

# SOUTH AUSTRALIA

## PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(HANSARD)

### Second Session of the Forty-sixth Parliament (1986)

Parliament, which adjourned on 25 March, was prorogued by proclamation dated 10 April. By proclamation dated 12 June, it was summoned to meet on Thursday 31 July, and the second session began on that date.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 31 July 1986

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. Anne Levy)** took the Chair at 12 noon.

#### OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

The Clerk (Mr C.H. Mertin) read the proclamation by His Excellency the Governor (Sir Donald Dunstan) summoning Parliament.

#### GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the bar of the Council Chamber and by her conducted to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read his opening speech as follows:

Honourable members of the Legislative Council and members of the House of Assembly:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.
2. It is with regret that I record the death on 14 February 1986 of, first, Albert Redvers George Hawke, who was member for Burra Burra from 1924 to 1927. Mr Hawke subsequently served in the Western Australian Parliament and was Premier of that State from 1953 to 1959. Secondly, the death on 4 June 1986 of Charles Albert Harrison, who was member for Albert Park from 1970 to 1979. I know that you will all join me in expressing sympathy to the members of their families in their sad loss.
3. Our nation is facing a major test of its ability to adapt to difficult economic times. During the first half of this year, our economy has experienced a sharp change from the buoyant conditions of the previous two financial years. My Government recognises the difficult decisions facing the Commonwealth in managing the national economy. However, recent changes made at the national level have made the task of economic and financial management within South Australia extremely difficult. The results of the recent Premiers' Conference, and in particular the major cuts to the funds available for capital works projects, mean that

my Government must draw on the State's own financial reserves if it is to ensure that services and essential public works can continue at present levels.

4. My Government's policies will continue to be directed towards the establishment of a sound base within our regional economy to ensure that, as far as is possible, South Australia is sheltered from the worst effects of any adverse national or international factors. There are, indeed, indications that in some respects our regional economy has fared better than those of other States. However, our economic position remains uncertain.

5. The revenue base of the State, and consequently the ability of my Government to meet the demands the community places upon it, depends almost entirely on activity and growth within our economy. The uncertain nature of our immediate economic future will compound the difficulties already brought about by reductions in funds from the Commonwealth. My Government believes that the only appropriate response is one of restraint within all public sector activities, coupled with a reallocation of resources to areas of greatest need. However, an active partnership between the public and private sectors of our economy will continue to be at the core of my Government's policies. To fully play its part, the public sector must ensure that it is responsive, efficient and accountable. Scarce resources mean that it is now even more imperative that these aims are achieved. My Government is confident that the Government Management and Employment Act, which came into operation on 1 July, will ensure that our public sector is more flexible and more effective.

6. The stimulation of the housing and construction industry has been a major part of my Government's economic policies. It has led to levels of activity in South Australia which have far exceeded those of other States. The general downturn in the industry, and the restrictions on funds available to South Australia from the Commonwealth, have meant that it will be difficult for the Government to maintain its housing and construction program. However, my Government is well aware of the direct boost that this industry provides to other sectors of the economy and will take all possible steps to ensure that activity is maintained.

7. Widespread soaking rains in the first week of July promise an optimistic outlook for agriculture after an indifferent start to the season. Ninety per cent of intended crops had been sown before the end of June and the need for

destocking, even in low rainfall areas, has been averted following the July rains. Nevertheless, the rural community is still under pressure from adverse terms of trade and the decisions of other countries to subsidise their rural production. My Government acknowledges the need to support the rural sector and will continue its present assistance. New ways to help the rural community adjust to changing economic circumstances will also be investigated. Export markets will be further developed, and improvements at Outer Harbor will create new opportunities for the livestock export trade.

8. The broadening of our State's industrial base and the restructuring of our economy over recent years are now proving to be successful. Many companies have taken advantage of the opportunities offered by location at Technology Park, and the development of that facility now exceeds similar ventures in North America. As part of its policies of supporting manufacturing industry, my Government is investigating the establishment of a tooling consortium to be located on the GMH Woodville site. The proposal is now being considered by potential private investors. The further development of South Australian industry will be enhanced by the integration of the activities of the Departments of State Development, Technology, Technical and Further Education, and the Office of Employment and Training. A review of employment conditions within the Department of Technical and Further Education will be undertaken to ensure that Government resources are used effectively for the benefit of the whole community.

9. My Government recognises the importance of regional centres in providing educational opportunities for all South Australians. New facilities for technical and further education have been provided in Naracoorte, the Eyre Peninsula College will be redeveloped, and additional courses will become available at Whyalla.

10. Our State's industrial future and security for domestic consumers depend upon reliable and reasonably priced energy supplies. During the coming year the Electricity Trust of South Australia will commence trial excavations at the Lochiel coal deposit and other deposits will continue to be investigated. In addition, work will continue on the establishment of a link between the electricity grids of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria, and the second stage of the coal gasification study will proceed.

11. The Australian Formula One Grand Prix will again be the focus of international attention in October this year. The Grand Prix adds to South Australia's attraction as a major destination for interstate and international tourists. Work on the Adelaide Convention Centre is proceeding and it is expected that it will be completed early in 1987.

12. South Australia's excellent record of industrial harmony remains one of our key attractions for investment and industrial development. My Government believes that all persons in the work force have a right to a safe working environment and to adequate compensation when they are injured in the work place. Legislation to provide for fundamental reform of workers compensation will be re-committed in the coming session. To complement these reforms, and to provide for a safe working environment within all sectors of industry, occupational health, safety and welfare legislation will also be presented.

13. The continuing toll of death and injury on our State's roads remains a major concern of my Government. Substantially increased penalties will be introduced for drivers who cause death or injury by dangerous driving, and the Road Traffic Act will be further amended to introduce more stringent requirements for the restraint of children and infants carried in vehicles.

14. The physical scars of the Ash Wednesday bushfires have all but faded, yet the loss of life and suffering they caused are still starkly remembered. My Government has greatly increased assistance to the Country Fire Service, and this session will introduce amendments to the Country Fires Act to clearly establish responsibilities for the prevention and suppression of bushfires. The Metropolitan Fire Service will be further developed by the resiting or construction of a number of stations at Angle Park, Northfield, Port Adelaide, Victor Harbor and Tanunda. Extensive replanting of forests destroyed by the fires has occurred, and regulations for better control and protection of native forests will be introduced this session.

15. My Government believes in the importance of high standard police communications facilities. A new communications and emergency operations centre will be commenced below ground at the rear of the Central Headquarters building in Angas Street.

16. The protection of the environment and conservation of our heritage are of vital concern to our community. The Flinders Ranges are of great beauty and environmental significance. My Government will develop a management plan for the area to ensure that any future development is sympathetic to the environment. The skills of the Aboriginal people are being employed in the management of our national parks. Aboriginal rangers have been working in the Gammon Ranges and will soon begin duties in the Coorong National Park.

17. The protection and security of our community remains a high priority for my Government. During the coming session, a Bill to consolidate the law relating to criminal sentencing procedures will be introduced. The Correctional Services Act will be amended to give the courts wider powers over parole conditions. The introduction of a fine default system will relieve pressure on prison facilities. Construction has commenced on the Mobilong Medium Security Prison at Murray Bridge, and the Adelaide Remand Centre, soon to be completed, will replace the present unsatisfactory remand accommodation in the metropolitan area.

18. My Government will continue to pursue policies aimed at promoting health, preventing illness and overcoming social disadvantage. A gradual redirection of our health and welfare services will occur aimed at providing more comprehensive and coordinated services for our community and, in turn, a more responsive and effective central administration. My Government recognises the vital role of nurses in the delivery of health services and will continue to support the upgrading of nursing as a profession.

19. Emphasis will continue to be placed on the principles of excellence, equality and efficiency in the education of our children. Amendments to the Education Act will be introduced to allow parents of handicapped children the right of appeal if aggrieved by a decision to place their child in a particular school. The Children's Services Office will concentrate on the requirements of young children with special needs. Legislation to allow the implementation of the four term school year will also be introduced.

20. The particular needs of persons with disabilities are being addressed by encouraging greater cooperation between government agencies and non-government bodies. Changes to the Private Parking and Education Acts to be introduced this session will provide for equality of opportunity and greater access to facilities for disabled persons.

21. Our State has been greatly enriched by the cultural influence of people from other countries. My Government has fostered multicultural understanding in the arts and education areas, and now all government agencies are devel-

oping plans to provide better access to services by that section of our community.

22. The increasing role of local government in our economic and social development is fully realised, and my Government will continue its review of the Local Government Act to reflect these changes.

23. My Government has initiated many legislative and administrative reforms which recognise the crucial and diverse roles played by women in our society. This year a more comprehensive analysis will be published of the impact of government expenditure on women in the community.

24. Our State's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary celebrations are continuing and will culminate in a spectacular closing ceremony on Proclamation Day. Community based activities, such as family reunions and historic re-enactments, have been at the true heart of our Jubilee spirit. In addition, conventions staged as part of the Jubilee have injected almost \$90 million into our economy. This year will leave its mark on our State for years to come, and will launch South Australia with pride into the next decade and beyond.

25. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

The Governor retired from the Chamber, and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

#### DEATH OF Mr C.A. HARRISON

The **PRESIDENT**: I have to draw the attention of honourable members to the recent death of Mr Charlie Harrison, a former member of the House of Assembly. He was a member of the House of Assembly for nine years and represented the District of Albert Park. He also served as a member and Chair of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. As President of the Council, I wish to express the deepest sympathy of all members of the Council to his family in their bereavement, and I ask all honourable members to stand in silence as a tribute to his memory.

