

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 31 October 1985

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.M. Whyte)** took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: CLEVE AREA SCHOOL

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia praying that the Council prevent any of the proposed staff cuts at the Cleve Area School was presented by the Hon. Peter Dunn.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—

Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Board—Report, 1984-85.

State Transport Authority—Report on Pension and Superannuation Schemes, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins):

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Meat Corporation—Report, 1984-85.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

Pursuant to Statute—

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Report, 1985.

South Australian Waste Management Commission—Report, 1984-85.

QUESTIONS

ROAD LINES

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about road marking.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.B. CAMERON**: On 12 September I directed a question to the Minister of Transport through the Minister of Agriculture about types of paint used to mark roads. I indicated that, particularly during the winter, these lines can cause serious problems for motorists as they are difficult to see and, more particularly, for people riding motor cycles because, as I understand from people who perform the hazardous task of riding motor cycles (something I frankly would not be involved in, but plenty of others are), of the smooth nature of their surface, particularly where there are corner signs.

There have been some very serious accidents as a result of people skidding on them. Most people deliberately try to avoid them, because they indicate that it is like trying to ride on glass. I noticed when the question was reported in the newspaper that there was some reply given on the spot by a person from the Highways Department but, as yet, I have had no reply whatever from the Minister of Transport on this matter. It is a serious matter. I realise that winter has once again passed and perhaps it is not seen to be so urgent now, but it is an important problem and one that should be looked at seriously. Will the Minister redirect the question to the Minister of Transport and ask whether there

can be a reply given and whether any investigation has taken place on the matter?

The **Hon. FRANK BLEVINS**: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

The **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about the Forensic Science Centre.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN**: I understand that as part of the restructuring of the Forensic Science Services various people have now been moved into the Forensic Science Centre to join people who were previously there, particularly those in the Chemistry Section. As a result there is severe overcrowding and concern among those who work in that centre that, because of overcrowding and disorganisation, they are unable to do their work effectively.

I am informed that there is also a waste of resources in the operation of the centre. For example, equipment items that may cost several thousand dollars have been purchased but they cannot be used effectively because there is no money or the attachment necessary to put the equipment to full use. Apparently, there is a practice of shifting staff from one job to another without allowing a particular job to be completed and a job on a piece of equipment may be interrupted before completion and the equipment used for another job.

While I appreciate that any restructuring may create short-term difficulties I do not believe that anyone would disagree that it is important to ensure that in the area of forensic services, which has been under close scrutiny in recent years, the best possible organisation, procedures and facilities should be available. With that background I ask the Attorney-General the following questions:

1. How many persons are now working in the Forensic Science Centre, and in what specialities?
2. Are there any problems as a result of the restructuring of the forensic services?
3. Will the Attorney investigate the accommodation, working practices, availability of equipment, and the organisation of the Forensic Science Centre to ensure that any problems are immediately resolved?

The **Hon. C.J. SUMNER**: No such problems have been drawn to my attention. The Forensic Science Centre comes under the responsibility of the Department of Services and Supply although, from a policy point of view, as Attorney-General, I have had considerable input into the rearrangement of the centre. I consider it to be one of the important achievements of the Government that it has given effect to recommendations of the Currie report, which had been commissioned by the former Government and, indeed, the recommendations of Commissioner Shannon in the Splatt Royal Commission to ensure that South Australians—and the South Australian police in particular—have the best possible scientific services available in the area of legal dispute and criminal cases.

There were a number of recommendations that arose from the Currie report, in particular, the most significant being that police officers—investigation officers—should not decide which material should go for scientific testing. As a result, further, of the committee chaired by the then Deputy Crown Solicitor, Mr Cramond, the rearrangements were brought into place.

A leading forensic scientist from Scotland (Professor Tilstone) was engaged to head the Forensic Science Centre. I have not had drawn to my attention the problems that the

honourable member has outlined. Whether or not they have been drawn to the attention of the Minister responsible, I am not sure. Nevertheless, additional resources have been put into the Forensic Science Centre by this Government, and I believe that the rearrangements should provide a more effective service.

The important thing is to provide a service which is a proper professional scientific service for the police and for other areas of government and which is less capable of being attacked and criticised. I think that that is particularly important because recently, as the honourable member knows, in a number of very notorious cases forensic science work has been criticised, and not just in this State. In the Lindy Chamberlain case in the Northern Territory one of the most critical areas of debate was the forensic science evidence presented during the case. We have had the Splatt inquiry, where again forensic science was under the microscope.

Following those cases, I believe that substantial improvements have been made in terms of equipment and also, more particularly, in terms of the procedures that are to be adopted in collecting scientific evidence for criminal cases. I think that that is bearing fruit in some of the more recent criminal investigations, which I do not intend to go into at present. Certainly, in one of the recent criminal investigations I believe the Government forensic evidence held up under examination by independent witnesses, and was a very significant factor in the ultimate result of that trial.

I think that they are the benefits that South Australians and law enforcement agencies in this State will see in a more professional and scientific approach to the question of scientific evidence in court cases. It overcomes the sorts of arguments and difficulties that have occurred and the sorts of avenues for attack that have existed in the past. I will ascertain the detailed information requested by the honourable member. The problems have not been drawn to my attention, but I will certainly discuss them with the responsible Minister and, in due course, bring back a reply.

WEST TORRENS OVAL

The Hon. K.L. Milne, on behalf of the Hon. I. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Tourism a reply to a question I asked on 29 August about the West Torrens Oval?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I was pleased to make inquiries on behalf of the honourable member with the Minister of Recreation and Sport, regarding the Asters Soccer Club and the proposed indoor bowls complex at Thebarton. My colleague has advised me that he is aware of the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 15 August and that he has not been asked to adjudicate this matter.

It is considered that it is the responsibility of the Thebarton Asters Soccer Club to negotiate its lease with the council. My colleague is also aware of the proposal to develop an indoor bowls complex at Thebarton to be used by able bodied and disabled persons. An application has not been received for funds through the Department of Recreation and Sport. However, preliminary discussions have been held with his departmental officers. The Minister has indicated that he will not make a public statement in relation to the future use of the Thebarton Oval.

TOURISM PROMOTION

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism a question about tourism promotion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last week I received an advance copy of the publication *South Australia 1986* which was prepared on behalf of the Jubilee 150 Board by the Department of Tourism. The publication was forwarded to me by a number of women prominent in preparing important activities for the Jubilee 150 year. They were upset and indeed most hurt and sad that the publication, in the feature about the Grand Prix, included a photograph of three women wearing bathing suit-type outfits that exposed far more of their buttocks than the outfits sought to cover. I am sure that the Minister will agree that the photograph is an inappropriate and unnecessary inclusion in the publication. Not only is it deliberately provocative but, as it was clearly taken overseas, I question its relevance in promoting Adelaide or South Australia or, indeed, the Grand Prix.

I am also sure that the Minister will share the view of the women who contacted me that the photograph is an insult to the hosts of women who have given tirelessly of their time to ensure that Jubilee 150 is celebrated with some style and also in a manner of which all South Australians can be proud. Looking at the photograph, I believe that it is not surprising that questions have been raised about how much longer women in this State will have to tolerate blatantly sexist publications produced at taxpayers' expense by the Department of Tourism. My questions are:

1. Has the Minister in the 2½ months since she responded to a question from the Hon. Anne Levy on tourism promotion on 20 August established for the Department of Tourism a framework to guide the Department on the appropriate content of material prepared by the department?

