doubt whether anyone will be satisfied—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: —with any report, and we are going to need a Royal Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I very much regret that the honourable member shows such a great degree of irresponsibility in this matter. I think that the Attorney-General has made quite clear publicly, and in another place certainly, that the report will not be released pending the outcome of certain trials which are currently in progress for fear that those trials could well be prejudiced. I do not know of the outcome of all those matters, nor do I intend to make any comment on them now. It would be totally wrong of me to do so. I do know that when serious charges are being heard before a court, and particularly (and here I must admit to some prejudice) when they apply to cases involving drugs, I for one want nothing whatever to interfere with the proper course of justice in those matters. I am a little surprised that the honourable member should appear to be suggesting otherwise. I will do him the credit of believing that that is not what he intended—

Mr Millhouse: He did say it would take only a few weeks, you know.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —and that he is concerned. He would know better than anyone else in this Chamber of the time that the legal process takes. He himself has contributed to it on more than one occasion. I simply say that in no way are we going to allow the due and proper hearing of those cases to be prejudiced, that they will be processed in the proper way, and that when they are completed the report will be released.

ON-THE-SPOT FINES

Mr KENEALLY: As the Minister responsible for the police, did the Chief Secretary personally consult with the police about the implications of on-the-spot fines prior to the introduction of that system and, if so, what was the result of that consultation? The documentation available to the Government clearly detailed the impact that on-the-spot fines would have on the community and consequently on the standing of the police. I wish to know whether these matters were discussed with the police.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The ramifications of on-the-spot fines have been well and truly canvassed, and the honourable member is not unaware of the manner in which they were brought in. A meeting was held this morning, and a public announcement has been made about that matter by my colleague in another place. I suggest that the honourable member, for his own edification, have a good look at what the Attorney-General has said this afternoon in another place. Perhaps then he will not be so athwartships in his public utterances tomorrow night, for example, or next week.

PORT PIRIE SMELTERS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy been maintaining liaison with Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie concerning the upgrading and modernisation of the smelting works at that location and, if so, can he say when such a programme of modernisation is likely to commence? I think it was early last year when the Acting General Manager at the smelters told me and the Leader of the Opposition who was with me at the time that the company was actively looking at a programme of modernisation.

Further, during discussions it became apparent to me that this process had been going on for about five years. The magnitude of the suggested modification and its benefit to South Australia would be apparent to all. The figure mentioned at that time was about $40 000 000, and I have since been advised that the figure has been increased to $60 000 000. In essence, the proposal concerns the installation of a new process and the equipment associated with that. The process is called Kivcet, which I understand is a Russian patented process. I have also been given to understand that some millions of dollars may have already been paid to the Soviet Union in royalties associated with the installation of that process. I believe the question needs no further explanation, except that I believe that it also gives the lie to the statement that the Opposition is not interested in the development of South Australia.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I did not allege that the Opposition was not interested: I said it was singularly unsuccessful in attracting any development. One does not have to look very far to understand why I would direct the attention of anyone who is interested in the development policies of the A.L.P. to the resolutions that were passed at the recent A.L.P. State conference and to see why it was singularly unsuccessful in attracting industry to this State. In answer to the first part of the question, I am aware that discussions are taking place, and in recent times discussions have centred around the price of electricity and the extensions relating to an expansion of the electrolytic process for refining zinc. I have a letter from B.H.A.S. in relation to this matter and, as I say, the major question being addressed is the price at which electricity will be supplied to that company in relation to this extension.

WHEAT TRANSPORT

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain from the Wheat Board an estimate of the amount of grain that is lost during rail transit in South Australia? It has been brought to my notice that the smaller four-wheel trucks that are used to cart grain throughout the State tend to lose a lot of grain on a continuous basis while travelling from one point to another, resulting in large amounts of grain falling to the side of the track. It has also been brought to my notice that this occurred in Canada until different trucks were used, there having been a problem with bears eating the wheat near the side of the rail and causing some concern to the drivers. It is quite evident that when trains travel through the Adelaide Hills a large amount of grain falls from the trucks through the gaps in the doors in particular, and I have been told that the Wheat Board allows for a certain amount of wastage each year by way

of this situation. How much is lost, and is there any likelihood of a change in the trucks used?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I will obtain that information for the honourable member. We in South Australia are fortunate that a former colleague of Government members is in a prominent position in the grain industry.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you mean the cockie from Rocky?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Yes, the former member for Rocky River is now the Chairman of the Bulk Handling Co-operative, which is a wellknown organisation in South Australia that has the responsibility of storing our grains.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I thought he owned it.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It could well be that he has a significant share in the business. He certainly owns a lot of land on which wheat is grown. He produces good samples and large quantities of that product. I am disappointed to hear about wastage of the implied magnitude suggested by the member for Fisher. Of course, at sharp corners and at silo sites and wharf side, etc., there is always a certain amount of grain on the ground, but I repeat that I am surprised to hear of the wastage factor referred to by the honourable member.

I appreciate the interest shown in this matter by a member for a near metropolitan-based district with no real implications involving the grain industry in South Australia. The honourable member has demonstrated as a member of the Party that our interest, collectively and individually, is widely applied and that the Party represents all sectors of the community, as we claim in our platform. On that note, I hope that the member for Fisher and any other metropolitan-based members will raise questions in this important area. Quite apart from giving me the opportunity to answer such a question, their interest displays the importance of the rural industry to this country.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Explosives Act Amendment,
Highways Act Amendment,
Imprint Act (Repeal),
Legal Practitioners Act Amendment,
Seeds Act Amendment.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It embodies the results of a complete review of the Pastoral Act undertaken by this Government. It is the Government's general policy to review and, where appropriate, to enhance the security of tenure of primary productive and other rural lands of the State, and also, where possible, to remove from land tenure legislation provisions that are archaic and inappropriate in the light of current social and economic needs.

The Government also recognises that there is public concern for the sensitive nature of the State's arid lands, and that there is a need to retain and strengthen controls over the use of these lands, so as to ensure their conservation and, at the same time, their sustained yield. There has been a gradual emergence of alternative and joint land use needs in the State's outback, in the areas of tourism and recreation in particular, and the Bill seeks to provide appropriate tenures and management measures to meet those needs, whilst providing for the protection of the environmental qualities of these unique lands.

The Government holds the view that, where arid land users are required to have regard for the long term or infinite productivity of such lands, it is reasonable that they be accorded a comparable long term or infinite interest in leases of the lands, subject to appropriate reservations, covenants, terms and conditions. The Bill therefore provides for the conversion of current leases (most of which are for 42 years) to perpetual leases, if the lessee so desires. The security of terminating leases is to be enhanced by providing a right of application for renewal between the twenty-second and thirty-fifth years of the term of such leases.

Control of the level and intensity of arid land use will be gained by inviting lessees to submit management plans with all applications, including applications for renewal of leases. Such management proposals will, if approved, be expressed in lease reservations, covenants and conditions, and be subject to review, and change where appropriate, each 14 years. All leases granted after this amending Act will be subject to review of conditions and covenants each 14 years.

An Outback Management Advisory Committee is to be set up to advise the Minister in matters and issues related to the use and management of outback lands and their renewable resources. The committee will be comprised of representatives of public land use interest groups, and will also provide a forum for the presentation and discussion of outback management issues of general public interest and concern. It is proposed that the rights of public access to pastoral lands in motor vehicles will be limited, and carefully regulated. Motor vehicles will by and large be limited to those roads constructed or maintained by the Commissioner of Highways, and some further tracks to be proclaimed, unless the driver holds a permit from the owner of the lands or the Minister.

Finally, the Bill seeks to repeal a number of archaic provisions, some of which are unrealistic and unrelated to contemporary management needs and circumstances, or are unduly regulatory. It should be noted that the Bill provides for differential proclamation dates. This will permit the Outback Management Advisory Committee to be established, and become involved in the determination of regulatory provisions related to the control of public access to the lands, prior to the proclamation of those sections of the Bill.

In summary, this Bill redirects the thrust of the Pastoral Act from its previous management criteria related to development and improvements, to one which emphasises management according to the condition of the land and its natural renewable resources. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Act. Certain provisions may be suspended if the need arises. Clause 3 amends the long title to reflect modern day policies in relation to pastoral lands. Clause 4 amends the arrangement of the Act. Clause 5 provides a transitional provision that preserves the validity of existing leases granted under provisions to be repealed.

Clause 6 amends the definition section. The definition of 'lands' is replaced by a definition of 'pastoral lands'—the

expression used in the relevant provisions of the Act. The definition of 'pastoral purposes' spells out the basic purposes for which leases under this Act may be granted. The definition of 'sheep' is amended to exclude reference to goats, to avoid possible future conflict with the Vertebrate Pests Act. Clause 7 provides the Chairman of the Pastoral Board with a casting vote in the event of an equality of votes.

Clause 8 updates the powers of the Pastoral Board, and sets out various considerations that the board must take into account in exercising its powers. Clause 9 makes clear that the Pastoral Board may administer an oath when it is obtaining evidence in relation to any matter it is investigating. Clause 10 provides that a lessee, as well as an applicant for a lease, may be required to attend before the board.

Clause 11 sets up the Outback Management Advisory Committee. The committee will consist of nine members, selected from a wide range of relevant fields. The Chairman will be appointed by the Governor. The committee's task is to advise the Minister generally on any matter relating to the management, use or further development of pastoral lands. The committee may initiate its own inquiries, or may have matters referred to it by the Minister. Clauses 12, 13 and 14 provide that perpetual leases may be granted under this Act in respect of unallotted lands.

Clause 15 makes clear that a lease may not have included in it some of the conditions set out in the first schedule. Clause 16 makes clear that the blanket provision that a lessee may use the leased lands for pastoral purposes may be qualified by the provisions of his lease. Clause 17 is a consequential amendment. Clauses 18, 19 and 20 remove the distinctions between lands north or west of the Murray River, and those south or east of the Murray River, a distinction that is no longer relevant.

Clause 21 extends the power of the Minister to all small parcels of lands to existing leases, where those small parcels are in close proximity to the leased lands, or are separated merely by a railway. The power is further widened to cover parcels that are up to 150 square kilometres if inside the dog fence, and up to 1 500 square kilometres if outside the dog fence. This latter amendment will provide greater flexibility for boundary determination, and will increase the control over the fencing of areas in support of animal health and disease control programmes.

Clause 22 strikes out a provision that is now redundant. Clause 23 gives the Minister the power to issue notices to a lessee not only in relation to reducing livestock numbers on his lease, but also in relation to reducing other animal populations on the leased lands. If the animal population in question is a species of animal that is protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, then the Minister may require the lessee to apply for a permit under that Act for the destruction of a number of those animals. Clause 24 is a consequential amendment. Where a provision of the Act is now to apply to both terminating and perpetual leases, it is no longer appropriate to refer to 'the term of a lease'.

Clause 25 enables a lessee to apply for the renewal of a terminating lease at any time from the twenty-second year of his lease to the thirty-fifth year of his lease. As the Act now stands, he may only apply during the thirty-fifth year, a mere seven years before expiry. The Minister may invite a lessee seeking renewal to submit a management plan in relation to the management and use of the leased lands during the first 14 years of the new lease. Clause 26 repeals a section of the Act that has no further work to do, in that it relates to surrenders of leases within 12 months of the commencement of the Pastoral Act Amendment Act, 1960. Clauses 27 and 28 are consequential amendments. Clause 29 provides that the rent of a perpetual lease granted under this Act is to be revalued every seven years. Clause 30 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 31 inserts two new provisions. The first relates to the payment of interest on overdue rent. As the Act now stands, this is provided for by way of a condition of leases, and is stated to be 10 per cent of the unpaid amount. New section 60a will enable interest at the fixed rate (as provided for in section 143 of the Act) to be added as soon as an amount becomes overdue, and thereafter at the end of each year. The Minister is given the power to remit any such penalty interest where he thinks fit. Failure to pay such interest is to be treated as a breach of covenant. New section 60b provides for the review of all the covenants, conditions, etc., of any lease granted after the amending Act, such review to be conducted every 14 years. Again, the lessee may be invited to submit a management plan in respect of the next 14-year period of the lease, to enable the board to determine the covenants and conditions that ought to apply over that period. The board's determination is subject to the Minister's approval. The lessee is given a right of appeal to the Tenants Relief Board, where new conditions sought by the lessee are rejected, or where the lessee opposes the proposed variations to his lease.

Clauses 32 and 33 are consequential amendments. Clause 34 repeals three sections of the Act that deal with the obligation of a lessee to effect improvements within a certain time. This is no longer considered appropriate as an across-the-broad obligation. If it is desirable to have such a provision in a particular lease, it may be added at the Minister's discretion. Clauses 35 and 36 are consequential amendments.

Clauses 37 and 38 repeal provisions that provide that an outgoing lessee is not to be paid for improvements made without the prior consent of the Minister. These provisions are now considered to be inequitable. Clause 39 rationalises the penalty for pulling down or damaging improvements. Imprisonment for up to two years is changed to a penalty not exceeding $2 000. Clause 40 also repeals two provisions relating to improvements, being provisions now considered to be inequitable from a lessee's point of view.

Clauses 41 and 42 are consequential amendments. Clause 43 repeals those sections of the Act that provided for the resumption of pastoral lease lands for the purposes of closer settlement or for enlarging holdings. These provisions have never been used, and are seen as no longer appropriate for pastoral lands. Clause 44 is a consequential amendment. Clause 45 provides that a lessee under a terminating lease may apply for the surrender of the whole, or part, of his lease for a perpetual lease. The Minister may invite the submission of a management plan in respect of the first 14-year period of the perpetual lease. The Minister may grant the application in part or in whole, and determines, upon the recommendation of the board, the conditions, covenants, etc., of the perpetual lease.

Clause 46 provides that a lessee under a terminating lease granted for a term that has been fixed on an averaging basis pursuant to the section, may be permitted to apply for renewal earlier than the seventh year before the expiry of his lease. The same provisions are inserted in relation to the submission of management plans as are inserted in the general section dealing with renewal of terminating leases.

Clause 47 is a consequential amendment. Clause 48 provides that purchase-money paid by an incoming lessee for improvements shall bear interest at the rate fixed under section 143 until it is paid over by the Minister to the outgoing lessee. Clause 49 increases the penalty for contravention of the provisions relating to travelling stock over pastoral lands to $1 000. Clauses 50 and 51 are consequential amendments.

Clause 52 inserts a new provision that provides an alternative to forfeiture where a perpetual lessee is in breach of

his lease (other than default in payment of rent). The Minister may convert the perpetual lease to a terminating lease of 21 years. The lessee will be given a period of two months (or more, if the Minister so allows) to take action to remedy the breach, where appropriate. If he takes such action, the Minister will not exercise his powers under this section. The lessee is given the right to appeal to the Tenants Relief Board against a decision of the Minister to exercise his powers under this section. Once a perpetual lease has been converted to a terminating lease, the lessee of course may at any time apply to surrender the terminating lease for a fresh perpetual lease under the other provisions of the Act.

Clause 53 increases the maximum level for penalties under the regulations to $200. A regulation-making power is provided for the questions of public access to pastoral lands and the activities of the public on such lands. It is proposed, for example, to place certain restrictions on camping on pastoral lands. Clause 54 repeals two sections that deal with the laying of regulations before Parliament—this procedure is provided for in the Subordinate Legislation Act.

Clause 55 increases the penalty for carrying on mining operations in a certain manner on leased lands, without the Minister's approval, to $1 000. Clause 56 repeals the provision that requires the Minister to furnish Parliament with an annual report on improvements he has permitted to leased lands. This is now considered to be an administrative burden that no longer serves any valuable purpose. Clause 57 restates the Minister's power to grant annual licences and commonage licences without restriction, and upon such terms and conditions, and for such purposes, as he thinks fit. Clause 58 is a consequential amendment.

Clause 59 increases the penalty for failing to give notice of intention to muster cattle to adjoining lessees to $300. Clause 60 inserts two new provisions. The first provides that a person is not to drive a motor vehicle on pastoral lands unless he is on a public road (as defined), or unless he has permission to do so from the owner of the lands (as defined). Where a lessee fails to give permission, the Minister may grant a permit. Certain pastoral lands may be exempted from the application of this provision. A wide range of persons are also exempted, and the Minister has the power to exempt further persons, or classes of person. The regulations also may permit limited rights of access, for example, the right to pull off a public road and picnic within a certain distance of the road. A defence is given to a person where he drives off a road in what he believes to be a situation of emergency. New section 140c provides that a lessee may erect barriers or gates across roads, etc., that traverse his lease and that are not public roads (as defined) if he has the permission of the Minister to do so.

Clause 61 makes it clear that the Minister may extend the period during which a lessee may perform any of the covenants or conditions of his lease, not only those referred to in the first schedule and section 61 of the Act. Clause 62 inserts a new provision exempting all leases and licences under this Act from stamp duty. Crown Lands Act agreements are presently so exempt, and it is intended also to exempt leases and licences under that Act and various other related Acts. It has been calculated that the costs of collecting stamp duty on leases and licences more than off-set the small amount of revenue derived in this area. New section 143b gives the Minister and the Director-General of Lands a power of delegation.

Clause 63 amends the first schedule which contains all the basic covenants and conditions of leases. The requirement to stock lands with a specified number of sheep or cattle is deleted, as such a blanket provision is no longer desirable. The prohibition against erecting brush fences is deleted. The condition dealing with payment of interest on overdue rent is deleted as the Act itself will now provide for this. The reservation relating to public access is modified so that it now relates only to public roads. Certain other consequential amendments are made.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 15 to 17 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (4) and insert new subsections as follow:

(4) This section applies to duty payable by virtue of a transaction entered into after the commencement of the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Act, 1982, not being a transaction of a class specified by proclamation under subsection (5).

(5) The Governor may—

(a) by proclamation specify a class of transactions for the purposes of subsection (4);

(b) by further proclamation, vary or revoke a proclamation under paragraph *(a)*.

No. 2. Page 3, lines 1 to 3 (clause 4)—Leave out subsection (4) and insert new subsections as follow:

(4) This section applies to duty payable by virtue of a transaction entered into after the commencement of the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Act, 1982, not being a transaction of a class specified by proclamation under subsection (5).

.(5) The Governor may—

(a) by proclamation specify a class of transactions for the purposes of subsection (4);

(b) by further proclamation, vary or revoke a proclamation under paragraph *(a)*.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That the suggested amendments of the Legislative Council be agreed to.

At the time that the legislation was before this Chamber I gave some notice of the possibility of devising a procedure under which certain credit transactions which comply with the spirit of the Government's intention may be exempted from the provisions of the two new sections so that the benefits which have already been preserved by the passage of the previous legislation could be preserved.

Now that the action has been taken in the Upper House, it has the effect of providing that a class of transaction can be excluded from the operation of those provisions, and that, of course, will be a matter that will have the effect of maintaining the benefits that have come to consumers from those finance companies which, in fact, have honoured the intentions of the Government's legislation last year by reducing the lending rate downwards on those transactions involving personal loans, mortgages, and bridging finance. My information is that lending rates have moved downwards in quite a number of cases. On many matters there has been no change as a result of the Government's repeal of sections 31*l* and 31p. The other advantages which come is that consumers know exactly what they are paying for credit charges and, indeed, the beneficial effect on the general market and the availability of funds is preserved. This will have the effect of, by proclamation, reinstating the two clauses which were in the legislation previously. By proclamation certain classes of transaction can be excluded and, of course, that will depend entirely on the Government's being satisfied that the provision will not be abused in any way, and it can go ahead and take such action.

There is nothing complex about it; it is quite straightforward. It is a matter of determining, on application, whether or not a proclamation ought to be made in respect to a certain class of transaction. Obviously, in that matter specific assurances and undertakings given in respect of

that class of transaction will be looked at very carefully indeed before any action is taken.

Mr BANNON: The Opposition is not inclined to support this amendment, particularly in the absence of any further information than that lamentable explanation just given by the Premier. This is yet another stage of an extraordinary piece of bungling and incompetence on the part of the Government—bungling and incompetence right from the point at which the Government had the relevant provisions removed from the Act last October, compounded by the fact that once the implications of that, which apparently it has not yet fully understood, were made clear to it, the Government then attempted to (I cannot use the unparliamentary term 'lie') mislead people into thinking that it had received assurances from groups in the community that had not the first clue about what assurances they had given or in which circumstances they were meant to have given them.

This is simply a further chapter of the farce. Last October, when the provisions were removed, the Opposition warned the Government about the implications; it warned the Government about the possible effects, but its warnings and doubts, and in fact its opposition was dismissed by the Premier, who said 'Don't worry, I have assurances from this range of organisations and institutions.' He said that he had them. 'Where are they,' we demanded, and the Premier said, 'That's a difficult question.' The question was repeated, and the Premier's final response was that there were verbal assurances.

Then came the bankcard revelation, the fact that these credit charges were to be passed on by the banking institutions, and suddenly we had the Premier running for cover. But did he produce the assurances? Was he able to go to those institutions and say, 'Look, you are not playing the game, you are backing away from undertakings you have given us?' Not a bit of it; the Premier could not do it because he did not have such assurances. There has been one single piece of documentary evidence produced throughout these proceedings, namely, a letter from the credit institutions, the financial representatives of them, the Finance Conference of Australia, saying that it could not give the assurance that the Premier wanted; that it could do so in certain respects, yes, but for other areas of transactions it could not. Every other institutional body involved has denied giving assurances, denied any understandings with the Government. This nonsense that the Premier talks about misunderstandings really ought to be exposed totally.

Following that, we have the farce of the Premier's bringing in a Bill to amend the Act to reinsert the sections. The Opposition agreed with that, said that it was the right and proper thing to do, and that we would support it. However, the Premier hinted, before the legislation came in, that there was to be a further amendment, an amendment which would allow the exemption of certain transactions. We indicated clearly that that was not good enough. We were seeking a return to the *status quo;* the advantages that consumers had had in South Australia should be continued. There is clearly no evidence that that has deterred financial institutions from investing in South Australia. Good Lord, they are not investing in some respects, in part because of the policies of this Government and the way in which it has mishandled the South Australian economy. The Government cannot blame that on this aspect.

It is absolute nonsense. When the legislation finally came before this Chamber it was, as we had requested, a simple reinsertion of the clauses that had been deleted, and on that basis we supported it. It went through. It went to the Upper House, and then what happened? The Attorney in another place introduced the amendment in the form in which that has come down to us providing this exemption. It is a convoluted and complicated amendment: its intention is not fully clear, and, perhaps most importantly, absolutely no evidence has been produced to indicate to whom it is to apply. What does the public know and what does the Parliament know from the debate in another place and here on this matter? Our colleagues in another place questioned the Government very closely, and got nowhere. We will not support it in this place unless we get that evidence from the Premier.

In his speech the Attorney said the Government believed that it should have a mechanism so that those credit providers who had played the game and honoured the spirit and intention of the Government's legislation would not be adversely prejudiced, nor would the consumers thereby affected be prejudiced by the repeal of the section. That is in two parts. First, there is absolutely no prejudice to the consumers being corrected by this amendment. Already, the Government has indicated its contempt for the consumers, because it refused to allow this legislation to apply retrospectively. As was said, if the Government had the assurance it claimed it had, then it had a moral obligation to put retrospectivity into the Bill to cover that period in which those undertakings were broken, and the institutions could not complain.