[Sitting suspended from 12.40 to 2.30 p.m.]

#### PETITIONS: PETROL PRICING

Petitions signed by 8 699 residents of South Australia praying that the Council urge the Government to make all possible efforts to remove the iniquitous position in relation to petrol pricing and asking it to strongly consider intervention to achieve realistic wholesale prices as a means of achieving equity for the country petrol consumer were presented by the Hons M.J. Elliott and T.G. Roberts.

Petitions received.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **PRESIDENT** laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- Cadell Training Centre—New Kitchen,
- Golden Grove First Primary School,
- Holden Hill Police Headquarters—Courts Complex (Stage 3),
- State Primary Geodesic Survey—Completion,

Supreme Court Precinct—Alteration and Renovation (Stage 1),

Wattle Park Reservoir (Flexible Membrane Liner and Floating Cover).

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1968—Fees.
- Criminal Investigation (Extraterritorial Offences) Act, 1984—Search Warrant.
- Dangerous Substances Act, 1979—Fees.
- Explosives Act, 1936—Fees.
- Government Management and Employment Act, 1985—General Regulations.
- Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, 1972.
- Asbestos Removal and Certificate—Fees.
- Industrial Premises—Fees.
- Registration of Premises—Fees.
- Lifts and Cranes Act, 1960—Fees.
- Long Service Leave (Building Industry) Act, 1975—Fund Contribution Rate.
- Pay-roll Tax Act, 1971—Accommodation Allowance.
- Rules of Court—District Court—
- Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926 and Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, 1977—Criminal Injuries Compensation.
- Planning Act, 1982—Planning Appeal Tribunal—Rules—Costs and Prescribed Functions.
- Rules of Court—
- Supreme Court Act, 1935—
- Interrogatories, Interest and Endorsements.
- Control of Substandard Housing Rental.
- Inquiry Fee.
- Remuneration Tribunal—Report.
- Reports—Determinations Nos 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
- Industrial and Commercial Training Commission—Report, 1984-85.
- National Crime Authority—Report, 1984-85.
- S.A. Council on Technological Change—Report, 1985.

By the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Commercial Tribunal Act, 1982—Register of Dealers and Delegated Powers.
- Second-hand Goods Act, 1985—Exemption General Regulations, 1986.
- Second-hand Motor Vehicles Act, 1983—Exemption from Repairing Defects.
- Trade Standards Act, 1979—Second-hand Furniture.
- Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—Report, 1985.

By the Minister of Corporate Affairs (Hon. C.J. Sumner):

- Pursuant to Statute—*
- Regulations under the following Acts—
- Business Names Act, 1963—Fees.
- Companies (Acquisition of Shares) (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—
- Commonwealth Jurisdiction Commonwealth Regulations—Date of Operation.
- Companies and Securities (Interpretation and Miscellaneous Provisions) (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—State Provisions.
- Companies (Application of Laws) Act, 1982—Commonwealth Application.
- Commonwealth Jurisdiction.
- Fees.
- Operation.
- State Jurisdiction Amendment.
- Securities Industry (Application of Laws) Act, 1981—Date of Operation.
- State Jurisdiction.
- State References.
- Trustee Act, 1936—
- Authorised Investor of Trust Funds.

## By the Minister of Health (Hon. J.R. Cornwall):

- By Command—*  
 Australian Agricultural Council—Resolutions of 123rd Meeting, 10.2.86.  
 Australian Soil Conservation Council—Resolutions of First Meeting, 11.2.86.
- Pursuant to Statute—*  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
 Bills of Sale Act, 1886—Fees.  
 Brands Act, 1933—Fees.  
 Chiropractors Act, 1979—Fees.  
 Controlled Substances Act, 1984—Prohibited Substances.  
 Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935—Prescribed Hospital.  
 Crown Lands Act, 1929—Fees.  
 Drugs Act, 1908—Child Resistant Containers.  
 Fisheries Act, 1982—  
 Lakes and Coorong Fishery (Licence Fees).  
 Marine Scale Fishery (Licence Fees).  
 Mesh Nets and Lobster Pots.  
 Non-Indigenous Fish Species.  
 Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Reduction of Pots and Licences.  
 Registration Fees for Nets.  
 Restricted Marine Scale Fishery (Licence Fees).  
 Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery—Reduction of Pots and Licences.  
 Wallaroo Reef Netting.  
 Health Act, 1935—  
 Notifiable Diseases.  
 Qualifications of Managers and Directors of Nursing Homes—Amendment.  
 Housing Improvement Act, 1940—  
 Control of Substandard Housing Rental.  
 Inquiry Fee.  
 Metropolitan Milk Supply Act, 1946—Penalties.  
 Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act, 1956—Fares.  
 Motor Vehicles Act, 1959—  
 Late Registration Fee.  
 Towtruck Fees.  
 Sundry Charges, Registration and Licence Fees.  
 Various.  
 Nurses Act, 1984—General Regulations, 1986.  
 Nurses Registration Act, 1920—Revocation of Regulations.  
 Occupational Therapists Act, 1974—Registration Fees.  
 Pastoral Act, 1936—Fees.  
 Planning Act, 1982—Crown Agency.  
 Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1985—General Regulations.  
 Psychological Practices Act, 1973—Fees.  
 Real Property Act, 1886—  
 Certificates of Approval.  
 Division Plan Fees.  
 Filing of Plan Fees.  
 Registration and Instruments.  
 Registration of Deeds Act, 1935—Fees.  
 Road Traffic Act, 1961—  
 Inspection Fees.  
 Substitution of Road Traffic Board.  
 Traffic Prohibition—Woodville.  
 Sewerage Act, 1929—Fees.  
 South Australian Health Commission Act, 1976—  
 Health Centre Audits.  
 Water Resources Act, 1976—Fees.  
 Waterworks Act, 1932—  
 Fees.  
 Registration Fees for Plumbers and Certificates of Competency.  
 Racing Act, 1976—Rules of Trotting—  
 Gelding and Ownership.  
 Fees.  
 Speed Racing.  
 Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports—  
 To construct a new overhead 66 kV transmission line from the Port Noarlunga Substation to Aldinga Substation.  
 To erect one single and two dual demac classroom units, Grange Primary School.  
 To erect two single transportable classrooms at Fremont High School, City of Elizabeth.

To construct a 10 ML capacity concrete water storage tank at Murrays Hill Road, Coromandel Valley.

- Department of Environment and Planning—Report on Administration of National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1985.  
 Radiation Protection and Control Act, 1982—Report, 1985.  
 River Murray Commission—Report, 1985.  
 Road Traffic Act, 1961—Report—Breath Tests.  
 S.A. Meat Hygiene Authority—Report, 1984.

## By the Minister of Tourism (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

- Pursuant to Statute—*  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
 Children's Services Act, 1985—Committees.  
 Education Act, 1972—  
 Education Allowance.  
 Remuneration for Members of Ministerial Committees.  
 Electrical Workers and Contractors Licensing Act, 1965—Penalties and Definitions.  
 Harbors Act, 1936—  
 North Arm Mooring Fees.  
 Port MacDonnell Mooring Fees.  
 Port Pirie Mooring Fees.  
 Robe Mooring Fees.  
 Harbors Act, 1936 and Marine Act, 1936—Survey Fees.  
 Marine Act, 1936—Survey Fees.  
 Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act, 1982—  
 Local Government Arrangement.  
 Establishment of Council.  
 Forestry Act, 1950—Proclamations—  
 Hundred of Gambier.  
 Hundred of Goolwa.  
 Hundred of Barossa.  
 Hundred of Nangwarry.  
 Roseworthy Agricultural College—Report, 1985.  
 Senior Secondary Assessment Board of S.A.—Report, 1985.  
 Tertiary Education Authority of S.A.—Report, 1985.

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

- Pursuant to Statute—*  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
 Building Act, 1970—  
 Ceiling Heights.  
 Certificates of Competency.  
 Surface Skimmer Devices—Amendment.  
 Dog Control Act, 1979—Dog Registration and Pound Fees.  
 Local Government Act, 1934—Expiation Fee for Litter.  
 Local Government Finance Authority Act, 1983—  
 Prescribed Body.  
 S.A. Waste Management Commission Act, 1979—  
 Licence Fees and Wastes.  
 Corporation By-laws—  
 City of Adelaide—By-law No. 14—Encroachments.  
 By-law No. 16—The Central Market.  
 Town of Gawler—By-law No. 42—Restricted Use of Roads.  
 District Council By-laws:  
 Port Elliot and Goolwa—No. 41—Dogs.  
 Willunga—  
 No. 1—Repeal of By-laws.  
 No. 23—Dogs.  
 No. 24—Poultry.  
 No. 25—General Amendment to By-laws.  
 Yorketown—No. 27—Foreshores Reserves.  
 Libraries Board of S.A.—Report, 1984-85.  
 Local Government Superannuation Board—Report, 1985.  
 West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1985.

## By the Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts (Hon. Barbara Wiese):

- Pursuant to Statute—*  
 History Trust of South Australia—Report, 1985.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL (Minister of Health):** I seek leave to make a statement on the subject of legionnaire's disease.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** On 11 February 1986 I made a lengthy statement in the Legislative Council following an outbreak of legionnaire's disease in the southern suburbs of Adelaide. On 26 February I made a second statement updating the initial exhaustive report to the Council. I now propose to make a further comprehensive report to the Council.

