

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 24 August 1982

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

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

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

Adelaide College of Technical and Further Education—Light Square.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Boating Act, 1974-1980—Regulations—
Blackfellows' Caves.
Clayton Bay—River Murray.
Classification of Publications Act, 1973-1982—General
Regulations.
Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Pro-
hibition—Enfield.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—
The University of Adelaide Act, 1971-1978—By-laws—
Traffic.

By the Minister of Community Welfare—(Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—
Workers Compensation Act, 1971-1982—Workers Com-
pensation Rules—Appeal Procedures.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MORTGAGE AND RENT RELIEF SCHEME

The **Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Housing)**: I seek leave to make a statement about the Mortgage and Rent Relief Scheme.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. C. M. HILL**: I wish to inform the Council that the \$3 500 000 Mortgage and Rent Relief Scheme, which is being jointly funded by the State and Commonwealth Governments, is now operational. Indeed, the first offer of assistance for mortgage relief was approved last Friday, 20 August. Members will recall that this scheme was announced by the Commonwealth in March as part of its 'housing package' to assist home buyers and private renters experiencing special difficulty in paying for their accommodation. The Commonwealth's suggested terms of operation for the scheme were made available to all States towards the end of July.

The State responded immediately in accepting the Commonwealth's proposal. Furthermore, on the same day that this acceptance was given, I announced publicly that those South Australians suffering difficulties with either rents or mortgage repayments should register immediately with the Housing Trust, which is administering the scheme. At the end of last week (20 August) over 300 inquiries had been registered at the trust: 55 per cent were for mortgage assistance, and the remainder for rent assistance.

The scheme effectively became operational last Wednesday (18 August) when a 'kit' of information was sent out to those who had registered for mortgage assistance with the trust. This included—

- A letter from the Acting General Manager of the trust;
 - An information sheet;
 - An application form; and
 - A form to be filled out by the applicants' lenders.
- As I have already announced, households are eligible where:
- Gross household income is less than 85 per cent of average weekly earnings.
 - Mortgage repayments exceed a proportion of gross family income, determined on a sliding scale appropriate to the income level.
 - The outstanding balance of the mortgage is \$35 000 or less.
 - The household is not in receipt of home purchase assistance (a Commonwealth requirement).
 - The percentage of gross income required to meet mortgage repayments exceeds the percentage required at the time the mortgage was entered into; and all available assistance has been provided by the lender.

I have emphasised, to the trust, that the overriding factor in providing assistance ought to be based on a sensitive appraisal of the individual household circumstances. The maximum mortgage relief assistance which will be available in a household will be \$20 per week, reviewable every three months. The money will be provided in the form of an interest free, unsecured loan; with the repayment terms based on the circumstances of the household once assistance is no longer required. It should also be noted that assistance payments will be made directly to the lender, and not to the individual being assisted.

I believe it is to South Australia's credit that not only were we the first State to accept the Commonwealth's offer to participate in this assistance programme, but also the first to get it operational. Furthermore, I believe the Council should be made aware that Commonwealth funds for this scheme (\$1 760 000) will not be available before November. In other words, it is due to the State Government's initiative that assistance payments have started as early as they have; since the State is spending its contributions to the scheme (also \$1 760 000) first.

Turning to the rent relief component of this scheme, uncertainty surrounding certain Commonwealth administrative arrangements have as yet prevented rent relief payments from being made. The problem faced by the State is that, if it were to make assistance payments to renters on certain social security benefits, without the necessary amendments to the Social Security Act, the assistance payments would cause a reduction of pensions. As part of my announcement of this scheme I made it clear that before the rental component could be implemented, the treatment of relief payments by the Social Security and Taxation Departments had to be determined. The favourable resolution of these problems was announced in the Commonwealth Budget, although the necessary Federal legislation will not be passed before November.

The implication of this in delaying assistance to renters is of great concern to the Government, and I intend to confer with the Minister for Social Security on ways of overcoming this problem as soon as possible. In the meantime, the Housing Trust will continue to register applicants for rent relief.