Why did it not do that? It was because, Mr Chairman, it did not have the assurances, and Government members knew very well that they could not produce them and they were not going to completely embarrass the providers of credit and indeed, force them, if you like, into the political arena by imposing that burden on them. So, the consumers have suffered by that. They are not going to get their money back for the period between October and February while this legislation has been going through. This amendment is not going to provide any benefit for consumers either—none whatsoever. Certainly, this is not revealed by the Attorney in another place. It is certainly not mentioned by the Premier here. So, let us give him one more chance. I ask the Premier to indicate what benefit there will be to consumers by placing this in the Bill. As I understand it, those companies that have lowered their rates may be adversely affected, and the consumer will benefit. Because the legislation is not being retrospectively applied, all those other consumers—the vast majority of them who have actually paid up—will not get any benefit at all. So, why single out one group for benefit, one group of finance companies for benefit, and not the consumers of this State? It is totally hypocritical and totally inconsistent.

Let us look at the first part of that statement: it is recognising those credit providers who have played the game and honoured the spirit and intention of the Government's legislation. Who are they? I would like to see the Premier produce, in documented form, their names and the evidence that they did give undertakings that they have played the game by lowering rates of interest. Unless that evidence can be produced, the arguments for this amendment fail on the second leg. Two questions must be answered: first, how is it that by not passing this amendment consumers will be prejudiced; secondly, how is it that by not passing this amendment those who have played the game and have honoured the spirit and intention of it will be disadvantaged? Unless those questions can be answered, we must oppose the legislation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Since the Leader of the Opposition said at the outset that he intends to oppose the legislation—

Mr Bannon: Not if you answer—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —quite clearly, I see no point in carrying on.

Mr BANNON: I take up the Premier's challenge. That is probably a fair statement, because I did say we are not inclined to support the amendments. I draw that word specifically to the Premier's attention: we are not inclined to support them. I have now given him the conditions on which I believe we can support them: namely, if he fulfils two simple prerequisites, if he answers two simple questions. First, produce the evidence of those credit providers who have played the game; secondly produce the evidence as to how consumers will be prejudiced if we do not pass this. They are two simple questions. If the Premier answers them to the satisfaction of the Committee, I assure him we will support the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN: The question is—

Mr BANNON: The Premier rose a minute ago and said that, as I commenced my speech by saying that we would oppose the amendments, there was no point in his replying to my questions. I am saying to him (and I hope that he takes this in the spirit in which it is offered, in case he misunderstood what I was saying) that I did not say we would oppose them willy nilly; I said that we were inclined to oppose them. I am now giving him the opportunity to provide the evidence the Committee requires. If he fails to do so we will oppose the motion. We have an open mind about this. Let him produce the evidence.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Wotton, Evans, and Glazbrook. Noes—Messrs Corcoran, O'Neill, and Hopgood.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 24 February. Page 3118.)

Clause 7—'The council.'

Mr HEMMINGS: Could I ask the Chair where the Minister is?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I must point out to the honourable member that that matter is not within the province of the Chair.

Mr HEMMINGS: Perhaps that was a little frivolous of me. However, it seems more than a coincidence that on Wednesday, when this Bill was in Committee, the Minister, for no apparent reason, moved that progress be reported, even though the programme stated that the debate on the Bill had to be completed that day. I therefore move:

That progress be reported.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hopgood, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Evans, Glazbrook, and Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr HEMMINGS: On Wednesday, I canvassed in some detail all the amendments that the Opposition intends to move to clause 7. However, I give notice that I intend to speak separately on each individual amendment. I move:

Page 3, line 2—Leave out 'ten' and insert 'eleven'.

The Opposition considers that the council should have at least one staff representative on it. We consider that this is vital and, as I said on Wednesday, one of the many problems experienced at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science over the past two years is that there has been a feeling by staff members that they have had no input to or representation on the council. You, Sir, will see that we spell out in detail later on that the staff nominee should meet with the requirements of clause 28. If the Government is committed to a council that will be truly representative of the disciplines within the institute, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Adelaide University and all the other areas involved, it should at least include a staff member on the council.

We point out that the elected member of the council shall be elected for a term of office of two years against the proposition in the Bill that all other members of the council be appointed for a period of four years. Whilst I cannot speak on that clause later, I have circulated a new amendment which clearly spells out that the member who shall be elected must be a member of the recognised organisations, as defined in clause 28 in the prescribed manner. We see that as a positive step. If the Government seriously considers our amendment it will find that it meets with the approval of not only the disciplines within the I.M.V.S. but also the staff members themselves.

Mr McRAE: If this amendment is not agreed to by the Government, I think it will be a shameful reflection on it. The Minister should indicate immediately (and save everyone's time) whether she will be accepting this amendment. In this day and age it is entirely appropriate, particularly in an organisation such as this, that there be a proper form of liaison between those who work in the institution or organisations and all the other interested bodies or persons who go to make it up. That is the case as one looks around educational and academic institutions throughout South Australia, throughout our universities and our teaching institutions. Time and time again we find that by Act of Parliament, provision has been made for participation of employees.

I am even more surprised at this lack of provision when I look at clause 28 of the Bill and find that there are no fewer than four recognised organisations: the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, the P.S.A., the R.A.N.F., and the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association. So, there are four recognised associations and others which may be declared to be a recognised organisation within the provisions of that clause. That has been the case ever since the recommendations of the Select Committee into the South Australian Health Commission. I can recall, when the member for Mitchell and I were sitting on that committee, how important we believed it was that we had those recognised organisations so that people knew where they stood. We also felt strongly that from those groupings of people there should be an input into management.

Two factors apply here. First, the staff members have something to offer the organisation. That is recognised throughout the Western World. If the Minister cannot recognise that, she is thinking archaically or she is covering up something. There is an input. Secondly, as my colleague

the member for Napier put it, there is a unique opportunity for liaison. That is so in any circumstances, let alone with an organisation such as the I.M.V.S., where staff trouble and industrial trouble have been simmering for years and blowing up now and again. So, there is a unique opportunity for liaison. I and many of my colleagues have sat on boards such as this, and have been able to give our input and receive the benefit of the knowledge of those around us.

Let me stress that in these circumstances the need becomes even greater because of the suspicion that already seethes around the I.M.V.S. as to the Government's true intention. When one looks at a Bill such as this, and sees that not one person from any of the four recognised organisations will have an opportunity to be an employee representative on the board, one can justly feel very suspicious indeed. I can draw only one conclusion: if the Minister is not prepared to accept the amendment, it cannot be that her mind is so archaic that she has not kept up with modern industrial practice (not even the Minister's mind is that archaic); it must be that she has something to hide, and she must be trying to put the lid on something. When I reach a conclusion such as that, I am most unhappy and I am sure the employees of the I.M.V.S. will share my feelings.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I reassure the member for Playford that I have nothing whatever to hide, and I accept his tribute that I have not an archaic mind. Those two things having been said, I should add that not only do I not have anything to hide but neither has the council of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. I would expect that the incoming council of the institute, following passage of this legislation, to continue the practice that the current council has adopted for some time; namely, that the staff of the institute are invited to attend council meetings and report on council decisions directly to the staff. I hope that that will demonstrate to the member for Playford that neither the council nor the Government has anything to hide. There is already a procedure by which staff attend meetings and report to their colleagues on the decisions of the council, and there is no reason why that should not continue.

Secondly, the Opposition has chosen to ignore the fact that there is a new development in terms of representation on this council through the appointment of the Director. That was not previously the case. The Government recognises the validity of the Wells recommendation that the Director be a member of the council *ex officio*, and that is being implemented in this Bill. More importantly, the Opposition seems to believe that the appointment or election of one member of staff to council is somehow or other going to solve all management communication and consultation problems that may have developed at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science over a period of many years.

Mr McRae: It will assist.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Very well, it may assist in the solution of those problems. Infinitely more important than the placing of one staff member on the council is the whole system and style of management adopted at the institute which, in future and at present, is in process of being altered to take account of the need to consult, communicate and involve staff in information and decisions taken at all levels. This is something that cannot be done artificially by representation on a council. It can be done at all levels of management throughout the institute. This was recognised by Wells and reported on in some detail on page 6 of his report where, under 'Recommendations for consideration and implementation by the institute council', Dr Wells recommended this:

> That a Planning and Resource Executive Committee (PAREC) should be established to advise council on planning and development of the institute's operations, on resource planning, allocation and control (both financial and manpower), policy development and review.

Dr Wells suggested that the membership of that executive committee should comprise the Director of the institute as Chairman, a member of the council nominated by the council, the Deputy Director, Business Director and Divisional Director of the institute and the Medical Director of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or his or her nominee. That was the basic structure of the Planning and Resource Executive Committee. However, it is worth looking at the further recommendations which go with that. Dr Wells recommended:

> That PAREC should give immediate attention to:
> (1) the establishment of Advisory Committees on
> —Veterinary Pathology
> —Medical Research
> (2) needs for increased accommodation; research policy; implementation of recommendations on teaching and research; and the role and administration of joint medical illustration and photographic services.

Those two short paragraphs recommend the establishment of a committee, which is now being established and whose function is to cover a wide range of matters which require liaison within the institute. Within veterinary pathology, medical research, accommodation, research policy, teaching and research and the role of administration of joint medical, illustration and photographic services there are opportunities for considerable staff input at the level where it counts. If the council itself were to be discussing those matters the input of staff via that committee would be of inestimable value, and I venture to say that that committee structure will involve an infinitely greater number of staff members and result in considerably greater benefit than the appointment of one single staff member to the council. Dr Wells went on to say:

> The membership of the Veterinary Pathology Advisory Committee should be:
> *(a)* the Director of the Institute (Chairman);
> *(b)* the two veterinarians on the Council of the Institute;
> *(c)* the Senior Director, Division of Veterinary Sciences;
> *(d)* the 'new' Professor of Animal Sciences—

who is to be appointed later this year at the University of Adelaide—

> *(e)* the Head of the Gilles Plains Field Station;
> *(f)* a member nominated by the Veterinary Division Joint Consultative Committee; and
> *(g)* a member nominated by the Director-General of Agriculture.

That is another broad spectrum of issues on which staff input will be sought. In addition, the I.M.V.S. has several union groups involved, and indeed it is interesting to see that the Opposition is suggesting not only that there should be a staff representative on the council but also that that staff representative must be a union member. That is something that the Government and, I believe, the community at large would find completely unacceptable. We are not—

Mr McRae: Why have you provided for it in your own Bill?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: We provided for the Health Commission to deal with the industrial conditions of people represented by those organisations. We have not provided for anyone to be considered for consultation and representation by virtue of the fact that he is a member of a union. That is totally unacceptable to this Government, it is unacceptable to the community of South Australia and, indeed, it is unacceptable to world bodies concerned with union structures. The member for Playford at least, even if the member for Napier is not aware of it, knows that there should not be discrimination of this kind. The Government would not entertain that idea, and we would certainly not adopt it in the form of the amendment.

I might ask how would the amendment be operated in practice when there are so many union groups represented at the institute, and how would it be possible to find a staff member who would adequately represent the interests and be aware of the broad range of issues confronting a highly technical institute that deals with both medical and veterinary science. The current staff representation was reviewed by Dr Wells; it was found to be adequate, and no specific recommendations were made by either Wells or Badger in regard to staff representation on the council except for that which the Government has adopted, namely, the inclusion of the Director on the council of the institute. For the good reasons that I have stated the Government does not intend to accept the amendment of the member for Napier.

Mr HEMMINGS: It seems rather astonishing to me that the Minister, when wanting to use the argument that the Government rejects a staff member going on to the council, is quick to point out that the Wells and Badger Reports did not make such a recommendation. Yet, as has been said before, this Bill is riddled with blatant omissions that the Wells and Badger Reports recommended, but that is a different story. When things are different, they are not the same, as far as this Minister is concerned. It is fairly obvious that the Minister's philosophy and ideology are such that there should be no staff representation on the council.

In fact, the Minister even referred to unions. However, clause 28 provides that the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union, the Public Service Association, the Royal Australian Nursing Federation and the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association are all recognised organisations for the purposes of that clause. Many people who hold responsible positions within the I.M.V.S. would be members of those organisations, and I believe that they could make an input into council decision-making. I think the Minister was more or less referring to only one particular organisation, that is, the Miscellaneous Workers' Union, when she put forward the argument about unionists.

Again, it astounds me that the Minister says that the Government has no intention of even considering the appointment of a staff member to the council because over the last 12 meetings staff members have been allowed to attend as observers. Surely the Minister is not going to say that because staff members are allowed to attend as observers they will be a part of the decision-making process of the council? At least the Minister has conceded one point which is something we did not know, and that is that there is going to be consultation with the staff. At least that is a step in the right direction. In other Bills that have been considered by this Chamber there has been a tendency, as my colleague the member for Playford has said, to allow staff members to be part of the decision-making process, but it seems for obvious reasons that the Minister believes that only those people who are listed in clause 7 could possibly make some input for the benefit of the staff.

The Minister says that as the Director will be an *ex officio* member of the council he will in effect be representing the staff. I will not pour cold water on that, but let us say that experience in the past has proved that, even though the Director was not a member of the council, he took little part in promoting the views of the staff at the I.M.V.S. We believe it is important for something more than consultation or allowing staff members to be observers of the deliberations of the council; we believe it is vitally important that, if the council of the I.M.V.S. is to work, a staff member should be on that council.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I just take issue with the honourable member's statement that I am quick to refer to Wells and Badger in support of the Government's attitude on this matter (incidentally, the Government's policy here is formed without reference to any report), and that I am selectively using the recommendations of the Wells and Badger Reports. I reiterate that the Opposition apparently refuses to grasp the fact that in this Bill the Government is implementing recommendations of both Wells and Badger. It is maintaining the institute as a medical and veterinary institute which both Wells and Badger wanted. It is bringing the medical divisions of the institute under the control of the South Australian Health Commission, which is what Wells strongly recommended, albeit not in the precise fashion which Wells recommended, for the reasons that I have outlined.

So I reject the assertion that the Government has not adopted the principal recommendations of Wells and Badger, because this Bill is evidence that the principal recommendations of both those reports are being implemented. I reiterate that there is no reason for the Government to accept the Opposition's amendment, for the reasons I have outlined, and we oppose it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister was at some pains to explain that in recent times 12 meetings have been held which staff members have been invited to attend as observers of the deliberations of the council. The Minister did not go on to say why they had been invited. What is the purpose? Does the Minister believe that this in some way indicates actual representation and a position on the decision-making body? I am quite certain she would be the first to agree that there are strict requirements for the behaviour of observers, one being that an observer must keep his or her mouth shut at meetings.

Mr McRae: And to leave on request.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, whereas having representation at least enables a person to express an opinion. When the previous Government was in power there were many protests and criticisms about industrial democracy from the then Opposition, which is now the Government of this State. What are the true facts? Has the present Government disbanded entirely the industrial democracy unit? No, it has not: within the department of the Minister of Industrial Affairs there is still a section involved with industrial democracy, and that is what this is all about.

The Opposition is putting forward a reasonable proposal. We want the Minister to ensure that the council will not be stacked, overloaded, stultified, or its operations interfered with in any way. The Minister should make that small gesture to industrial democracy and provide for representation. Let us look at the matter from another angle. Is the Minister arguing that there is no staff member who could make a worthwhile contribution to the council? From what I have seen of the Minister in this House over the years in which she has been here, I am sure, or I hope, that she would not put forward that argument. Therefore, why is the Government, through the Minister, so opposed to this simple amendment? Is it because it believes that one staff representative will wreck the council? No, we have not been told that.

The Government should give the Opposition the courtesy of outlining the real reason why it will not consider this perfectly reasonable amendment. If it is a matter of blind ideology on the part of the Government, then the Minister should say so and have the guts to own up to it, instead of fossicking around picking up reports and quoting from them. That is not the way to operate. We may be able to accept the statement of truth that the Government is so opposed to such words as 'union' that is is not prepared to consider the merits of the proposal and will knock it off on that basis. The Government should provide a better and more reasonable explanation for its opposition to a perfectly acceptable proposal. No-one would stack the council, because an election would be involved. The Minister was one of those who told us about the calibre of the staff of the

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, and there has been no quarrel from this side with that sort of statement. The Opposition believes that one of those people of very fine calibre should be placed on the controlling body of the organisation.

Mr McRAE: I will take up one or two of the points made by the Minister. First, the Minister referred to what she termed the international industrial provision relating to non-discrimination between union members and non-union members. If the Minister was really fair dinkum about this, she could accept my colleague's first amendment and proceed to amend subsequent amendments, although I do not say that the Opposition would be happy with that. I served on the Roseworthy Agricultural College Council purely to draft the statutes and by-laws, and for no other reason. When I served on that council, people with a tremendous variety of occupations were employed by that college at that time. Provision was made in the Act for a staff representative, who on one occasion was a lecturer and on another occasion was a gentleman from the field staff, as it was called at that time, one of the people actually involved in the college's farming practices.

The fact that a number of industrial organisations are involved has nothing to do with the case. Once a person is elected from those groups, it is possible for him to pass on the information to the other groups and, in fact, that would be his duty. Quite apart from that, based on my Roseworthy experience and my experiences elsewhere, I know that certain people tend to become interested and available in stages, so that over a period of years all of those bodies, one way or another, get representation.

If it is a question (as the member for Mitchell said) of the Government's standing completely firm on its own ideology and saying 'No, we will not have a bar of these recognised organisations, except to the extent that is is convenient for us to do so' (because it is mighty convenient for the Government to do so in relation to clause 28 of this Bill). Let the Minister take up the challenge and say, 'No, we have an ideology. This is our ideology, and we will not have a bar of the amendment.' By the same token, the Minister cannot get out from under in that fashion. She well knows that throughout Australia and the world it has become almost the invariable practice in public organisations such as this that a staff member be present on the council, not only as an observer. I was pleased to hear of the process of consultation that had been introduced.

That part pleased me; I am sure it has done a lot of good, and I hope it keeps going. Again, I follow my colleague the member for Mitchell by saying that just to be there as an observer is nothing, because an observer can be asked to leave at any time. An observer, say, with the permission of the chair, and that of the whole council, I might add, could not make any contribution. All that the Opposition is saying in this very first amendment (and remember that we have not yet come to the recognised organisations involved) is that we should acknowledge a principle, not just because it happens to be a practice, but because it is something that has worked and worked very well elsewhere. I, like my colleagues, challenge the Minister to come forward with the real reason, otherwise the Opposition, as will the employees of this organisation, will be left with the indisputable impression that there must be something to hide.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am wondering whether the three members opposite listened the first time I spoke, but I can do little more than reiterate what I have already said, although I will make it briefer this time. I simply say that the Government believes that the council, as it is constituted in the Bill, is satisfactorily constituted. The Government also believes that the systems in process for the establishment of much improved communication and consultation at all levels up and down and across the staff of the institute are satisfactory. Therefore, the Government cannot accept the Opposition's amendment.

The member for Playford suggested that it is an invariable practice to appoint or elect members of staff to councils and boards. It is by no means an invariable practice in the case of statutory authorities in South Australia. The member for Mitchell suggested that, in opposing this amendment, the Government is guilty of alleged blind ideaology. I do not know whether the member for Mitchell wants to call it ideology, or what he wants to call it, but certainly the Government believes that effective staff involvement, good communication and consultation within an organisation rely far more on good management practices at all levels, from storemen and maintenance personnel up to para-professionals and professionals, than it does simply on the election of one person to a board of management. On the grounds that the council is satisfactory as it is constituted in the Bill, reinforced by the knowledge that very much improved procedures for communication and consultation are being undertaken at the institute, the Government opposes the amendment.

Mr McRAE: Really, all that it gets down to is that the Minister is saying, 'What we have provided in clause 7 is totally satisfactory, because it is totally satisfactory.' That is a totally circular argument; it does not come to the point of what the Opposition has been saying. The Opposition did listen on the first occasion to what the Minister had to say. We on the Opposition side will be reporting back to the employees of the I.M.V.S. that this is yet another example of my famous question to the Minister of Education, namely, 'Will you accept any amendment no matter how reasonable, just or fair?' and the Minister's saying to me 'No'. What a disgrace to Her Majesty's Opposition that we have to put up with such arrogance as this. The Government says that it will not accept an amendment because it has got what is right and that it does not intend to proceed any further. The Opposition now knows what the truth is.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister, in replying to the remarks I made and also to those of my colleague, suggested that we had not listened correctly to the answer she gave. However the Government is really saying that the present situation is satisfactory and, because it is satisfactory, then it is.

Mr Mathwin: It's your policy of workers on the board, isn't it?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member who has just interjected raised the question of McNally about 400 times two years ago but he has never said a word on that topic since.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is out of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The argument that it will not make any difference can be turned around, and one can ask, 'Why not do it? It will not do any harm, either.' It is recognised at all levels of management, the handling of personnel and the running of organisations, such as that from which the member for Todd came before he made his unfortunate entry into this place, that there are gestures that need to be made. In this case it is not only a gesture, because the Minister made no attempt to answer the point that I made. She said that they have a terrifically high calibre of persons at the I.M.V.S. I do not quarrel with that. My understanding of the organisation is that over the years it has gained world standard, and that is not so simply because they have, say, clean test tubes: it is because of the calibre of the people there. However, the Minister says that the proposition is not very important and will not really help, but I suggest to her that it will not hurt, either, and there is the value to be gained from the staff as a whole

after seeing that the Government is prepared to take this step.

I feel some sympathy for her in this predicament; I have sat on the Government benches myself and have had ideas on certain matters which one could not always carry in Cabinet. However, this matter certainly does not appear to be in that area at all; it will not cost the Government untold hundreds of thousands of dollars; it will do nothing to hurt the Government. I am almost wondering why I am supporting my colleagues—this measure would damn well help the Government. Yet I am standing here because of the principle involved; it will help relations between the staff and the I.M.V.S. The Minister would not deny that there will be a period of trauma, change and adjustment in the organisation. It is clear that there will be change from the passage of this Bill.

Having worked at the Institute of Technology, a not dissimilar body, with persons from various disciplines of high academic level, as well as low, I can tell the Minister from experience that the greatest problems which occur during a period of change (and I am referring to a time when The Levels was underway and so on—I was there) are those which are caused by the viewpoints of those down below concerning what is going on in the boardroom, in the council room. For the Minister to suggest that that can be cured by having some observers there is not a total palliative by a long chalk, for the reasons that the Opposition has already outlined.

Representation must be given in a totally unfettered way, whereby someone can say 'No, the Governor will not choose this person'; 'No, the Minister will not choose this person'; or 'No, the Minister of Agriculture will not choose this person.' (If I had to make a choice between the two Ministers I am certainly willing to tell members which person I would be willing to have make the selection, but that is not at issue here.) If representation is unfettered in that way, staff morale in these organisations, as a group, is lifted, even though one of those members is that horrible sort of person to the Minister, a unionist. Members of the staff would be able to get together and put forward a person to represent them. I can tell the Minister from my own experience at the Institute of Technology and on the council of the Flinders University, another not dissimilar body, that the people give this task in such organisations do not run around and elect someone not worthy of the position.

In fact, it is surprising how they can get together from widely separated areas and put up a person who is going to contribute to the running of the institute in a way of which we could all be proud, if only the Minister will agree to this amendment and for once recognise merit when it is put forward in the Chamber and accept it.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (17)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hopgood, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Evans, Tonkin, and Wilson.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member for Napier wish to move the next amendment standing in his name?

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 3, line 7—After 'Hospital' insert ', at least one of whom must be a medical practitioner'.

I seek your guidance, Sir. I would like to make this a test clause for the following amendment in my name on line 9.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Olsen): It is in order for the honourable member to move his amendment in line 7 and canvass the subject matter of line 9.