2. Does she agree, even if the guidelines have not been prepared at this time, that her announced intention to do so in August should have been sufficient warning to the department that deliberately provocative and sexist portrayals of women were not appropriate material for publications seeking to promote South Australia?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I share the concern that has been expressed by the Hon. Miss Laidlaw and other women who have seen the publication to which she refers. On this occasion, I am very happy to say that that publication has absolutely nothing to do with the Department of Tourism. That publication was produced by the Jubilee 150 Board, which is not under my Ministerial control, and which has its own publicity and promotions section, which I understand was responsible for the publication of the booklet to which the honourable member refers.

With respect to the Department of Tourism's promotions, since the publication of the postcards which were referred to earlier, I have had extensive discussions with the people in my department about any advertising and promotional material that the department might produce in the future and have impressed upon them my view (and the Government's view) that all material produced through our department should portray women in a favourable way. The department is aware of that and will be pursuing those principles in the future. With respect to the publication that the Hon. Miss Laidlaw refers to, as I said, it is a Jubilee 150 publication, not a publication of my department. However, I shall pass on the concerns that the honourable member has expressed to the Premier to be passed on to the Jubilee 150 Board.

STUDENTS INTERNATIONAL NETWORK

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I ask the Minister of Youth Affairs:

1. Is she aware of any approach to the State Government by the Australian Students International Network or associated organisations with a request for funds in order to

facilitate the organising and running of an international conference for the Asian Students Association, to be held in Adelaide in January 1986?

2. If such a request has been received, can the Minister inform Parliament who made the request, which department received it, how much money was requested and what was the money to be used for?

3. If such a request exists, does the Government intend to consent to it or has it already consented?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I am not aware of the application to which the honourable member refers, but I shall make inquiries to see whether such an application has been made to the State Government and to which department, and I will seek the information that he requests.

DRUG REHABILITATION CENTRE

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about a proposed rehabilitation centre at Strathalbyn.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: It was reported some days ago in the *Advertiser* that the Drug and Alcohol Services Council was planning to set up a rehabilitation centre at Strathalbyn. There was then a report in the *Sunday Mail* regarding the purchase of this property for this purpose, and the *Sunday Mail* article alleged that there had been lack of consultation with local bodies prior to its purchase and suggestions of trying to bypass the normal planning approval processes. It also reported objections by some local residents to this very worthwhile project being established in the region of Strathalbyn. Can the Minister allay the alleged fears of the local community on these matters and reassure those people regarding the value of such a centre to the people of this State?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I was very disappointed by the manner in which this significant initiative was reported last Sunday. I will not respond to that personally: I do not think that it behoves me, but it would be worthwhile my reading to the Council at least parts of a letter that I have from Mr A.M. Laws, the President of the Alcohol and Drug Foundation of South Australia Incorporated. That is not a Government or a semi-government body. It is not to be confused with the Drug and Alcohol Services Council: it is therefore in this situation able to take an impartial point of view. Mr Laws states:

The *Sunday Mail's* story about the establishment of a country rehabilitation centre for recovering drug users does violence to the concept of responsible journalism. The attack on the probity of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council, and in particular on those seeking recovery from the agonies of their addiction is a disgrace to the name of fair reporting. The article does nothing to create a caring attitude in the community: instead it encourages stigmatisation and approbrium. The reporter and those whose comments are quoted have much to answer for.

I stress that they are not my words but the written words and considered opinion of Mr A.M. Laws. With particular respect to the Croxton Park property and the various matters of alleged public controversy that had been raised, first there was criticism, of course, about making a public announcement before the planning processes had been gone through. I must say that I find that quite amazing. I do not know how one can invite people to comment on a proposal for a change of existing use unless one makes the matter public. That is just a simple matter of fact.

I announced this matter in Canberra in a report to the Ministerial Committee on Drug Strategy, to which I announced it as one of the centre pieces of one of a significant number of initiatives being undertaken in 1985-86 substantially to upgrade services to alcohol and drug abusers

in this State, and more importantly to upgrade programs involving prevention, education and rehabilitation. I will give the Council some of the facts.

Prior to my seeking Cabinet approval for this particular initiative (and, of course, one does not rush in and buy a property with a blindfold on) the Chairman and Acting Chief Executive Officer of the Drug and Alcohol Services Council (DASC) met with the Mayor, Town Clerk and Town Planner of the District Council of Strathalbyn on 4 September. They met specifically to discuss the proposed use of the Croxton Park property.

It is a delightful property. I had the good fortune to visit it last Saturday and it is as picturesque and suitable for the purpose we require it for as anyone would find in the State. On 16 September 1985, following the initial contact which had been made with the Mayor, Town Clerk and Town Planner, the Chairman of DASC and the Acting Chief Executive Officer attended a full council meeting at Strathalbyn and explained the proposed establishment of a therapeutic community in the Strathalbyn area. At both meetings with the Strathalbyn council officers of DASC received a positive indication of support in principle for the proposed rehabilitation facility.

On 23 September, that is almost three weeks after the initial discussions with the Strathalbyn council, Cabinet approved the purchase of the property known as Croxton Park at Ashbourne at a price of up to \$205 000. It was reported also in this article that we had paid \$205 000 for the property and that it had been valued at \$136 000. I will come to that in a few moments. Let me make it clear that Cabinet approval was given to proceed with the purchase prior to obtaining full planning consent for use.

It was also indicated that should consent not be forthcoming the property would be resold. The simple fact of the matter was that the Drug and Alcohol Services Council realised (and it was their advice to me) that the full planning processes should be gone through. I never queried that at any stage—they will be gone through. It was unreasonable in the circumstances to say to the vendors that we would like an option on the property but that it would be subject to planning approval and that we would keep them waiting for three months or nine months (however long it might take) so a decision was taken to purchase the property.

Let me make it clear that, if the full planning processes, appeals and so forth, having been undertaken there is not full consent use, we will have to look elsewhere and we will have to resell the property. I believe that we have an overwhelming case, nevertheless, the full planning processes will be gone through. On 21 October 1985 settlement occurred and the amount of \$205 000 was paid for the purchase. Prior to purchase the Drug and Alcohol Services Council obtained two valuations on the property, one from R.J. Taylor and Associates Services Pty Ltd, property management and valuation consultant services, for an amount of \$210 000 and one from the Valuer General for an amount of \$195 000, so at the end of the day we paid somewhere in between. Certainly, nobody ever put a valuation on the property of \$136 000.

Indeed, it has, among other things, two houses on it. It is, from a commercial farming point of view, grossly over capitalised, but from our point of view it suits admirably. It is intended to establish a long-term drug free residential rehabilitation program catering for clients and, where appropriate, their families. Clients who elect to participate in this drug free program and who have been assessed as suitable for the program will enter into a contractual agreement following satisfactory detoxification. In other words, residents will have undergone a comprehensive appraisal, including physical, social and psychological assessments, will be free of drugs and committed to long-term change.

So much for the headline which suggests 'Tiny town will fight "addicts invasion" '.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Miss Laidlaw does not seem to be too concerned about these major efforts that we are making to rehabilitate those unfortunate victims of this heinous drug trade, but I am sure that other members of the Council are.

Let me make it clear to the Council that any of the clients who are assessed as being suitable for long-term rehabilitation at Croxton Park will also be required to have shown that they are responsible and responsive to the country environment. There will be strict rules and guidelines that clients must adhere to as part of their contractual obligations with the centre. The Drug and Alcohol Services Council intends to maintain the property as a grazing property and to ensure that the current high standard of facilities is maintained.