QUESTIONS

LEGAL AID

The **Hon. C. J. SUMNER**: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about legal aid.

The **PRESIDENT**: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The PRESIDENT: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Commonwealth Government's contribution to legal aid in this State has been reduced as a result of the Federal Budget announced last week? If it has been reduced, to what extent has it been reduced, and what effect will this reduction have on the provision of legal aid services in this State? Finally, if there has been such a reduction, what action does the Attorney intend to take?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It has not been drawn to my attention that the Commonwealth Government's contribution to legal aid in this State has been diminished. I will have the appropriate Budget papers checked, and I will bring down a reply.

MEAT HYGIENE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a question about meat hygiene.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Some time ago I raised matters in this Chamber that have been raised by the Local Government Association regarding the operations of the Meat Hygiene Act, and I read some extracts from a letter that had been circulated by that association to members of Parliament and the Minister of Agriculture. Unfortunately, I have not yet received a reply from the Minister to the question I asked then. Since then the Meat and Allied Trades Federation has also raised the matter of the administration of the Meat Hygiene Act, and I would like to quote its letter, because it explains succinctly the problems that are being experienced. The letter states:

We have noted the question and statement made in the Legislative Council dated 16 June 1982 by the Hon. B. A. Chatterton regarding meat hygiene.

We have noted below several observations made by operators currently working under the Meat Hygiene Act.

1. Local Government Control:

This question was fully canvassed at the meeting held at Angaston on 5 May 1982 at which you were present. Operators are still of the opinion that clarification of this control is necessary by amplification of regulations and request that you consider same.

The second point that the Meat and Allied Trades Federation raised with the Minister of Agriculture involved the coverage of the Act. The letter continues:

2. Coverage:

The Meat Hygiene Act is covering three major categories of works: 1. Abattoirs; 2. Large slaughterhouses; and, 3. Small slaughterhouses. As stated previously, we believe that the current Act and regulations do not distinguish sufficiently the different applications necessary for the different types of works, and we ask that you consider some clarification in the regulations.

3. Conditions of licensing:

Currently the only coverage in the existing legislation is section 24 of the Act. We believe that this is inadequate treatment of this subject, and that further guidelines should be added to the regulations. Currently, questions regarding levels of throughput and distribution cannot be answered satisfactorily by the operators, as the effect of section 24 puts the *ad hoc* decisions back onto the authority, without any amplification for future planning being made to operators. This *ad hoc* decision making makes also, in our opinion, for an onerous burden on the Chairman who fortunately for the meat industry is a conscientious and fair minded person.

The final point raised by the Meat and Allied Trades Federation involves illegal killing, which is still taking place within the industry and which is apparently not being controlled adequately by the Meat Hygiene Authority. Has the Minister considered this letter from the Meat and Allied Trades Federation and, also, the questions I raised previously? Those questions involved similar sorts of queries to

those raised by the Local Government Association. Can the Minister provide a reply to the very specific questions just asked and to those questions asked previously?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

PROTECTION OF CHILDREN

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare about protection of young children from abuse.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I read with some dismay the report on the front page of the *Sunday Mail* of the past weekend describing the birth of a child in a home spa. The hazards to the mother are obvious. Even in Great Britain, where domiciliary midwifery is practised widely, the first child is never born at home. The hazards to the mother are of concern in terms of medical ethics. The fact that a doctor was present at this happening evoked the comment from one of my colleagues, 'That only goes to prove that there are a few cranks in any profession.'

I do not seek to interfere with people's rights to hazard themselves. I think that Governments, in the past, have been only too ready to protect people from their own stupidity. Frankly, if someone wants to get their name in the record book as being the first person to disappear whilst walking across Bass Strait, that, perhaps, is not the concern of the Government. However, the very important question arises as to whether the child involved in such a situation has rights.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: It didn't have much say in this case.

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: No. Some people do believe that the child is the play thing of the mother, but the law may hold that it is not.