Mr HEMMINGS: On Wednesday, in reply to my second reading speech, the Minister referred to my suggestion regarding one nominee from the Royal Adelaide Hospital being a medical practitioner and both nominees from the University of Adelaide, being employed in the faculty of medicine of that university. In effect, the Minister said that it is a management body and not a medical body. We accept that the council is a management body, but the Bill should stipulate that some people in that council should have a medical background.

All through this debate, and I am sure right to the bitter end, the Minister and I, and other members on this side, will be quoting from the Wells Report, the Badger Report, and Bede Morris Report. That is a fact of life. We say that in many cases the Minister has completely ignored the Wells or Badger reports, or glossed over them. That is our view, and the Minister has her own view. I think it is important, when we are dealing with the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the University of Adelaide, that there should be a predominance of medical people. It is useless for the Minister to say that in all probability someone coming from the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be a medical practitioner and that, in all probability, someone from the University of Adelaide will be from the faculty of medicine. I will be prepared to agree to not only the faculty of medicine but the faculty of science. The Wells Report deals with the subjects of teaching and education and I am sure that this is one of the reasons (I am not saying the main reason) why there is representation from the R.A.H. and the University of Adelaide; that is, in the teaching and education area, also in the actual disciplines itself.

Plenty of other people who can give the managerial skills have been put up by the Minister, but nowhere does she spell out the medical or scientific skills that are coming on to the council. It is an important part of the provision that the person from the Royal Adelaide Hospital shall be a medical practitioner and that both the people from the University of Adelaide must be employed in the faculty of medicine.

When one looks at the Wells Report (page 74), one sees that the committee made four recommendations. It is important that I read out those recommendations. In all probability, the Minister may use some of those recommendations to demolish my arguments. However, I think it is important, from what I am proposing, that we should at least ensure that there is on the council a balance of medical and scientific people from the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the university. The report states:

The committee of inquiry recommends that:

(1) the institute should continue its educational role at undergraduate and postgraduate levels;

(2) the institute, The University of Adelaide and the Royal Adelaide Hospital jointly explore various avenues for more effective integration of teaching to medical and science students irrespective of whether or not this is achieved by joint appointments, university status or integration of institute divisions with appropriate departments of the faculty of medicine of the university;

(3) the institute and the universities combine their facilities to develop viable postgraduate training programs for students proceeding to the degrees of M.Sc. or Ph.D.

(4) the institute should play a greater role in postgraduate medical educational activities in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. These activities could include physician and surgeon training programs and other special training.

That is all very commendable, and I am sure that the Minister agrees with those recommendations. For those reasons, the Opposition considers that it is best to spell out in the Bill that both these august bodies will, in effect, be told that their representatives should meet the requirements of our amendments. As the Minister said in reply, in all probability this will happen. However, I think that this Bill is so important (it is the first time since 1937 that we have had to look at this legislation) that it is vital that we spell out exactly what the representation from those bodies should comprise. For that reason, I urge the Government to accept the amendments.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I really have very little to add to what I said last week in response to the honourable member when he moved these amendments. It would be quite inappropriate for the Government on this occasion through the Parliament to tell the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital whom it should nominate to the council by way of an occupational group.

I do not know where the Opposition dreamed up this amendment or whom it consulted before drafting it. However, I guarantee that there were no consultations with the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Vice-Chancellor and the faculties of medicine and science at the University of Adelaide. If the honourable member can enlighten me otherwise, I should be very interested to know. I take it from his silence that there has been no consultation by the Opposition with the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or with the University of Adelaide.

As I have said, the council is a management body. It is highly unlikely that either of those bodies would elect two people who were not doctors. In fact, in the case of the University of Adelaide, it would be virtually impossible for that to occur. I suppose it is conceivable, but it is highly unlikely. If it did happen, it would be because the university in its wisdom believed that two people, one or both of whom may not be a medical practitioner, had the necessary skills that were, in the opinion of the university, required to represent its interests on the institute council, although I should stress that the council is there to represent the interests of the institute rather than any sectional body.

In terms of the input of doctors and the relationship of the institute to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the University of Adelaide for professional education, the honourable member will be interested to know that the specific Wells recommendations in terms of improving the professional training capabilities involved are being considered by the commission and by the implementation team at the institute, and in many instances they are in the process of implementation. However, I will not tell, and nor I believe should the Parliament tell, the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital board whom it should nominate as its representatives on the institute council. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendments.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister asked where the Opposition dreamed up these two amendments and whether we consulted with the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the University of Adelaide. We did not do so. However, perhaps I can ask the Minister a question. Did she consult with the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital regarding their representation on the institute council?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I can say that, although there was no consultation on this specific matter, certainly the composition of the council was submitted for the council's consideration before this Bill was introduced. I have had no indication from either the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital, whose Chairman is one of the representatives on the institute council, that they would wish the composition of the council to be any different from what is provided for in this Bill. If I were to receive such a representation in support of the honourable member's amendment, I would certainly consider it. However, I have not, and, on the basis that those bodies should be entitled to select whom they believe to be appropriate, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr HEMMINGS: I find that quite incredible. The Minister has told the Committee that Parliament has no right to tell the Royal Adelaide Hospital that its representative should be a medical practitioner and that the two nominees from the University of Adelaide shall be employed in its faculty of medicine. This is incredible to me, because the Minister had those amendments on Wednesday. For some reason the Minister decided then that progress should be reported. The Opposition has its own thoughts on why progress was reported: it was fairly obvious that the Minister was uneasy in relation to our amendments and that she wanted to burn the midnight oil with her advisers in order to ascertain which way the Government should go.

One would have thought, because of the way in which I canvassed this amendment in my second reading speech, because of the way in which the amendment was spelled out, and the fact that the Minister admitted in this Chamber a short while ago that she has not consulted with the University of Adelaide on this matter (that is what she said) that, after reporting progress on Wednesday night, a telephone call to the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital might have been sufficient for her to have come back, and we would have accepted that she had consulted with those bodies and that they believed they would be able to meet the requirements of what the Opposition was seeking.

One would have thought that that would have been fairly simple. This is the Government of discussion with all bodies. The Minister was quick to get a hurriedly drawn statement from the Past President of the A.V.A. to demolish my argument that the Department of Agriculture should not take over the veterinary side of I.M.V.S. However, from Wednesday until today she did not think it worth her while to discuss those two bodies' viewpoints on the Opposition's amendment. If that is the general attitude to what we believe are two major parts of the representation of this council, it may be indicative of the kind of response we will get to the rest of the amendments before us this afternoon.

The Government, in effect, will say, 'No, we do not want it and we are not going to have it.' It is not giving any sound reasons. The Minister is saying that it is unlikely that the Royal Adelaide Hospital would not have a medical practitioner as a nominee, and that it is unlikely that the University of Adelaide will not have as nominees two people who are in the faculty of medicine in the university. It seems that the Opposition has acted responsibly and has tried to include in the Bill the recommendations of the three committees that have looked at I.M.V.S. We are trying to spell them out. When the last committee of inquiry report was released, we had the fanfare of trumpets that this would be the new I.M.V.S. Act to embrace everything else, but it seems that few people have been consulted and that little notice has been taken of the relevant parts of the reports. We have to accept that it may or may not happen and it appears that the Government will not accept our amendments to the Bill.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: If I had thought there was any merit in this amendment I would certainly have consulted the Vice Chancellor and Chairman of the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Equally, I am sure that, if either of those two persons had believed that the Bill as they had it explained to them required amendments of this kind, they would have indicated that to me, and those views would have been taken into account. It seems

that the member for Napier is going to quote Wells and Badger as Holy Writ thoughout this debate and ignore the fact that, when I made a Ministerial statement tabling the Wells Committee Report, I said that the Government accepted the general tenor of the recommendations and has indeed embraced the general tenor of those recommendations in this Bill. Nevertheless, in this case there is nothing in the Wells Report to indicate the specifics of the amendment. Wells simply says, 'two persons nominated by the board and council respectively'. The Government believes that that is a satisfactory arrangement. We are simply not going to prescribe one occupation or another but leave it up to the good judgment of the council of the university and the board of management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am somewhat bemused by the reasoning of the Minister in this matter. It is an institute of medical and veterinary science. We are not proposing to change its role unduly and yet, in setting up the council which, under the Minister's proposal consists of 10 persons, our excellent amendment to increase the numbers having not been met at this stage, it seems almost that the Minister has set out to keep medical persons off the council. I invite the Minister to explain where else in the presently proposed council a medical person is to be included. The Minister has been very careful (and I am grateful for that) to ensure that at least one person is to be a veterinary surgeon, but for some reason medical people seem to be precluded. The amendment being put forward by the member for Napier does not go any further than to prescribe that two persons be from the faculty of medicine. The other point put forward by the member for Napier simply says in simple terms that, of two persons from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, one shall be a medical practitioner. I am quite mystified as to why one or both of the amendments are not acceptable. What is it about the medical fraternity as a whole to make the Minister try to prevent them getting on to the governing body of the I.M.V.S.?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is no suggestion whatever that medical practitioners are precluded for membership of the council of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. It is quite ridiculous to suggest that there is. There is nothing whatever in clause 7 to suggest that there should not be a doctor. Clause 7 deals with the freedom of nomination by the bodies laid down under this Bill. It would be almost unbelievable to suggest that the University of Adelaide would not nominate one or indeed two medical practitioners. At the moment the nominees of the University of Adelaide on a council of seven are Professor Shearman, who is in the faculty of medicine, and Mr Mervyn Smith, who is a surgeon. The nominees of the Royal Adelaide Hospital are Mr Lewis Barrett, who happens to be Chairman of the Board (although when originally nominated to that position he was not Chairman of the Board). The other nominee is Professor Pilowsky. I think my memory serves me right in the disposition of those four people. We have three medical people out of four nominees. I think it would be most unlikely that that should not continue.

However, I will not constrain the University of Adelaide or the Royal Adelaide Hospital in choosing people for what is essentially a management function. I should point out, by way of an interesting observation, which is not necessarily relevant to that clause, that, in terms of boards of management for hospitals, more than one doctor is specifically excluded. We are looking at management skills rather than medical input.

Mr Hemmings: Hardly a fair comparison.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, I agree. I do not suggest that that should be applied here, but I am taking up the point implied by the member for Mitchell that a doctor, by the very fact of his being a doctor, is intrinsically an asset to this council. These people will be chosen by the respective bodies on their merits and on the contribution they have to make to the deliberations of the council. It might be that there could be a distinguished scientist who was not a doctor. There might be two people with extremely good business management expertise from the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Government believes that it should be up to those two bodies to determine who they want on the board of the institute which provides pathology teaching service and professional training, through the Royal Adelaide Hospital and through the University of Adelaide, and provides, from the Royal Adelaide Hospital viewpoint, what is a management function for its pathology laboratory. That is what the I.M.V.S. is. In its primary function it is the pathology laboratory of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In the latter remarks made by the Minister she put forward a wonderful case for accepting the amendments of the member for Napier because she carefully explained to us how much of its activity is for the benefit of those two bodies and people who are there. I really do not understand the Minister in this instance. I take it that we are being told that the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science can be run better by people who are not involved in the science of medicine. I do not understand that reasoning at all. Apparently those who are involved in veterinary science are acceptable, and a veterinary surgeon is mentioned specifically.

I really cannot follow this kind of reasoning. I am quite certain that some eminent medically qualified people could not follow the argument either, if it was suggested to them that they do not have management ability as well as medical skills. If management of money is any criterion, I think it is demonstrated throughout Australia that they have some ability to organise their affairs in a well managed way, as they amass large sums of money, so apparently they have business acumen as well as medical qualifications. I am not suggesting that a person on the board of a hospital comes necessarily into that category, but we are not being given a reason at all by the Minister except I think what was put to her by a couple of people as to what they wanted and not necessarily what was wanted by any of the bodies involved.

We were told that there had been no consultation, although the amendments of the member for Napier have been available for some time. In the face of that sort of intransigence there is no point in my talking any further. The amendments commend themselves without comment by me. If the Minister does not want to accept them we will be in exactly the same situation that we were in when the Minister of Education gave a similar answer, but he used much more honest and blunt language, when he said, 'I don't give a damn what you put up, we will not have it.' The Minister is saying the same thing, but in somewhat more polite language.

Mr HEMMINGS: As the member for Mitchell said, we would be wasting the time of the Committee if we pursued this matter, because the Government has made up its mind. The Minister says that in no way will Parliament dictate to a body what it has to do in relation to appointments of people to a council.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yet the Bill is also saying that it can only have 10.

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, Parliament is dictating that. Later on in this clause the Minister says exactly that. It is stated that a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice shall be a member of the council. That completely stops the appointment of any other veterinary surgeon who could possibly be of value to the council making a real input. Such a person will not be allowed to be a member of the

council because the Bill states that the member shall be a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice. If that is not the Parliament dictating who shall be on a council or who shall not I do not deserve to be here; I might as well be in the refreshment room having a cup of tea. In one part of the clause the Parliament dictates, and yet the Minister says that Parliament shall not dictate to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or to the Adelaide University as to who should be on the council. The Minister says it is unbelievable that they will not be appointed; we want it spelt out.

Finally, the Minister said that she did not canvass the views of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Adelaide University about this amendment, because she did not believe it was relevant.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I said that I believed it did not have merit.

Mr HEMMINGS: Relevant or 'merit', I am perfectly happy. I would have thought that 'relevant' was the case. Can the Minister now say whether a copy of the Bill was forwarded to the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Adelaide University for their views on the matter and, if so, who requested a copy of the Bill?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I cannot understand the sense of the second part of that question. If the honourable member is asking me whether a copy of the Bill was forwarded to both those bodies, which I take it would have been done voluntarily by me, and it was and, if so, who requested a copy—

Mr Hemmings: If the Minister did not voluntarily send a copy, was any application made by members of the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the Adelaide University for copies of the Bill to be sent for their consideration?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, there was no representation made by either of those bodies; there did not need to be, because copies of the Bill were forwarded to both bodies through their representatives on the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Council. The member for Napier has just indicated total failure to appreciate the difference between specifying a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice, in order to ensure that there is an input by veterinary surgeons in private practice whose interests may not otherwise be taken account of, and the position of the Royal Adelaide Hospital (of which the institute is its pathology laboratory), and the Adelaide University (which uses the institute to fulfil its pathology teaching function). Those three things are integral to the Bill; that the Royal Adelaide Hospital has an input into the management of the institutes affairs; that the Adelaide University has an input into the management of the institute's affairs; and that veterinary surgeons in private practice, through a nominee, have an input into the institute. Those three things are taken account of, and to suggest that we should specify medical practitioners overlooks the fact that both the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Adelaide University are likely to nominate medical practitioners. If they choose not to, they choose not to for their own good reasons, and I do not propose to constrain them.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Hopgood, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr HEMMINGS: I do not intend to move my amendment to line 9, as it is consequential.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 12 and 13 (clause 8)—Leave out 'and Certain Organisations to which Public Moneys are Provided'.

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 8)—After line 17 insert 'or'.

No. 3. Page 2, lines 20 to 27 (clause 8)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 4. Page 2, line 28 (clause 8)—Leave out 'Subject to subsection (3) the' and insert 'The'.

No. 5. Page 2, lines 37 to 40 (clause 8)—Leave out all words in these lines.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

There has been a good deal of discussion about this entire matter in relation to the powers of the Auditor-General concerning bodies that receive Government grants. This has been a matter of some concern, not as was originally stated in this Chamber in respect of sporting clubs, churches and school bodies but in respect of the assistance given to a number of industrial firms. This was certainly not the intention of the legislation, nor do I believe that it would necessarily apply but, where considerable support and assistance is given to industrial concerns by way of establishment payment grants or decentralisation grants, then inevitably those bodies would be caught in the web of this legislation. That is something that I cannot support, and for that reason I am perfectly happy to accept the amendment made in the other place.

I must say that the suggestion that was made that this provision would adversely affect churches, clubs and sporting bodies is, in fact, not valid, but the suggestion is certainly valid as it would apply to those other industrial concerns. The important thing is that on many occasions assistance is given with the attached conditions that either a director or two directors be appointed to the board of an organisation or that sufficient safeguards be provided to enable the affairs of the company to be monitored from time to time to the satisfaction of the Government. The other issue is that a number of bodies receive large sums of money from the Government, and they may be charitable institutions. There is some need in those instances for a proper check to be maintained, and this could be done in ways other than by the application of this portion of the legislation. I repeat that I am quite happy to accept the amendments.

Mr BANNON: The Opposition is pleased that the Government is prepared to amend its views in this matter and back down from the original proposition as contained in the Bill. I believe that this is another case of hasty and ill-conceived legislative action being taken by the Government, supposedly based on the principle that it would improve efficiency and the accountability of public moneys but, in fact, having implications that go far beyond that. Those implications were spelt out very clearly by the Opposition in the debate in this Chamber, and the Government chose to override them completely. It dismissed them as being

without substance or validity and, in the course of that, pointed to a number of very spurious arguments in defence of the original proposition. Quite frankly, I believe that, when the Government introduced the Bill in this place, it did not fully understand its far-reaching nature.

I hope that that is the case. I will give them the benefit of the doubt. Certainly, their willingness to accept these amendments in another place indicates that they are at least prepared, on reflection, to take the steps that the Opposition attempted in this place. One of the things of which much was made in this Chamber when the matter was being debated was that it was not the Government's intention to gather up a whole range of groups, organisations, clubs, churches and other bodies and that this would be demonstrated in part by fixing a proclaimed amount which would only really affect large organisations, although I might add that that would definitely have affected churches and other bodies.

However, the point that the Opposition made in debate was never fully tackled by the Government, namely, that this was a proclaimed amount, that it could be changed at the whim of the Government by proclamation with no recourse to Parliamentary procedures and no ability to debate it; it would not be entrenched in the legislation. Therefore, whatever the current intention might be, there was obviously the potential to extend the inquiries beyond that which the Opposition felt was reasonable in terms of accountability of public moneys.

Let me stress again, as I stressed in that debate, and as the Opposition has stressed in another place, we are not in any way suggesting that organisations which receive public moneys should not be accountable for the way in which they are spent—of course they should. The Opposition is suggesting that this sledge-hammer approach to the matter—this power that the Auditor-General would have—is not the appropriate way to deal with bodies which are outside the Government and not statutory authorities. That point of view, apparently, has been accepted by the Government.

I must say that I am disturbed by part of the reasoning that the Premier adduces for the Government's change of mind. Apparently, when the matter just appeared to involve churches, sporting bodies and clubs, it did not matter very much; it was only when someone pointed out that it involved industrial concerns that it became of import. Perhaps the Opposition did not strike the right chord in the debate here: if we had been able to highlight industrial concerns, namely, businesses (and presumably the Chamber of Manufactures or some other body has pointed out to the Premier the implications for firms that receive assistance from the Government), the Government might have changed its mind in the Assembly. The Government listens to the interests of these business enterprises; it does not give a fig for the churches, sporting clubs, and so on, whose interests might be quite as legitimate and whose concerns about confidentiality and the other matters that we have raised might be quite as strong as those of what the Premier has called 'industrial concerns'.

So, I am sorry that the Premier dismisses the Opposition's concern about those other bodies. I am very impressed with the power of the industrial concerns or the industrial lobbying on the part of the Government, which I will bear in mind in the future, because there have been other legislative issues taken by the Government with bad implications for the business sector, and sometimes the Opposition (as was obviously the case during the second reading debate in this Chamber) has not fully drawn that out and spelt it out to the Government. That appears to be the key in this instance. It is a pity that these other interests have been disregarded. However, the correction has been made. The Auditor-General's powers have been extended properly to include statutory organisations, but they stop short of bodies in receipt of Government funds. As the Premier has said and as we have said in debate earlier, there are ways and means of ensuring accountability. The Opposition supports the Premier's motion on the acceptance of the amendments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition has a reputation from school days of being an adept debater, more concerned at making debating points than, in fact, really getting down to the nitty-gritty of what is being talked about. Let me point out to him once again that he made a fundamental error when he first launched himself on his tirade in the Chamber earlier on this matter, which was, of course, that he assumed that the Auditor-General was a servant of the Government and not a servant of Parliament. I do not intend to remind him of that any further. He has made another fundamental error when he said that this provision would apply to churches: I would ask him under what part of the Constitution the Government gives direct grants to churches. I think the Leader has made a mistake there; it is a small point, but if he wants to make debating points, I can make as many as he can.

The legislation as it was proposed would not have given the Government any power at all; it was, in fact, simply giving power to the Auditor-General. That is the long and short of it. I am glad that the Leader has acknowledged that the change is necessary, but I am afraid his reasons for taking credit or for trying to take credit do not really stand up to close examination.

Mr BANNON: I cannot let those comments lie, because I believe I was addressing the substance of the matter and not making debating points. The fact that these amendments have come in from another place and have been accepted by the Government indicates that at least some of those points were not debating points, but were points of substance. On this question of the Auditor-General's being a servant of the Government, let me say that I did not make any such error. I point out two more things, beginning from the basis that the Auditor-General, once he has commenced his inquiries, of course, is independent of the Government. I never questioned that, but two important points had to be borne in mind.

The first was that under the legislation he can only investigate those accounts if the Minister directed him to do so and, if he did, the Auditor-General had to do so. That provision was in the legislation, so to that extent the Government would give the Auditor-General his orders. If he were instructed to look at a particular organisation, the Auditor-General was not in a position to be able to demur or say 'No', he did not think it was a good thing that he should have to go ahead with such an investigation. The second point was that, the Auditor-General having completed that investigation, the legislation demanded that his findings be made public. There was no question of discretion on his part; the findings had to be tabled publicly—that is what the legislation stated.

The integrity of the Auditor-General and his independence in such investigations was not in question. What was at question was the Government's directing him to investigate certain bodies that it might have all sorts of underhanded or political reasons to do so and there would be no way of testing that; and, secondly, that his findings would be made public, there being no grounds for the confidentiality of those organisations being preserved. If such was required, that would be bad luck, because the legislation demanded that the findings be made public. Again, I suggest that they were not debating points but points of substance. If the Premier chooses to dismiss them in that way, I think he has misunderstood the legislation as I submit he did in first introducing it. Finally, the Premier asked, 'Where are churches involved?' I point out to the Premier that church

schools in this State receive very substantial grants from the Government.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That's a different matter, isn't it?

Mr BANNON: Yes, it is a different matter, apparently—the churches are inter-connected with the church schools.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That's correct.

Mr BANNON: I am afraid the Premier is wrong. He should look at the constitution, the method of government of some of them, and the land holdings. I know, for instance, that in my own electorate there is a church school which in fact shares its premises, location and management with the church itself. An investigation of the church school and its funds would also embody the church itself. But even if the investigation stops short of the school, I am still suggesting that that is going too far. If the Government wanted to investigate church schools, rather than the Premier instructing the Auditor-General under this Act to carry out the investigation and publish it, I suggest that it is for the Government to take the issue head on and establish some sort of inquiry, I would suggest, in co-operation with the body concerned. As I said a moment ago, there are other ways of doing it. However, to return to the basic points, I say again that they were not debating points being made but matters of substance raised which were acknowledged by the Government's acceptance of these amendments.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for his clear statement of his regard for the Auditor-General which I am very pleased to see that he is now prepared to come out with, contrary to the comments he made in a previous debate. Also, I am grateful to him for reminding me that I omitted to answer one of his points earlier, namely, that the only reason why any acceptance of this amendment is being contemplated is that industrial bodies are involved. I think it is important that the Leader does not take that too much further, because to suggest, as he has done, that the Government is not concerned about churches, sporting bodies, schools, or indeed about the fourth category that he now raises, namely, church schools, is quite ridiculous. We are most concerned about them indeed.