The legionnaire's disease bacillus, as I have explained, is a common water and soil organism. We know that it is widespread in the environment. Blood tests indicate that more than a quarter of the population have antibodies, indicating past contact with legionella bacilli at some time in their lives. The most recognisable form of infection is legionnaire's disease which manifests itself as a moderate to severe pneumonia, often accompanied by confusion, diarrhoea and kidney and liver disfunction. Only about 10 to 15 of these cases are identified in South Australia each year, despite many hundreds of tests being carried out on cases of severe pneumonia in our hospitals.

There is no doubt that milder forms of pneumonia caused by legionella infection occur in the community and that the link with this particular organism is never established because the necessary specific tests are not performed. As a result, these cases are never diagnosed as legionella infections. Another manner in which legionella infection can be manifested is as an influenza-like illness without pneumonia which is often described as Pontiac fever. The majority of South Australians with antibodies to legionellae—and that is probably more than 300 000—have no history of illness that can be ascribed to legionella infection.

The main reason why South Australia has recorded more cases of legionnaire's disease than other parts of Australia over the past decade is that awareness at the scientific and public health level is higher than elsewhere. In addition, our laboratory testing is more sophisticated than in most other States. I do not propose to repeat the detailed information which I gave to the Council earlier this year concerning the investigations which were set in train following the outbreak of legionnaire's disease in the southern suburbs. I think it is important, however, that I remind honourable members that I went to great pains to avoid creating an impression that actions by me as Minister, by the South Australian Health Commission, or by the Public Health Service could guarantee eradication of legionnaire's bacillus from the environment. In fact, I pointed specifically to the dearth of information on contamination of household plumbing systems and control of the bacillus. I want to emphasise again, as I did in the Legislative Council on 26 February this year, that the paucity of information is a world-wide phenomenon and not confined to South Australia.

There is a great lack of information both in Australia and overseas about the ecology of legionella in the environment and about the effectiveness of suggested control measures for domestic or institutional hot water systems and for cooling towers. The fact that the most distinguished public health authorities and medical scientists in the world have been unable to define uniform protocols to enable households or institutions such as hospitals to eliminate the risk of legionella from hot water systems has, regrettably, not prevented the positing of simplistic strategies which are

portrayed as essential. It is imperative that we keep in correct perspective the overall question of legionella contamination in the environment and, particularly, the extent of scientific knowledge concerning hot water systems.

The Public Health Service, and particularly Dr Scott Cameron, head of the Communicable Disease Control Unit, have spent years studying legionella and tracking progress in studies of legionnaire's disease around the world. For example, in June 1982 when it was proposed that thermostats in hospital hot water systems should be set at 50°C or even 45° as an energy saving measure and to reduce the chance of scalding, Dr Cameron consulted the Director of the Centres for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia, the outstanding public health authority in the world today. Among other things, Dr Cameron asked if there was any evidence that this move would promote or allow the persistence of legionnaire's disease bacillus in the hot water systems. The reply, from Dr Claire Broome, Chief of the Epidemiology Section, Respiratory and Special Pathogens Branch, Division of Bacterial Diseases, Centre for Infectious Disease, dated 28 July 1982, read, in part:

Legionella has been isolated from hot water systems maintained between temperatures of 30°-54°C. We have in fact isolated it from water with temperatures up to 60°C, although there seems to be a decrease in quantity of organisms as 60°C is approached.

The Centres for Disease Control constitute perhaps the foremost collection of scientific information and public health research in the world. Officers from the centres investigated the original outbreak of legionnaire's disease in Philadelphia, isolated the causative organism and have been actively involved in research on the disease since that time. The South Australian Health Commission had been advised, in effect, that the organism was ubiquitous, that it could be found in hot water systems despite apparently high temperatures, and that eradication was hit and miss. Furthermore, Dr Broome was explicit that eradication should be attempted only if a particular system was found to be the source of a human case 'because of the ubiquity of the organism, and the difficulty in eradicating it from water systems, we have not recommended routine monitoring for presence of the organism. If disease occurs which can be shown to be associated to contact with potable water systems, elevation of temperature to greater than 62° may be tried'.

I ask members to note that the advice of Dr Broome 'if disease occurred which could be shown to be associated with potable hot water systems, was that elevation of temperature to above 62°C may be tried'.

Similar terminology is utilised in the Occupational Health Guide on legionellosis distributed under the auspices of the National Health and Medical Research Council. The NHMRC document is canvassed in a report on legionnaire's disease investigations in South Australia forwarded to me by the Deputy Chairman of the South Australian Health Commission earlier this week. Part of that report states:

On 19 February 1986 Dr S. Cameron received a letter from Dr A. Wade, Secretary, Water Quality Committee of the NHMRC. He noted that the NHMRC Occupational Health Guide: Legionnaire's Disease (Legionellosis) (Annex 24) was the only national statement addressing the maintenance of cooling towers and water supplies and control of legionella. It was over two years old and if re-endorsement by the NHMRC of the document was required it would need to be reviewed because the Occupational Health Guide series had now become the province of the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission. He proposed that the subject be discussed at a forthcoming meeting of the Water Quality Committee (24-25 March 1986) of which Dr Cameron is a member.

At that meeting Dr Cameron was nominated as the committee's representative on a proposed working party of NHMRC to review the document. The Public Health Service concurrently was moving to issue this guide to all health units as a South Australian Health Commission information bulletin, to be updated as further

practical and substantive advice came to hand. It had some limitations, in particular with respect to the use of biocides in cooling towers. Notwithstanding its limitations, the document was issued (on 5 March 1986 as a circular) for advice to hospitals with covering advice from the Chairman. It was expected the advice contained in the circular would increase the awareness of hospital administrators who would then refer their particular difficulties to the Public Health Service of the commission.

The South Australian Health Commission report goes on to say that the expert international information and advice available at that time (that is, in February 1986) was generally in accord with the NHMRC document. I will provide the Council with examples of expert information and advice in a few moments. Members will see that they corroborate the next statement in the South Australian Health Commission report:

In particular the international advice was and still is that control measures to water systems to attempt to eradicate legionellae cannot be justified until the source of an outbreak is known to be a particular system. This advice is set out in paragraph 9 of the NHMRC document which details some interventions which 'should be tried' if cases are found to be associated with a contaminated general water supply.

This crucial point is essential for a proper understanding of legionnaire's disease as a public health issue: the best international advice available to the South Australian Health Commission was and still is that 'control measures to water systems to attempt to eradicate legionellae cannot be justified until the source of an outbreak is known to be a particular system'. I will hammer this point until it is properly understood. I will repeat it *ad nauseam*—and I will back it up by quoting international experts.

The South Australian Health Commission report notes that throughout 1984 and 1985 the Communicable Disease Control Unit continued to receive weekly bulletins on communicable disease from the United States and the United Kingdom, but they did not offer any schemes of practical advice which could be applied to the prevention of contamination by legionellae of either cooling towers or hot water systems. This situation persisted throughout 1985. From June 1983, when two 'state of the art' lectures were delivered at an international symposium on legionella at Atlanta, Georgia, the prevailing attitudes to legionnaire's disease and its control remained unchanged. For the benefit of the Council, I will quote excerpts from those two lectures. Dr Claire Broome, the authority mentioned earlier, when speaking about cooling towers, said:

Because of the difficulty of eradicating the organism and the unknown toxicity of altering currently recommended cooling treatment protocols, current recommendations call for routine maintenance of cooling towers and do not suggest surveillance culturing for legionellae.

The problems of legionellae in water systems were addressed by Dr Christopher Bartlett of the Public Health Laboratory Service, Colindale, London. He said, in part:

Turning finally to the issue of prevention of legionellosis: is control practicable, and what are its indications? There is general agreement that control measures are indicated when a water system is identified as a source through epidemiological investigations. It is now really a matter of deciding on the best strategy, be it continuous or intermittent chlorination, temperature control, or some other method.

The application of control measures to the majority of water systems, however, cannot be justified at present, although good engineering practices in their maintenance and operation should be ensured. More needs to be known about the pathogenesis of legionellosis and the ecology of water systems before the question of primary prevention can be properly addressed.

I have gone to great lengths to place these extracts on the record. Ms President, first, because it is important that members can judge for themselves the quality of the advice available and, secondly, to demonstrate the comprehensive steps taken by the South Australian Public Health Service to pursue advice which could inform our efforts to combat

legionellae in the South Australian environment. The picture is not one of apathy or failure to exercise responsibility, nor is it one of taking a remedial or protective stance simply for the sake of being seen to do so. Our officers, and particularly Dr Scott Cameron, have been diligent and responsible in the exercise of their duty.

The views I have outlined above in the two state of the art lectures still constitute current advice from the Centres for Disease Control. Dr Cameron was sent overseas earlier this year to gather amongst other things any further available information concerning legionellae and its control. On 16 May 1986, he met with Dr James Barbaree, Chief of the Epidemiologic Investigation Laboratory, Respiratory Branch at the CDC, who receives many inquiries about cooling towers that may be contaminated with legionellae.

Dr Cameron reports that Dr Barbaree stated that if no disease was associated with the towers in question there would be no reason to eradicate the bacteria. He said, however, that close monitoring of legionnaire's disease, as is practised in South Australia, was warranted. Two other officers in the Respiratory Diseases Branch at the CDC told Dr Cameron that it was clear that there was not enough knowledge concerning legionellae to allow CDC to prescribe preventive maintenance schedules for potential amplifiers such as cooling towers and hot water systems. I should repeat that: that was the advice given to Dr Scott Cameron at the CDC in Atlanta, Georgia in May of this year.