The hazards to the child are significant. First, the protection offered by the presence of the doctor is largely nullified by the handicap of trying to operate under water. There then arises the questions of monitoring the foetal heartbeat during the second stage of labour, of the doctor trying to perform an episiotomy or untangle the cord from the child's neck, and there is the question of sterility. The theory that the child is somehow better off by coming from a nice warm fluid into another nice warm fluid is a load of rubbish. The nice warm fluid that the child is going into is not isotonic with human body fluid: it is quite capable of drowning the baby. While the baby needs the normal bowel organisms it gets from its mother during delivery, it does not need the various pathogens that come from the boil on the bottom of the midwife in the spa.

I suppose that one could achieve sterility by massive chlorination of the spa, but then the child may be hazarded by those halogenated organic compounds which Dr Cornwall has warned us about. I do not argue that the maternal hazards are necessarily the concern of the State, but I do believe that this procedure is an unwarranted and unacceptable hazard to new-born babies.

Will the Minister sample opinion from senior paediatricians and lawyers conversant with medico-legal work? If the Minister, as a result of seeking those opinions, agrees that this procedure is an unwarranted hazard to the health and life of a new-born baby, and if the Minister's advice is that the present situation either at common law or statute law is that such a procedure is illegal and is a form of child abuse, will he seek to advertise this view, perhaps with similar fanfare as was accorded the opposite view on the front page of the *Sunday Mail*?

The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: It's a terrible paper, isn't it?

The Hon. R. J. RITSON: I think that the honourable member is referring to the Insider and Onlooker columns. Does the Minister believe that the proposed showing of the video tape of this delivery on the Mike Walsh Show represents the highest standards of media responsibility? If such practices as this become common in South Australia and if they are not presently proscribed by law, will the Minister consider legislative intervention?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I cannot promise the fanfare on the front page of the *Sunday Mail*, but I will investigate this matter. I will carry out the investigation in the way the honourable member requested, namely, to sample paediatric and legal opinion. I shall also refer the matter to officers of my department who operate in the area of the prevention of child abuse. Those officers will no doubt take opinion from members of child protection panels. If necessary, I will certainly consider an education pamphlet. I would be prepared to consider legislation if necessary, but the investigation may well show that this practice is fraught by existing legislation. The answer to the third question is 'No' and the answer to the fourth question is 'Yes'.

DIESEL FUEL

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish to direct the following questions to the Attorney-General, representing the Premier and Treasurer:

1. Will the Attorney-General request a statement from the Premier and Treasurer in his Budget papers in relation to the cessation of the diesel fuel certification by the Federal Government?

2. Is the Attorney-General aware that, as a result, diesel fuel costs in manufacturing industry have increased substantially by the Federal Government Budget change?

3. Will the State waive the State levy in relation to diesel fuel, thereby reducing the cost already imposed by the Federal Government?

4. Will a survey of industry be made by the appropriate department or departments to ascertain:

- (a) the extent to which diesel fuel is used in manufacturing industry;
- (b) the cost of conversion to natural gas or other fuel from diesel;
- (c) the inconvenience on mobility of plant within manufacturing industry resulting from conversion;
- (d) the total cost to manufacturing industry because of increased use of diesel fuel generally?

5. Will the Attorney-General request the manufacturers organisations, the Trades and Labor Council, and the Department of Labour and Industry to estimate the effect on employment, loss of markets, and other aspects likely to cause further erosion of the manufacturing employment base in this State?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I shall refer these questions to the Premier and Treasurer and bring back replies.

PATIENT CARE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to a question I asked on 22 July regarding patient care?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Minister of Health has fully investigated the circumstances referred to by Mr C. J. Stead, of Renmark, and gives an assurance to the honourable member that adequate funding is being provided to public hospitals to ensure the maintenance of high quality patient care. The circumstances relating to Mr Stead's stay at both

the Queen Elizabeth and Royal Adelaide Hospitals are as follows—

Queen Elizabeth Hospital: The nursing staff for ward 5B over the period during which Mr Stead was a patient averaged 7.5 registered nurses, 12 student, two enrolled and two trainee enrolled nurses, which is the standard staffing for the ward. Excluding study days, this allows 4.4 hours of nursing per patient over a period of 24 hours when the ward is 87 per cent occupied. This compares favourably with the accepted standard in South Australian hospitals of 4.5 hours of nursing per patient per 24 hours when the ward is 87 per cent occupied, and with the accepted standards in New South Wales of four hours per patient per 24 hours with 87 per cent ward occupancy.