He has made the point that apparently the industrial lobby is greater than the people lobby. I refute that and throw that statement right back in his teeth. Such sentiments come very strangely from someone representing a Party which earlier introduced the Associations Incorporation Act Amendment Bill in this Chamber which required those people themselves to publish, without the Auditor-General's discretion, full details of all their affairs, to be able to refuse membership, to give reasons why memberships were refused and which confirmed obligations which were totally themselves inquisitorial.

I will do the Leader of the Opposition the credit, before he got carried away, by saying that he hit the nail on the head. Difficulties have arisen but not for the reasons that he originally outlined. I can understand his wanting to take some credit for it. If he wants to take any credit for it, that is fine; I do not mind. However, I believe that the legislation will be better for this amendment, and I am perfectly happy to accept it in that spirit.

Motion carried.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE BILL

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3200.)

Clause 7—'The council.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

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

I would have thought that by now the Minister would accept some logic and reason for the amendments we have moved so far which have unfortunately been defeated. Everywhere in clause 7, with the exception of the membership of the council, we have attempted to spell out exactly what a certain person should be, or from which discipline. We believe that the stipulation in line 13 that 'one shall be an officer of the Department of Agriculture nominated by the Minister of Agriculture' should be spelt out to include a veterinary officer of that department, because it is important that the officer appointed by the Minister should be an expert in veterinary affairs.

In my second reading speech, I said that it should be spelt out correctly, and when the Minister of Agriculture read the prepared speech from his department he said that in all probability the nominated person would be a veterinary officer. Then when the Minister of Health, who is in charge of the Bill, replied, the veterinary officer had become a veterinary scientist. We are not asking for a veterinary scientist; we are asking for a veterinary officer. Surely it is not too much to ask that it be spelt out in the Bill that the officer nominated by the Minister shall be an expert in veterinary affairs. The Department of Agriculture has officers with a great variety of different skills, expertise and qualifications. We are not going to say that the Minister will not make sure that it is a veterinary officer.

When we were in Government the Minister would give assurances, and that the then Opposition used to say, 'Well, spell out exactly what you mean.' That is exactly what we are saying here. I am not really concerned about what the present Minister of Agriculture says, because Ministers come and go, and Governments come and go.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise to support my colleague in this matter. I can see a difficulty that perhaps faces the Minister. Since the Minister of Agriculture is not here, perhaps the Minister might wish to report progress and consult with him. This is very interesting: there are apparently occasions when the Minister does not have to consult the Minister of Agriculture. I believe she is quite fortunate, because we often see other Ministers who sit rather closer to him not consulting with him but being told by him what to do. I congratulate the Minister on having this independence in her authority under the Crown to the degree she has just demonstrated to us.

I do not think that the amendment is unreasonable. It would seem to me to be in line with what the Minister of Agriculture, in the midst of the homily he gave us the other day from his prepared brief, told us might happen. I must say that I agree with my colleague entirely: it is valid to argue that Ministers do come and go. Assurances may be of some value; there are many of us who would put a weighted value on different Minister's words. In this case I think it was a resonable assurance given by the Minister of Agriculture, but as has been pointed out that is not for ever and a day; as far as I can see, it is for not more than another year when there is very likely to be a change in the occupancy of this portfolio.

I think the Minister would be doing a service to the I.M.V.S. if this provision were written in. Now we will know that it is her decision and not the decision of the Minister of Agriculture as to whether it can go in or not, because we have been told by way of discussion, as occurs in these Committee matters, with an interchange across the Chamber, that there is no need to consult with the Minister of Agriculture. I look forward to the Minister exercising her independence in this matter and sensibly accepting the amendment.

Mr McRAE: This is one matter which the Opposition must insist on. The way the clause reads at the moment, any Minister of Agriculture—let alone, God help us, our

existing one—can appoint any officer of the Department of Agriculture to this organisation. That is an intolerable situation. Surely, there must be total reason and reasonableness in what both my colleagues have said. No matter what assurances are given, Ministers come and go. Departments usually go on for ever, although they are sometimes amalgamated. Bearing in mind the nature of the organisation, it is totally reasonable that the officer who comes from that department should be a veterinary officer. If the Government cannot even accept that amendment, it gets back to what I said earlier, namely, that no-one will be accepted, no matter how reasonable, just or logical, simply because the Government has made up its own dogged ideological mind.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is interesting to see the rigidity that is now apparent on the part of the Opposition. When in Government, Opposition members sought (and rightly) flexibility in terms of Ministerial discretion.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Any many amendments, too.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: When amendments had merit in the eyes of the Government, they were accepted. It so happens that these amendments do not have merit in the eyes of the Government, and I have explained why. Basically, they do not differ in substance and principle from the reasons for the Government's opposition to amendments that would have constrained the University of Adelaide and the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital in relation to the choice of nominees to the institute council.

Those same reasons apply in respect of the Minister of Agriculture. The member of the institute council from the Department of Agriculture should obviously have general responsibility for animal matters. In practice, as the member for Mitchell particularly may know, that does not necessarily mean that that officer will be a veterinary surgeon. He or she could be an agricultural scientist, an agricultural economist or a general administrator who is charged with responsibility by virtue of his or her position as a Department Director-General or a Director. It could be one of a number of occupations but nevertheless involve one who has the responsibility for the administration of animal matters.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That would be excellent; he could advise on an outbreak of foot and mouth disease or something like that.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It would be too ridiculous to suggest that someone in that position needs to have the technical and scientific expertise to advise on an outbreak of foot and mouth disease. That person needs to have the administrative competence in order to ensure that technical advice from the appropriate officers is sought, taken and implemented in the appropriate manner. That is what we are looking for in this position. It is possible that the person may be a veterinary surgeon, but it is not necessary for that person to be a veterinary surgeon; nor does the Government believe that this clause should require that person to be a veterinary surgeon.

The person who has overall responsibility for the management of animal matters and general authority for the management of animal matters should be on the institute council. That person may have under him or her a number of veterinary surgeons, but he or she may not be a veterinary surgeon. The Government believes that the person with the responsibility and authority should be nominated to the council. Whether or not he or she is a veterinary surgeon is, to some extent, a matter of chance.

Mr Hemmings: A veterinary officer?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Or a veterinary surgeon. I repeat that the person from the Department of Agriculture who sits on the council should have the authority and responsibility not only in scientific and animal matters but also in personnel and budgetery matters. That is why the Government believes that this clause should be worded in the way that it is worded, in order to give the Minister of Agriculture of the day the discretion that he needs in nominating the appropriate officer.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Apparently the Minister of Agriculture is not taking any chances in this matter, in case the Minister occupying the bench wavers in the face of the Opposition's logic, because he has now returned to the Chamber to bolster—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Russack): Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the clause.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I should be pleased to do that, but I have had to put up with this for 10 years when I have had to leave the Chamber. This has been written into the record time and time again, and I thought that I might serve it back for a change. I agree with you, Sir, that it is purile, and I will not do it again. However, it is done regularly in this Chamber.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I simply want it—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: This isn't my Bill; it is the Minister's Bill.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the Minister of Agriculture wants to speak, he can get up. Otherwise, he should get out.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rose simply to say that, if we take the Minister's logic, the next time that my colour television goes on the blink I will telephone the doctor.

Amendment negatived.

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 3, line 14—Leave out 'Minister of Agriculture' and insert 'South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association'.

One of the Minister's closing remarks before she reported progress last Wednesday was that our fears were unfounded and that the Minister of Agriculture has seen her. We saw the Minister of Agriculture move across and tell the Minister of Health that he would select that person from a panel of three veterinary scientists or surgeons nominated by the Australian Veterinary Association, South Australian Division. That smacks of the greatest piece of hypocrisy that I have seen in the short time that I have spent in this House.

When the Labor Government was in office, and we suggested that a nominee should come from a panel of three persons to be selected by the Minister, person after person in the then Opposition used to say that this was a vile socialist plot and that we would pick the one person who would cause the least amount of trouble. We intended at one time, when discussing this amendment, to put forward a panel of three members. However, we decided against this because of the Government's known attitude in the past that every association that is going to provide a nominee should be given the right to pick that person, and the Government accepts that nomination. Yet, here we have the Minister of Agriculture strolling across the Chamber to the Minister of Health, saying—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: When?

Mr HEMMINGS: That happened. The Minister has said that that did not happen.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: I didn't say that at all.

Mr HEMMINGS: Let me quote what happened, as follows:

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.

Will the Minister of Agriculture now say that he did not go up and indicate to the Minister of Health that he would ask the A.V.A. to provide him with a panel of three names?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It's in the Bill.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister says it is in the Bill. I will not go as far as my colleague the member for Mitchell, but it is not in the Bill. The Bill provides;

One shall be a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice nominated by the Minister of Agriculture.

The two are not compatible. The Minister of Agriculture gave assurances to the Minister, who correctly relayed that assurance to the Chamber, that he would ask the A.V.A., South Australia Division, to give a panel of three names and he would select. Yet, time and again when that Minister was in Opposition he used to say that we were using that method to pick the weakest nominee, especially in the case of the Law Society. That shows the double standards that this Government has, particularly the Minister of Agriculture. He should never have come into this debate, but he had to impress upon the committee his involvement and his recognition of his new responsibility with his added empire. As a crumb he would ask the A.V.A. to give a panel of three names.

Our amendment provides that the A.V.A. should have the right to say who should be a representative, but the Minister is not prepared to accept that. He wants to sit there and pick. I am pointing out the hypocrisy of this Government. What it says in Opposition it conveniently forgets when in Government. We will not forget, because Ministers come and go and Governments come and go. When we are the Government we will throw those comments back to the present Government members, who will be banished to this side of the Chamber. We will throw it back to them when they start to talk about the principals of associations and organisations being able to name their own representatives on any committees, boards or councils.

We believe that the A.V.A. should have the right to nominate a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice. We are not even opposed to the position of the person being in private practice, although it tends to keep a lot of people out of the running as far as being nominated is concerned. We are saying that the A.V.A. is quite capable of nominating one person and the Minister should stand by that nomination and accept it in good grace, not have three bites of the cherry by asking for three names from which he will make his choice.

This is an important part and we believe that this is an important amendment. We would have accepted reasonable arguments that the Minister might have put forward but the Minister of Agriculture, as is his wont, cannot restrain himself from being the outrider of Cabinet, as I think he was called. He keeps them all in herd and order, from the Chief Secretary to the Minister of Education, and that time he tried it with the Minister of Health. I have a lot of respect for the judgment of the Minister of Health and it suprises me that she has herself snowed by this Minister. This Government is committed to having a panel of three names unless the Minister is going to go back on his word and say that the information he gave the Minister of Health was a load of twaddle and that he did not mean it, that he thought he could feed it to the proles on this side and we would be satisfied but we are not.

The Minister has been hoist by the petard of the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister should be moving an amendment in line with what the Minister of Agriculture said when he sidled up to her on Wednesday afternoon. The Minister may be laughing. I may be treating this in a seemingly trivial way, but it is very important that the Minister either refute what the Minister of Agriculture said or say that what she said on Wednesday was a figment of her imagination. Perhaps the Government can change that line to fall into line with the philosophy of the Minister of Agriculture. I will now give the Minister a chance to respond.

Mr McRAE: I find this clause terribly obnoxious.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr McRAE: I know that the Minister was out of order, although I heard only snorting and laughing. I make the point that any responsible organisation should be able to nominate a responsible person to an organisation. Why is a distinction drawn between the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which has a right to nominate two persons, the University of Adelaide and the A.V.A.? Why is such a distinction drawn? It is an interesting question. It is clear that it is a calculated insult to the A.V.A. The Government has said that everything in this Bill is right because the Government thinks it is right and therefore it must be right. That is the course of non-logic that this debate has followed.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital, as part of the Health Commission generally, is considered responsible enough to nominate two people without the scrutiny of the Minister. The Government would not dare to touch the University of Adelaide, because it knows it would not get away with it. The university is considered responsible enough. However, is the association of veterinary surgeons considered in the same light? No, it is not. One could ask why. I suggest that the answer is that the Minister of Agriculture, in his well-known stand on all these matters, is determined that he will be the one who picks the person from his own department (we have had that established) and he will also be the person to pick the veterinary officer coming from private practice.

I have pointed out, first, the insult to the association and I also point out that it is a very strange break or deviation in Liberal Party ideology, because it seems to me that, had this been the A.M.A. instead of the A.V.A., there would have been no question of the Minister's doing the picking, because it would have been accpeted. The problem is simply that the Minister is frightened that the A.V.A. would put up a responsible person who would find out what lurks there which is hidden at the moment. We say that a responsible organisation should be treated as such and should have its own right, regardless of whether it is the Trades and Labor Council or the A.V.A.

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

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Before the dinner adjournment the Opposition made much play in support of its amendment of the fact that a veterinary surgeon in private practice should be nominated by the South Australian division of the Australian Veterinary Association. The arguments advanced in support of that proposition were lightweight, to say the least, and in some cases positively ludicrous. The Opposition also tried to suggest that somehow or other either the Minister of Agriculture had been overruled by me or I had been overruled by the Minister in respect of this clause and some other clauses of the Bill.

I want to make clear to the Committee that this is a Government Bill; it was endorsed by Cabinet; it was the result of long discussions by officers of the Health Commission, the I.M.V.S., and the Department of Agriculture, and between the Minister of Agriculture and me. Needless to say, we are at one on all the clauses of the Bill as introduced and we are at one in our opposition to the amendment that has been moved to this clause. In essence, the member for Napier, in his diatribe on this clause, stated that the Opposition, when in Government, supported the clause that this Government has inserted in the Bill to

provide that the Minister should have the right to nominate an individual to a council. Indeed, that goes to the very heart of Ministerial responsibility. The Labor Party obviously recognised that when in Government, yet it conveniently overlooks it in this case.

Mr Hemmings: That is not what I said. You read *Hansard* tomorrow.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Opposition stated that when it was in Government, the Liberal Party opposed such clauses, therefore implying that the Labor Party when in Government supported the proposition that the Minister should have the right to nominate a person to a council. It is logic: that implication must follow from that proposition put by the member.

Mr Hemmings: Read *Hansard* tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Only one member must speak at a time.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government believes that that should be the case in respect of the nomination of a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice nominated by the Minister of Agriculture in accordance with clause 7 (2) (vi). The Minister carries responsibility for the administration of veterinary services. The veterinary services provided by his Department through the institute must be responsive not only to the requirements of the Department of Agriculture but also to the requirements of veterinary surgeons in private practice. It is common throughout all Acts and Statutes, and it is common practice in Government, that, when Ministers are selecting nominees for various boards or committees, the advice of the appropriate professional or occupational group is sought. In this case, as I indicated last week in the Committee stage, the professional group is the A.V.A., so the Minister will seek the advice of the A.V.A. in the form of nominations of a panel of three veterinary surgeons in private practice, of whom he will select one.

That is common practice, and it will apply in this case. I indicated that, whether this was the result of the Minister's sidling up to me (as was alleged by a member opposite) or whether information was contained in the notes before me and the Minister simply came to me to commend me for the remarks I had made, I honestly cannot recall. In any case, that is irrelevant. The fact is that the Minister of Agriculture has indicated to me that he intends to seek a panel of three names from the A.V.A. and to select an individual from that panel.

There is no way that the Minister will be going back on his word in this respect. The member for Playford suggested that somehow or other the Government was inconsistent in its attitude, on the one hand, to the nomination of the board of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and to the council of the University of Adelaide, and on the other, to clause 7 (2) (vi). There is no inconsistency whatsoever in this clause and it is quite foolish to liken the A.V.A. to either the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the University of Adelaide. The A.V.A. is a professional body that has a professional interest in the person who represents private veterinary surgery on the council.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital is a Government hospital and is entitled to nominate two people through its board. The University of Adelaide is a statutory body, and, of course, is entitled to exercise its own judgment as to whom it nominates, but the Minister is the person who will carry responsibility for the services that are provided to the veterinary surgeons in private practice. It is therefore appropriate that he should nominate who he thinks will be the most appropriate to represent veterinary surgery on that council. It is equally appropriate that he should seek the advice of the professional body that represents the veterinary surgeons. The Minister has said that he will do that, and I believe that that is sufficient to ensure that a veterinary surgeon who is acceptable to the A.V.A. will be chosen.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I forget now, but I think that I may have been in this place longer than you, Mr Acting Chairman, but during that time I do not ever recall an occasion on which a Minister has said that the probity or veracity of a Minister is irrelevant. I was quite surprised to hear the Minister say that. The Minister was trying to dismiss an important occurrence prior to the dinner adjournment, when the member for Napier, in speaking to the amendment, which concerns how we shall get a registered veterinary surgeon on the council, pointed out, and quoted from *Hansard*, remarks that show that the Minister, a Minister of the Crown, stated (the remarks are recorded in *Hansard* for posterity) the following:

> The Minister has indicated that he will select that person from a panel of three veterinary scientists or surgeons nominated by the A.V.A., the South Australian Division.

If the Minister considers that to be irrelevant to what transpires in this place, I believe the Minister should reconsider her position as a Minister of the Crown. All members in this Chamber respond to and are responsible to the people of this State and, individually, to their electorates for their probity and integrity, and that normally does not seem to interfere with the running of the Chamber. However, tonight, to my amazement, I heard the Minister say, 'Well, it is irrelevant anyway; if I said something in this House, if what I said is not correct, it does not matter.'

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Oh, come on.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That is what the Minister said.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: You look at the record.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Does the Minister want me to bandy the meaning of 'irrelevant'? Those are the words that she said, as I wrote them down carefully so that I could not be accused of paraphrasing or misrepresenting the Minister. The Minister said that it was irrelevant. The question of integrity of a Minister is never irrelevant, and never are the words of a member, for that matter, so let us get that clear.

I have quoted the words here again tonight that were mentioned by my colleague earlier in which it was indicated that a certain procedure was going to be followed. Is the Minister now telling us that it is not going to occur that way any longer? The Minister tried to dismiss it, in a rather coy performance, by saying that the Minister of Agriculture had sidled up to her and that is a curious—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That was not—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Did the Minister say 'sidled' or not?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I was repeating the remarks of my colleagues.

An honourable member: It was the member for Napier who said that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: You see, whenever a person in this House is under stress we get dissimulation and a trying to shift the emphasis. It was the Minister's word. The Minister of Agriculture—

Dr Billard: It was the member for Napier.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Newland has been at some pains to demonstrate that nuclear power is so beautiful that I am amazed he does not support it for South Australia. I know why, but he does not want to go that far and he ought to stick to that area, because he has some qualifications in that area.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Russack): Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the matter before the Chair.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will come right back to that point because it is a question of the member's word also. I feel we would be at one on this matter on my knowledge

of the issue. I recall the Speaker having made rulings along the lines that a member can say almost anything in this place, but that member is required to live with it. We are told by a Minister of the Crown tonight that whether a certain thing happened, which she told us happened, is irrelevant. That is an amazing statement from a Minister. I ask the Minister to consider this: do we treat all of her other remarks in the same vein, as not important? Are they all irrelevant, too? They were said in the same place, in the same context, and during the debate on the same Bill. How is an Opposition expected to know when the Minister is being irrelevant and when she is being fair dinkum, to use a term that we on this side understand. I ask the Minister to give some consideration to that point. When she rises, if she does, to respond, she may be in a position to clear up this *contretemps*. We can then proceed to the more important matter of accepting this very sensible amendment put forward by my colleague, the member for Napier.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is difficult to follow the somewhat convoluted argument of the member for Mitchell. I did not say that it was irrelevant that the Minister of Agriculture had undertaken to seek a panel of three names from the Australian Veterinary Association. I said, in response to comments and questions by the member for Napier, that whether the Minister had given me that information by coming up to me in the Chamber—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Sidling.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:—or sidling up to me, as he put it, or by virtue of notes which he had provided to me in explanation of clauses from his point of view, is irrelevant. It matters not how I came to give the House that information, whether it was by information provided in writing by the Minister or whether it was by the Minister in conversation giving me that information; the fact is that the information was given to the House. I have repeated it to the Committee tonight. The Minister of Agriculture will stand by it, and the Committee can be assured that the veterinary surgeon in private practice who will be nominated by the Minister of Agriculture to the Council of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science will be chosen from a panel of three submitted to the Minister by the Australian Veterinary Associaton (S.A. Division).

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is nice to know the Minister has now got clear in her mind what did happen in this matter. Ministers of the Crown are required to be on the ball and to know what happens and we have just had described to the Committee, on the basis of the irrelevancy, 'I cannot remember what happened.' I advise the Minister, in the future, to be certain about what did happen. I am not talking about 12 months ago or a year ago, when it is reasonable to say that one cannot remember every transaction that occurred. This is the Minister's Bill it does not come from another House. It belongs to the Minister, she needs to know every word in that Bill backwards, if the person with that responsibility is discharging it for the benefit of this State, as is often remarked in the daily prayer in this House. The member for Newland has still a mile or two to go in this area before he can interject and make a sensible remark that we may listen to.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Whilst the Minister may choose to say that I have convoluted reasoning, at no time did she question of integrity of the remarks I made. I suggest that the member for Mallee give consideration to that point. The Minister was caught and she knew that, if the Minister of Agriculture gave her some information, she ought to be in a position to tell the Committee how she got it—whether it was on the latrine network, on the phone, or on a piece of paper.

Mr Lewis: When were you last drunk?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I take exception to that remark, and ask for it to be withdrawn immediately.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitchell has taken exception to words used by the member for Mallee and has asked for them to be withdrawn.

Mr LEWIS: Unless you, Sir, rule those words to be unparliamentary I have no inclination to withdraw them.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Chair can only request that the remarks be withdrawn, and the honourable member for Mallee considers that he does not wish to withdraw. The words are not unparliamentary.

An honourable member interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I am sorry to put you, Sir, in this position but I believe I would be in order to draw to your attention rulings given in this House by the Speaker that where a member takes objection to remarks and immediately draws attention to them and asks for their withdrawal there is a reasonable requirement that they be withdrawn.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In reply to the honourable member for Mitchell, the only time the Speaker has suggested that it should be withdrawn is when a term is considered unparliamentary. I am sure the honourable member will recall in the past few days an incident similar to this one. As the words were not unparliamentary, it was left to the honourable member to decide whether or not to withdraw them.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I now ask your indulgence, Sir, because I must digress from the Bill in order to indicate that the member who has described me as drunk is totally incorrect.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He did not say that.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I heard what he said, and I need no clarification. I know the implication. Does the honourable member deny that? The member said, 'When was the last time you were drunk?' The answer is that I do not recall but I indicate that on this occasion I am not drunk. Surely I have that right.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! There cannot be a debate on the situation. The member for Mitchell has accepted a statement from the member for Mallee as personal and has asked for it that be withdrawn. I have asked the member for Mallee, who has declined to withdraw the statement. After the explanation, has the member for Mallee the desire to withdraw that statement?

Mr LEWIS: If it will help the member for Mitchell to get on with the substance of the Bill, I will be willing to withdraw those remarks.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you, Sir, for your assistance in the matter and I regret that the member does not have the internal fortitude—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to continue with the debate.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:—to admit that on this occasion he has made a mistake. I will demonstrate that he has made a mistake as I relate my comments to the remainder of the passage of this measure. I was making the point (and I do not believe that I am in error in making such a point) that it is tremendously important that a Minister of the Crown (also a member, but even more so for a Minister if one can take it that way) has to be very accurate and very careful about what is said in this Chamber. The correctness of what is said is to be taken by all other members as something upon which they can rely and which need not be questioned in any way. I was trying to indicate in this amendment the position in which the Opposition finds itself when a Minister describes a statement she made on 24 February, which is not that long ago, as being irrelevant. Surely, that is important enough and relevant enough to

this matter. I will leave it there. If the Minister does not wish to pick up the hint or clue that I was helpfully trying to give her, that is fair enough, and I do not want to go further.