Ms President, in the late 1970s and early 1980s the CDC's Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report carried up to date information on the results of experimental work on cooling tower disinfection and other aspects of legionnaire's disease. The South Australian Health Commission's report on legionnaire's disease investigations in South Australia says, in part:

There has been a dearth of such information in the past two years or so. It is clear that the reason for this lack of information is that there is little data on which to base policy. The lack of information highlights the concern held by the Public Health Service, South Australian Health Commission, that oversimplified statements about prevention could instil a false sense of security. There are no easy blanket rules that can be laid down in the expectation that risks of contamination will be abolished.

I turn now to the question of the death of a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from legionella pneumonia on 23 May 1986.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** On a point of order. Madam President, it is normal for Ministers to provide a copy of a ministerial statement to the Opposition. I have waited patiently.

**The PRESIDENT:** I do not think it is a point of order, as covered by the Standing Orders.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I turn again to the question of the death of a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from legionella pneumonia on 23 May 1986. At my request the Coroner, Mr K.B. Ahern, has agreed to consider the circumstances surrounding the death of Mrs Jeanette Fuss. An approach to the Coroner was recommended to me by the South Australian Health Commission following allegations of 'failure to act' upon a Department of Environment and Planning internal memorandum. The circumstances in which that memorandum was received and the actions which were taken by the Health Commission officers are covered in the South Australian Health Commission report on legionnaire's disease investigations. Relevant papers have been forwarded to Mr Ahern who is, of course, empowered to make whatever independent inquiries he sees fit during the course of his investigation.

I do not propose to canvass this matter further except to stress, as I did in my press release of 10 July 1986, that nobody should jump to hasty conclusions about the role of

the South Australian Health Commission or hospital officers. At the time of the patient's death the matter was not reported to the Coroner because the hospital authorities took the view that it was not a coroner's matter. There is nothing to suggest that this view was unreasonable in the circumstances as then known. The decision whether the death should be the subject of an inquest is one for the Coroner.

At a press conference in my office on 11 July 1986, I was asked when I first learned that a patient at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital was suffering from legionnaire's disease. I confirmed that I had been advised that a patient had legionnaire's disease (not that a patient had died) and that I believed that was about 6 June. When I was informed by a reporter that Mrs Fuss had, in fact, died on 23 May I said that my memory was not infallible and repeated, to the best of my recollection, that I had been advised before the patient's death.

In fact, although my memory was incorrect in relation to the exact time when I was first advised, I was quite correct in saying that I had been advised of the illness. This is confirmed by a memorandum dated 22 May, sent to me by the Deputy Director of the Public Health Service, Dr Malcolm Collings, on behalf of the Acting Director, Dr Chris Baker, admitting, or informing me, rather, that a 48-year-old woman was critically ill in the intensive therapy unit of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital with legionnaire's disease.

I am unable to say exactly when I saw that memorandum, since a search of the relevant files has failed to unearth a copy bearing my signature with the notation 'seen' or 'noted' by the Minister, which is the usual way in which my sighting a document is recorded. However, I am quite happy to accept that I would have seen it soon after it was penned. It is my clear recollection, Ms President, that I saw it before the patient died. By way of update I also indicate that an 87-year-old patient admitted to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from a nursing home earlier this month may have died of legionnaire's disease. This will not be known until the results of cultures and other tests are available. I am advised that if the patient was indeed suffering from legionnaire's disease, the infection mainly occurred before admission to the hospital and appropriate steps have been taken to investigate possible sources at the patient's former home.

We now have dramatic evidence from the South Australian Health Commission's own case-control study of factors potentially related to risk of infection in the Adelaide southern suburbs outbreak that legionella contamination may persist in domestic hot water systems even when the temperature is as high as 70°C. The study, which I released publicly a little earlier today, shows that the median temperature in systems with no apparent legionella contamination was 59°C and that the median temperature in systems which did yield *legionella pneumophila* was 55°C. The water temperatures of other systems which yielded *legionella anisa* had a median value of 51°C. I quote directly from the study's findings:

The lack of a consistent relationship between hot water temperatures and *L. pneumophila* contamination is an important finding, for it demonstrates that having a temperature of 54°C or higher is not necessarily an effective preventive measure. Indeed, two out of the three contaminated services delivered water hotter than this, and one produced repeated isolations from a shower head despite a water temperature of 70°C. This service was colonised at a number of sites before and after the heating vessel.

This illustrates that water temperature is not necessarily a crucial factor in hot water system colonisation by legionellae. Attention must also be paid to plumbing fittings, making it unlikely that a simple practicable approach to the control of legionellae in the home is available.

As members will realise, we are adding to current knowledge about the problem, but the jigsaw has by no means been solved.

The inevitable conclusion is that it is still not possible to frame detailed recommendations which guarantee control of the organism. As Dr Broome has pointed out, 'Currently available methods such as biocides, water temperature elevation and hyperchlorination may not be effective and may have unexpected adverse effects.' Following distribution of the NHMRC document in March 1986, which was basically an 'awareness raising' exercise, the public health service has maintained regular communication with hospital administrators and engineers. Private enterprise has also been keenly interested in the ongoing work and there have been many approaches to the public health service, particularly to seek advice on the maintenance of cooling towers.

Following notification of a legionnaire's disease case at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the actions of the hospital and the public health service conformed with the available advice on how to proceed. For example, the patient's movements were traced, as far as possible, to try to establish possible sources of infection. Since there appeared to be a possibility of her being infected in the hospital, environmental studies of cooling towers and hot water systems at the hospital were instituted. It was not until 4 June that the hospital's hot water system was positively identified as contaminated although, of course, other sources of infection cannot be excluded.

Confirmation that the hospital's hot water supply harboured legionella bacteria prompted a series of control measures, appropriate for that hot water system and in line with the internationally accepted guidelines, notwithstanding the reservations about the long-term effectiveness of such measures. The hospital's administration has pointed out that the hot water system had been operating at temperatures of 55°C at the calorifiers (which NHMRC guidelines also suggested) for the previous 2½ years. The operating temperature was subsequently raised in accordance with the guidelines, which suggest that in case of infection the temperature at the calorifiers be raised to a point at which all the water in the system, including that at the top, is at least 55°C. In a memorandum to the Chairman of the Health Commission dated 9 July 1986 the Administrator of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Mr Bill Layther, advised:

Following the illness and death of an immuno-compromised patient from legionella in May of this year, the public health service recommended raising the temperature of the hot water supply to a tap temperature of 55°C. This occurred on 10 June 1986. Follow-up cultures of the tap hot water are negative for legionella organisms.

Furthermore, all tap washers in the ward block which had been occupied by the patient were replaced; little used taps and showers were flushed. Steps have since been taken to remove unused taps and fittings as a further precautionary measure. Following ongoing consultation with the public health service, the hospital is now considering removing 'dead' piping still attached to the unwanted taps and fittings which have now been closed off.

Notwithstanding the considerable remedial action undertaken further tests on hot water collected on 17 June 1986 produced one sample slightly contaminated by legionella. Reporting this to the Chairman of the Health Commission in a letter dated 10 July 1986, Mr Layther said:

This was detected in a hot tap which had not been used regularly and the water was cold. The sample of water taken a minute or so later after flowing was negative for legionella.

A key feature of this case was that the patient had undergone a recent renal transplant and had been on a course of immuno-depressant drugs. These drugs, while helping to



overcome problems of rejection of a transplant, also considerably reduce a patient's ability to resist infection. All such patients are at considerably increased risk of serious infection from a wide variety of organisms, although lung infections are not as common as septicaemias. The Australian and New Zealand Combined Dialysis and Transplant Registry has published figures showing that 70 patients died following renal transplants in the two countries in 1984. Two of these died of lung infections caused by legionella and another nine from other infective causes such as peritonitis, central nervous system infection, or blood infections. Dr Scott Cameron consulted a senior medical officer in the Victorian Public Health Department for any available information on remedial actions which were taken following a case of infection of a renal transplant patient who contracted legionnaire's disease while being treated in a Melbourne hospital. There appeared to be nothing more that the South Australian authorities could do than was already under way.

The South Australian Health Commission has consulted with the medical superintendents, administrators and engineers of Adelaide's major hospitals, particularly with regard to control measures which could be instituted, where appropriate, in the light of the experience gained following the Queen Elizabeth case. Although it was clear that the public health service could not issue detailed instructions which could be applied in each hospital, each hospital has been advised that it should devise its own strategy depending on its peculiar or particular system. It should be stressed that hospital hot water systems vary considerably in design, operating characteristics and fittings. Particular regard is being paid to 'high risk' areas such as renal transplant units and oncology wards. The public health service has asked hospitals to report back on their test results and alterations to their hot water systems and cooling towers which could be considered as part of ongoing maintenance and upgrading programs.

It is clear that, despite the extensive media coverage of matters related to legionnaire's disease in the past decade and the publication of scientific papers around the world emphasising the limited amount of information available, there is still considerable ignorance of important issues. The complexities of legionnaire's disease and its control remain largely unappreciated. From a public health standpoint we must strike a correct balance between disseminating information which the community is entitled to have and creating false expectations about the effectiveness of precautionary measures. I repeat the cautionary statement that I made in a press release on 11 July 1986 that simplistic statements about raising temperatures in hot water systems may give a false sense of security to householders or institutional administrators.