There is a substantial amount of improvement that has been done on the property and, as I said earlier, it is a very attractive property indeed. To date all of those processes of consultation have been gone through. I repeat that there is no intention to try to subvert or short circuit the planning system in any way. Of course, I also made it clear that officers from DASC have met with the officials and the Mayor of Strathalbyn and subsequently the full council. In addition (and I think that this is important) letters were distributed to local residents through the Ashbourne post office which clearly explain the DASC position and its intentions. The Chairman and Acting Executive Officer of DASC will be attending a public meeting called for tomorrow evening where the whole position will be explained to the local community. The Strathalbyn council and its District Clerk are fully aware that DASC is required to make application for consent to use the property and that members of the community will be able to follow traditional processes in voicing their opinions once application for planning consent has been made.

CUMMINS AREA SCHOOL

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Education, about staffing cuts at the Cummins Area School.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Staffing cuts seem to have hit the western area quite severely. It has been brought to my attention by a number of people that staffing cuts at the Cummins Area School are creating a problem in the curriculum by cutting down in that area and causing students to seek that curriculum elsewhere, or not take advantage of being taught that curriculum. If the parents seek that curriculum elsewhere they have to pay high fees. They feel that their children should be at home. I have a letter here from Mrs Heather Nettle from Wangary, who states:

Area schools—

she means the Cummins Area School—

seems greatly disadvantaged in the way they are staffed as they have very different needs to a primary or high school, especially in larger [city] areas where students may be able to attend an alternative school to satisfy subject choice.

Will the Minister say what formula was used to come to the conclusion that the 2.1 staff and ancillaries should be removed from the Cummins Area School? Has the western area budget been cut causing these displacements. Have the displaced staff from Cummins been shifted to other schools in the western area? If not, what areas have these people been shifted to?

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Health a question about health services in the southern suburbs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: The Minister of Health on more than one occasion has admitted the fact that Flinders Medical Centre has an occupancy rate in excess of 90 per cent—higher than the acceptable level—and the pressures on medical and nursing staff are enormous. The Minister would also be aware that there is a strong view at Flinders Medical Centre that the additional wing initially planned for that centre should be built, sooner than later. However, the Government's commitment to a 100 bed public hospital at Noarlunga has deferred the additional wing, at least for the time being.

Recently, the Minister announced that the 100 bed public hospital at Noarlunga will be complemented by a facility of 60 beds to be built by Mutual Community—formerly Mutual Health—which has some experience in the hospital field, for example, owning Wakefield Hospital. In other words, it will be a partnership between the public and private sectors that at first glance sounds most attractive. There seems to be general agreement that the pressure on health services in the southern suburbs will continue, particularly in the specialist areas that Flinders provides so well, rather than in the general services provided by a smaller establishment such as that proposed for Noarlunga.

My questions to the Minister are first, in view of that fact, has the Minister of Health and/or the South Australian Health Commission considered inviting Mutual Community to develop the 160 bed hospital at Noarlunga on the understanding that an acceptable number of public beds would be made available and, secondly, if not, will consideration be given to this option, thus releasing Government moneys for the much needed additional wing at Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: One thing I would like to know above all else: what would the Liberal Party do in Government about hospital services in the south? I challenge it to tell me.

An honourable member: We will find out after 7 December.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We will find out after 7 December! We have to take this as an act of faith. I challenge the Hon. Mr Burdett to say in this Council what the Liberal Party would do about hospital services in the south. The Liberal Party has been strangely silent—it has been totally negative. It has knocked and knocked. The whole Noarlunga Health Village complex has been knocked by the Opposition since day one.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Davis scoffs about the Noarlunga Health Village, and that ought to be on the record. The Liberal Party should ask Mr Burdett what the feeling was like among the 500 or 600 people who attended the official opening of the health village. Indeed, I thought the people were going to carry the Premier out on their shoulders—it was a remarkably warm and enthusiastic gathering. Let honourable members opposite talk to the Hon. Mr Burdett about that: it is fact. They can sit and scoff as much as they like, but that is the reality.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Burdett did not ask the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: We do not know who is the shadow Minister of Health.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We can easily find that out for you. Just a few days ago the Minister of Health made a special plea that he should have treatment equal to those asking the question. Previously I have not been able to do that, and it is obvious that the Minister wants his answer to be relevant to the question; otherwise, he would not have made that appeal. The question has nothing to do with Mr Burdett or the shadow ministry. It seemed quite a simple question to answer.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: What I asked for the other day was a fair go, and I would ask for it again today.

The PRESIDENT: You will get it.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Why don't you protect me from the persistent interjections and do your job?

The PRESIDENT: Because you continually provoke people.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Turn it up: I am under constant attack from the moment I am on my feet, and I get no protection from the Chair, and you know it.

The PRESIDENT: You asked for the same treatment as those who asked the questions. Now be relevant with your answers.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I know that you have a few worries, but at least you could do your job. I repeat my challenge to the Opposition, if it considers itself to be an alternative Government, to tell the Council (whether it is in Flinders or wherever it announces it) what it will do about hospital services in the south. Our position is well known. I also point out, and this is entirely relevant, that stage 4 of Flinders Medical Centre was axed by the Tonkin Government. The Opposition has never had any intention of providing additional facilities in the south. There was no proposal at the time it was in government to build a hospital facility at Noarlunga or anywhere else.

When we announced that we would do so we were attacked. We were attacked by the then Minister of Health and by the then Government in general. We announced that we would build the most comprehensive community health facility in Australia, and again we were attacked.

The Hon. L.H. Davis interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Mr Davis still sits there and scoffs and makes sick little jokes about ping pong balls. Mr President, if you controlled him from making his inane interjections I could get on and answer the question directly. Again, I challenge the Opposition, because it has been strangely silent on this matter, to tell us what it would do: this is the same lot, the same tired old men—with the exception of the Hon. Mr Lucas who is a well worn young man—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I put it to the Minister: why do you not take the opportunity of Question Time to ask that question?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: I have.

The PRESIDENT: The question to you was what your Government is going to do.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: My question to them is, 'what would they do?' I will tell the Council. The Opposition knows very well what we will do—it is a matter of public record. I will take it a step further and tell the Opposition what we will do in the term beyond. It knows—we have announced publicly—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: We have announced publicly—and given further details at the opening of the Noarlunga Health Village—precisely what we will do: we will

build in association with Mutual Community (the largest private health insurer in this State) a twin hospital complex, the first of its kind in Australia. We will share the catering facilities; we will share, I would hope, the operating theatre complex; we will have joint admitting privileges so that we will have the same standards in both the public and private sector; and we will have—again, this is a matter of public record, and the Hon. Mr Davis ought to know about it—a close association through that hospital complex with Flinders Medical Centre.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Answer my question.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Further, at this moment, at the request of the Treasurer and in full consultation with the Treasurer, I have asked the Chairman of the Health Commission to set up a major consultancy to look at our capital works program in health for the next five years and beyond. That is the sort of approach we are taking. There will not be a slashing down to the \$11.7 million—the disastrous \$11.7 million—that was made available for capital works in health in the last budget brought down in this Parliament by the Tonkin Government. I might add that this year it is something in excess of \$30 million: we are getting it back to the sort of level that we need to start talking about the possibility of more beds at Flinders.

As part of that five year program—and I challenge the Opposition again to give its response to this as an alternative Government (God forbid that that should happen, but let it tell us what it would do if it did)—we will be looking at the construction of purpose built facilities at Flinders for an acute psychiatric facility and for purpose built geriatric beds for the existing geriatric assessment and rehabilitation unit.