The Minister was unwise in referring to a statement that she made in relation to another Minister (a double compound, so to speak) as being irrelevant. That is just not on, and it cannot be continually worn.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister who is doing all the side feeding has an opportunity to enter the debate and justify or otherwise his position in the matter.

True, I have made play on the words used, but I believe that that was reasonable licence in this place and is often indulged in by members other than the member for Mitchell; there is nothing new about that. Returning to the matter we are considering, whether the South Australian Division of the Australian Veterinary Association is a body of sufficient standing and, history I was about to say 'a body of sufficient integrity', but I suppose I would be accused of being provocative, so I will not use that word, but will use the word 'history' in this matter to be entitled to make a nomination and the Minister ought not to be sitting in some kind of Solomon-like position where he chooses who will function on the institute's council.

If the Minister believes that I am being unfair to him, I point out that collectively Ministers select, at least from my count, five of the members anyway, and the Director is also a Government appointment. Is that not so? How much does the Minister of Agriculture want the situation sewn up? In this case, why not demonstrate *bona fides* and good faith in the matter and allow a responsible body, of which Mr Speaker has long been a respected member, and even a former President, to exercise a normal function for such a body and nominate a member? No further words are necessary.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Having been cited as a party to the debate before the Committee, it is reasonable for me to explain to the member for Mitchell that, within the ambit of agriculture, we have now 198 committees serving that industry cum departmental industry within South Australia. Of that 198 committees—about 70 fewer than the 268 in existence when we came to office—a significant number are made up of departmental officers (some from my department, from other departments, from industry, the Commonwealth, and so on). Where industry is involved and, more importantly, where it is invited to have nominees participating in that committee work, the principle has been for many years, as I understand it, to invite the industry concerned to submit a panel of persons that it believes are suitable for that job, and for the Minister to choose one of those nominees. The opportunity is there for one nominee from that direction. I do not know all of the reasons or the history of events that led up to that principle being adopted within Government departments, but certainly happens in a number of others.

I am sure that the member for Mitchell would recognise this. I have known the occasion since coming into Government where industry has submitted its panel of names, or local government has submitted its panel of names (to name another group) and associated with that panel of names has been an explanation of specific interest areas of the individuals. It is recognised that from the A.V.A. they are all professionals, that there may be certain aspects about individual representatives nominated by that organisation that demonstrate special interest in a given area. It may be that special interest expertise that the council is looking for within its ranks.

It is for those general reasons, I gather, that more than one person is nominated by the organisation concerned, and that in every case that I am referring to the Minister in my department and, indeed, Ministers in other co-departments, are given that opportunity to take from the information provided to them, and accompanying the nominees from the authority, the professions or local government group or organisation concerned, so that with that information they then formally appoint one of those nominees. It being the practice, and it being on the records as being accepted by both sides of the House for as long as I have been in this place, I see no reason for exception in this instance. I know of no reason given by the authority, or any other like authority, to complain about the situation. It leaves me wondering, to say the least, why the Opposition is seeking to make such an issue about this matter and to abuse the Minister of Health, as indeed has been done. Her integrity has been abused.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Minister's integrity has been abused during this debate and I take exception to that. I think it has been quite unnecessary to get to that level during this debate and, if my comment in relation to explaining the procedure proposed, the procedure consistent with so many other committee appointments in Government departments across the board, is of any assistance, then I hope it will be accepted in good faith and in the way that it is given.

Mr HEMMINGS: I will not say much about the gutter tactics of the member for Mallee in this debate when he attempted to—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Any reference to that incident has been dealt with. I ask the honourable member to keep to the clause.

Mr HEMMINGS: Thank you, Sir, I will abide by your ruling, but we on this side will not forget it.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that I am offended by the imputations in the remarks made by the member for Napier and I ask him to withdraw.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Would the honourable member indicate the words that were offensive?

Mr LEWIS: The words used to describe my interjection when I was inquiring of the member for Mitchell as to the last occasion on which he lost his sobriety, the words used to describe my inquiry being 'gutter tactics'. I take exception to the inference and the use of those words by the member for Napier.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mallee has been offended by the expression used by the honourable member for Napier and asks that those words be withdrawn.

Mr HEMMINGS: Gladly, Sir. I withdraw them. I am rather amazed at the Minister of Agriculture's statement that in all cases a number of nominees is submitted, that it has been common practice for many years and that everyone accepts that situation. That is not the case. What I said earlier is that when this Government was in opposition and my Party was in Government, when we had reason to call upon certain organisations, associations, institutes and so on to nominate a person, and when we asked for a panel of three, four or five names to be submitted, it was the Minister of Agriculture who was in the forefront standing up and screaming that the then Government had no faith in the organisation that we were seeking nominations from.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr HEMMINGS: That is correct, especially in the area of law. The Minister is shaking his head. Before the evening is over I hope I will have conclusively proved, through statements made by members of the Government, their opposition to this measure, especially that of the Minister of Agriculture, and we have two people working on his

speeches at the moment. I will prove that conclusively. The Minister of Agriculture should never have become involved in this debate, as I said before the dinner adjournment. The Minister of Health has been handling herself very well but, as I said earlier, she was snubbed. If there will be three nominations from the A.V.A. and the Minister will make the final selection, can that be provided in the Bill? We have said before in relation to different aspects of this clause that Ministers and Governments come and go.

There was no mention at all about a panel of three in the Minister's second reading explanation. All she said was that one shall be a registered veterinary surgeon in private practice nominated by the Minister of Agriculture; she did not say 'nominated by the Minister of Agriculture through the A.V.A.' Our amendment provides that one person shall be placed on the council by the A.V.A. and the Minister will accept that nomination. My colleague, the member for Playford, said earlier that there should be no Ministerial interference with the Royal Adelaide Hospital or with the Adelaide University. The Minister of Agriculture, in his prepared brief, said that he was mindful of the onerous responsibility of the enlargement of his Ministerial portfolio. I will not say that he is going to be mindful—I believe he wants to have sole command over whoever goes on to the council from the agricultural area. I think we have pursued this line enough and proved in this particular clause that the Minister of Health has been overruled by the Minister of Agriculture. The Opposition stands by what it has said and hopes that the Minister of Health disregards what the Minister of Agriculture says and supports the Opposition's amendment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is ridiculous for the Opposition to assert that I have been overruled by the Minister of Agriculture in this matter. As I pointed out earlier, this is a Government Bill and its provisions have been endorsed by Cabinet and by the Parliamentary Liberal Party. The Minister of Agriculture and I are agreed on the Bill as it stands and the Government is not going to accept any amendment to this clause because we do not believe that it is necessary to have a professional body nominating people to the council of the I.M.V.S. in the way that the Opposition suggests. The Minister is going to have responsibility for the provision of the services and the Minister is therefore entitled to select who will be the veterinary surgeon in private practice who is on the council.

It is true that that procedure, which the Minister intends to adopt as a courtesy to the A.V.A., could have been mentioned in the second reading explanation. A lot of things could have been mentioned in the second reading explanation. The honourable member will recognise that it was a long and detailed explanation; indeed, usually long and detailed. We could have made it twice as long and perhaps removed the necessity for any information to be provided in Committee, but we believed that the second reading explanation gave sufficient information to give the House a clear understanding of the Government's intentions in introducing this Bill. The information about the A.V.A. came out naturally during the course of the Committee and was provided for the information of Committee members to indicate that the Minister will consult with the A.V.A. and select one from a panel of three names. We believe that that is a proper and satisfactory procedure and is procedure widely followed. At no stage did the Minister of Agriculture say that it is followed in all cases. He simply said, 'In a significant number of cases' this procedure is followed and that is a very significant number when one considers the number of committees and boards that are related to the Department of Agriculture. It is going to be followed in respect of the council of the institute and, for the reasons the Minister of Agriculture has stated and I have stated, the Government does not propose to accept the amendment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise to make two brief points. First, I was pleased to note that the Minister did not accept the remarks I made in other than the correct spirit. The Minister of Health is charged with this Bill, if one looks at clause 15. The Minister of Health understood the point I was making (and that does not mean she necessarily agreed with me) that it was important that the Minister understand that remarks made in the House by such a person need to be on the ball, correct and (if we want to get down to the guts of it) true.

I respect the Minister for recognising that fact, because that is all I was talking about. I made no personal assault on the Minister. I pointed out that one has to be careful about these things when one is a Minister, and I was speaking from a position of some knowledge because I was once a Minister. The point I want to make in relation to the clause is that the Minister (and I preface this by saying that I make the point in a kindly way so that we do not upset the member for Mallee and have him go off into one of his aberrations) has shifted ground again in her last answer. Shall we return to 24 February and see what the Minister of Health said? No-one questions the veracity of *Hansard* because, as we all know, members have a chance to check and disagree with what is printed there. The Minister of Health said:

> The Minister has indicated that he will select that person from a panel of three veterinary scientists or surgeons nominated by the association.

The Minister just told us that there would be a process of consultation and selection. So, there is an additional bit of information that has come forward. I suggest to the Minister that there is need for care in these matters. In the words of my colleague, the member for Napier, I suspect that the Minister may have been snowed in the matter and, if the Minister wishes to enlarge on that, that is fine. It has been made clear time and again that, on the Opposition side, we are wasting our time in endeavouring to develop logical and sensible improvements to this Bill.

Surely the Minister can see the logic of what we are saying. The Minister can already select a number of nominees, in any case. Why will she not allow this responsible body to put forward its representative singly instead of in triplicate?

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (19)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Russack, Schmidt, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Bannon, Corcoran, Duncan, Hopgood, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Allison, Evans, Randall, Rodda, and Tonkin.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr HEMMINGS: I will not proceed with the further amendment, as it is consequential on the amendment just defeated.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 and 9 passed.

Clause 10—'Removal from vacancies of office.'

Mr HEMMINGS: In my second reading speech I drew attention to the Opposition's query concerning clause 10 (1) *(a)*, which provides for the removal of an appointed member of the council on the ground of 'any breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of his appointment'. I

canvassed this matter at some length during my second reading speech and I asked the Minister for some clarification of this provision. I pointed out that having searched many Bills I could not find any similar provision dealing with the removal of a person from office for any breach of, or non-compliance with, a condition of his or here appointment. Will the Minister say why this provision is included?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I recall the honourable member referring to this in his second reading speech, but I overlooked responding to it in my reply. Clause 10 (1) *(a)* is a standard provision which occurs in various Statutes. It was, in fact, used by the honourable member's Party when in Government. I can refer to at least two pieces of legislation which have identical provisions; there are probably many more. As this Bill is strongly related to the health field, the South Australian Health Commission Act is a good one to refer to. The provision in section 11 (1) *(a)* of the Health Commission Act is identical to this provision. Section 10 (2) *(a)* of the Country Fires Act, 1976, also contains this provision. There is nothing sinister about it whatsoever; it is simply regarded as a standard provision for inclusion in clauses which deal with conditions of employment.

Mr HEMMINGS: I thank the Minister for quoting certain Acts that contain this provision. Could the Minister tell the Committee why a certain condition of appointment should be placed on members of the council? Could she give some examples of what the conditions of employment are? I previously quoted the Official Secrets Act, which I had to sign when I was employed in a Government department and which clearly stated exactly what I could or could not do. Is the membership of the I.M.V.S. council so rigid that the members on being appointed have to agree that if they breach or do not comply with this condition of appointment they are immediately removed from office? This is a rather rigid provision, on which we would like further information from the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I said, it has become a standard catch-all clause, and in that respect it picks up issues which may not have been dealt with in the other grounds of removal of appointed members, such as dishonourable conduct or a mental or physical incapacity to carry out duties of office. I imagine a condition of employment would cover an expectation that a person was to attend and participate in meetings of the council. There is certainly no intention to get people to sign a pledge—if I can respond to the reference to the Official Secrets Act—no intention of that kind whatsoever. When the Governor makes appointments it is for a certain term; there is an expectation that people will attend meetings, and it is to cover things of that nature.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I take it really that the Minister is saying that, in these sorts of term appointments, which are basically contractual in nature, this is a type of catch-all clause that is now being used.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Yes.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: What sort of conditions other than those indicated would the Minister have in mind that might be listed under failure to comply with the requirements of this clause? Mental and physical incapacity is listed and, sad though this might be in individual circumstances, I think all members would understand what would be implied there. I assume it is not being suggested that failure to attend a meeting results in the heavy hand of dismissal.

Mr Becker: I think you've got to look at the area where they come from.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Is the Minister pointing out, as the member for Hanson has wisely pointed out, that the membership of the council is going to be rather mixed; some will be from a Government area directly and others will result, unfortunately because our efforts have failed, from the selection by the Minister from three persons, for example, plus consultation, as we later heard from the Minister, with the Australian Veterinary Association?

One would think that the requirements on a person appointed from the Department of Agriculture might well be different from those that could be expected from a person appointed from the A.V.A., albeit from that tripartite arrangement I mentioned and the selection of the Minister. I think, because of the very nature of the range pointed out by the member for Hanson, it would be useful if the Minister could outline any information she has at hand at this time. I would be the first to admit that it is not possible to foresee every eventuality. However, it would be helpful to the Committee and intended appointees if they knew where they stood in this matter.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I think the member for Mitchell has satisfactorily answered his question, following the response from the member for Hanson.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I did chair the Health Commission—

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In that case the honourable member will recall that the conditions of employment for various people appointed at that time, namely, three full-time commissioners and the others part-time, were different. In this case, the officer of the Health Commission would rely for his status on the Council of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in his position as an officer of the Health Commission. Similarly, the person nominated by the Minister of Agriculture would rely for his status as a council member on his status as an officer of the Department of Agriculture. It is my understanding that the clause is there principally in response to those members of the council whose position on it depends on their employment in another organisation, be it the Health Commission, the Department of Agriculture or the university, depending on the nominations. It would have a lesser application, for example, to the two persons nominated by the Minister of Health who have experience in financial management because they will come from outside Government.

The member for Mitchell's assumption as to the reasons for inclusion of this standard catch-all clause in this Bill, as it was included in other Bills by his Party when in Government, is just to take account of the different locations from which various members come in order to become members of the council and the fact that their membership in certain instances depends on their having a Government appointment elsewhere.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It was interesting to note that the Minister was only too pleased to point out, without any carping criticism, that something had been adopted from legislation introduced by the previous Government and was apparently quite satisfactory and suitable to the occasion. That was refereshing to hear. At times one could be excused for going home with the impression that we never did anything right. However, from time to time it comes out that we did do some things right. I thank the Minister for the frank explanation she gave.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Functions and powers of the Institute.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 5, lines 20 to 24—Leave out paragraph *(c)* and insert paragraphs as follows:

(c) to provide such veterinary services or facilities, and undertake such research in the field of veterinary science, as the Minister of Agriculture may require;

(ca) to provide a veterinary pathology service for veterinary surgeons in private practice;

I spoke at length on this matter in the second reading debate. I do not want to canvass what I have said, because

the Minister knows the Opposition's view on this matter. Subclause (1) *(c)* provides:

> to provide and maintain such services and facilities for the Department of Agriculture, in relation to veterinary services (including services for veterinary surgeons in private practice) or research provided or carried out by that department, as the Minister of Agriculture may require;

We believe that that provision goes against the recommendation of the Wells Committee. I said in my second reading speech that many facilities are available for pathology services to medical practitioners in private practice. The Minister and I disagree about the number; I said that there was an abundance and the Minister said that there were not that many, but there is certainly sufficient.

Nowhere is there a pathology service available for veterinary surgeons. Only one pathology service in the Adelaide metropolitan area employs a veterinary pathologist. We have moved to split paragraph *(c)*. We agree that research in the field of veterinary science be carried out as the Minister of Agriculture may require, and we believe that the institute should be directed to provide a veterinary pathology service for veterinary surgeons in private practice. The Wells Report, at page 59, paragraph 12.1.5, states:

> The Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science Act, 1937-1978, introduced the concept of provisions of medical and veterinary laboratory services to both the State and to the private sector. While medical practitioners are specifically included under this Act, private veterinarians are not. It is also debatable whether the Act as it now stands includes any obligation to provide a veterinary diagnostic service. Of relevance is the Stock Diseases Amendment Act, 1968, which states that all private laboratories performing work to identify disease in animals must be approved by the Minister of Agriculture. At the present time the only approved laboratory is associated with a private poultry company, but this matter is under review.

That paragraph points out that there is no directive to the I.M.V.S. to provide a veterinary pathology service. I do not want to be seen as a person who constantly criticises private pathology services in as much as they take the cream of the cake and leave the complex and costly work to the I.M.V.S., but that is a fact of life concerning medical services because, in the past, the I.M.V.S. has been given no clear direction.

Unless we include this amendment in the Bill, I think that the private pathology services will wake up to the fact that there is a lucrative market in the diagnostic services to the veterinary surgeons, and they will take all of that work and leave all of the arduous and costly research to the I.M.V.S. I hope that the Government will see the logic behind this amendment. In effect, all we have done is shift the provision that the Government has put in this Bill, but we make quite clear that there is a specific instruction given to the I.M.V.S. that, where veterinary surgeons in private practice need a pathology service, the I.M.V.S. is there to provide it. I hope that the Minister sees the reasoning behind the Opposition's amendment and supports it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government cannot support this amendment. I am at a loss to understand the reasoning outlined by the member for Napier, because it appears to me that his arguments in support of his amendment conflict with his amendment. In fact, the Bill requires the institute to provide and maintain such services and facilities for the Department of Agriculture in relation to veterinary services, including veterinary surgeons in private practice or research, provided or carried out by that department as the Minister of Agriculture may require. Therefore, in that respect the Bill ensures that the institute provides services to the veterinary surgeons in private practice.

Clause 14 (1) *(c)* is as fundamental to the Bill as is clause 5, and the Government cannot accept any alteration to it on the ground that it is an essential part of the implementation of the Government's policy in respect of the I.M.V.S., namely, that the veterinary services continue to be provided through the institute but by the Department of Agriculture. The amendment moved by the member for Napier effectively writes the Department of Agriculture out of the Bill in respect of the functions of the institute. That is precisely what the Government cannot accept. We do not have any argument with the Opposition's belief that the provision of services to private practitioners should be sufficient, ample, and of an appropriate standard. We agree with that, but not in the form that the member for Napier proposes.

The level and maintenance of services must be determined by the Minister of Agriculture in accordance with the perceived needs of both the Department of Agriculture and veterinarians in private practice. As I have said, clause 14 (1) *(c)* is as fundamental to the Bill as is clause 5 and is the means by which the Government approach to incorporating both Well's and Badger's recommendations in this Bill is put into practice. We cannot accept an amendment which diminishes the responsibility of the department in these matters.

Mr HEMMINGS: It seems that we have a dispute on our hands, if I can use that term, because of a play on words. The Minister has said that this measure is fundamental to the Bill, as was clause 5. I do not believe it is as important as clause 5. The Opposition agrees with clause 14 (1) *(c)*, apart from the last few words which provide 'as the Minister of Agriculture may require'. The Opposition agrees with all the things in paragraph *(c)* of the original Bill, but says that they should be split up. In the research area of veterinary science in the provision of services, facilities and so on, we agree that they should come under the ambit authority of the Minister as the Minister may require. However, there should be a clear directive to the institute to provide a veterinary pathology service for veterinary surgeons in private practice, full stop.

I accept what the Minister has said. However, what would be the situation if staff at the I.M.V.S., those poor unfortunate people who have been hived off under the authority of the Minister of Agriculture (even though they are still working within the I.M.V.S.), wanted to provide a service to private veterinary surgeons in this State, because the paragraph contains the proviso 'as the Minister may require'? The Minister could tell the I.M.V.S. not to provide a service to private veterinary surgeons in the area, because it is being provided by private enterprise.

The Opposition believes that it has a valid argument in relation to this particular paragraph. We have no argument with clause 14 (1) *(b)*, which states 'to provide, to such extent as the Institute thinks fit . . .' We believe that is perfectly proper. However, in the field of veterinary pathology services, which are non-existent in this State with the exception of one company that has employed a veterinary pathologist, there is a need for the I.M.V.S. to provide a service. Our only disagreement with the original Bill is with the words 'as the Minister of Agriculture may require'. The Minister may say that, if there is a need, the I.M.V.S. will provide it. It seems to be the trend throughout these clauses that it is improbable that it will happen, it is unbelievable that it will happen; and that we are entirely correct that it could happen, but the Government will not spell it out in the Bill.

The Opposition is asking the Minister to split paragraph *(c)* into two parts. That will make clear that the I.M.V.S. has a responsibility to private veterinary surgeons. We are not taking any power away from the Minister—that is the last thing we want to do. The Minister wants all this power: the Opposition has lost out and has given it to her. We do not want to take that power away from her. However, we want it clearly spelled out in the Bill that the I.M.V.S.

should provide a service to those in private practice, not 'as the Minister may require'. We see a danger there.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I honestly believe that there is a genuine lack of understanding by the Opposition that this is what is intended by this clause. I want to assure the member for Napier that, when paragraph *(c)* says that the institute will provide and maintain services and facilities in relation to veterinary services including services for veterinary surgeons in private practice, that is a direct indication to the institute that the private veterinary surgeons need to be looked after. The reason why the qualification 'as the Minister of Agriculture may require' is put at the end of that clause, is to bring paragraph *(c)* in direct parallel to clause 14 (1) *(a)*, which states:

> To provide and maintain a medical pathology service for such hospitals or other health care organisations as the Health Commission may direct.

The whole thrust of this Bill is to bring the institute under some kind of control in areas where it has previously been uncontrolled. Whilst, in human pathology, the Health Commission will determine policy in order to ensure co-ordination and integration of services so that they can be delivered in the most cost efficient fashion, similarly, the Minister of Agriculture will determine the policy for the provision and delivery of service in regard to veterinary matters in the most cost effective, co-ordinated and integrated manner.

I hope that the member for Napier can see the direct relationship between clause 14 (1) *(a)*, which gives the Health Commission power to direct the council in respect of the provision and maintenance of medical pathology services, and clause 14 (1) *(c)*, which gives the Minister of Agriculture power to direct the institute in respect of veterinary services including those for veterinary surgeons in private practice.

I would have expected that this would have been an area in which the Opposition would be at one with the Government, because the indications so far are that the Opposition warmly supports the proposition that the institute should be brought under Ministerial control. Just as it is valid that there should be control in respect of health matters through the Minister of Health, it is equally valid that there should be control by the Minister of Agriculture in respect of veterinary matters, including those affecting private veterinary surgeons.

It would be irresponsible, because public funds are involved in the provision of these services to private veterinary surgeons, for the Minister of Agriculture not to be involved. The whole thrust of this Bill gives effect to the Government's policy that public funds are being used and must be used efficiently. Therefore, there must be control at Ministerial level. That applies as equally to agriculture as to health.

I hope that this explanation makes clear to the honourable member that we are not trying to downgrade private veterinary services. On the contrary, we want to upgrade them through the provisions of this Bill and want to ensure that they are properly controlled. I know that it is the intention of the Minister of Agriculture that services to private veterinary surgeons be maintained and improved. This service is already an integral part of the activities of the Division of Veterinary Science. As the member for Napier has recognised, the Division of Veterinary Science is really the only effective provider of such a service in this State. There is one private provider in a very modified way.

Within the Department of Agriculture it is also the intention that services by the Animal Health Division to private veterinary surgeons be improved, and these two developments will proceed together. As I have said, the service is an integral part of the provision of veterinary services to the Department of Agriculture, the Zoological Gardens, stockowners, and the National Parks and Wildlife Division.