#### **MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: YABBY FARM PROJECT**

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Local Government):** I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** I wish to inform the Council that on 20 June this year the Minister of Employment and Further Education was advised of difficulties associated with the as yet uncompleted CEP project to construct a commercial yabby farm at Gerard Reserve. The Minister was apprised of the matter that same day. This was the first contact on the matter his office had received since he took over responsibility for CEP. The Minister

immediately called for a report from the Office of Employment and Training, which jointly administers CEP projects in South Australia. That report was delivered on 26 June. Its contents caused the Minister some serious concerns.

The history of the Gerard project can be summarised as follows: in September 1983 a grant of \$430 015 was made available to the Gerard Reserve Council to develop a commercial yabby farm at its property at Winkie under the Fraser Government's wage pause program. The project also included funds from the Aboriginal Development Commission of \$102 716. The project managers were Adelaide consultants Trojan and Owen. Due to difficulties experienced with obtaining water diversion rights and supply of power to the site, it became obvious that the project could not be completed by 30 June 1984, the last date that expenditure could be incurred under the wage pause program. Consequently, the project was transferred to the Community Employment Program in May 1984. However, by January 1985 major delays had been incurred due to locational difficulties, construction problems and harsh climatic conditions. The project was stopped in February 1985.

After appraisal of the project, further CEP funds of \$188 683 and State funds of \$142 591 were approved in April 1985 to meet outstanding debts as estimated at the time and to complete the project. However, the project did not recommence because of concerns by the Aboriginal Development Commission about the construction methods being used. As a consequence, the ADC commissioned an independent inquiry which reported in August 1985 that an estimated \$612 000 would be required to substantially reconstruct work already commenced and to complete the project.

To date, a total of \$868 005 has been allocated to the project from the Federal Government, the State Government, and the ADC. Of this, \$142 591 is State money. So far, \$684 726 has been spent, with the balance remaining in the bank and committed CEP lines. Of the money spent, the report showed some \$9 000 was not properly accounted for. In May of this year, an officer of the Office of Employment and Training and an officer of the Commonwealth visited the project. Their visit revealed that some deterioration of the project had taken place since February 1985. They asked the council to propose ways by which it believed the project could be finished and by whom. The council indicated to those officers that it wanted no further dealings with Trojan and Owen.

On reading the report, the Minister called for the complete files on this project. After considering those files, he contacted the Auditor-General through the Chief Secretary on 15 July 1986 and requested him to conduct a full and independent inquiry into the project. The Auditor-General replied on 18 July 1986 stating that he would be in a position to investigate the matter in mid-September after production of the audit report. The Minister advised the Auditor-General on 21 July 1986 that this would be satisfactory. Subsequently, further investigation by the Minister's department has revealed that the \$9 000 of unaccounted for expenditure was spent on items which are unlikely to be chargeable against the federal or State advances. The Minister was subsequently advised that federal officers are also conducting their own investigation of this matter. I will keep the Council informed when the Auditor-General has investigated this matter and provided a report.



## QUESTIONS

### PROPERTY TAX

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** Will the Minister of Health say whether the Premier, at any stage before the announcement on 17 July that there would be a property tax—which we have all heard about—to help fund the Government's welfare spending, gave the Minister of Health an instruction that he should not raise that matter publicly?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I think that I should put on record the precise sequence of events that occurred through 15, 16 and 17 July. To highlight the fact that the allegations that were made by the Leader of the Opposition—and I mean the default Leader of the Opposition in the other place, not the one in here—

*The Hon. M.B. Cameron interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Yes, and I do not mind at all. He got it all wrong. The sequence of events was that on Tuesday 15 July I lunched with Geoff de Luca and told him about my proposals.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** And regretted it afterwards.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Whether I regretted it afterwards is quite another matter. I had lunch with Geoff de Luca and told him about my proposals, and there was an end to it—or a beginning to it, if you wish. I made it very clear, and it was clear in the story that Geoff de Luca subsequently ran, that the proposal was not in contention or consideration in the 1986-87 Budget; that was accurately reported.

I floated the story with him. It is not the first time a politician has ever floated a story. It may be a spectacular case for one getting shot down; nevertheless, I am not going to apologise for trying to do something to actively intervene to help that one child in six in South Australia who lives below the poverty line. If the time ever comes that I have to publicly apologise as Minister of Community Welfare in a Labor Government for wanting to help people out of poverty or to improve the quality of their lives and lifestyles generally, then I really would not want to be about. On the Wednesday morning I had a longstanding appointment—

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I rise on a point of order. My question was very direct and I do not think requires the rather long answer that the Minister is giving. I repeat my question for the Minister: did the Premier give the Minister any instruction that he should not raise the matter of the property tax publicly? I did not ask for a history of the event.

**The PRESIDENT:** There is no point of order. Standing Orders merely say that in answering a question the member shall not debate the matter to which it refers.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Let me go back a little further, just to make sure that everything is on the record. On the Tuesday morning, before I had lunch with Geoff de Luca, I met with the Executive of SACOSS. The Chairperson of SACOSS, of course, is Mrs Judith Roberts, a very well-known public figure in South Australia, a person whose integrity has always been, and remains, absolutely beyond reproach. She is a very outstanding figure in the South Australian spectrum, yet she is the one whose integrity was called into question by the Leader of the Opposition—which I thought was a quite heinous performance. So I spoke to them in general terms about a social justice strategy: that is, a long-term and very comprehensive social strategy, which was approved by Cabinet initially in March this year. I also canvassed with them—floated with them—the possible ways in which a shorter term social justice strategy might be financed.

In the prevailing climate it is very difficult to devise a social justice strategy where money is required. It is even more difficult, of course, to devise a social justice strategy where that money can be raised in an equitable and progressive way. It would not be at all exceptional. I would have thought that a Minister of Community Welfare should discuss such matters with the executive of SACOSS. I subsequently had lunch with Geoff De Luca, as I said, and gave him some of the detail—floated the idea of a social justice levy with him. On the morning of Wednesday the 16th I had a long-standing appointment with the Premier. I attended that meeting with the Deputy Chairman of the Health Commission and the Director of Administration and Finance of the Health Commission. The Premier for his part had the Under-Treasurer and two senior Treasury officers. Before that meeting began, but certainly in the presence of five other people, I mentioned briefly to the Premier that I had talked with Geoff De Luca the day before and that I expected the story to appear on Thursday the 17th. The Premier's recollection of that meeting was reported and was accurate.

To my recollection, among other things he said, 'I hope you have been saying the same sorts of things that I have.' The reality and the obvious fact was that I had gone substantially further. I had actually floated the possibility of being able to finance a social justice strategy in the short term. The death of that particular float and that idea was fast; it was swift and it has all gone away. But, of course, the people I had been trying to help have not gone away. Tonight in this city and in this State one child in six will go to bed wanting in some way or other, and at this very moment women are appearing at our DCW counters in cotton frocks and thongs because they do not have sufficient money to live above that poverty line.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** How long have you been in government?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Members of the Opposition, untroubled by conscience and largely unhindered by intelligence, can sit there and scoff as much as they like, but I will never apologise for wanting to help those kids and for wanting to help their mothers, and the deserted wives out there in the community, and being in or out of government has little to do with—

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** The Bannon Government does not want to—is that what you are saying?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** —the deserted wives who at this very moment with their children need help and who certainly need more rather than less help.

**The Hon. M.B. Cameron:** Are you going to increase welfare spending?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** There you go!

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! You need not take any notice of interjections.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** No, I don't, Ms President. Increasingly, like other people involved in the health industry, I take no notice at all of the Hon. Mr Cameron.

### ASIAN REFUGEES

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Ethnic Affairs a question about Indo-Chinese refugees.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L.H. DAVIS:** The July edition of *Refugee*, the official newsletter of the Indo-Chinese Refugee Association in South Australia, has strongly condemned the Federal

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr Chris Hurford, for inflammatory remarks about Asian refugees. An article in the *Weekend Australian* 17-18 May 1986 (Sydney edition only) reported that Mr Hurford at a three-day OECD conference on migration in Paris had claimed 80 per cent of Asian immigrants who applied for permanent settlement in Australia as refugees were not genuine.

The Indo-Chinese Refugee Association's newsletter has taken this comment as a slur on the 10 000 refugees who have come to South Australia over the past 10 years. Officials of the Association both here and interstate are upset that Mr Hurford has apparently chosen to ignore the political oppression, brutality, violence, persecution, threats or detention faced by many Vietnamese, Laotians and Kampuchians. They point out that one-third of the people fleeing their country are never seen again. As the Minister would know, refugees must be screened before being officially registered by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and before being admitted to Australia they must be vetted by Mr Hurford's own department. My questions to the Minister are as follows:

1. Does the Minister support Mr Hurford's allegations and, if not, will the Minister immediately and publicly dissociate himself from Mr Hurford's inaccurate and intemperate remarks which have caused great distress to the Indo-Chinese community in South Australia and elsewhere?

2. If the Minister does not support Mr Hurford's allegations, will he speak to Mr Hurford and ask him to apologise to the South Australian Indo-Chinese community?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I have not seen the remarks of the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Hurford) to which the Hon. Mr Davis has referred. I do know that the refugee program is run by the Commonwealth Government and that it has seen the admission to Australia of a large number of refugees, including a large number from the Indo-China region. They are people who have been assessed as being refugees according to the criteria laid down by the United Nations. However, I will attempt to obtain details of Mr Hurford's comments and provide the honourable member with a reply.