In total, although we will not reinstate the original stage 4 development, we are looking at the further development at Flinders of 132 beds. That will be considered as part of the five year program.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: What year is that?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is not very hard for the Hon. Mr Davis to work out what year it will be in five years time. I would have thought that although he may not know, because of the way he carries on occasionally, what day it is, he should be able to add five years to 1985 and work out what year it will be. Even the Hon. Mr Davis is not that foolish.

That is part of the five year program. That additional 132 beds at Flinders will certainly be reinstated, and a report will be prepared which will show us how to go to that as the next stage after the completion of the 160 bed twin hospital complex. Let me make clear that because of the maldistribution of hospital beds in metropolitan Adelaide—and that is a maldistribution that occurred over a very long period, well before my time—even with the additional 160 beds that will be provided at Noarlunga, even when one puts them together with the other hospital facilities in the south, including Flinders, we will still be somewhere below four acute hospitals beds per 1 000 of population. Clearly, we will need additional beds.

Of course, that should be seen in the context of redistribution. Significantly, the 100 public beds—and the Hon. Mr Davis should listen to this because he is a pretender for the Hon. John Burdett's crown as shadow Minister—that will be provided at Noarlunga have been provided by a rational transfer from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Overall in metropolitan Adelaide we have an adequate number of beds both in the public and private sector. Let me make it clear that the last thing I would want to see happen, if we are to contain costs, is an overall expansion of hospital bed numbers in metropolitan Adelaide, whether it be in the

public or private sector. That would be very bad management.

I know that the Hon. Mr Burdett goes to Whyalla and elsewhere and says, 'You should have a private hospital.' It is called open ticketing, I believe (an open cheque book)—the opportunistic but desperate men of the Opposition, promising anything. Let me make it clear again that overall we have adequate bed numbers in Adelaide. What we need in these construction programs and in the provision of beds in the south, for example, is a redistribution of existing bed stocks. I talked to the private hospital people along these lines and, overall, people like Mutual Community, in particular, agree that that is the way to go. Mutual Community, of course, as much as anyone, has a vested and very keen interest in containing the day bed costs in our hospitals.

Let me tell the Hon. Mr Davis that, if he wants to see what happens when one allows the private sector to run rampant without any control on bed numbers at all, he should go to the United States and have a look at its day bed cost where it runs somewhere in excess of double the day bed cost in this State and about double the day bed cost in this country.

The Hon. M.B. Cameron: What's their average wage?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Their average income is about the same as in this country. Their costs are huge. It is a known fact—it is not a matter open for contention. Try having a simple appendectomy in an American hospital without insurance.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: How about finishing your answer and let us ask a question.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: It is pretty important that you get this background.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: You've been going for 10 minutes.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The crown prince of waffle interjects.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: My health is very good, but it is not good enough to wait around long enough for this lot to get into Government. Having given that very comprehensive background, and I repeat, all those putative shadow Ministers over there, whether it be the Hon. Dr Ritson, the Hon. Mr Davis, the Hon. Mr Lucas—

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: And Miss Laidlaw.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: The Hon. Miss Laidlaw is not quite in the act, but there are two or three members in the other place as well. The wrong way to go would be to simply look at the public sector or the private sector providing unlimited beds. We will provide 160 beds in the twin hospital complex; 100 of those will be beds that have been decommissioned over a period of time at the Queen Elizabeth hospital, and that is good management. We would not be interested in seeing a private facility of 160 beds. There are a number of reasons for that, but one very good reason is that a private hospital would not cater for the needs of approximately two-thirds of the population of the south. If one looks at the cross-section of the population in that area and its needs one will see that somewhere around two-thirds of them want access to a first class public hospital system, and that is what we will provide. Having done that, and as part of the five year planning program, we will be looking very actively at the provision of 132 beds at Flinders, specifically for acute psychiatric facilities and acute geriatric facilities.

Once they are provided they will free up existing beds so that there may well be an addition of more than 100 beds to literally complete the building program at Flinders. That is well in hand, and I am very pleased to be able to tell the Council about it.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: I have a supplementary question. Will the Minister consider inviting Mutual Community to

develop the 160 bed hospital at Noarlunga on the understanding that it provides an acceptable number of public beds? If not, why not?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: Because the private sector does not provide public beds. It is as simple as that.

The Hon. L.H. Davis: It could.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: That is quite ridiculous.

HMAS WHYALLA

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for the Arts, a question about the restoration of HMAS *Whyalla*.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Members of the Corvette Association in South Australia, whose membership comprises those who served on corvettes during the last war, are very concerned with the future of a ship that was once known as the HMAS *Whyalla* and which, for many years since the last war, has been a pilot ship in the rip at the entrance of Port Phillip Bay. Endeavouring to preserve the history of this section of Australia's naval force, members of this association have been able to acquire the vessel, which was no longer needed for service in Victoria. They sailed it to Whyalla some time ago in the hope that it could remain and be established there as a naval museum commemorating the service of the corvettes that served Australia during the last war. It is of particular interest to South Australia because this vessel and many other similar corvettes were built at Whyalla during that war.

There seems now to be a complete impasse as to the vessel's future. The reason for this is that undoubtedly considerable expense will be involved in converting the vessel to a naval museum, and the corporation at Whyalla seems to find it hard to allocate funds for any restoration work that is needed. Indeed, there seems to be some controversy—I am sure that the Hon. Mr Blevins will support me in all that I am saying, because he comes from Whyalla—as to whether the ship should remain afloat alongside a wharf there or whether it should be taken on to dry land.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Or—!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: Well, I am disgusted at the suggestion that the Hon. Mr Blevins makes by interjection which rather indicates, by sign language, that he thinks it ought to be sunk.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: He didn't say that.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I clearly saw the movement of his hand, and the movement of his hand indicated that a third proposition might be that it might be sunk. Probably he wants to make a—

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Three alternatives: the third one is that it be a scuba diver's—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: He apparently believes there is no difference between it being sunk and it being made a haven for scuba divers. Let me say that I speak for members of the Corvette Association, of which I am a member. With pride, I disclose my interest.

The Hon. C.J. Sumner: You probably have enough money to do it up yourself.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: The Attorney does not want to have envy take over in his soul.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. HILL: My question is in the form of an appeal. Let me say that a former Speaker of this Parliament, a member of the Labor Party, worked on the building of the *Whyalla*, but I only mention that as an aside.

The Hon. Frank Blevins interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I cannot get together with him, unfortunately, because he is deceased.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I doubt if any of this is nearly as funny as some of you think it is.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I agree with you, Mr President, because the situation at the moment is that Australians from all over this country have contributed to getting this vessel to Whyalla. Some of them served on it during the war. They know there is only one other of all the corvettes now in existence, and that is a ship that is a museum at Port Melbourne. Here we have an opportunity to preserve this part of our proud naval history and to preserve something of our history that occurred during the war when this country was saved from the invader. So, I ask the Minister—

The Hon. L.H. Davis: Were you on this ship?

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No, I remember it being at sea with me. I was on the *HMAS Pirie* at the time. That was another corvette that was built at Whyalla. I was very proud as a South Australian to be on a ship that was built at Whyalla.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: One of your federal mates closed the shipyard down.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: They did not close it down at all. You could not tender on a competitive basis. You and your mates in the left wing union up there—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Frank Blevins: It was Mr Fraser—

The Hon. C.M. HILL: No, it was your costs at Whyalla that ruined the shipbuilding industry.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister of Labour and the Hon. Mr Lucas will come to order and let us hear this question.

The Hon. C.M. HILL: My question is: will the Minister for the Arts, being in charge of the history trust, endeavour to see what help the history trust might provide to the city of Whyalla and to the membership of the Corvette Association to establish this ship as a permanent reminder of those who served in the corvettes and in the Navy during the war, and to see what they can do about providing funds and the management of its rehabilitation as a naval museum within the city of Whyalla?