There is an expanded interest by the Department of Agriculture in this regard. Services are available to private veterinarians under clause 14 (1) *(c)*. I cannot see that the honourable member's amendment advances at all the cause of the private veterinary practitioner, because I believe that their needs are adequately catered for under clause 14 (1) *(c)*. The Government's policy of ensuring proper control through Ministerial direction in terms of policy is taken account of by providing the Minister of Agriculture with the same powers as the Minister of Health can exercise through the South Australian Health Commission in respect of human pathology services.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It seems to me that clause 14 in many ways is one of the most fundamental clauses of the Bill, because it touches on the requirements that will be put on the institute. I spent a substantial part of my speech in the second reading debate on that matter, and in particular I referred to research. I take issue now with the Minister about a comment she made in closing the second reading debate, as follows:

> 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 . . .

I do not believe that there is any irony in that at all. It is quite reasonable, on the one hand, to promote the institute as a research body. Indeed, that is quite consistent with the initial ambit of the 1938 legislation. It is quite reasonable, given the promotion that was given by all members of this House at that time. That is in no way to contradict the design of all members to ensure that functions of that institute, as, indeed, of any Government facility, are undertaken with the utmost propriety.

The points I made in regard to overseas trips some time ago, in 1980, concerned the fact that at that time there was some suggestion that questions could be raised about the propriety of research funds going into the institute. At the time I believed that that matter deserved investigation, and I do not resile from the fact that I held that view at that time. It was in no way attempting to undermine the research capacity of that institute, but rather to ensure that the reputation of the institute was maintained as it had been in the previous decade. Whatever happens in the future, we all want to maintain, build upon, increase, and improve the reputation of the institute, and anything that might cast aspersions on that should be subject to investigation. The Minister's comment in that regard was not only irrelevant but unworthy.

The other point that concerned me was that the Minister did not answer the question I raised in the second reading stage about the level of service provision in research. I defined primary and secondary areas of research. The Minister now raises her eyes heavenwards, but she answered at great length research and service provisions and the connection between those two, but did not answer my definition of research falling into two categories, primary and secondary. Honourable members may recall that I identified secondary research provision, according to my definition, as being that in the area of agriculture more closely related to commodity production. I cited the examples of the Parafield Poultry Station, the Wine Research Institute, and other such facilities.

I also suggested that there was a primary source of research that was not so clearly commodity based. I identified I.M.V.S. as playing its role in that sector of research. That part of my speech was not answered by the Minister. It may well be that she may choose to answer it tonight,

and I look forward to hearing her comments. Let us come back now to the question of relating research to service provision. I raised a number of points on this matter, and the Minister stated that, by relating research to service provision, it would prevent research scientists at the I.M.V.S. from rocketing off into outer space. I did not know that the I.M.V.S. was an astronomical institution.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It could be if we didn't relate research to service provisions.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister had them off with *Voyager* and *Columbus* amongst the stars.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should return to the Bill.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am coming back to earth. When I raised the matter that the council of the institute surely should be interpreted as a responsible body that in itself could determine whether something was irrelevant and flippant, the Minister replied, and soundly so, I might say, 'Yes, it could, and indeed it has.' If it has, why the need for change? Why the need for defining that down? It implies to me that defining it down to research for the purposes of service provision is *(a)* casting a commentary on the research that was conducted in the past, and *(b)* constraining it in a strait-jacket with regard to research in the future.

In her second reading explanation the Minister automatically contradicted that first assumption and therefore the second assumption then becomes all the more cynical because of that. I think we really need to understand that the I.M.V.S. was originally set up not as a pathology provider primarily. That was an important part of its function, but not its primary purpose. In the early stages it was primarily set up as a research institute and it seems to me that now this Bill seeks to alter and change that function.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not believe that the member for Salisbury is deliberately trying to misrepresent me—I am sure he is not—but I am getting the impression that he either failed to appreciate the points I made in regard to the breadth of service provision and the importance of linking research with service provision, or he is determined not to see the relevance and responsibility of those arguments. However, perhaps I can reassure him with further information in regard to veterinary research activities and the new scope that will be opened up for veterinary research activities by the transfer of the Veterinary Division of the institute to the Department of Agriculture, whilst maintaining its physical presence in the institute.

At the moment, veterinary research done within the institute is done precisely there: within the institute. There have not been the close links and the opportunity for collaboration and co-operation in research matters that there should have been between the institute and the Department of Agriculture. Now that the Veterinary Division is to be part of the Department of Agriculture, it necessarily follows that the research programmes of the Department of Agriculture and those of the institute in regard to veterinary matters will be, if you like, common programmes.

It is interesting to note that, in regard to the Struan laboratory of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, this development opens up enormous possibilities for research in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture. It is worth providing to the Committee information to demonstrate what opportunities are available. The member for Salisbury might be aware that the Struan facility was set up as a joint I.M.V.S. and Department of Agriculture facility costing about $750 000. It has the potential to be a most impressive research and service centre of considerable importance to the region. As the honourable member would also know, the South-East of South Australia carries about 50 per cent of the beef and 25 per cent of the sheep stock of the State. Therefore, it is the ideal location for a research and service provision facility for veterinary services.

The Government recognises the importance of Struan by adopting plans to upgrade the centre with five scientific and technical positions, as I mentioned in my second reading explanation. The close affiliation between the laboratory at Struan, the stockowners in the region, and the Department of Agriculture field staff will provide an opportunity for the development of veterinary research facilities which the Minister of Agriculture confidently expects will gain pre-eminence in a fairly short time because of the considerable input of the Government as a result of this Bill and corresponding developments in the Department of Agriculture.

It is suggested that research, including veterinary research, will somehow be downgraded in the institute as a result of this Bill, but the facts indicate the opposite. The fact that the veterinary division of the institute will now be linked very closely with the Department of Agriculture, because the department will be the single employer, is worth examinging in light of the following. The agricultural research activities of all State Departments of agriculture on a national basis show that, of all agricultural research undertaken in this country, State Departments of Agriculture (or Departments of Primary Industry, as the case may be) accounted for 56 per cent of the research and development budget and utilised 62 per cent of committed professional manpower in 1976-1977. Whilst they are the figures before me, I have been assured that these proportions have not changed substantially since and, if anything, they are likely to have increased. The C.S.I.R.O. is the other major research organisation, with 31 per cent of the research and development budget and 27 per cent of the professional manpower.

Mr Lynn Arnold: What about the contribution of the Waite Institute in South Australia? How does that affect those figures in this State?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I may be able to come to that. The honourable member will appreciate that I am no expert in agricultural and veterinary matters. I have been given the benefit of much helpful information by the Minister of Agriculture and, if I am not able to answer the question tonight, I will ensure that the answer is given to the honourable member.

Mr Lynn Arnold: It brings a slightly different perspective in South Australia.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, it does. In South Australia in 1980-1981 the Department of Agriculture spent $6 400 000 on agricultural research, a very significant figure. $1 570 000 of this was provided from approximately 31 rural industry research funds and special Commonwealth grants. These sources have also been used by the veterinary division of the I.M.V.S. to fund research. Thus, the South Australian Department of Agriculture is accustomed to seeking and obtaining outside research funds and expending them productively. In 1981 the total research effort in the Department of Agriculture resulted in at least 38 papers in journals. The honourable member will know better than I do that that was a very significant contribution to professional journals. The department has 122 professional research officers and 49 of these have Masters degrees or Ph.Ds. Again, this is a very impressive indication of the calibre of the staff of the Department of Agriculture. This is relevant because the existence of staff of that calibre is without doubt going to provide a significant boost to the whole quality of research that is undertaken in the veterinary division of the institute.

In the past four years 175 scientific papers in well recognised journals have been produced by departmental officers. These papers cover a wide range of disciplines, including animal health, animal husbandry and animal physiology. The staff of the division of veterinary sciences will transfer

into an administrative environment where research is highly valued, highly prized and conducted on a very high level by people who are highly qualified. At the institute, of 30 research projects reported as at December 1980, nine involved fauna or laboratory animals; of the remaining 21 (animal health oriented health projects), 11 were collaborative activities involving South Australian Department of Agriculture professional staff as co-workers. I think the figures that I am giving the Committee should reassure the member for Salisbury and indicate to him that the transfer of officers from the veterinary division of the institute to the Department of Agriculture will put them in an extremely advantageous position as far as research goes. In reference to the question of primary and secondary research, the research undertaken by the department is divided into basic strategic and practical research.

While Departments of Agriculture in Australia are concerned with tactical research, they also have a consistent record in strategic research and in encouraging basic research of relevance to agriculture. Agriculture Departments do 56 per cent of research in Australia. I am not able to provide the percentage that the Waite Institute contributes, but some of that would no doubt be done in close liaison with the Department of Agriculture. I believe that the facts demonstrate that this whole question of research and provision of service will benefit considerably as a result of this Bill, which transfers the veterinary division to the Department of Agriculture.

Amendment negatived.

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 5, after line 31—Insert new subclause as follows:

(1a) In discharging its function of providing a veterinary pathology service, the Institute shall engage in active competition with non-government pathology laboratories.

It has been agreed in many places, although perhaps not in Government circles, that the I.M.V.S. should be given the power to enter the private market as far as pathology services are concerned. Obviously in the area of medical pathology services that can no longer be the case because history has taken place. The fact that I.M.V.S. could not do it in the past has resulted in a crop of other private practices in medical pathology springing up in Adelaide. The Minister may disagree as to the number but they have made a lot of money out of it and have taken the cream off the cake, as I said earlier. The institute has been required to carry out the costly search.

This is not the case at the moment in veterinary pathology services. Under this new Bill, this new management orientated council, this New Director, and all these people who will be pushing the I.M.V.S. to the fore and to greater heights of efficiency and uniqueness in the Commonwealth, the time is right now for the I.M.V.S. to be charged by this Government with the responsibility of engaging in active competition with non-government pathology laboratories. The Badger Committee clearly spells it out on page 42 where it recommends:

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

That again is in line with Liberal Party philosophy: the free market shall reign supreme. I hope that the Government, although I have doubts, will support this amendment and give I.M.V.S. veterinary pathology services a chance to enter the possible future lucrative area of the private market.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have news for the member for Napier. It astonishes me that he is not aware of the fact that the institute competes with private pathology services all along the line. In fact, until the comparitively recent establishment of two other larger pathology laboratories, the institute has been the only laboratory to compete with the major private laboratory in South Australia, that is, Gribbles Pathology Laboratory.

Until that laboratory came into the field the institute had a monopoly. There has always been and there is still competition between the four pathology services, between the institute and other private providers. That is a fact of life. It is not a question of something not having been allowed to happen. It has happened, and it still is happening. I do not see any reason why it should not continue to happen according to the Badger recommendations. That is a fact which I bring to the honourable member's notice. I reassure him that there is nothing necessarily ideological in the Government's opposition to the honourable member's amendment.

The honourable member and his colleagues would realise that questions of competition are essentionally matters of Government policy and not matters for statutory determination. The reason why the Badger Committee recommended competition was the way that pathology fees are scaled and pathology benefits are provided. Who is to say that there should not be some dramatic change in the manner in which pathology fees are structured and pathology benefits provided in the next 12 months by the Commonwealth Government? I doubt that it will occur, but there is nothing to say that it cannot.

If it were to occur, there could be a completely different situation which the Government would have to take into account in determining policy and whether a statutory authority like the institute should be actively encouraged to compete with private enterprise. As the honourable member would know, in the normal provision of services this Government believes that Governments should get out of the way of private enterprise so that it can provide the services that it is properly equipped to provide. Therefore, on the grounds that it is inappropriate for a law to intervene in matters which are essentially policy and administrative matters, I cannot accept the amendment but, if the honourable member was in the dark previously about whether the institute competes with private laboratories, I hope I have enlightened him to the fact that it does.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister claims that the institute has been competing with non-Government pathology laboratories for some time. The Minister should credit me with some sense, although I know the Minister has continually over the years said that I do not know much about what I am talking, but the whole thrust of my amendment is that in the veterinary pathology service the institute shall engage in active competition. I do not care what the Minister has been told by the institute's previous administration or what its charter says, because it is a fact of life which the Minister cannot dispute that firms like Gribbles have taken all the easy pathology services away from the institute and left it to do the costly research.

The Minister cannot dispute that and, if one examines the I.M.V.S. reports and the Wells Committee Report, to which I referred earlier concerning the percentage of work done, and, if the Minister has the nerve to say that the institute has been engaging in active private competition with the private pathology services, she does not even deserve to hold her position.

As I said earlier, she was conned by the previous administration of the I.M.V.S., and she is being conned now. The I.M.V.S. has never been engaged in active competition with private pathology services, that is, in the medical area. In no way has it been engaged in private competition with the non-Government laboratories in the veterinary pathology services, because there is only one laboratory in this State that employs a veterinary pathologist.

I do not mind being lectured, I am used to it, and that is one thing that the Minister is good at—lecturing members

of the Opposition. I will accept those lectures, but what I am saying is the truth—that the I.M.V.S. has never been engaged in active competition. The structure of the I.M.V.S. has always gone against that. If the Minister is saying that it can do it and that it has been doing it in the past, why not accept our amendment? That is all the Opposition is asking.

If the Minister says that we were wrong, that we did not understand and should be more aware of what the I.M.V.S. has done in the past and is going to do in the future as a result of this Bill, why not accept our amendment, which clearly spells out that the veterinary pathology service can engage in active competition with the private sector?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: When I spoke about competition I was referring to human pathology services. I did not make any reference whatsoever to the veterinary pathology services.

Mr Hemmings: That is what the amendment says—'veterinary pathology services', not 'medical pathology services'.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is correct, but I ask the member for Napier how on earth the institute is going to compete with services that do not exist in respect of veterinary services. Certainly, if there are other—

Mr Hemmings: That's the whole point of the amendment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: How can the Government, through legislation, require competition with a private sector that does not exist?

Mr HEMMINGS: It does not exist now, but it will exist in the next 12 months if this Bill is passed; that is what we are trying to tell the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is hard to believe the reasoning of the Opposition. I do not know what the member for Napier thinks an amendment of this kind will do to develop private veterinary services. I would think it would have the reverse effect to the one he is intending. If the Government were to accept the proposition that matters of policy can be entrenched in legislation and the Government does not accept that proposition, because it is patently ridiculous, it would have to accept that, by including in an Act a requirement for the Government to compete with private veterinary pathology services, that would somehow generate a rash of private veterinary pathology services. It defies reason and cannot happen.

As I said, the reason for the Government opposing the amendment is that it is quite inappropriate. I am sure that the Leader, who has just come into the Chamber, would recognise the situation regarding matters of policy, such as a requirement to compete or not to compete, being enshrined in legislation when essentially they are matters that should be determined by Governments in terms of current issues of the day. I referred to the fact that the whole question of competition is really determined by the Commonwealth Government's policy in respect of pathology charges, and no State Government has an influence over that. I refer the member for Napier to page 15 of the Badger Committee Report, which states:

> The present system is now one of extreme complexity. Not only are there different rates as set out above—

And, in fact, that is one of the reasons why the private pathology laboratories have been able to, as the honourable member puts it, cream off the easy pathology services, because they are allowed to charge what is known as S.P. rates while the institute charges O.P. rates—

> but people may elect to insure for medical benefits only, for hospital benefits only, for both or for neither.

I realise that veterinary benefits as such do not exist. The report continues:

> There are concessions for pensioners and their dependants and also for disadvantaged persons. Government-recognised hospitals are subject to different arrangements from those pertaining to private or community hospitals and there are also differences depending on whether they are in the city or the country.

To intervene in the midst of all that complexity and require the institute by legislation to engage in competition with veterinary pathology services defies comprehension. It is not a thing that any responsible Government would do. The whole system of charging for pathology services, veterinary or human, could be altered by the Commonwealth Government in six months, 12 months or two years time to completely change the scene and to make competition a most unwise requirement for the institute, something which could cost the taxpayer many hundreds of thousands of dollars. The Government will certainly not accept an amendment which cements in legislation a policy decision which should rightly be taken in relation to the issues of the day in the judgment of the Government of the day.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 14a—'Animal Ethics Committee.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 6—After line 13, insert new clause as follows:

> 14a. (1) There shall be a committee entitled 'The Animal Ethics Committee'.
>
> (2) The committee shall consist of the Principal Veterinary Officer (referred to in section 16a) and such other members as the Minister may appoint.
>
> (3) A member appointed to the committee by the Minister shall hold office at the pleasure of the Minister.
>
> (4) The Principal Veterinary Officer shall be the chairman of the committee.
>
> (5) The committee shall advise the institute in the formulation of policies relating to the use, management and handling of animals used for research purposes by the institute.

The need for this new clause is fairly obvious. It arises from the trauma that surrounded the I.M.V.S. during 1980 and the mishandling and maltreatment—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: In 1978.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister says '1978', which clearly places the matter in the days of the Labor Administration. I am talking about the allegations raised in this Parliament by the member for Mitcham, myself and others which were dealt with in 1980. As a result of those allegations, the Bede Morris Committee of inquiry was set up to inquire into the use of laboratory and experimental animals. We could indulge in petty Party politics with each Party saying what happened while the other Party was in Government. If the Government wants to follow that line, the Opposition will be happy to oblige. The Bede Morris Report was quite clear. If this debate is to continue for some time, I could horrify members who have not read the report. I do not intend to do that, but I advise all members to read it. As a result of the Bede Morris Report, the I.M.V.S. set up an animal ethics committee, which met on a few occassions. We were assured by the Minister, and I hope it is true, that things were put right.

This report followed quite closely after the Wells Committee Report. In the space of three weeks, the Minister was forced to commission two committees of inquiry into the running of the I.M.V.S.: first, the Wells Committee which dealt specifically with the levels of management at the I.M.V.S. and, secondly, the Bede Morris Committee which dealt exclusively with the illtreatment of laboratory and experimental animals. Therefore, one would have thought that there would have been some reference in the Bill to an animal ethics committee.

I am no good at seeing into the future, but I would bet my last dollar that the Minister, in reply to this amendment, will say that in all probability the new council will introduce an animal ethics committee. The Opposition says that it should be enshrined in the legislation. We do not trust this Government; that is the plain fact of the matter.

The Opposition is saying that, in line with the Bede Morris Report and the recommendations, there should be

an animal ethics committee. I do not think that this Committee can accept yet again the Minister's saying that it will happen, that we do not understand why the Government cannot legislate in this area, and so on. All the evidence of the Bede Morris Report reinforces the amendment this evening.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes the amendment on very sound grounds. The member for Napier says that I will be reassuring the House that an animal ethics committee will happen. Let me assure him that it has happened; the animal ethics committee is now constituted at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science in the way that Professor Morris recommended in his report. The reason why the Government opposes the amendment is that an animal ethics committee is an administrative structure established by a council. Animal ethics committees exist in universities throughout Australia where animal experimentation is conducted and in health units throughout Australia where animal experimentation is conducted. There is nowhere in this country—and as far as I am aware anywhere in the world—where an animal ethics committee is set up under Statute.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Maybe it is time we started.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is interesting to hear an honourable member opposite say that it is about time we started. Was it not about time they started in 1978; at last they have admitted it. The previous Government did nothing when it was in office to ensure the welfare of animals was taken into account. It did nothing in the hospitals or at the institute. The Opposition is now full of holy fervour, it has a holier than thou attitude, and it is full of self-righteousness when it says that this committee be enshrined in legislation.

How utterly foolish to set up committees of this kind in legislation. One cannot legislate for animal ethics. Animal ethics are an approach to animal welfare which pervades an institution, profession or occupational group because of the way in which it is managed. The animal ethics committee has been established at the institute, just as animal ethics committees have been established in the other health units in accordance with Professor Morris's recommendations. In most instances, with one or two noteable exceptions, they existed before Professor Morris was invited to Adelaide to investigate and report to me on matters on animal experimentation and use of animals in laboratories. The current animal ethics committee at the institute will continue as a committee of the council under the proposed new arrangements.

Honourable members will note that clause 14 (3) *(a)* allows the council to establish committees in regard to any matter, with membership as the council sees fit. The development of the appropriate procedures and protocols for the Animal Ethics Committee is vested in that committee by the council. It is scarcely more appropriate for an Animal Ethics Committee to be set up under legislation as it is for a Pathology Services Advisory Committee, or for any of the other committees of the institute that are seen as being appropriate for the day, to be set up in that way.

Because this issue aroused a great deal of Parliamentary interest, I believe it appropriate for me to indicate precisely what measures have been taken at the institute in regard to Professor Morris's recommendations. Professor Morris recommended that there be a review of the Animal Ethics Committee at the institute, and that review has been completed. The draft terms of reference were submitted to the council and were approved by the council on 17 June. The animal ethics document was printed and distributed; as far as I am aware, its contents are entirely satisfactory from the point of view of the veterinary surgeons who would have an interest in this matter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You said, 'as far as I am aware.' Have you read it, or have you been told that?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have been told by Professor Morris, and I take him as the pre-eminent authority on this. The recommendation that there be a regular review of approved projects by the ethics committee at the institute is now completed. This recommendation was accepted by the ethics committee, which is considering the best way of achieving effective oversight. The committee has developed new application forms to ensure that any research scientist who wants to use animals provides the necessary information to enable the Animal Ethics Committee to make sure that the protocol is applicable and correct.

Professor Morris recommended that a lay person be appointed to the committee. That recommendation has been adopted, and Colonel Harries from the R.S.P.C.A. has been appointed and has been attending meetings of the committee. Professor Morris also recommended that the committee rule on all aspects of animal experimentation; that recommendation has been accepted by the council, and that now occurs. He has also recommended that the committee should report twice yearly to the council and that its report should be included in annual reports, which, as we know, come before Parliament. In fact, the most recent annual report was tabled in this House today. Therefore, Parliament will receive an annual report from the Animal Ethics Committee.

The committee is reporting regularly to the council of the institute on specific occasions as is necessary. I can assure the Committee that relevant items from the committee's report will be included in the annual report of the institute. Other recommendations dealt with proposals to upgrade physical facilities, and without going into too much detail because of time constraints, I point out that the proposal to renovate the basement facilities at the I.M.V.S. has been assessed, money has been voted for the work, the Public Buildings Department is about to begin work shortly, the redecoration of the animal holding facility will begin this month, work on the infectious animal house is due to start in May, work to ensure that cats and dogs can be separated at the institute is due to begin in April, and work on the cat colony at Gilles Plains has already started. All of the work I have just described is expected to be completed this financial year. So we go on.

Mr Millhouse: I can't see much relevance in all of this to the amendment.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is very relevant, because it indicates quite clearly that matters of animal ethics and the operation of committees of the council are scarcely matters to be included in the Statute. They are policy and administrative matters of the council and I have just demonstrated to the Committee that those policy and administrative matters have been taken very seriously by the council of the institute and Professor Morris's recommendations have been implemented. Having given the Committee an indication of what the council has achieved, I repeat that, if there were validity in the Opposition's arguments, one would expect that somewhere in this country, by virtue of the efforts of universities or of people who are interested in these matters, there would be a Statute that provided that an Animal Ethics Committee shall be set up.

No Government in this country has deemed it appropriate to get down to the administrative matters inherent in animal ethics and lay them down in the Statute Book, and this Government does not intend to do so either.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I support this amendment very strongly indeed. I do not give a damn what people in other States do. If we want to do it, that is up to us. As I remember the situation a few years ago at the I.M.V.S., or what we discovered subsequently, it has been absolutely disgraceful. If Parliament can do anything to ensure that

that sort of thing does not happen again, I believe we should do it.