Royal Adelaide Hospital: Mr Stead's stay at the Royal Adelaide Hospital coincided with a temporary freeze on all recruitments whilst the hospital reviewed its budgetary situation. The freeze lasted approximately three weeks, following which normal recruitment resumed. During this period, the staff available in the wards in which Mr Stead was accommodated was supplemented from other areas.

With regard to Mr Stead's comments on the availability of rubber cushions, it is believed that he was referring, in fact, to a rubber air ring. The delay in obtaining one of these rings is not surprising as they are not in common use. In this regard nursing practices have changed to the extent that repositioning of the patient is now the recommended course of action. Furthermore, rubber mattresses on patient transport trolleys are regularly checked for wear and tear and are replaced as required.

COMPUTERS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Has the Minister of Community Welfare a reply to questions I asked on 27 July regarding computers?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The answers to the honourable member's 10 questions are as follows:

1. No. However, the South Australian Health Commission has been instrumental in the acquisition of a small I.B.M. mainframe computer. An I.B.M. model 4331 computer has been the subject of a rental agreement between the Supply and Tender Board and I.B.M. This acquisition followed two tender calls for a system to support patient admission and registrations at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.
2. No. The responsibility for the installation and implementation of the system based on the I.B.M. 4331 computer has been vested in the Board of Management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In due course, the computer will be installed at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the period of the project.
3. No. The Royal Adelaide Hospital project is a specific exercise aimed at patient admission and registrations with the hospital. As such, it is a stand alone project for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and there are no plans to integrate it with the new equipment for the Government A.D.P. Centre.
4. See answer to 3.
5. When initiating the current computer inquiry, the Public Accounts Committee clearly indicated that it did not wish to delay or interrupt any initiative taken by the South Australian Health Commission or work in progress at the time of the announcement of the inquiry. Plans for the acquisition of the computer for the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been in progress for in excess of 18 months.
6. I.B.M. has contracted to supply the computer and terminals for the project at a cost of \$286 000.

7. The computer acquisition was appraised by the Data Processing Board. The board's comments on the proposal were considered by the Government before it gave approval for the acquisition. This is in accordance with the Government directive for Data Processing Board appraisals.
8. See answer to 7 above.
9. The computer will perform the major functions of patient admissions and registrations at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.
10. Yes. The acquisition has been the subject of two tender calls, the first an open tender call and the second a restricted tender.

CARDIOTHORACIC SURGICAL UNIT

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Has the Minister of Community Welfare the reply to a question I asked on 21 July about the cardiothoracic surgical unit?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: My colleague the Minister of Health informs me that the Royal Adelaide Hospital has not requested additional funds from the South Australian Health Commission for the cardiothoracic surgical unit. The cardiothoracic surgical unit has submitted redevelopment plans to the Administrator (as have many other departments with the hospital) in response to the Board of Management's direction to develop a strategy for redevelopment of the hospital. Although the South Australian Health Commission has been informed of the strategy, the board has not yet adopted any recommendations.

Although it is acknowledged that there are risks involved in waiting six weeks for an operation, this waiting time is low compared to the rest of Australia. The expenditure of an amount of \$40 000 on equipment for the cardiothoracic surgical unit has recently been approved and this has been supplemented by the most generous donations from other organisations, in particular, Heartbeat Inc. The hospital is very appreciative of the assistance given by this voluntary organisation.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES STAFF

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Has the Minister of Local Government the reply to a question I asked on 29 July about equal opportunities staff?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister of Education has advised me that he is fully aware of the needs of the equal opportunities programme and expects to receive a recommendation shortly in relation to a permanent staff appointment. In the meantime, the Equal Opportunities Officer is being directly assisted by 1.5 professional staff and has access to a reception and typing service equivalent to a 0.5 person. If and when a permanent appointment is made, a press release will be issued.