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: It is most unfortunate that the honourable member has left me no time to respond to this very serious question.

Honourable members: We will give you an extension.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Well, honourable members are most generous. On that basis, I move:

That Standing Orders be suspended to enable me to respond to the question.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: The honourable member has raised a very serious question as to the future of the *HMAS Whyalla* which has, I understand, been purchased by the Corporation of the City of Whyalla and was transported from its previous place of work to Whyalla where it currently stays. I understand that having got the ship to Whyalla, there is now the question of what should be done with it, and I am sure that everyone would agree that because of its historic significance to Whyalla, its historic significance to Australia, and in particular its historic significance to those people who served in the armed forces, a satisfactory solution is found for the future of this ship. I understand from a recent visit to Whyalla that there are a number of options that are currently being considered.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Three.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER: Three, the Hon. Mr Blevins interjects, being considered by the Corporation of the City of Whyalla. Allow me to say that the Government did not have any direct part in ensuring that the ship was returned to Whyalla. That was a matter taken up by the Corporation of the City of Whyalla, I understand, in conjunction with the local community. It is at this stage something that they are considering. Obviously, the suggestions put forward by the honourable member would need assessment and would probably have some substantial cost factor attached to them. As I mentioned to the honourable member, as a distinguished member of the Corvette Association, it may be that this is a case where the private sector in the person of the honourable member and some of his friends may be in a position to assist financially with any solution to the future of the corvette *HMAS Whyalla*. I only put that to the honourable member as a possibility, knowing his deep interest and commitment to the future of this ship, a sister ship as I understand to that which he had the privilege of serving on in the defence of his country during the Second World War.

Whether there are any other options available outside of the possible private funding that I have mentioned, that I am sure the honourable member will take up with his association at its next meeting, I am not in a position to say. It is certainly a matter that is exercising the community of Whyalla and in particular the corporation. I do not know whether there is anything that the Government is able to do through the history trust or in any other way. However, I am happy to refer the question to the Minister for the Arts and bring back a reply.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: When the Hon. Mr Hill was waxing lyrical about the ex *HMAS Whyalla*, he said that there were two propositions which had been floated for the use of the ship. I indicated by gesture that there were not two: there were three. The third was that the ship be taken outside the Whyalla harbor, sunk and used as a marine park for scuba diving.

The Hon. C.M. Hill: That is absolutely insulting!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: That is a suggestion that has been put by some very responsible people in Whyalla.

The Hon. R.J. Ritson: You aren't going to bow to them?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I will not bow to anyone. The matter is entirely in the hands of the Whyalla council, which has a proposition for funds that is being processed through the Federal Government. The Whyalla City Council wants to relocate the ship closer to the Port Augusta road and use it as a marine museum.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON ARTIFICIAL
INSEMINATION BY DONOR *IN VITRO*
FERTILIZATION AND EMBRYO TRANSFER
PROCEDURES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on Artificial Insemination by Donor, *In vitro* Fertilization and Embryo Transfer Procedures in South Australia be extended until Thursday 12 December 1985.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SECTION 56 PLANNING ACT, 1982, AND RELATED MATTERS

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): We have done a lot of work on this select committee, but we are not quite finished. I therefore move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on section 56 of the Planning Act 1982 and Related Matters be extended until Thursday 12 December 1985.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON DISPOSAL OF HUMAN REMAINS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: We have done a great deal of work on this committee, as I am sure other members will agree. A lot more has to be done yet. I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Disposal of Human Remains in South Australia be extended until Thursday 12 December 1985.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C.J. SUMNER (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In light of the fact that the Bill has been considered in the House of Assembly, I seek leave for the explanation to be inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill provides for Government guarantees to be given under the Industries Development Act to cover real or contingent liabilities rather than just loans as is the present case. In recent times there has been an increasing number of requests for the Government to guarantee financial facilities other than loans, particularly performance bonds. Strict interpretation of the Act as it now stands precludes the provision of guarantees for performance bonds and other contingent liabilities.

The inability of South Australian firms to obtain such guarantees can result in expansion and employment opportunities being lost to this State. The proposed amendment, while still limiting the Government's liability to a specified figure, will enable the guarantee provisions of the Act to be used more positively and effectively to assist South Australian industry.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 14 of the principal Act which provides for guarantees to assist the establishment, carrying on or expansion of businesses. At present section 14 does not authorise the Treasurer to give guarantees except with respect to repayment of loans. The clause amends the section so that the Treasurer may also (subject, of course, to the recommendations of the Industries Development Committee) give a guarantee in respect of any other liability that has been or may be incurred in connection with a business or proposed business. Such a guarantee must meet the requirement that it is for the purpose of assisting a person to establish, carry on or expand a business in any industry; it must be limited to the payment of a fixed or ascertainable amount; and it must also meet or satisfy the other current requirements of section 14 (2). The amendments to section 14 (2) proposed by the clause

are of a consequential nature only designed to apply the provisions to this new form of guarantee.

Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 16 of the Act which empowers the Treasurer to make it a condition of a guarantee that the Treasurer may, if satisfied that the business is satisfactorily established, require the person who received the guarantee to raise capital to repay the loan in respect of which the guarantee was given. The clause makes consequential amendments to this section so that it relates only to guarantees in respect of loans.

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 October. Page 1627.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this Bill, which is a very sensible rewrite of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, which has been in existence for a considerable period. The major part of it, which formed the basis of existing legislation, was passed in 1908.

Of course, a lot of changes have occurred in that time in people's attitudes and in the manner in which we use animals. In the days when this Act was first brought into being, animals were a very important part of society and provided virtually the only mode of transport and work in society. Nowadays, that is not the case. Probably, members will notice a greater emphasis now on domestic animals.

The other area where there have been a number of changes in practices relates to the farming community. The Bill is very extensive. A number of organisations have been involved in the process of drawing it up and in consultation. Out of that consultation has come a very sensible Bill. The original draft had a provision in relation to the definition of fish as animals that caused some concern in a lot of areas. That could have caused a lot of controversy because there is still considerable doubt as to whether and where fish feel pain. It certainly would have been difficult to provide for the fishing industry if that aspect had remained. It could be called an over-zealous provision and, as such, it was considered—and rightly—that it should be left out of this because it would have become a very vexed issue indeed.

The RSPCA is a very sensible organisation, which takes into account commonsense in relation to cruelty to animals as well as being vigorously opposed to cruelty as such. I have for some time been closely associated with the RSPCA and have been impressed by the way in which it arrives at decisions in relation to this matter and takes into account, particularly in relation to farming practices, what is sensible and necessary to prevent cruelty. It is an area in which a large majority of members of society would feel that it is required that there be provisions for the prevention of cruelty.

Some people in society have very strange and sick attitudes towards animals and for unaccountable reasons consider that they should be allowed to do as they wish to their animals and neglect them. There are people who do the same thing to their families. I am sure that nobody in this Council would act in that way, but there are some very strange people in our world, so it is very important that we provide for penalties for people who do not have what is regarded as proper and reasonable attitudes towards animals.

The other area in which it is important to provide some sort of regulation relates to people using animals for experimental purposes. It is very necessary that animals are treated reasonably. It is essential, of course, that animals be used for experimentation. There are people in this society who would stop all such experimentation, but it is absolutely essential if we are to provide for relief from suffering of members of our society afflicted with disease or other problems that at least in the first stages of arriving at prevention or cures of disease and other problems relating to surgery that there be some use of animals.