It is not a matter of what the Government wants: it is a matter of what Parliament wants, and it is a pity that the Minister does not learn that elementary lesson. The member for Napier said a little while ago that he did not trust this Government. Let me tell him and other members of the Committee that I do not trust any Government, whether Liberal or Labor, and it is a very good principle for Parliament to work on, that is, never to trust any sort of Government.

Mr Trainer: What about the one in which you were Attorney-General?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park is out of order, in interjecting from out of his seat.

Mr MILLHOUSE: That was the one exception. It is a very good principle for Parliament not to give a Government any more power than it needs; never to give it *carte blanche*. If it is possible to restrict its power and to direct the way it should go, that should be done. Now, of course, we are dealing with the I.M.V.S., which is not precisely the Government, but the principle is the same. I remember that a few years ago the Animal Ethics Committee nearly ceased to function, and that is why we got into trouble. If the committee had been under statutory obligation, it may not have happened and we may not have had the appalling situation that arose.

I must say that I have become a little less detached about this matter than I used to be, because the other day I had a look at the book *Animal Liberation*. I am beginning to wonder whether these sorts of things should be allowed to happen at all. The Minister said, 'You cannot do this by legislation; it is a matter of the spirit in the institute,' or some damn thing, but if that is true, what is the good of having a committee, whether it is by legislation or not? I support the amendment and I believe that it is one of the most important amendments to this Bill moved by the Labor Party, and that is why I am hear to speak to it. I think we ought to divide on it if the Minister is too obstinate about it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I believe I heard the Minister say earlier that in a report tabled in the House today there was a report of the Animal Ethics Committee.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: No, I didn't. I said it would happen in future.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The footwork improves as the evening goes on!

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Your hearing needs testing.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: That may be so; it may be that we need some medical evidence on that; I am prepared to go along with the Minister to the audio laboratory and we can check it out. Certainly, there is nothing that I can find in the report tabled in the House today in relation to animal ethics, so let me first establish that. In Federal *Hansard* of last year there is something about animal ethics that I believe the Minister may be interested to hear about. The question asked in the Federal House by Mr Jacobi last year on 28 April 1981, in part, was as follows:

> How many of these experiments [referring to animal experiments] were for *(a)* medical and *(b)* non-medical purposes?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Which experiments was he talking about?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: He is referring to a Federal basis, for the moment. If the Minister will be patient I will explain as I go along. The answer given in relation to that aspect of the question was:

> In the Australian Capital Territory 86 272 animals were used for medical purposes and 18 280 for non-medical purposes.

Therefore, presumably, 18 280 animals were subjected to various forms of experiment (I suppose that is the right word) for non-medical purposes.

Mr Bannon: Would that be for cosmetics?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: There is not sufficient information contained in the answer, but the categories are clearly separated into animals used for medical and non-medical purposes.

I take it those figures related to the Australian Capital Territory only; there is much more of Australia outside the Australian Capital Territory. If the Minister thinks we are somewhat emotional or upset about this matter, she is right. If the Minister thinks we are suffering from some remorse and we did nothing about it in the past, then she is also right. I can say that any sensible person who finds out about something and who then does nothing about it is the person who is guilty in these matters. We are aware, through various means (the member for Mitcham and others raised these matters earlier), that this a very sorry area in relation to previous performance. I support the amendment of the member for Napier on that basis and I cite these figures as evidence that something needs to be done.

If the Minister is claiming that all we need is a feeling in a committee or a promise or an undertaking, there is the proof, because presumably those people in the Australian Capital Territory have committees, boards, and so on, who have the same feelings. Apparently it does not work there either, I think if ever there was a case for writing this in, so that there is the ability for a constant check-up and for the requirement of performance, by Statute, then here is the case.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I want to reinforce what I said earlier when I was referring to the Ethics Committee at the I.M.V.S. reporting twice yearly to the council, with its report included in the annual report. I was reading from the document I have in front of me and I said that relevant items would be included in the I.M.V.S. annual report. The report was prepared in 1979-80, and that progress had not been made. In next year's annual report there will be a report of the Ethics Committee.

I go back to the arguments of the member for Mitcham and the member for Mitchell. I have had long conversations with Professor Morris about questions of animal ethics, and anyone reading his admirable report will very quickly grasp the fact that the existence of an animal ethics committee alone will not guarantee that animals will be well treated. As the member for Mitcham pointed out, the animal ethics committee existed or purported to exist at the I.M.V.S. at the time the (to put it in plain terms) cruelty to animals took place at the institute in 1978.

In other words, as the member for Mitcham would surely acknowledge, the very existence of a committee did not necessarily create the climate that ensured that everyone who handled animals, in whatever capacity, did so in the knowledge of the real needs of those animals. It must be clearly understood that the existence of an animal ethics committee, whether it exists on a Bill, on a piece of paper, on a memo, on an instruction from X, Y, or Z, does not necessarily mean that animals are going to be treated as they should be treated.

Mr Millhouse: There is a better chance if it is in legislation and there is some statutory sanction.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I venture to say that the opposite point of view could be put. It would be quite valid to suggest that, if this Committee were enshrined in legislation, everyone could go home and say, 'It must be all right. The animals at the institute must be well treated. The institute Act says there must be an animal ethics committee, therefore it follows that we can be sure that ethical procedures are followed in regard to the treatment

of laboratory experimental animals.' Anyone with any common sense and knowledge of the recent history of this affair knows that is not so. Far better for reports of the kind that I have just given to the Committee and that I have undertaken will be provided in future annual reports of the institute, be tabled in Parliament and subject to question, and that the matter continue to be a lively issue in the community than to have a section in an Act which says that we have an animal ethics committee and therefore everything must be all right with the animals.

I would put to honourable members opposite that, if it is valid to have an animal ethics committee included in the Institutes Act, is it not equally valid for us to somehow require by Statute the Adelaide Children's Hospital (to name but one) to have an animal ethics committee, to have it properly chaired?

Mr Millhouse: Of course it is properly chaired—my sister chairs it.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I repeat, Mr Chairman: to have it properly chaired, to have its protocols properly established and to have the requirements of the board or the Minister in respect of its operations properly fulfilled. The member for Mitcham should know that that cannot happen by Statute. If the honourable member believes that I have in any way impugned the integrity of his sister, I am happy to withdraw any such imputation. Perhaps it would be more diplomatic if I were to relate the same remarks to, for example, the University of Adelaide, the Flinders Medical Centre, or the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because at all of those places (particularly at the University of Adelaide) animal experimentation is carried on and no Act of Parliament is going to make, in my opinion, any difference to the quality of ethics simply by including a provision for it in that Act of Parliament.

The quality of animal ethics, as Professor Morris has so aptly demonstrated in his report and as he has reinforced to me many times in conversation, comes from ensuring that the people on that committee have a thorough understanding of the needs of animals. The best people to ensure that that thorough understanding comes about are veterinary surgeons, by virtue of their professional commitment and occupational training. By their choice of vocation they have committed themselves to the welfare of animals. The animal ethics committee of the institute has such a person on it, and so do the committees of other units I have mentioned. I cannot speak for the University of Adelaide. I know that the university read Professor Morris's report with great interest and recognised that there was a great deal to be done in that institution if its standards were to meet acceptable requirements.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If, as the Minister maintains, legislation is not necessary and it is purely in the minds, capabilities and qualifications of the people involved in the handling of animals, why was it that there were 18 280 non-medical experiments carried out last year? That is a fair question. The Minister said that the expression by the Parliament by way of Statute of the Parliament's feeling about this matter will have no effect whatsoever. I feel like going home and never coming back. What are we doing here?

Mr Millhouse: A complete waste of time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Yes, in all matters. As representatives of the people, we try to enact laws and Statutes which indicate to the people what is the required behaviour in any matter. On-the-spot fines is one example. I agree with the member for Mitcham that we are not talking about the Government. The Minister persists in saying that the Labor Government did nothing about it. We agree that we ought to have. We did not know about it but when we do know about it we would be far worse people and far more guilty if we did nothing about it. It is absurd to say that the expression of the viewpoint of the Parliament of this State about the handling of animals will have no effect whatsoever. The Minister cannot sustain that argument even if she won some of the earlier arguments. Semantics or otherwise, that is nonsense and really she was arguing that there is no need, no true purpose, for Parliament at all in any matter.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That is a ridiculous statement that has just been made by the member for Mitchell. If Parliament is to legislate for every administrative and policy matter, the shelves would not hold the Statute Books and, in terms of the general thrust of the honourable member's argument, it just cannot be sustained. The person whose advice the Government has sought and taken in regard to animal ethics is Professor Morris, who did not see the need to legislate for animal ethics or welfare in the institute or in any other unit in South Australia. He said, and it is worth repeating, that the standard of animal care now established at the institute is of a high order.

I might add that, whilst the criticism was directed to the I.M.V.S. in the Parliamentary debate last year, there were other institutions which were well and truly deserving of some criticism, which escaped Parliamentary scrutiny and which, to their credit, have tried with varying degrees of success to improve their standards. It is ironical, but these things often happen, that the institute, which at the time of the Parliamentary scrutiny had in fact achieved a reasonable standard (although it still had some way to go), was under fire when other organisations which still have a long way to go escaped completely. There should be a more balanced approach to this whole question in Parliament than has been the case.

I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that the Cruelty to Animals Act would be the appropriate legislation in which to embody questions of animal ethics as they apply State-wide. This Act is presently being reviewed and a subcommittee has been working on it for some time. The R.S.P.C.A. has been active on it, if not leading that subcommittee. I hope that members will accept the soundness of these arguments in regard to the overall application of animal ethics through the Cruelty to Animals Act, because it is inappropriate to single out a single institution and leave others untouched.

Mr Millhouse: This is the one we're dealing with now.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This is the institution that we are dealing with now, but there are many others. The institute has demonstrated to Professor Morris's satisfaction that its animal ethics are of a high order. I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I was pointing out to the Committee that I believe that it is inappropriate to incorporate in legislation animal ethics committees as such and that questions of animal ethics as they affect the whole community, and all institutions that deal with laboratory and experimental animals, are better dealt with under the Cruelty to Animals Act, which is currently under review. Again, I assure the Committee that the animal ethics committee at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science is now constituted and operating in a way that is in accordance with Professor Morris's recommendations. I should add for the benefit of the Committee that when I tabled his report last year I indicated that I had asked Professor Morris to return to Adelaide at the end of the year to investigate progress that had been made on his recommendations and to report to me.

Professor Morris did come to Adelaide at the end of the year. He had reservations about some health units and I

asked him to defer his report until he could satisfy himself that all procedures were in accordance with his recommendations at all health units under my administration. He is in Adelaide now doing just that—investigating and preparing a report to me. However, so far as the institute is concerned, the details I outlined to the Committee should indicate that his recommendations in respect of the institute have been taken seriously by the institute and if not all then all the significant ones have been implemented.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Hamilton, Hemmings (teller), Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (20)—Mrs Adamson (teller), Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Olsen, Oswald, Rodda, Russack, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Corcoran, Duncan, Hopgood, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Mathwin, Randall, Schmidt, and Tonkin.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16—'Director of the institute.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 6, line 25—After 'council' insert 'for a term of five years'.

This is a fairly simple amendment in line with a recommendation of the Wells Committee of Inquiry Report. It is also in line with the Minister's second reading explanation. Recommendation 2.4.5 of the Wells Report states:

The position of Director should be offered on a five-year contract of appointment, with the possibility of extension.

In her second reading explanation, the Minister said that the position would be a contract appointment. The Opposition asks that the term be spelt out in the Bill. I do not believe that the Government could argue with this amendment, because it will clearly spell out in the legislation that the position will involve a five-year contract term. More and more major appointments within both the private and Government sectors are for five-year terms. We believe that if the term is spelt out in the Bill the new Director, when appointed, will know exactly where he stands in relation to his term of directorship with the I.M.V.S.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The Government opposes the amendment for purely practical, not philosophical, reasons. The Opposition seems to be moving a lot of amendments which would, if they were accepted, build a quite unacceptable rigidity into the administration of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. The reason why the Government will not accept this amendment is that, whilst there is no argument with the desirability of the five-year term, the institute council and, indeed, the Government, when it advertises for the position of a new Director, will be looking not only in South Australia but all over the world for a eminent person (possibly an eminent scientist) who can assume responsibility for the institute and, by his or her presence, act as a magnet to attract staff and research workers of very high calibre to the institute in order to maintain and improve its excellent reputation.

It may well be that someone would be willing to come to Adelaide for, let us say, four years or six years. We believe it is important that there be some flexibility in the contract term of appointment to enable the Government to have the greatest possible opportunity to select someone of eminence who may not find a five-year term acceptable, for all kinds of reasons. It may be someone who is holding a professorial chair and who does not want to leave that chair, in whatever institution it may be, for more than four years, for example. He or she may find a six-year appointment acceptable. I would think it unlikely that the term would be longer than six years, and the Government will certainly be looking at five years. However, we do not want the council to be constrained in a way that the honourable member's amendment suggests. We believe that there should be flexibility in order to ensure that we can attract the person we want, who may not be willing to accept a five-year term.

Mr HEMMINGS: The Minister is certainly not kidding when she talks about flexibility as far as this Bill is concerned. This Bill seems to be so flexible that one cannot pin it down at all. Time and time again, with every amendment moved by the Opposition, the Minister has given some excuse as to why things should not be spelt out in this legislation; that something will be coming, that it is unbelievable, etc. We are now getting a story from the Minister that the council needs flexibility inasmuch that a person who is seeking the position may wish to come for only four years or possibly six years. Who is doing the employing? Is it the institute or is it the person who is seeking the appointment?

The Minister has a reputation for being a hard liner; one never steps out of line when she is cracking the whip. If the institute says that it is a contract appointment and it should be for a term of five years, that is what it should be. No-one will come in and dictate to the institute and say, 'Because of my professional qualifications and because I can attract expertise, you are only going to employ me for four years,' or, 'I wish to stay here for six or seven years.' The Minister should have the courage to say that the appointment of a Director by the institute should be a contract appointment and that it should be for five years with the right of renewal.

That was a recommendation from the Wells Committee and is in line with most major appointments in either the private sector or the Government sector. I do not accept the Minister's reason for refusing to accept the amendment when she says she wants it to remain flexible. It is pointless to continue. Let us have a vote now, and hopefully in another place someone may be able to extract the real reason why a five-year term is not being fixed.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

New clause 16a—'Division of Veterinary Science.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 6, after line 32—Insert new clause as follows:

16a. (1) There shall continue to be a Division of Veterinary Science in the institutue.

(2) The chief officer of that division must be an officer of the institute employed on a full-time basis, with the same status and salary as those of the chief officers of the other divisions in the institute.

(3) There shall be a Principal Veterinary Officer in that division, who shall be responsible for the control and oversight of the animal breeding and holding facilities associated with the research centre and operating theatre located within the premises of the institute.

(4) The office of Principal Veterinary Officer must be of a senior classification.

(5) The chief officer of the Division of Veterinary Science and the Principal Veterinary Officer shall be appointed by the council upon terms and conditions fixed by the Health Commission and approved by the Public Service Board.

We have talked about many clauses that are fundamental to the Bill, such as clause 5 and clause 14; we believe that this new clause is also fundamental to the Bill. As I outlined in the second reading stage, the Division of Veterinary Science within the I.M.V.S. has been downgraded, as stated in both the Wells Report and the Badger Report. In fact, recommendation 2.4.8 on page 7 of the Wells Report states that the status of the Division of Veterinary Science within the institute should be lifted to restore relativity with the

medical divisions, and that the Director of the Division of Veterinary Science should play a more significant role in policy and decision-making and be made a full-time employee of the institute.

The Wells Committee makes many references to the fact that the Division of Veterinary Science has been downgraded. I made the charge in the second reading stage that that was the direct result of the representative of the Department of Agriculture on the previous council, Mr Harvey. The Minister refuted that claim. I have my opinion, and the Minister has her opinion, but there is no doubt that, if one looks at the record of the minutes of the meetings held by the previous I.M.V.S. council, one sees that, time and time again (and this occurred during the term of the previous Labor Administration—I am not saying that it started from 15 September 1979) during the past years the Department of Agriculture has moved to downgrade veterinary services within the I.M.V.S. That is a fact of life and, if the Minister wishes to refute that fact, she is being rather silly.

The facts speak for themselves. There was one instance when a committee was set up between the I.M.V.S. and the Department of Agriculture that, in effect, stifled the Division of Veterinary Science. That committee was used time and time again to downgrade the Division of Veterinary Science within the institute. In fact, Wells recommends that that joint committee be abandoned. So, that is fact.

Another part of our amendment deals with the Principal Veterinary Officer, who shall be responsible for the control and oversight of the animal breeding and holding facilities associated with the research centre. That has nothing to do with the Animal Ethics Committee. The Opposition maintains that that provision should be included in the Bill. In regard to that, Professor Morris states:

> There shall be a Principal Veterinary Officer appointed within the I.M.V.S. at an appropriate classification to be responsible for the particular control and oversight of the animal breeding facilities, the animal holding facilities and the operating theatre complex.

The Opposition has lifted out that recommendation and included it in this amendment to the Bill.

There are many things that I could say about the fate of the Division of Veterinary Science if it is not upgraded at that time. The functions have been handed over to the Minister of Agriculture: he may be sympathetic to this new expanded role of the department as far as the I.M.V.S. is concerned and prepared to act responsibly, although I am sorry that I cannot say that about some of his officers. I will not say any more at the moment, because obviously there is a time restraint, but I would urge that the Minister look at this amendment sympathetically. There is overwhelming evidence that, despite the fact that the veterinary section of the I.M.V.S. has been hived off to the Department of Agriculture, there needs to be a director of the Division of Veterinary Science at the same level as his counterparts within the I.M.V.S.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As the Opposition would anticipate, the Government opposes this amendment. Again, it is an amendment which alters the fundamental nature of the Bill. What the Opposition is proposing is against the whole basis of the Bill, namely, that there will continue to be a veterinary division of the institute, albeit that its officers will be employees of the Department of Agriculture. The Veterinary Science Division will continue to be maintained, housed and managed through the I.M.V.S., whilst its officers will be employed by the Department of Agriculture, and that, as I have stressed time and time again throughout this debate, is completely in accordance with the principles of accountability that the Opposition purports to espouse, and is in accordance with the entire proposition of Programme Performance Budgeting, which is a fundamental plank of the Government's economic platform. Therefore, there is no way in which the Government would consider entertaining the inclusion of this amendment in the Bill. The member for Napier's proposed new clause 16a (2) provides:

> The chief officer of that division [that is, the Division of Veterinary Science] must be an officer of the institute employed on a full-time basis, with the same status and salary as those of the chief officers of the other divisions in the institute.

As a matter of interest, the Chief Officer of the Division of Veterinary Science will be transferred to the Department of Agriculture as a divisional head, under his existing conditions, and that will put him on a level with other directors.

I might also add, Mr Chairman, that the Opposition's amendments are framed with reference to the same status and salary as the chief officers of other divisions, or words such as 'of a senior classification'. They are industrial matters; they are not matters for legislation. They are industrial matters that are covered by the Industrial Court in the course of determining terms and conditions that are not spelt out in legislation. Industrial matters of that nature are simply not spelt out in legislation.

I reiterate that this amendment moved by the Opposition would fundamentally alter the nature of the Bill. As far as the proposal for a principal veterinary officer goes, the appointment of a clinical veterinarian in the division of veterinary science will go a long way towards meeting the proposals for improved attention to animal handling practices, which are behind this amendment. The position for clinical veterinarian has been advertised and it is hoped to make an appointment shortly.

The positive role of the clinical veterinarian in promoting responsible animal welfare considerations within the Department of Agriculture is fully accepted by the Minister of Agriculture and his department. The new appointee will have the responsibility for promoting improved handling practice for animals wherever they are held in this State. That again demonstrates the foresight and practical nature of the Government's intentions in this Bill. Not only will there be a benefit to the institute, and through that benefit to the Department of Agriculture: there will also be considerable benefits for the users of veterinary services. In that regard, it is interesting to note that users of services, for example, the United Farmers and Stockowners, strongly support the provisions of this Bill.

To summarise, the Department of Agriculture recognises that the position of clinical veterinarian is an important additional function, one that will require the most careful support and development. What the Opposition seeks to achieve by the specifics of this amendment, not the general nature in terms of maintaining all veterinary staff as employees of the institute, already in the course of implementation, or have been achieved.

New clause negatived.

Clause 17—'Staff of the Institute.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 6—

Line 40—Leave out 'proclamation' and insert 'regulation'.

Line 42—Leave out 'specified in the proclamation' and insert 'prescribed'.

Page 7, lines 1 and 2—Leave out subclause (4).

I think this particular clause should come under the scrutiny of the Parliament through the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 18—'Superannuation, accrued leave rights, etc.'

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I move:

Page 7, lines 18 and 19—Leave out 'within three months'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

New clause 18a—'Accouchement leave rights.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 7, after line 45, insert new clause as follows:

18a. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a female officer or employee of the institute shall be entitled to accouchement leave upon terms and conditions fixed by the council and approved by the Public Service Board.

New clause negatived.

Clauses 19 to 21 passed.

Clause 22—'Budget estimates and staffing plan.'

Mr HEMMINGS: I move:

Page 9—After line 2, insert new subclause as follows:

(2) Where the Institute proposes to finance, wholly or partially, a trip outside Australia for a member of the council or an officer of the Institute, the budget and intinerary for that trip must be submitted to the Health Commission for its approval.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 23 to 26 passed.

Clause 27—'Jurisdiction of Industrial Court and Commission.'

Mr McRAE: My question is simple on the face of it, but I have not been able to get an answer during the course of the day. Why is clause 27 (3) so framed?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This provision is similar to section 60 in the South Australian Health Commission Act. The provision was put in the Health Commission Act, as the honourable member may recall, as a result of a Select Committee, as a two subsection provision which gave jurisdiction to the Industrial Commission to make awards in relation to officers and employees of the Health Commission, incorporated hospitals, or health centres.

As the honourable member would know, the whole purpose of bringing the institute under the control of the Minister of Health and the direction of the Health Commission is to ensure that there is an across-the-board application of provisions that apply throughout the health industry as it is called. In February 1979 the previous Government extended the section, adding sections (2), (3) and (4) to clarify doubts which had arisen as to who was the employer. The amendment provided that, for the purposes of awards, orders and industrial agreement under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the Health Commission would be the employer.

At common law the incorporated hospital or health centre is the employer. So, this was seen as being a logical corollary of the fact that the Health Commission fixes terms and conditions of employment for such people. I appreciate that it is a fine point and hope the explanation I have given the honourable member placed on record a somewhat complex series of background events which led to this being included.

Mr McRAE: I would like to know whether clause 27 (4) has any reason behind it other than the reasons now advanced by the Minister.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The answer is 'No.' The subsection excluded the representation of the hospitals or health centre before the Industrial Commission without the Commission's consent. It was done in order to reduce the proliferation of separate proceedings. It was also considered necessary if the Health Commission is to retain control of proceedings before the Industrial Court and the Industrial Commission in negotiations for industrial agreements and is also necessary for the efficient disposal of industrial disputes.

Mr McRAE: Can the Minister assure the Committee that clause 27(4) has not been introduced to prevent persons such as Dr Coulter from seeking their just remedies before the Industrial Commission of South Australia?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Certainly not. The reasons are as I have explained: because we want consistency of commissions across the health industry. That was recognised by the previous Government, and it is recognised by this Government.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (28 to 33) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I have not taken part in the debate in the second reading stage or in Committee but, as the Bill comes out of Committee, bearing in mind the importance of the Bill and the course of this debate, I believe it is necessary to briefly put on record that the Opposition believes that this Bill represents a major step backwards for medical and veterinary services in this State. The dismembering of the I.M.V.S. is something that we find quite deplorable, and the reasons why we find it so have been adequately canvassed during the second reading debate and in Committee.