### LEGIONNAIRE'S DISEASE

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking the Minister of Health a question about legionnaire's disease.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** There has been a great deal of public disquiet about this matter, which has been fuelled by the Opposition spokesperson on health in a quite outrageous manner. The Minister has just made a very lengthy statement on this matter and I now want to ask a question supplementary to his statement. Does the Minister consider there are any risks to children in child-care centres, preschools and primary schools from legionnaire's disease?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I regret that by inference at least it has been suggested today that children in child-care centres or kindergartens where the water temperature is kept at or around 43°C may be at some kind of risk.

**The Hon. M.B. CAMERON:** I said the people who worked in our institutions.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** That is quite irresponsible, indeed recklessly irresponsible, as increasingly are most of the actions of the Hon. Mr Cameron. In relation to the honourable member's question, as I have done consistently throughout the discussions on legionnaire's disease, and as

I always do where expert opinion is required, I sought the opinion of Dr Scott Cameron on this matter. It is a furphy that the Opposition started in the last couple of weeks. I was aware of it before we came into Parliament today so I sought an opinion from Dr Scott Cameron, the Senior Medical Specialist at our Communicable Disease Control Unit.

Dr Cameron is the man, as I said in my statement today, who has quite recently been to the Centres for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia, and he has been our No. 1 expert and indeed he is something of a developing world authority on legionnaire's disease. He had this to say and I think it is very important that it be placed on the record, because I do not want parents to be alarmed by the antics of the Hon. Mr Cameron. I quote:

The child-care centres, preschools and primary schools are not areas which have demonstrated themselves to be associated with a risk of legionnaire's disease. Though children can be infected by legionellae just as can adults, the symptomatic disease, legionnaire's disease, is very rare in children, even if they are compromised.

That is, if their immune systems are compromised. Dr Cameron goes on to say:

The risk of children contacting legionellae and even of having silent infection in these institutions—

that is, in preschool centres and kindergartens—

would be much less than that associated with their normal living and bathing at home.

The risk of scalding that would follow from an increase in temperatures in the hot water systems in child-care centres would be of grave concern to the Public Health Service. Scalding from tap water (as opposed to hot drinks, etc.) is a common childhood problem, 10 cases being recorded at ACH since December 1985. This is one of the accidents receiving special attention from the injury surveillance program of the Public Health Service.

Inquiries have been made of education authorities to see if the 43°C standard applies. In special educational schools water is delivered at a safe temperature via mixing valves from high temperature storages. These valves each cost several hundred dollars. Hot water systems are not installed in primary schools, again because of the risk of scalds. High schools have normal hot water systems for shower rooms, and small instantaneous heaters in wash-up areas in science and art rooms.

The simple answer is, as Dr Cameron has said (and I repeat—I stress again—I do feel that the Hon. Mr Cameron has not had one of his best days in politics today), the risk of children contacting legionellae and even of having silent infection in these institutions would be much less than the risk associated with their normal living and bathing at home.

### CONSPIRACY CHARGES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** My question relates to a hit-run accident that occurred on Christmas Day 1984 in which a young woman was killed. Conspiracy charges were laid against two men, Ricky Phillips and Mark Williamson. Those charges were finally heard in committal proceedings in the Holden Hill magistrates court on 30 June 1986, but the magistrate dismissed the charges. I am informed that the magistrate criticised the Crown for the omission of two critical pieces of evidence as to the legal ownership of the car involved in the hit-run accident and the logging by police of a report by one of the defendants that his car had been stolen.

One of the persons who attended the hearing as an observer has told me that there was lengthy legal argument about the

admissibility of certain evidence and that the magistrate was troubled by the complexity of the conspiracy charge. Requests have been made to the Attorney-General to take the conspiracy charges to the Supreme Court to have the matter resolved once and for all. Will the Attorney-General take the conspiracy charges to the Supreme Court and, if not, why will that action not be taken?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I will examine the matter and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL ON THE AGEING

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare a question about the South Australian Council on the Ageing.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** The South Australian Council on the Ageing has provided a valuable service as an umbrella body for many of the South Australian groups—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:**—providing for the welfare and benefit of elderly people. It is the primary organiser for the annual seniors' week and is in the process of helping to organise local Abbeyfield Societies to provide cheap group accommodation for elderly people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I take a point of order, Madam President. I cannot hear the question because of the outrageous interjecting of members opposite.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. CAROLYN PICKLES:** Has the Minister been notified of any concerns about the operation of the South Australian Council on the Ageing? If so, what are these concerns and what action has been taken?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** As the Hon. Ms Pickles said, SACOTA provides valuable services as an umbrella body for many South Australian groups providing for the benefit and welfare of elderly people. In many ways, it is a big organisation and one with which the Government has worked closely and in harmony in the past. Of course, it is also the primary organiser for the annual seniors' week and again we have worked closely and in harmony with SACOTA.

From 1986-87 the State Government has promised to provide \$50 000 per annum to help SACOTA provide social services to the elderly and to act as a voice for the elderly on policy issues. That funding will increase from \$25 000 to \$50 000. The grant, of course (as is the case with all Government grants), is contingent on the Government's being satisfied about a number of issues. It would be less than responsible if we did not ask voluntary organisations, whether they be SACOTA or any other organisation, to produce good financial records and to show that they were being administered adequately.

I would have to say that since the beginning of the year the Government (but let us not put too high a point on 'the Government') or I as the Minister of Community Welfare have had some concerns about the functions and services of SACOTA, principally regarding the directions in which that organisation might be heading. More recently there appears to have been a strong emphasis on commercial activities, particularly activities such as selling insurance and investment advice. I believe that these concerns are shared by the Executive Director of SACOTA, Bob Randall, former member for Henley Beach and a person known to

all of us. In this particular matter I have every reason to believe that Bob Randall has been a good director and has acted most responsibly.

I do not bring up these matters in any way wishing to reflect on SACOTA as an organisation or particularly on Bob Randall (because I believe that he has acted most honourably). There have been some difficulties. For whatever reason or reasons, it appears that, in the past six months or so, to some extent SACOTA's policy in social service roles has taken a back seat. I think it is probably the worst kept secret in town that there are some difficulties. I am not suggesting there are irregularities of a nature that would have involved impropriety—not at all—but, because of the concerns, I have told SACOTA that I believe some of its associations or the groups, with which it has associated and some of its activities in promotion may be somewhat less than wise.

As a result, SACOTA has agreed to a role and function study, which I as Minister of Community Welfare will finance. I have made clear that additional funding will be subject to the outcome of a satisfactory role and function study. I repeat that I have no wish at all to reflect upon the integrity of SACOTA or any of its members.

It has been a useful organisation for the aged in the past. I am determined that with our help, and with the help of the Community Welfare Non-Government Unit in particular, it will again be a very useful organisation for the elderly. Indeed, I hope that it develops to a point where we can deal with it as the peak council of the elderly in this State. It is important that we have a peak council with whom we can deal in the whole range of matters of support for the ageing and aged care, but the matters are now matters of some public concern.

I understand that at least one journalist in this fair city has already made some inquiries, and no doubt there was a story about to be written, anyway, so I thought it ought to be on record that we do not believe that there are any matters which should be seen to the detriment of SACOTA in any way; it is simply that we wish to assure ourselves that it is going in the right direction and that its financial management is in order before we proceed with additional funding.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT REVISION

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** I ask leave to make a short statement before directing questions to the Minister of Local Government on the subject of the revision of the Local Government Act.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** Members will recall that the revision of the Local Government Act dates back now to the 1968-70 period and that the general concept that has been accepted is that a series of Bills will be introduced into Parliament, and ultimately these will be consolidated into the one new Act. Over that 16 year span, one Bill has been introduced and passed.

**The Hon. C.J. Sumner:** Was that by you?

**The Hon. C.M. HILL:** No, it was all ready to be introduced when I was retired compulsorily and the new Government, after considerable delay, ultimately introduced it. Local government has been waiting now for over 12 months for the second Bill. The proposals of the Minister's department for this new Bill were available in December of last year, and this second Bill is to deal principally with financial provisions such as rating, revenue, assessments and items of that nature. However, it was not until July this year that

these proposals were circulated to councils for comment. That was done by a letter which was dated 30 June but which was not received by many councils until the middle of July, and the Minister then sought responses from councils by the end of August. At this time of the year, of course, councils are involved with complex problems of assessment, rating and so on, and in the view of many councils this action is resorting to panic and is irresponsible ministerial administration.

What was the reason for the delay from December to June in circulating these proposals to councils for their comment? Will the Minister extend the August deadline? Is it a fact that the Minister's officers are already preparing the Bill so that she will not miss out on her November deadline to introduce the measure into Parliament? Does the Minister believe that local government is being treated fairly and sensitively in having this hasty conclusion to such a long drawn out saga to achieve the reforms that local government so desperately needs?

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** What a performance! As far as I am aware, the matter of the second revision of the Local Government Act was never intended to be introduced prior to this session. Certainly, in the time that I have been Minister the timetable for the second revision Bill was as we are now proceeding: that it is to be introduced in this budget session of 1986 and that, as far as I know, was the intention of the former Minister. It has certainly been the timetable that I have been following since my appointment in July last year. To suggest that local government has been waiting for 12 months for this event to occur is not correct.