MULTICULTURAL SOCIETY

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs a question about a newspaper article published in the *Advertiser* on 18 August by Brigadier P. J. Greville. I also wish to refer to a reply to this article by the Legal Officer for the United Ethnic Communities of South Australia, which was published in the *Advertiser* on 21 August 1982. I also seek leave to read a portion of the newspaper article and incorporate in *Hansard* relevant portions of the article, together with the reply.

The PRESIDENT: Order! If leave is granted I can see no reason why the honourable member cannot read the article. Any material incorporated in *Hansard* must be purely statistical.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: Mr President, I repeat what I said. The letter I wish to incorporate is very relevant to the point of my question. It would be useless if I incorporated only a small section in *Hansard*, because the rest would be lost. My purpose is to make people aware of the whole subject.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member has leave he can read from that article and there should be no difficulty.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: The article is entitled 'United States wants oil out of conflict', and it states:

One of the lessons Australia should learn from the experience of multiculturalism in the United States is the disproportionate and adverse effect of minority ethnic or religious groups on that nation's foreign policy. Ernest Bevin claimed that Israel was created to enable Harry Truman to carry the State of New York in the 1948 presidential election.

Masaryk claimed that Czechoslovakia was born in Pittsburgh and evidence exists that Poland owed its independence after World War I to the need for President Wilson to carry Illinois State in an election.

Mr Whitlam started the nauseous business, at the national level, of currying favour with particular ethnic pressure groups after Mr Dunstan had demonstrated its effectiveness in South Australia.

That Australia's foreign policy is not immune to such pressures was evident by the events of last week when the Prime Minister was called upon to explain to Australia's Jewish leaders his actions in criticising Israel's conduct in Lebanon.

There is an urgent need to re-examine not only Australia's immigration policy but its assimilation policies. We must have a national aim more comprehensive than simply increasing the number of residents in Australia.

People not committed to Australia and its future should not be allowed to settle here.

Those not prepared to become Australian citizens should not be permitted to vote and after a reasonable period should be asked to leave.

To this end all publicly-funded ethnic radio and television should be disbanded, and Mr Grassby's Office of the Commissioner for Community Relations closed forever.

Before asking my question I will add one personal comment. This great soldier, Brigadier Greville, should be disciplined. I believe that he is part of a very dangerous element in our community. Indeed, he has placed in jeopardy all the work that has been done to bring together the people of this country. Therefore, I believe that brutal intervention such as this—

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is not really the forum to express an opinion. I see no reason why the honourable member cannot do that in some other way. The honourable member is prefacing his question with certain information. Question Time does not permit the expression of an opinion.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: Mr President, I will abide by your ruling. Please forgive me. However, it is important that I stress this point to the Chamber, because there could be some honourable members who do not agree with what I am saying. I believe that what I am saying is correct, so you should forgive me, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member could make his point in several other ways. I point out that Question Time only allows for the explanation of a question.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I consider that Brigadier Greville is very dangerous and he is completely ignorant of what multiculturalism is all about. Furthermore, he does not know that no-one can vote in a State or Federal election unless they become an Australian citizen.

The PRESIDENT: Order! As I have said, there are other methods by which the honourable member can proceed with these matters, but he is now entering into debate, instead of proceeding with his question.

The Hon. M. S. FELEPPA: I am now coming to the question, Mr President. Does the Minister still think that it is better not to react to insulting newspaper articles, or does he now believe that it may be time for the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission to start educating and explaining to some influential people, such as Brigadier Greville, what multiculturalism is all about? Secondly, has the public relations officer of the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission taken action on this matter by answering this most offensive article, offensive not only to migrants in general but also to the public office of the Commonwealth Community Relations Commissioner?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In regard to the second question, the Chairman of the Ethnic Affairs Commission has informed me that he has sent a letter to the *Advertiser* and, hopefully, that will be printed. I understand that in that correspondence he rebuts strongly the statements made by Brigadier Greville to which the honourable member has referred. In regard to the first question, it is not a matter of my deciding whether I still think it is prudent to take up these issues or consider whether it is wise perhaps to let some of them go: it is simply a matter that, on occasions, it is quite proper that they should be answered. Bearing in mind that the honourable member has raised the incident in this manner, I join with him in saying that it was most unfortunate, in my opinion, that statements such as this from Brigadier Greville were printed in our daily press. Let me refer to just three of them, and I think that they are the three most pertinent points that the honourable member has made. The first dealt with the Brigadier's statement, as follows:

People not committed to Australia and its future should not be allowed to settle here.

Apart from skilled workers who enter the country on a short-term work visa and who are expected to return to their own country at the expiration of that visa, all migrants come to Australia as permanent settlers. They are carefully screened by experienced officers of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on the basis not only of character and skills but also desire and aptitude to settle.

The current criteria for selection are the result of widespread public consultations, careful review of prior practices and close study of settlement experience. These policies have the support of both the Government and the Opposition in all State and Territory Governments. Few other policies of Governments can claim such unanimity of support. I repeat: the statement by the Brigadier was most unfortunate.

He went on to suggest that migrants who were not citizens should not vote. Certainly, that suggestion will be received with much consternation by British, New Zealand and other Commonwealth migrants who have not chosen to become citizens but who have the right to vote because they are British subjects. So far, they constitute the largest group of migrants who have not become citizens. I believe that they, and most Australians, would be shocked to think that their loyalty is in any way in doubt. Census figures indicate that in mid-1981 only about 10 per cent of New Zealand, 17 per cent of American and 31 per cent of British migrants had taken out Australian citizenship. By contrast, 87 per cent of Greek, Polish and Cypriot migrants have become citizens.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What are the figures for Italians?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not have those figures with me. The third point made by Brigadier Greville was that 'all public funded ethnic radio and television should be disbanded'. This disregards the fact that such ethnic media is beneficial not only for migrants but also for Australians. Japan and other countries are spending millions of dollars to teach their business men and scientists other languages so that they can function effectively in international scientific programmes and global trade relations. Ethnic media is the cheapest way for Australia to develop and maintain the

valuable community languages of its diverse ethnic population for the benefit of the whole nation.

For the recently arrived and for elderly migrants who are hindered in their community participation because of their lack of English language skills, ethnic media provides the main source of entertainment and an essential service which enables them to develop as good citizens of our nation. Multi-cultural television, with its English language subtitles, enables the overall Australian community, including the deaf, to learn about the diverse cultural and social background of the many different people who make up our nation, helping in a continued development of a tolerant, equitable and harmonious Australian society. As I have mentioned previously, both in Parliament and outside, the present Government expresses its support for public-funded ethnic media and multi-cultural television. I hope that the letter from the Ethnic Affairs Commission will be printed in the press, and that we will not see any more of these quite ridiculous statements by Brigadier Greville.

WEIGHT REGULATIONS

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Premier, say when I can expect to receive a reply to my question of 7 April 1982 concerning weight regulations?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: No, I cannot say, but I will make some inquiries and see whether the reply can be expedited.