As the Bill comes from Committee, it is unchanged, because the Government has insisted on taking a hard line over the amendments moved and the suggestions that we have made. Most importantly, it has insisted on that part of the Bill which dismembers the medical and veterinary services. That was a course not recommended by the various reports and committees of inquiry. Why this is so, and why the Government has insisted on it, is hard to establish. It is certainly not based on any sort of expert or community feeling about the institute. Certainly, we can see that changes and reforms were needed, and those reports and inquiries have indicated that, but the Government in this Bill has gone way beyond what was suggested there.

Some sort of power play has been going on. It may have been at the Ministerial level, where the Minister of Health has apparently washed her hands of responsibility there and has succumbed, as other of her colleagues have done, to the Minister of Agriculture. I pay him the compliment of saying that he has some sort of clout in Cabinet. If that is so, it is deplorable. It may be that there is some sort of battle within the medical bureaucracy, whether it be at the Health Commission level or in other parts of the Public Service, and, if so, it is equally deplorable that such back biting and power play should be introduced in this Parliament in the form of a Bill, and that the Government should lend its support to it.

Whatever its defects and problems, the I.M.V.S. has been a world-ranking institution with a high reputation. It is part of those groups of institutions, both tertiary research institutions and practical technological institutions, in a number of fields that are very distinctive in South Australia, and so I simply enter this debate at the third reading stage to say that the Opposition very much regrets the dismembering of this unique institution, and to put firmly on record that a future Labor Government will restore the I.M.V.S. to its former active co-ordinated role in relation to medical and veterinary services, and put together this shameful dismembering that has taken place.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): The Leader has just made a statement that, if he were ever to become Leader of a Government in South Australia, he would most bitterly regret. The Government, in considering the future of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, has given many months of careful deliberation to a solution of the problems which are in the best interests of both medical and veterinary science, to the future of those sciences in South Australia, and to the clients of the providers of the institute's services. I reject outright the suggestion that the institute is being dismembered. On the contrary, it is

being maintained as an institute of medical and veterinary science. The recommendations of both Badger and Wells, the import of their recommendations, have been implemented in this Bill.

Badger recommended that the institute remain a statutory body. Wells recommended that the divisions of medical and veterinary science remain together as an institute, and that is what will occur. Wells also recommended that the institute as a whole be incorporated under the Health Commission in order to ensure Ministerial responsibility and the direction and control of the Health Commission that is obviously essential if we are to have co-ordinated and integrated health services in South Australia. In implementing Wells's recommendation the Government recognised that the practical implementation of that was simply not possible—one cannot incorporate a veterinary body under a public health authority which has no statutory power to be responsible for veterinary matters; so the essence of the recommendations of those two reports has been implemented in what I believe is a practical, sensible and far-reaching piece of legislation which will bring great benefits to the people of South Australia in respect of the maintenance and improvement of human pathology services and the maintenance, expansion and improvement of veterinary pathology services. The Opposition has imputed motives to the Government, the Public Service, the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture which simply do not exist. There are no bogeys under the bed. The Government has tried to do the right thing by the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and I believe that its decisions in regard to this Bill will be thoroughly vindicated when the institute goes from strength to strength, as it will under its new legislation.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 3 March at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 2 March 1982

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

337. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What was the cost to the Government of the constitutional conference held on 27 and 28 November and how is that cost made up?

2. What result, if any, has come from the conference?

3. Does the Government propose to have any more such conferences and, if so, why, when, and will the arrangements be the same as for the last one?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The replies are as follows:

1. $10 000—the cost includes printing and publishing of *Hansard,* reporting costs, advertising costs, accommodation for delegates, lunches, and sundry items.

2. The conference has achieved a wider understanding of the complexities surrounding various specific aspects of our Constitution. The conference should be viewed as the first step towards constitutional reform as it affects the length of term of Parliament, whether terms should be fixed, and on the patriation of our State Constitution.

3. The Government is currently studying the proceedings of the conference and other related reports, and has not yet made any decision on whether to hold similar conferences in the future.

RAPE TRIAL

365. **Mr MATHWIN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education representing the Attorney-General:

1. What was the cost of the recent rape trial in the Supreme Court before Justice White at which five accused were found guilty?

2. Were the costs of the legal representatives of the accused paid by them or by the taxpayers through Legal Aid, and if the costs were paid through Legal Aid, what were the costs of—

(a) Taylor;
(b) Hunt;
(c) Mrs Hunt;
(d) Glennon; and
(e) Hicks?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Costs of recent rape trial in the Supreme Court before Mr Justice White have been estimated as follows:

against Courts Department $35 000.

against Attorney-General's Department (Crown Solicitor's Office) $5 000.

2. This information is not available to me.

YATALA GAOL VISITS

368. **The Hon. PETER DUNCAN** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What changes are proposed for visits to prisoners in Yatala Labour Prison?

2. Is it a fact that each prisoner will have to nominate a 'cardholder' who will have to be present at a pre-arranged time each weekend so that the prisoner can receive his visitors and, if so, what arrangements are proposed where the 'cardholder' does not turn up for a visit but other visitors do?

3. Were prisoners or prisoners' visitors consulted about the proposed changes to visits and, if so, to what extent and when?

4. When is it expected that the new visiting facilities to be built at the Yatala Labour Prison adjacent to the new industrial complex will be completed?

5. Is it proposed that the 'card system' of visits will continue after the new visiting facility is built?

6. Does the new visiting facility include a tunnel and, if so, why and at what cost?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. The proposal provides for half-hourly visits by appointment at ten nominated times on Saturdays and Sundays. This will ensure that prisoners and visitors are aware of the day and time of their visit, which will be of half hour duration.

2. The cardholder will be nominated and, should that person not arrive, arrangements will be made for other visitors to be admitted at the appointment time.

3. Yes they were consulted, particularly the visitors, who were interviewed by the Director and supported the proposal as avoiding the present long waiting periods.

4. Approximately two years.

5. It will be necessary to have some system of regulating the flow of visitors, so depending on the success of the system, a modified form may be used.

6. No decision has been made on access to the new visiting facility.

SOCCER POOLS

376. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Premier: What was the amount received by the Government from Soccer Pools and paid into the Soccer Pools Fund for each of the months October, November and December 1981 and January 1982?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The reply is as follows:

October 1981, $104 615.82, 5 weekly payments.
November 1981, $77 462.85, 4 weekly payments.
December 1981, $64 503.25, 4 weekly payments.
January 1982, $70 175.87, 5 weekly payments.

TOURIST DEVELOPMENT LOAN PLAN

378. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Tourism:

1. What procedures are necessary for tourist developers to obtain a Government guarantee on capital loans under the Tourist Development Loan Plan?

2. Will the applications have to be considered by the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The procedures are described in a three page pamphlet entitled 'Tourism Development Scheme', which is available from the Department of Tourism.

2. Yes.

PENSIONER COUNCIL RATE REBATE

379. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Premier: Will the Government consider raising the present $150 maximum rebate to pensioners of council rates in accordance with the increases in council rates since the increase in the maximum rebate in 1978?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In the formulation of its Budget, the Government considers all such matters.

MURRAY RIVER DREDGING

384. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Why was it necessary to undertake the dredging of the River Murray between Berri and Loxton and who will benefit by such dredging?

2. What was the total cost of the operation?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

1. The formation of sand bars across the navigable channel, between lock 4 and Loxton, during the high river flows in 1981, resulted in the channel becoming impassable to large vessels. The tourist industry will stand to gain the most benefit from the dredging work.

2. Not known at this time as dredging work is still continuing.

APPRENTICES

387. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Public Works: How many applicants for apprentice positions in Government departments or semi-government authorities failed entrance examinations during 1980 and 1981 and what were the subjects in which applicants failed to pass such entrance examinations?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The Government does not carry out entrance examinations for apprentices as such but uses aptitude test results to assist with the selection of apprentices. Results are not used in isolation and are by no means the sole criteria in the selection of applicants.

INDUSTRY DEATHS

388. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Industrial Affairs:

1. How many persons died in South Australia through industrial related diseases during 1980-81 and since 1 July 1981, respectively?

2. What were the respective numbers of deaths caused by each type of industrial disease?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The replies are as follows:

1. and 2. Statistics on industrial accidents and diseases are published on a financial year basis by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in the *Industrial Accidents Bulletin.*

It is understood that the collection is in the process of being adapted to conform with the proposed Australian minimum standard collection, and that considerable delays have been experienced in finalising the information for 1980-81. Accordingly, the information sought by the honourable member is not yet available. Any further inquiries should be directed to the Adelaide office of the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

GOVERNMENT FLEET

393. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government appointed consultants to recommend cost savings on buying, managing and replacing its vehicle fleet and, if so, when, and who are the consultants?

2. Is it a fact that the study would cover possible use of pooling arrangements and the use of private sector couriers and taxi services instead of Government vehicles?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. No.

2. A working group has been established to investigate Government vehicle utilisation in the central city area, and to determine the feasibility and the economics of establishing either a central city car pool or departmentally based car pools.

U.S.A. ROAD FATALITIES

398. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Is the Minister aware that the small car is being blamed for an increase in road accident fatalities in the U.S.A.?

2. What research has been carried out in South Australia to determine the number of deaths on South Australian roads in which small cars were involved, and what are the statistics for the past three years?

3. What were the respective percentages of small and large vehicles involved in accidents in which deaths occurred in each of the past three years?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. No research has been undertaken in South Australia to determine the number of deaths on South Australian roads in which small cars were involved. Statistics in this regard are not maintained. However, some research has been undertaken by the Road Accident Research Unit at the University of Adelaide which indicates that the risk of serious or fatal injury on South Australian roads is much greater for the occupants of small cars involved in a collision than large cars. This accords with overseas research. The research unit's study also tended to indicate that the risk of involvement in a crash appears to be greater for small cars.

3. Statistics in this regard are not maintained.

TICKET VALIDATING MACHINES

399. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Is it the intention of the State Transport Authority to install ticket validating machines for—

(a) bus and tram travellers; and

(b) rail travellers,

and, if so, when and at what localities in metropolitan Adelaide, how many are to be installed, over what period, and what is the cost of each machine?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority currently has ticket validating machines installed in all buses and attended railway stations. These are used by authority employees to validate tickets sold by them and pre-sold tickets presented to them. Tickets sold on trains, trams and at street queue selling points are validated by ticket nippers. The State Transport Authority has no immediate plans to introduce automatic ticket selling or validating machines at railway stations, bus stops or termini.

S.T.A. ADVERTISING

402. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What were the costs in 1980-81 and since 1 July 1981, respectively, for all advertisements and advertising campaigns used by the State Transport Authority for—

(a) television productions;

(b) television time;

(c) radio productions;

(d) radio time;

(e) press productions; and

(f) press space?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The reply is as follows:

	1980-81	Since 1 July 1981
(a)	Nil	Nil
(b)	Nil	Nil
(c)	Nil	Nil
(d)	Nil	Nil
(e)	*$14 900	*$5 800
(f)		

*These amounts cover advertisements for the following: timetable changes; route changes; road closures, etc. They do not include advertisements for tenders and contracts.

ELECTORS

405. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. What number of electors were enrolled in each of the State electorates at each computer print-out from and including 15 September 1979 to date?

2. What are the reasons for the reduction in numbers of 2 per cent or more for any particular electorate?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. To answer fully the member for Albert Park's question would be a time consuming and costly process as computer print-outs are generated at each fortnightly update of enrolment details. In the attachment are shown the numbers enrolled at the last State elections and at six monthly intervals since, commencing at 1 January 1980. As the rolls were recently updated for local government purposes, the enrolment details at 22 January 1982 are included.

2. Decreases in enrolment of more than 2 per cent have occurred in the districts of Adelaide, Bragg, Gilles, Spence and Torrens. These decreases result from—

(a) transfers to other electorates including those interstate;

(b) objections; and

(c) deaths.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ENROLMENT

	15.9.79	1.1.80	1.7.80	1.1.81	1.7.81	22.1.82	% Decrease in enrolment
Adelaide	16 288	16 543	16 339	16 499	16 114	15 918	2.3%
Albert Park	18 112	18 364	18 909	19 152	19 206	19 205	
Alexandra	18 402	18 716	18 878	19 536	19 535	19 657	
Ascot Park	16 432	16 739	16 335	16 930	16 586	16 613	
Baudin	21 097	21 888	21 896	23 041	22 803	23 061	
Bragg	16 716	17 220	16 647	17 153	16 482	15 978	4.4%
Brighton	18 656	18 983	19 430	19 226	19 382	19 078	
Chaffey	18 074	18 443	18 320	18 885	18 718	18 831	
Coles	18 416	18 971	18 733	19 389	19 818	19 421	
Davenport	17 983	18 237	18 452	18 720	18 761	18 514	
Elizabeth	18 583	19 342	19 089	19 923	19 106	19 212	
Eyre	15 317	15 673	15 271	16 014	15 653	15 624	
Fisher	20 670	21 023	21 872	22 417	23 056	22 633	
Flinders	15 932	16 181	16 042	16 430	16 462	16 320	
Florey	17 770	17 803	18 055	17 760	17 934	17 513	1.4%
Gilles	17 499	17 484	17 753	17 320	17 386	16 974	3.0%
Glenelg	17 058	17 212	17 400	17 399	17 411	16 896	0.9%
Goyder	16 893	17 056	17 051	17 387	17 267	17 306	
Hanson	17 377	17 577	17 538	17 892	17 672	17 573	
Hartley	18 504	18 546	19 000	19 123	18 586	18 650	
Henley Beach	18 417	18 600	19 078	19 023	19 120	18 809	
Kavel	17 923	18 278	18 492	18 964	18 893	19 024	
Light	16 257	16 572	16 532	16 993	16 751	16 789	
Mallee	15 552	15 670	15 577	15 917	15 697	15 798	
Mawson	21 470	22 269	22 457	23 515	23 664	23 772	
Mitcham	16 794	16 886	17 386	17 116	17 261	16 814	
Mitchell	17 077	17 230	17 503	17 473	17 740	17 368	
Morphett	16 968	17 041	17 119	17 077	17 366	16 862	0.6%
Mt Gambier	17 699	17 973	17 816	18 386	18 430	18 054	
Murray	18 017	18 333	18 309	18 903	18 778	18 667	
Napier	17 748	18 355	18 309	18 934	18 466	18 440	
Newland	21 401	21 822	22 817	23 157	23 739	23 703	
Norwood	16 670	16 876	17 481	17 535	17 434	16 733	
Peake	16 493	16 868	16 581	16 990	16 684	16 528	
Playford	18 340	18 635	18 916	19 421	19 739	19 472	
Price	15 885	16 130	15 857	16 315	15 748	15 661	1.4%
Rocky River	17 071	17 288	17 203	17 440	17 284	17 256	
Ross Smith	16 031	16 360	15 934	16 540	15 988	15 807	1.4%
Salisbury	20 557	21 293	21 073	22 152	22 153	22 097	
Semaphore	18 029	18 196	18 813	18 695	18 537	18 529	
Spence	15 578	15 889	15 454	15 820	15 231	15 077	3.2%
Stuart	17 038	17 360	17 188	17 707	17 394	17 525	
Todd	18 850	19 332	19 182	20 078	19 778	20 027	

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ENROLMENT

	15.9.79	1.1.80	1.7.80	1.1.81	1.7.81	22.1.82	% Decrease in enrolment
Torrens	16 884	17 096	16 475	17 116	16 626	16 306	3.4%
Unley	15 892	16 069	15 798	16 653	16 082	15 864	0.2%
Victoria	15 564	15 690	15 688	16 027	16 038	15 686	
Whyalla	16 602	17 232	16 659	17 401	17 115	17 133	
Total for State	826 586	841 344	842 707	861 544	855 674	848 778	

NATURALISED CITIZENS

406. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General: Does the Government propose to introduce legislation requiring British subjects to become naturalised Australian citizens before being eligible to vote and, if so, why?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Yes, to complement Federal Government Legislation.

HERBICIDES

410. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture:

1. Are herbicides 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T still used by Government departments or instrumentalities under the Minister's control and, if so, in what quantities, at what locations and for what purposes?

2. How many staff in such departments or instrumentalities have lost time from work as a result of using these herbicides during 1980 and 1981, respectively?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, by *(a)* the Department of Agriculture as follows:

Wanbi Research Centre—During July 1981 used 18 litres of 2,4-D Amine for control of wild turnip in cereal crops. In January 1982 used 1 litre of 2,4-D Ester 80 per cent as spot spray to control Horehound. Turretfield Research Centre—Uses 20 litres 2,4-D Amine per annum to control broad leaf weeds in cereal crops.

(b) the Pest Plants Commission as follows:

During 1980-81 used 100 litres of herbicide containing 2,4-D and 100 litres of herbicide containing 2,4,5-T.

All of this was used to control pest plants in the pastoral areas, as follows:

Nundroo Stock Route to control Horehound and Boxthorn. Flinders Ranges to control Prickly Pear North East to control Noogoora Burr Boxthorn and mesquite.

2. There were no reports of time lost by staff which was attributable to the use of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T during 1980 or 1981.

STRYCHNINE

413. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. What are the restrictions on the sale of strychnine to the public?

2. Can strychnine be used in therapeutic preparations and, if so, under what conditions?

3. What register is kept of such preparations and on how many occasions were such preparations used during 1981?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Regulation 131 of the poisons regulations under the Food and Drugs Act prohibits the sale or supply of strychnine or products containing more than 1 per cent of strychnine for vermin destruction unless the purchaser has an approval issued by the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority for a specific quantity.

Schedule 7 of the poisons list also includes preparations containing strychnine for vermin destruction, and requires the vendor to be licensed or authorised to sell these preparations.

2. Strychnine is not recommended for human therapeutic use, although some old preparations contained small doses for the promotion or stimulation of appetite. Preparations containing strychnine for this purpose are included in schedule 1 of the poisons list and may be sold by pharmacists or persons holding a medicine seller's permit.

3. The sale of schedule 1 and schedule 7 poisons is required to be recorded in a poisons book by the vendor. To ascertain the number of sales of such preparations requires the extensive searching of each licensed and authorised vendor. In view of the cost of such a search, it is not intended to provide this information.

DISEASES

418. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: How many cases of the following were reported during 1980-81 and since 1 July 1981—

(a) hepatitis 'A';
(b) hepatitis 'B';
(c) tuberculosis;
(d) salmonella poisoning;
(e) food poisoning;
(f) rubella;
(g) Q fever;
(h) malaria; and
(i) Scherman's disease?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The reply is as follows:

	1980-81	Since 1 July 1981
(a) Hepatitis 'A'	117	68
(b) Hepatitis 'B'	100	42
(c) Tuberculosis	119	58
(d) Salmonella poisoning	690	445
(e) Food poisoning	37	21
(f) Rubella	23	40
(g) Q Fever	201	59
(h) Malaria	47	18

(i) Scherman's disease is not known to the Public Health Service of the South Australian Health Commission. It may have been intended to refer to Scheuermann's disease, which is not a notifiable disease, and no data on its incidence is available to the Public Health Service.

ENGLISH CLASSES

423. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many on-the-job English classes were provided by the Government in 1981 for—

(a) private firms;

(b) Government departments;

(c) semi-government departments,

and what was the cost of these classes?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Department of Technical and Further Education Language and Migrant Education Centre, in 1981, provided on-the-job English tuition for—

(a) 14 courses.

(b) 12 courses.

(c) Nil.

the total cost being $71 880.

CARAVANS

426. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. What specific fire precautions and regulations exist for caravan parks?

2. How many fire extinguishers are required under regulations to safeguard the occupants of caravans in caravan parks?

3. How many fires occurred in caravans during 1980 and 1981, respectively?

4. How many deaths occurred as a result of fires and/or explosions in caravans in 1980 and 1981, respectively?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Legislation specifically designed for caravan parks has not been enacted in this State. However, if permanent structures on the site are large enough, Part 27 of the building regulations would be applicable.

2. Under section 46 of the Country Fires Act, 1976, and associated regulations, every caravan used outside the boundaries of a municipality or township during the fire danger season shall carry an 'efficient chemical fire extinguisher'. Caravans used within municipalities or townships are not required to carry fire extinguishers.

3. Fires attended by the Fire Service: 1980—15; 1981—10.

4. Fire reports indicate no deaths at time of leaving the fire scene.

WEST LAKES WATERWAY

432. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Marine: When is it intended that the Department of Marine and Harbors will hand over the control of the West Lakes waterway to the Corporation of the City of Woodville?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The Department of Marine and Harbors does not have any control over activities on the West Lakes waterway. The Corporation of the City of Woodville already has such control in terms of the West Lakes Indenture and West Lakes Development Act, 1969.

POLICE VEHICLES

437. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary:

1. Are any police vehicles operating in country areas fitted with protection bars on the front and, if so, what proportion and, if not, why not?

2. How many police vehicles have been involved in accidents with kangaroos and other animals straying on to roadways during 1980-81 and what has been the cost of restoring such vehicles?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The replies are as follows:

1. Current policy is to fit only commercial-type vehicles, e.g. Ford F100, Toyota Landcruisers and similar vehicles, on issue to outlying country areas, with protection bars. Approximately 85 per cent of such vehicles are at present so equipped and the remainder are to be replaced with appropriately equipped vehicles in due course.

2. These records are not maintained.

LEGAL ASSISTANCE

441. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. How many disadvantaged persons seeking legal assistance were turned away from the Legal Services Commission during each month of the 1981 year?

2. Will the Government increase funds and staff during the 1982 year to meet the expected increasing demand for legal assistance and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Government is not in possession of this information.

2. The funding allocation for 1981-82 has been made. The allocation for 1982-83 has yet to be considered by the Government.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS

442. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Community Welfare: Will the Minister advise what restrictions, if any, are placed on the activities of persons who go from door to door representing various religious groups?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: There is in this State no legislation designed expressly to place restrictions upon the activities of persons who go from door to door representing various religious groups. However, persons who do go from door to door representing religious groups are obliged to abide by the law of the State. They therefore may not—

(a) go from house to house begging or gathering alms (Police Offences Act, 1953-1981, section 12 (1) *(c)*);

(b) remain on private premises without a lawful excuse (Police Offences Act, section 17);

(c) sell goods door to door without acting in compliance with the Door to Door Sales Act, 1971-1979, or where applicable the Hawkers Act, 1934-1960; or

(d) collect money for charitable purposes (which are defined to exclude purely religious purposes) without being licensed under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, 1939-1947.

LICENCE TESTS

454. **Mr HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. What are the current average delay periods for licence tests at Port Adelaide and Lockleys?

2. What is the minimum and maximum waiting period at these locations?

3. How many persons are tested in an average day at these locations?

4. What are the minimum and maximum waiting periods at other licence testing localities, respectively?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The current average delay period for licence tests at both Port Adelaide and Lockleys is approximately seven weeks.

2. The waiting period varies at both locations between six and eight weeks.

3. On average two examiners are employed at each of these branch offices. Each examiner on average conducts 10 tests daily. Twelve appointments daily per examiner are made but cancellations and non-attendance reduces to 10 the average tests conducted.

4. The minimum waiting time at other testing localities is approximately four weeks and the maximum is nine weeks.

Provision is made to handle tests required urgently, where it is considered the circumstances warrant special attention.