It is necessary that in the institutions where these experiments take place there are ethics committees that will provide responsible attitudes and provisions for the use of such animals. In many cases, these ethics committees will be absolutely necessary where there is wholesale use of animals. The other area where the RSPCA will be involved is where animals are locked in cars and left in the sun.

I know that this has been a problem for a long time where animals are left in this situation and an inspector can do nothing about it until he finds the owner of the car. That is not always easy if the owner is in a large crowd. Inspectors are then placed in a very difficult situation, indeed. This new Bill will provide that an inspector will have the right to take whatever steps are necessary to free an animal from that situation. It also provides inspectors with powers to enter premises and do those things necessary when an inspector suspects that an animal is being ill treated.

The Bill provides that a person will be subject to a very large penalty (\$10 000 or imprisonment for 12 months) if that person deliberately or unreasonably causes an animal unnecessary pain; being its owner, he fails to provide it with appropriate and adequate food, water, shelter or exercise; fails to alleviate any pain suffered by it, whether by reason of age, illness, or injury; or abandons it and neglects it so much as to cause it unnecessary pain. These things are commonsense and necessary. Probably to many people it would seem unnecessary to have such provisions.

The next provision in the Bill will end a sport that has been conducted in South Australia for a long time—live hare coursing. The Bill deals with the situation where an animal is released from captivity for the purpose of it being hunted or killed by another animal. I know that there has been a long argument over whether or not live hare coursing is cruel but, whether we like it or not, when animals such as hares are subjected to live hare coursing they face the danger of being killed or maimed regardless of all the safety provisions put in. I support that provision being put into the Bill. I know that some members may find that not entirely necessary, but I certainly support that provision, as does the Opposition.

The Bill also provides that, where a person causes an animal to be killed or injured by another animal, that will be subject to a penalty, as will a person who is present at an event where animals are encouraged to fight. That is not an area that I find very acceptable. Where a person having injured an animal fails to take reasonable steps to alleviate its pain; where he kills it in such a manner as to cause unnecessary pain; where he transports it in a manner contrary to regulations; where he traps, snares or catches it contrary to regulations; poisons it contrary to regulations; cages or confines it contrary to regulations—all those things will be watched very closely through regulation to make sure that that does not interfere with what are reasonable and normal farming practices.

I am sure, knowing the attitudes of the organisations associated with this Bill, that they will not make the regulations so unreasonable as to interfere with what are normal practices within the agricultural community. The Bill also provides that a person shall not use an electrical goad or

any other electrical device designed to control an animal in contravention of the regulations. As you would know, Mr President, and as any other member in the farming community would know, there are now certain devices used in the farming community for the restraint of animals. That is an area that has always been subject to investigation.

There are various opinions on this matter but, while it may be of some concern that people do not now treat an animal while it is under such restraint, I believe that probably those methods of restraint are reasonable, provided the people operating such devices treat animals within reason. There is nothing worse than an animal being treated (as the Hon. Dr Cornwall would know) if it is not under reasonable restraint. That situation can be even more cruel than keeping it under reasonable restraint.

There are a number of other areas provided for in the Bill. It sets out how an inspector shall conduct himself. It gives him all reasonable facilities to carry out his work. He does, before entering a property, have to receive permission from the owner. If he intends to break and enter a property he must not do so except on the authority of a warrant issued by a justice, unless the inspector believes that an animal is suffering unnecessary pain and that urgent action is required. The Bill also sets out the details of how the justice shall conduct the issue of a warrant. Overall, I indicate that I believe that this Bill is a reasonable provision, that it does provide for reasonable behaviour by people in relation to animals. It does take into account the problems that the farming community will face. I have been informed of strong support for the measure by the United Farmers and Stockowners Association as being a sensible approach to the prevention of cruelty to animals.

I indicate my strong support for the organisation that takes so much interest in preventing cruelty to animals, that is, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. I believe that the RSPCA has done an excellent job in this State over a long period and has itself raised most of the money needed. It has done an extremely good job and I trust that Governments of the future will give it the necessary support for it to continue its work in the field of prevention of cruelty to animals, which it has carried out in a very worthwhile and proper fashion.

The RSPCA provides excellent facilities in this State and has moved in other directions in the provision of facilities for stray dogs. I know that this is an area that has caused considerable cost to the RSPCA and I hope that Governments and councils recognise this and ensure that it is provided with sufficient resources to enable it to carry out its work. I also hope that under the new Act we will see careful provision of facilities for animals involved in the live sheep trade. It is absolutely essential that in the provision of facilities we provide (and that people in the industry provide) proper facilities for the storing and holding of animals prior to their departure in the live sheep trade.

Unless we do that, we will find ourselves in a situation, if we are not careful, where the rural community will lose excellent markets because of public reaction to the improper handling of stock prior to its departure on ships. I believe that this is an area where a considerable amount of work needs to be done and that proper support needs to be given to those organisations that are trying to ensure that animals are not treated cruelly during the time that they are held prior to shipping. With those few words I indicate that the Opposition strongly supports this new Bill and trusts that it will receive speedy passage through this Council.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health): I thank the Hon. Mr Cameron for his thoughtful contribution. I have little to add to what has already been said both in the House of Assembly and in this place. I would like to be on

record as thanking all of those who have been involved in what has been a lengthy gestation period for this very substantial reform of legislation relating to cruelty to animals. I cannot recall how long ago it was that this matter was first raised with me as a veterinarian, but it was certainly back in the days when I was on the back bench sitting behind the Dunstan Government representatives some time in the mid to late 1970s.

However, I think it has been well worth waiting for. It has been done very well and I pay a tribute to those officers who I know worked very diligently on this matter over quite a lengthy period. I compliment the RSPCA, the Animal Welfare League and all the animal welfare organisations that played a responsible role. It is also fair to acknowledge the role and the responsible attitude of the Australian Veterinary Association, the UF&S and all those people who are involved one way or another in primary production.

In 1985 sometimes a distorted and, I think, very exaggerated stance is taken with regard to some of these matters. It is of deep concern to me, for example (and I know that it is of concern to the federal President of the AVA and members of that profession), that there is a concerted move at present to stop the supply of dogs and cats for surgical training of student veterinarians. For decades animals have been fully anaesthetised and used for surgical training; then, of course, they were euthanised without ever recovering or coming out of deep third stage anaesthesia. There was no cruelty whatsoever in the very carefully supervised way in which that was carried out.

But notably there is a very active movement in the States where there are veterinary schools in Australia to stop this practice altogether. Since no form of internship or residency is required for veterinarians, if this movement was successful all I can say is, 'God help the animals upon which trainees learn their surgery post graduation.' Surely common sense dictates that it is far better that this is done under controlled circumstances on surplus animals in regard to which no cruelty whatsoever is involved than for young graduates to be let loose in the community to treat both domestic and farm animals without having any experience in operating on living tissue or live animals. I make those comments, because they are genuinely matters of deep concern to me as a member of the veterinary profession of, dare I say it, almost 29 years standing.

Having said that, may I also say, as I said at the outset, that I commend the Bill to all members of the Council. Because of the flexibility provided and the way in which codes of practice can be incorporated in the regulations, I think that the competing interests of all the responsible bodies can be well accommodated, including those areas that are of great moment to me as Minister of Health, that is, the laboratories and research institutes in which animal colonies are kept for one reason or another. The compulsory provision of adequate animal ethics committees in all those institutions, or in the case of the Education Department, the Children's Services Office or other bodies, to supervise and be responsible for the establishment of adequate ethics committees, is a major step forward and hopefully it will prevent the sorts of things which, regrettably, occurred in South Australia in the latter part of the 1970s and which, of course, were the subject of an extensive investigation and report by Professor Morris.