PIE CART

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of the Adelaide City Council's autocratic dictatorship in respect of the council's pursuit of ensuring that changes in respect of by-laws are such as to deny Parliament scrutiny and authority on behalf of citizens of this State? Secondly, can the Minister require an explanation from the council in respect of at least one business man who is about to suffer business and trade annihilation because of overzealous council pursuits? Thirdly, is the Minister aware that that commercial undertaking is beyond the reach of Parliament, in spite of the Minister's advice in recent days in relation to Mr Oram?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not have any knowledge at all of any improper activities by the City Council in regard to the preparation and promulgation of its by-laws. In answer to the second question, I do not think the honourable member mentioned specific names—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I did; I mentioned Mr Oram at the end of my question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That was in regard to another question. In regard to the second question, I think I should get the details from the honourable member, and I shall be most pleased to have the matter investigated.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Why not put it at the side?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: One does not know from that interjection what the honourable member is talking about.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If honourable members opposite want questions answered about the pie cart, let them come out in the open and ask those questions. At the moment I am answering a question from the Hon. Mr Foster. I shall be pleased to take up the matters to which the honourable member has referred, have my departmental officers investigate them closely, and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Will the Minister request from the Hon. Mr Carnie, a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, a copy of the regulations which were supposed to enable a committee of this Parliament to endeavour to protect the business interests of Mr Oram, as was the advice of the Minister a few days ago? Does the Minister know that he has been shamefully misrepresented by Mr Smith, the Clerk of the Adelaide City Council?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We are getting into a real pickle, are we not, when a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation comes into this Chamber and talks of the evidence before and discussions within that committee during a period that that committee is considering whether or not a particular by-law is to be disallowed?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You've missed the point, mate.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think that is what the honourable member is doing. If the honourable member has any claims against Mr Llewellyn-Smith, Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide, I am quite happy to have those claims investigated. I want to assist every citizen in this State as much as I can, including Mr Oram.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Put the pie cart at the end of the road.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is not a question, as the Hon. Mr Sumner should know, of where the pie cart should go.

The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw: Why can't it go under Anne Levy's window?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Hon. Miss Levy took some objection to that happening at some stage.

The Hon. Anne Levy: I did not—read *Hansard*.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not want to be unkind to the Hon. Miss Levy about this matter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister is wandering away from his answer to the question, and it is no wonder, since there are so many interjections.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The main problem, as I understand it, is Mr Oram's hours of business being restricted by the Adelaide City Council. Why honourable members should be interjecting and saying 'Put it here' or 'Put it there' I do not know, because it is his hours of business which are of concern. Mr Oram does not want the pie cart to go here, there or anywhere else; he wants it to stay—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Put it around the corner.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is not the point. At the moment, Mr Oram's hours of business are restricted and that is causing him great concern. I will look at this question in detail, as the Hon. Mr Foster has explained it, and bring back a report.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the interests of this State, of which the pie cart is a revered part, will the Minister make representations to the Adelaide City Council in a spirit of compromise that perhaps it should consider allowing Mr Oram to retain his present hours of trading, but should ask him to move the pie cart about 30 yards around the corner, so that the objections from the hotel directly opposite the railway station will be overcome, while the pie cart will still be within 20 to 30 yards of its present location directly up North Terrace in the small street alongside the railway station?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall pass that question on and do my best to assist.

IRAQI PROJECT

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Agriculture, about farmers employed on the Iraqi project.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Today's *Advertiser* contains a report on the progress of the South Australian project in Iraq. The end of that report states that the South Australian Department of Agriculture is presently seeking a South Australian farmer to join the project on a short-term assignment, for about 10 weeks, beginning in early October. Previously, when the South Australian Government has employed farmers on this project the salary levels offered have been quite inadequate. Farmers who are currently employed on the project get, I believe, salaries at levels that have changed little (even in money terms) from what they were paid on a project in Libya some three or four years ago. The department seems to be unwilling to pay South Australian farmers adequately for their practical skills. Will the Minister say what is the salary being offered for this 10-week assignment in Iraq, and how that salary compares with the salaries that would be offered to departmental staff if they were to undertake a similar short-term assignment?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

RUST-PROOFING

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister of Consumer Affairs a question about rust-proofing.

The PRESIDENT: Is leave granted?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In view of the confusion that currently exists amongst consumers and traders who offer rust-proofing services to the public, will the Minister say when the information standard under the Trade Standards Act to ensure that products used comply with specified standards and are applied in accordance with the standard of the Standards Association of Australia will be prescribed, as he indicated that they would be in answer to a question I asked last week?