The second inaccuracy that I would like to correct is the suggestion that the discussion papers, which have now been circulated to local government, were available in my department in December last year. That is not so. I think I indicated to the honourable member in reply to a question he asked during the autumn session that I intended to circulate the discussion papers by the end of March this year. Unfortunately, I was not able to meet that deadline, because a number of changes occurred in the Department of Local Government during the past few months. This meant that for a time we were rather short staffed, and a number of matters which I had hoped could be addressed before now unfortunately were not able to be addressed. There have been some delays with a number of issues; this is one of them.

We were short staffed, because, first, the Deputy Director of the department became ill and went on extended sick leave for a number of months prior to the announcement of his retirement in March. Then the Director of the department was transferred to the Department of Environment and Planning in March or April. Also at that time, it so happened that a number of local government advisory officers moved to other positions, so that in the early part of this year a few problems occurred in relation to staffing arrangements.

We are now recovering from that situation, and the discussion papers concerning the financing and rating provisions of the Local Government Act were circulated, as the honourable member has said, at the end of June, and I hope to be able to stick to a two-month consultation period.

To suggest that local government is in a state of panic about this issue is, I think, a little far fetched. I have received not one complaint from any council in this State about the timing of the consultation period. A couple of weeks ago at the Southern and Hills Local Government Association meeting a councillor asked me about the cut-off time for consultation, and I pointed out that, if the time seemed too short for one reason or another, I would con-

sider extending the consultation period, but as far as possible I would like to stick to the timetable we have set so that I can be sure we can introduce an amending Bill later this session.

The honourable member also asked whether or not officers of my department were already drafting a Bill. Certainly, officers of my department are looking at those clauses of the Bill which can be drafted at this stage. The issues which require decision and which are the subject of consultation will be drafted once the consultation is over and we have decided, in consultation with local government, what provisions are best. However, those provisions which are very clear—those sections of the Act which should be deleted for one reason or another and which are concerned with the routine tidying up of the Act—are being drafted at the moment, so we will be able to proceed as quickly as possible once the consultation period is over. By and large I believe it should be possible for us to stick to the timetable, and that is my intention, if at all possible.

### CFS FUNDING

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Emergency Services, questions concerning CFS funding and operation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT:** Two documents have recently been brought to my attention, one an internal CFS document circular No. 86/101 and the other a draft Bill controlling the CFS. The contents of both are causing a great deal of concern in the CFS to the extent that, if fears are not allayed and some decisions reversed, we may see large numbers of resignations from this very efficient body. Worse still, some of the decisions in my mind increase the risks to hills residents and the CFS volunteers themselves.

On first glance, one of the things that circular No. 86/101 does is to redistribute new equipment subsidies to council areas on the basis of ability to pay. Whereas, before, funding was 50 per cent council and 50 per cent from CFS administration, some councils will now have to pay 90 per cent, while others will have to pay none. What is more noticeable, though, is that the big cuts from the CFS have affected councils with large numbers of units in high risk areas, for example the Adelaide Hills, and the savings have gone to councils with fewer units.

While I support the increase of funds to poorer councils, I have more than a slight suspicion that what has in reality happened is that there has been a massive cut overall in equipment subsidies to CFS units across the State, but this is hidden within a supposed redistribution. Maintenance subsidies have been slashed right across the State. Under the new proposal, the number of units in the hills areas may be reduced by in excess of 30 per cent. In particular the number of quick attack vehicles—smaller, highly mobile 4-wheel drive units—will be reduced. The administration is refusing to offer maintenance subsidies to some vehicles with the intention of having them removed from service. We need to be wary that the efficiency of the CFS is not undermined.

As an example of the efficiency that I am talking about, the Stirling council region CFS has, I have been told, 27 pumping vehicles, over 300 volunteers and costs \$300 000 to administer. To set up one MFS vehicle in the Stirling area, to staff and to house it, would cost about the same amount. That vehicle would be useless in a bushfire. My questions are as follows:

1. Can the Minister say what sums in total will go outside CFS administration under arrangements as specified in the circular 86/101, as compared to the present position?

2. What money will be spent this year on administration compared to last year, when there has been a reported increase of \$1.8 million allocated to the CFS?

3. If, as I suspect, there have been cuts outside administration, were they with the knowledge or at the direction of the Minister?

4. Was fire rating information taken into account when the redistribution and cuts were decided on?

5. Why has the financial and logistical restructuring been forced on volunteer brigades without notice or consultation, as these people best know their areas?

6. Why has there been a significant drop in required vehicle standards, particularly in terms of pump equipment and crew safety?

7. Why have vehicles that have previously been approved, and are in the process of being purchased or built up, had their funding cut off?

8. Is it correct that the Director of the CFS has said that he refuses to negotiate with volunteers?

9. Why, when the CFA in Victoria is adopting vehicle standards similar to those of the CFS, are we going in the directly opposite direction, particularly in the light of the relative casualty rates of the two services?

10. Why have the volunteer representative associations not been consulted in the drafting of the new Bill?

11. Why, in the draft Bill, do we now have councils in some areas being asked to supply nearly all required moneys and yet having no control over equipment purchased?

12. Can the Minister also justify why the same thing will happen to funds raised by volunteers?

13. Is the Minister aware of morale within the CFS at the moment, and does he believe that the 22 000 volunteers will continue to give their unquestioned support, when such drastic changes are carried out without consultation?

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** Obviously, I will have to take those questions on notice. The Budget will be brought down on 29 August and some of those questions may then be answered. I will refer the questions to the Minister in order to ascertain whether any information can be provided prior to that date.

### BLACKWOOD FOREST RESERVE

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to asking the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Lands, a question relating to the Blackwood Forest Reserve.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.C. BURDETT:** On 14 August 1985, I moved a motion to disallow a proclamation under the Forestry Act relating to the Blackwood Forest Reserve. On prorogation the motion lapsed. The *Advertiser* of 7 July 1986 reports:

More than 400 people gathered at Hawthorndene yesterday as part of a campaign to save the Blackwood Forest Reserve from bulldozers. Local residents believe the 20-hectare property in Turners Road, which was bought by the State Government in 1908 as the site for an experimental orchard, is in danger of being handed over to developers.

The rally was organised by residents, who have banded together to form a pressure group, the Save the Blackwood Forest and Farm Group. Spokeswoman Mrs Laura Swain said if the public did not act to preserve the land as open space, its 'wonderful heritage' would be lost.

It is further stated in that report that the member for Davenport, who is the Chairman of an advisory committee set up by the Government, said 'it was unfair for residents

to suggest that the land would be bulldozed'. He also referred in that report to the preparation of a supplementary development plan.

The Hills Messenger press of 16 July also reports on action taken by the residents. In that article, amongst other things, it is stated that a group of children from the Hawthorndene Primary School, on their own initiative, started a petition to save the forest. Because the residents have expressed concern that the forest will be bulldozed, will the Minister give an undertaking that any future use of the area will be such that the forest is preserved?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I will take that question on notice. I will refer it to the relevant Minister and bring back a reply.

### LAND VALUATION

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister representing the Minister of Lands a question in relation to land valuation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. PETER DUNN:** Some individuals in my area who have received valuations for land under the system of site valuation—a system that I understand has been adopted by the Government—have told me they are concerned about the recent increases in some of the valuations. For example, I cite the case of a total district council area; in July 1983 the valuation was \$93 million, but it has now risen to \$111 million, which is an increase to July 1986 of approximately 20 per cent. While land values—having regard to public auctions in the area and also to what is said by land agents—have fallen by at least 20 per cent over the same period.

To cite another example of how the valuations have increased, my own property was valued in July 1983 at \$220 000 and in July 1986 at \$280 000, but within a radius of five miles land values have halved. My questions are as follows:

1. What are the criteria used to determine site valuations?

2. Does the valuation take into account the drop in value of properties caused by the poor economic performance of the Federal and State Governments?

3. How does the Minister explain the rise in valuation of 25 per cent when there have been no sales in the vicinity for the past five years?

4. Is it a back-door method of raising revenue for the E&WS Department and the Lands Department as their rating and freeholding are influenced by the valuations?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I will be pleased to take those questions to my colleague, and to bring back replies.

### NURSING CAREER STRUCTURES

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking the Minister of Health a question about nursing career structures.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** Nurses belong to a noble profession: they are subjected to rigorous training; they work irregular shifts; and they get bled upon, vomited upon and have to tell people that relatives are dead. I cannot think of any other group in the community that would do such work for the pittance that they are paid, except perhaps police constables.

I want to express a concern about the proposed nurses career structure for one reason only: that is, at the level of

the bedside nurse or operating theatre nurse it adds only one promotional increment before it branches out into administration and teaching. So, while the structure provides for great benefits to the teaching hierarchy and the administrative hierarchy in the large hospitals, there is some anxiety still that those very excellent and highly skilled nurses who would wish to devote the whole of their career to thoracic surgical operating theatres, to the intensive care unit, or to a particular specialised outpatient clinic, have in fact nowhere to go after reaching the top of the career structure at the bedside or clinical level. If they wish to have a real career they have to leave that sort of work and take to a desk or a lecturer's rostrum.

There is still a grave shortage of nurses. In the last week or so Flinders closed its doors to new admissions due to not having beds when, in fact, it had some beds but not enough nurses. I want to draw the Minister's attention to the fact that there are rumours in the community that the cost of this career structure will be something of the order of \$30 million—I have heard a figure of \$50 million expressed, but doubtless the Minister will give us a more accurate figure.

*The Hon. J.R. Cornwall interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** It would be responsible to pay anything that is necessary to justly reward and to attract back to the nursing profession the people that it is losing. Will the Minister give the Council an estimate of the cost of the new structure? Is the Minister confident that the distribution of promotional positions will remedy the nursing shortage where it matters, that is, at the bedside and in the operating theatre?