The Bill covers all the interests and, perhaps most important of all, it guarantees that animals, whether domestic or farm animals and regardless of the type of husbandry that is practised within the law, can be free from the sometimes mindless and quite sadistic excesses to which they might otherwise be exposed.

Bill read a second time.
In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

Clause 14—'Use any form of electrical device unless banned by regulations.'

The Hon. PETER DUNN: Do the regulations limit the electrical capacity, or the amount of voltage, of electric goads or fences?

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: As I said, the Bill has the flexibility for these matters to be worked out by consultation prior to the regulations being introduced. It was not deemed wise to prohibit specifically or enshrine a limitation in the legislation. Cattle goads will be a matter for discussion between the animal welfare agencies and other interested parties in the drawing up of the regulations.

The Hon. PETER DUNN: I asked that question because goads are used commonly and very effectively, and I do not believe that they have a lasting effect on the animal. They shock them a bit, but I believe they are effective mechanisms.

The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL: From experience, I believe that they can be quite hazardous if one stands too close while using them. They will leave a lasting impression on the operator in certain circumstances. I do not know—that is a contentious matter on which I would not care to express an opinion either in my capacity as a veterinarian or as a legislator. I think I could probably produce as many ayes as noes or noes as ayes on the matter. I am not too sure that on balance they are a great help. I suggest that a Queensland heeler might be significantly better, if the Hon. Mr Dunn is having trouble loading cattle.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I wish to place on record that this Bill is at last achieving what Mr J.J. Jennings, former member for Ross Smith and before that member for Enfield in the House of Assembly, tried to achieve for many years, and that is the outlawing of live hare coursing. He brought in many a private member's Bill on this topic, most of which did not reach a vote. Clause 13 (2) (c) will achieve what he tried to achieve for so long, and I for one would like to recognise the cause to which he devoted so much time.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (15 to 44) and title passed.
Bill read a third time and passed.

BUILDERS LICENSING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 October. Page 1632)

The Hon. L.H. DAVIS: This is an important legislative amendment. The Bill seeks to repeal the Builders Licensing Act 1967 and the Building Contracts (Deposits) Act of 1953. It is a far-reaching measure and affects many people. In fact, the building industry in South Australia employs directly, as far as I can gather, at least 30 000 people. Those 30 000 are skilled and unskilled tradesmen, workmen and professional people, both employers and employees, who work under an Act that is very much antiquated. There has been general agreement for many years that reform is long overdue.

My colleagues the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Griffin have already spoken at length about that point, and the Hon. Mr Burdett quite rightly observed that this Government for three years has sat on this important measure. I was disappointed and, frankly, amazed, to learn that the Master Builders Association was not even consulted about this Bill, and that the first it knew about the proposal to repeal the existing legislation and introduce a new Bill was when the Hon. Mr Burdett telephoned it.

That is a measure of the Government's concern about this proposal and the consequences it will have on the building industry. Certainly, we all accept that legislation such as this has to balance the competing interests, rights and obligations of builders and home buyers, or the people buying commercial buildings. Nevertheless, for no consultation whatsoever to have taken place is both distressing and disappointing. I understand that in fact a meeting is arranged for next Monday between the Minister and representatives of the Master Builders Association and the Housing Industry Association.

There are many good points to this legislation correcting, as they do, inadequacies in the existing legislation, but the lack of consultation has meant that the Bill is defective in many ways, and it was left to the Hon. Mr Feleppa yesterday to highlight just one of those inadequacies when, quite rightly in my view, he drew attention to the fact that no reference was made in the legislation to building consultants.

I do not want to damn the Bill out of court, but I do wish to place on record my disappointment that the Government has not seen fit to make any consultation on what is surely a major and long overdue reform in this area. Certainly, the existing legislation provided for a very cumbersome inquiry procedure in the case of complaint, and that has been corrected. Again, the Bill has desirable administrative procedures in the sense that the administrative structure in future will vest with the Commissioner of Consumer Affairs and that the Commercial Tribunal created by the Tonkin Government will have responsibility for the licensing of builders and classified tradesmen, and necessary disciplinary control.

Also, the Bill will provide for a code of conduct for licensed builders. The legislation is very much a Committee Bill and the Hon. Mr Burdett and the Hon. Mr Griffin have detailed at some length their concern about some of the inadequacies of the legislation. The very fact that discussions are to take place next Monday between industry representatives and the Government suggests that further matters perhaps have not even been raised in this Council that will be the subject of some attention, hopefully, by the Government.

I understand that the Master Builders Association has made a 39 page submission. It is disappointing that that submission was not made to the Government before the Bill was introduced in this Council. I hope that the Government proceeds slowly with the measure, notwithstanding the fact that it is a Committee Bill, and that adequate attention is given to the concerns of the Housing Industry Association and the Master Builders Association representing, as they do, the considered views of those two very responsible organisations. Of course, their interests must be balanced with the interests of the consumers. Quite sadly, the lack of action by the Government in recent years has meant that many consumers have been affected by home builders who have gone bankrupt or who have not met the standards that one would necessarily expect when houses are built.

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GROUNDWATER (BORDER AGREEMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 30 October. Page 1648.)

The Hon. M.B. CAMERON (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill has the support of the Opposition. It is the result

of consultation between the States of Victoria and South Australia on the question of groundwater supplies and the sharing of such supplies. It is an area in which there has not yet been a major problem, but there could be a major problem if there was a different attitude and a different method of handling the sharing or the use of groundwater supplies. One thing we do know is that underground water areas do not recognise the boundaries that we have drawn above the ground, so in a number of areas—I think 22 regions will be detailed under the Bill—a groundwater supply is shared by Victoria and South Australia. These groundwater supplies are a very valuable part of an area of the State, particularly the south-eastern area, which is well known for its underground water resources that exist in a large number of cases at comparatively shallow levels and in poor soil. It would not be difficult for that supply to be over used.

This agreement is more essential from South Australia's point of view than from Victoria's, because there is a natural flow of water from Victoria to South Australia and on to the coast. Any overuse that occurred in Victoria could tend to have a very dramatic effect in South Australia. The supply that will be allowed to be used under this Bill in both South Australia and Victoria will be sufficient to last over the next century.

The present use of underground water is 35 000 megalitres per annum, and under this Bill South Australia will be allowed to use 137 additional megalitres per annum for agricultural, industrial and urban purposes. That in itself indicates that this particular agreement should not need to be rewritten in the foreseeable future. However, provision is made for there to be amendments to the agreement, if that is required at any stage, so that there can be constant monitoring of the control, protection and management of these designated areas that will be detailed under this legislation.

One of the most attractive points in this Bill is that it should not involve any extra cost to either State, and the agreement can be operated in already existing structures within Government in each State. The zones will be 20 kilometres from each border, so that allows a zone of 40 kilometres. I do not suppose that it is worthwhile going back to the fact that the area in the South-East on the Victorian side of the border to be contained in this legislation should have been part of South Australia, but some foolish people during the early period of this State allowed a surveyor to head off towards New South Wales using the wrong markers with the result that we lost that portion of land to Victoria. That is an old argument which was fought out long ago in the Privy Council and which we lost.

However, it is absolutely essential that there be some control, although the control will not extend to domestic and stock wells. Of course, those wells do not cause a problem. There was a move in the early 1970s to control bores in South Australia. This caused considerable problems when an over zealous Government of that time moved to put controls on stock and domestic wells as well as irrigation wells. That provision was designed for public servants to have plenty to do.

In this case common sense has prevailed and only irrigation and large industrial wells will be controlled. Where required, wells will have to be cased (where appropriate) which will prevent further development when the permissible annual volume or rate of draw-down has been exceeded. Even in industrial areas this can be quite a problem. Around the paper mills in the Millicent area the draw-down has been somewhat dramatic. There is a huge drop away once an industry really starts pumping. Wells in that area have gone from 15 to 20 feet down to a draw-down depth of 150 feet or more.

The Bill also indicates that wells for other than stock and domestic purposes may be constructed within one kilometre of the State border only with the consent of the review committee. This is to ensure that there are no arguments between the States over wells close to the State boundary, and it overcomes a potential problem between the States. The Bill also indicates that, where a Minister in the State decides to grant a permit against a recommendation of the review committee, the Minister will be obliged, forthwith, to notify the Minister of the other contracting State in order to allow that State to decide whether or not it will exercise the right of appeal given under the Bill.

Again, I believe that that is sensible and cuts across the potential for problems. The Bill also provides for the joint imposition of restrictions in any zone after which interstate consultation becomes obligatory before development is allowed in that zone. The Bill also allows regular review with a view to amendment.

The Bill enables each State to control the administration and management of the zones in each State. It does not set up a joint authority so much as lay down conditions under which each State will operate its zone; it allows each State to continue to operate within reasonable guidelines. The Opposition believes that this is a very sensible move that is perhaps foreseeing problems rather than reacting to them. These problems can be coped with before they arise. We support the Bill.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Tourism): I thank the honourable member for his informative contribution to this debate and for the support he has expressed for this important measure.

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

BLOOD CONTAMINANTS BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PEST PLANTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

DOG CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal aim of this Bill is to enable a deaf person, including a partially deaf person, accompanied by a hearing dog, to enter property open to or used by the public and vehicles used for the carriage of passengers for hire or reward without incurring penalties or restrictions under any Act.

Most members would be aware of the provisions that are available under the Dog Control Act to enable blind or partially blind people, if travelling on public transport or going into public places or in taxis, to use a seeing eye dog. I believe very strongly that the same provisions should be available for people who are deaf or partially deaf. The Lions Hearing Dogs Incorporated is an organisation totally funded by the Lions Club of Australia and Papua New Guinea.

The project began in 1982 after a Lions member visiting America saw a demonstration of how dogs could be trained to help their deaf or hearing impaired owners. On his return to Adelaide the project was adopted as a Lions project. The training centre is situated in the electorate of the Hon. D.C. Wotton at Verdun in the Adelaide Hills and, being the only one, supplies hearing dogs all over Australia. Dogs are trained to alert their owners to ordinary everyday sounds that we take for granted, such as someone knocking at the door. Their dogs are trained to alert the owner to a whistling and boiling kettle, a baby crying, the telephone ringing and, in particular, a smoke alarm.

I am told that the dogs investigate the sound, return to their owners, touch them and lead them back to the sound source. The local RSPCA Dog Rescue Home provides these dogs, which are mostly chosen from crossbreed dogs who are friendly and eager to please. They are small to medium in size and between the ages of six to 12 months. On arrival at the centre the dogs are given excellent treatment. They are bathed, given a thorough physical checkup and are fully vaccinated. They are then quarantined for three to four weeks, during which time their training begins, and it is a very extensive training program indeed.

The first sounds taught are door knocking and a smoke alarm. These are compulsory, as everyone receives visitors and we think that every home should be protected against fire. So, all dogs are delivered having been taught about a smoke alarm. Basic obedience is also taught. The dogs are required merely to walk quietly by the side of the person involved, sit when told to stop, lie down, stay and come when called.

Once a person has applied for a dog, a nearby Lions Club is contacted and asked to complete the necessary paperwork. This gives the group a comprehensive picture of the person's needs and requirements, and it is then able to choose a dog that will suit the individual and their lifestyle. The last few weeks of training is carried out with the needs of the new owner in mind. For example, if the person is non-vocal the training is silent with hand signals only. When the dog is ready for delivery a trainer stays nearby for five days. During this time the recipient and dog learn to work together. By the end of the week the dog has made the transition and is working for its new owner.

The help of three Lions Club members is then requested to visit weekly to help reinforce the training of the dog for a probationary period of three months. Reports are kept and forwarded to the centre concerning the progress of the dog. If, at the end of this time, the dog is well cared for and is working satisfactorily, it becomes accredited. It is interesting to note that there is a formal handing over ceremony of dog to owner. A special orange coloured blaze and lead are presented, which signify to the public that the dog is an accredited hearing dog.

The cost of a hearing dog is approximately \$1 500. This covers all veterinary expenses, training and delivery. The recipient bears no part of the cost. Each dog is sponsored by a Lions Club. To date 52 dogs have been placed with deaf or hearing impaired people throughout Australia. Something like 15 applicants are on the list waiting for the delivery of a dog. Letters are constantly received by the Lions Hearing Dogs Incorporated telling how the dogs have changed their owners' lives. I am aware that mothers of young babies can go about their household duties quite confidently knowing that their dog will alert them if the baby should cry. Deaf and hearing impaired people, with the help of a hearing dog, often regain lost independence. Dogs give elderly people who live alone a reason to go on living, with something to love and care for while also giving them confidence and companionship.

Dogs are trained to respond to sound stimuli that occur in and around a normal home. Although permission has been given for these dogs to accompany their owners on public transport, they cannot go with them into public places. These matters need to be clarified and rectified. Hearing impaired people on holidays suffer as they are away from a safe, known environment. Take the example of a hearing impaired person staying in a hotel or motel. They have two choices: first, they can inform the desk staff that they are deaf and their door will not be locked—not a good idea these days, I suggest; secondly, they can lock their door but they would not hear a knock to signify breakfast or anyone trying to gain attention for any reason, such as evacuation in case of fire.

Telephone calls are missed. Many hearing impaired people are able to speak on the telephone, but cannot hear the phone ringing, even if it is in the same room. Mothers in strange houses, such as holiday houses, need to be alerted to babies or youngsters crying. Hearing impaired people staying anywhere other than in their own homes still need to know what is going on around them. They have become used to the security of a dog being their ears.

Hearing dogs are trained to alert their owners to prowlers and intruders—a common occurrence in households where

there are deaf people, because burglars always assume that the home is empty. To stay in a strange place is a nerve racking experience for the hard of hearing. Most forms of deafness include head noises to a varying degree. It is hard to tell whether something was really heard or whether the noise was in the head. Stress of any sort aggravates this complaint.

As the hearing dogs are trained to be with their owners virtually for 24 hours a day, working for most of this time, it is extremely stressful for owners and dogs to be separated, because the dog is not permitted to accompany its owner in certain places. Many owners of hearing dogs have reported that dogs have not only alerted them to burglars in their homes or gardens, but have also warned of characters approaching unexpectedly in deserted streets, even in broad daylight.

This is a common occurrence in larger towns. The hearing impaired who have hearing dogs become very used to relying on them in strange situations. Loss of hearing is an invisible but very real handicap to active participation in many facets of our society. Although the use of hearing dogs will never replace the pleasure and joy associated with the sensation of sound, it will afford a degree of protection to those of our fellow citizens who are not able to enjoy those pleasures personally.

Honourable members will realise the need and the assistance that can be rendered by guide dogs assisting their owners in moving to and from or seeking employment, in just going about their everyday business, and in relaxing at home in the knowledge that ears other than their own are protecting them. I commend the proposed amendment to the Dog Control Act to honourable members.

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 5 November at 2.15 p.m.