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** Ms President, as you know, and as all members know, when I want expert advice on any matter I always go to experts. In this particular matter I have had very close dealings over a long time with the Royal Australian Nursing Federation. The RANF is both the professional body and the industrial trade union for the great majority of nurses in this State. It negotiated the clinical career structure with us and agreed to the major pilots which are currently going on in a large number of our public hospitals—something well in excess of 50 per cent of our hospitals.

It is at their request, and with their assistance and the assistance, of course, of other health professionals, that these clinical career structures have been devised. The cost of the current pilots over one financial year running into another will be of the order of \$9 million. It is, in fact, the most constructive way that we could have gone about it. We are very grateful to the nursing profession for the cooperation and assistance that it has given us. I would like to put on record immediately that I have an enormous admiration for the work that is done by the nursing profession. It is not so very long ago, and I remember it when I am out exercising every morning, that I was an in-patient. I recall with great affection the level of care that I received.

We were anxious that the nursing profession should be enhanced through developing very considerably better career structures to allow nurses to stay in the clinical levels of nursing at higher levels and to make that their life's career. We were also concerned, of course, that their claims for transfer to tertiary education should be met. They are being met currently within the allocated time-frame and, again, by and large with a minimum of fuss because of the great cooperation that we have received. I might say in passing that it is not true to say that we have a grave shortage of nurses. It is because of the cooperation that we have had from the nursing profession that we have a reasonable balance at this time. We are a little on the short side,

probably of the order of perhaps 200 or 300 positions, but it is by no means a grave shortage. That is partly, of course, because we have conducted, with the assistance of Federal Government funding, retraining courses and have recruited a lot of women back into the nursing work force.

We have had the cooperation of the RANF for both temporary and permanent immigration of nurses, principally trained nurses, principally from the United Kingdom, and we have looked to greater flexibility all round. The position is tight and will remain tight. It is not, however, as the position is in some other States where they are not able to tackle their waiting list problems, principally in many cases because of a straight-out shortage of nurses; we are significantly better off than that. Having said all those nice things, I think that it is an oversimplification to suggest, as Dr Ritson does, that there is only one extra step.

The nurses are happy with the way we are going. By and large, the hospitals are happy with where we are going. The surgeons have expressed some reservations about the increased and improved status of nurses. I will not be judgmental on that in any way; some of my best friends are surgeons, so I will let that one pass and see how it settles down with the passage of time. But let me say that, because we have received the cooperation of the nurses, I would anticipate that we will be able to ratify an agreement in the Industrial Commission at the end of these piloted clinical career structures. The likely recurrent annual cost of that to the South Australian health budget is an estimated \$17 million to \$20 million a year. I would not want to be held to that in terms of my future political career—and I look forward to quite a long one—but, as near as my advisers can get, it will probably be of that order of \$17 million to \$20 million. On the other hand, if we had a 17 per cent rise across the board, as happened recently in New South Wales, then applying it directly to the current cost of nurses' salaries would result in a cost to the annual health budget of the order of \$37 million.

**The Hon. R.J. Ritson:** That is where we get the figure that was floated.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** One can arrive fairly simply at that if one has the current cost of nurses' salaries and a factor of 17 per cent. It is not \$50 million certainly, but almost twice as much as it will be if we continue to get the cooperation that we are getting from the nursing profession and are able within the spirit and terms of the accord mark II to have the agreements that we will come to. I would hope that in the not too far distant future, ratified in the Industrial Commission.

**The Hon. R.J. RITSON:** By way of a supplementary question, will the Minister provide to the Council the following details: of that \$17 million expected cost, what percentage will go to the combined administrative and teaching section of the nursing profession and what percentage will go to the bedside section of the nursing profession—details of the proportional distribution.

**The Hon. J.R. CORNWALL:** I cannot give that exact percentage. I think I can fairly safely say that the overwhelming majority will go to nurses who are nursing in the wards and at the bedside. Of course, there will be increased and improved salary structures for nurses in senior administration. From memory, I think that under the pilot scheme that is going on at the moment the Directors of Nursing in our three major teaching hospitals have certainly been elevated to the executive officer salary range, and that is entirely appropriate.

When I became Minister of Health I was dumbfounded to learn that the Director of Nursing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital—the top nursing position in this State at a hospital

which employs in excess of 4 000 people, the majority of whom are nurses, and the person who is responsible for the good conduct of nursing in the State's largest teaching hospital with well in excess of 900 beds—was getting a salary of about \$36 000 a year, while the administrators of the major hospitals, usually male, exclusively male (indeed as I am sure Madam President knows), were getting salaries which were some \$20 000 a year more than that. So, I think that one can certainly make out a case for the Directors of Nursing and the administrators in nursing for comparative wage justice with people who are in comparable administrative positions as well as make out an overwhelming case for comparative wage justice for the nursing profession *vis-a-vis* people in the other health professions, and we are aiming to strike a balance in both. But, in terms of the exact percentages, if they or even reasonable estimates are available, I will be pleased to provide the Hon. Dr Ritson with those details.

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

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

That the Select Committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to Wednesday 26 November 1986.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON COOBER PEDY  
(LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXTENSION) ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL**

**The Hon. BARBARA WIESE (Minister of Local Government):** I move:

That the Select Committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to Wednesday 20 August 1986.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON DISPOSAL OF  
HUMAN REMAINS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. G.L. BRUCE:** I move:

That the Select Committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to Tuesday 23 September 1986.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON ENERGY NEEDS IN  
SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I move:

That the Select Committee have power to sit during the present session, and that the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended to Wednesday 26 November 1986.

Motion carried.

**SESSIONAL COMMITTEES**

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The President and the Hons G.L. Bruce, M.B. Cameron, K.T. Griffin, and C.J. Sumner.

Library: The President and the Hons J.C. Irwin, Diana Laidlaw, and Carolyn Pickles.

Printing: The Hons Peter Dunn, M.S. Feleppa, Carolyn Pickles, R.J. Ritson, and T.G. Roberts.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

**The PRESIDENT** having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's speech, the Hon. C.J. Sumner (Attorney-General) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons M.B. Cameron, B.A. Chatterton, M.S. Feleppa, R.I. Lucas, and C.J. Sumner be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

**STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

**The PRESIDENT:** I lay upon the table the report together with minutes of the proceedings of the Standing Orders Committee, which has met since Parliament last sat.

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

That the report of the Standing Orders Committee be adopted.

This report arises from a meeting of the Standing Orders Committee that was held during the recess and followed a statement made by you, Madam President, when you assumed your office as President of this Council. You indicated that you considered it inappropriate for you to read the Lord's Prayer at the beginning of each day's session because of your personal beliefs.

At that time it was proposed that Standing Orders be suspended to enable someone else to read the prayer, but that was not agreed to. Part of the opposition to that action, it is fair to say, was that the matter had not been referred to the Standing Orders Committee for consideration. That was done during the recess. In the meantime you, Madam President, have been performing your duty of reading the prayer in accordance with the existing Standing Order. The upshot of it all is that the Standing Orders Committee has now agreed that the Standing Order should be amended to provide that the President or the President's delegate read the prayer.

That comes to this Council as a recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee. I understand that in the event of this Standing Order being adopted you would delegate the task of reading the prayers to the Clerk of the Council and that the Clerk has indicated that he is happy to perform that task. I think that it is appropriate, in light of your personal beliefs on this matter, that there be an alternative provided for the reading of prayers.

I understand that it is not universal practice in the Westminster system for prayers to be read by the Presiding Officer, and it seems to me that this recommendation of the Standing Orders Committee provides the necessary flexibility to deal with the sort of problems that arose with your concern that you should not read the prayers because of your own personal and conscientiously held beliefs. I commend the report of the Standing Orders Committee to honourable members.



**The Hon. K.T. GRIFFIN:** As a member of the committee, I reluctantly support the resolution for amendment to the Standing Orders. I say 'reluctantly' because the Standing Orders have been in existence for many years, and any person taking the office of President knows the rules and the Standing Orders and has generally accepted the responsibility to say prayers on behalf of the Legislative Council.

With this background I would have expected any aspirant for the presidency to conform to the long-standing practice rather than the Legislative Council conforming to the preferences of one person, but I have thought through the matter at some length and consulted with a number of people, and I have reached the conclusion that if a person has a deep-seated objection to saying prayers it would be wrong to compel that person to say them.

The Christian faith itself would be debased by such compulsion, so rather than devaluing the significance of prayers, which I believe to be an important part of the proceedings of the Legislative Council, I supported the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee and I reluctantly support the motion moved by the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. I. GILFILLAN:** I support the proposed amendment. It seems appropriate to me personally that the prayers

as spoken in this place are done in full sincerity and are not just a perfunctory exercise to conform with some ancient tradition; certainly not in my opinion. I think that it is important that the person who is saying the prayer feels content in his own conscience that it is a meaningful and important thing for him to do, and I feel that this may be the first time in the history of the State that this dilemma has arisen.

I believe that the amendment will allow future Presidents to exercise their consciences in the matter, without detracting from the contribution, the value and the dignity that, in my opinion, the prayers give to the work of this place.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. C.J. SUMNER:** I move:

That the report be printed and the amendment be presented to the Governor by the President for approval pursuant to section 55 of the Constitution Act.

Motion carried.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.30 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 5 August at 2.15 p.m.