What was the result of the discussion on this matter at the meeting of the Standing Committee on Consumer Affairs Ministers held on 20 August 1982, and the result of his recommendation that the question of the adoption of a uniform standard by the States be examined by the Commonwealth—States Consumer Products Advisory Committee? Finally, when is it likely that a set standard and accompanying regulations will be made public so that the current state of uncertainty in the industry can be cleared up?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I do not know that there is such a great deal of confusion, or state of uncertainty, because there is already a draft standard and the final standard is likely to be similar to it. I know that people object to being called on to act in accordance with draft standards. The standard is to be fixed by the Standards Association, not by me, the South Australian Government, or my department. I am advised that I can fix the information standard only by reference to a standard finalised and fixed by the recognised body. That is why I have proposed to act in this way—to fix the information standard by reference to the Standards Association standard when it is finalised.

There are in fact two standards: one as to product and one as to application. At the meeting of the Standing Committee of Ministers of Consumer Affairs last Friday it was agreed to request the Standards Association to expedite the finalisation of the standard and, as I understand it, the Chairman of that meeting will be writing to the Standards Association accordingly. In regard to uniform standards, it was agreed at the meeting that that matter be further exam-

ined. It was the first time in recent years that the question of rust-proofing had been raised at a Ministers' meeting.

O'BAHN BUSWAY

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Is the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, aware of the remarks of Mr Smith, Town Clerk of the Adelaide City Council, in response to an announcement by the Minister of Transport relating to the O'Bahn city terminal? Does the Minister or the Parliament have the right to determine the city terminals and transport routes? Has the Adelaide City Council the right of veto in respect of these matters? If so, what course is open to the Government to implement a Parliamentary decision?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer that question to the Minister of Transport and bring back a reply.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Health, a question concerning the childrens ward at the Mount Gambier Hospital.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: On 19 August 1982, I received a letter from Mrs Kathy Michaels, Secretary of the Australian Association for the Welfare of Children in Hospital. In that letter Mrs Michaels brought to my attention the fact that the association was concerned about the closure of the childrens ward at the Mount Gambier Hospital, which was located on the ground floor. Mrs Michaels said:

It must be stipulated that we opposed this relocation and deem it highly unsuitable for the reasons given in our letter.

That refers to the letter written to the Chief Executive Officer and the Medical Superintendent of the Mount Gambier Hospital. The letter continues:

We would very much appreciate your attention to this matter as we feel it is important to the emotional and mental welfare of the paediatric patients in the Mount Gambier Hospital.

In the letter written to both the Chief Executive Officer and the Medical Superintendent in Mount Gambier, the association says:

It has been heavily documented that most children are traumatised by hospitalisation. Although there are many ways to alleviate this traumatisation, one of the most important aspects is the environment. It was stated in the special supplement to *The Medical Journal of Australia* 9 August 1975 that 'the ward should be at ground level and include a playroom and outdoor play area for ambulant children . . . bright colours, ample light, play areas, appropriate furniture, etc., are all highly desirable. As the childrens ward on your ground floor [of the Mount Gambier Hospital] has been specifically designed for children, it is obvious that this need has already been acknowledged by your hospital'.

The letter goes on to detail the many problems associated with the closure of the ward on the ground floor. The letter continues:

We understand that the children are now alongside the coronary and intensive care units.

That is a fact. I have seen the very cramped and inadequate conditions under which the children are now—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Question! He's gone on long enough.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member has been asked to ask his question.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Is the Minister aware that it is widely recognised that children who are not bedridden or seriously ill are very much aware of what is going on in the environment around them? Is he aware that medical authorities in general and the Australian Association for the Welfare of Children in Hospital in particular are seriously questioning the suitability of the childrens access in these areas? The association also points out that it is healthy for children to make noise while playing.

Will the Minister of Health take urgent action to review the situation existing in the Mount Gambier Hospital, where the children are located quite inadequately and inappropriately adjacent to the intensive care and coronary units on the fourth floor of the hospital, while the childrens ward was built specifically for the purpose of children on the ground floor of the hospital where it has been in operation for 20 years?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: Order! In deference to the *Hansard* staff particularly, I ask that honourable members conduct their conversations more quietly, so that we can all hear the questions.

SMALL LOTTERIES

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Transport, a question about the tax on small lotteries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: A few minutes ago, the Minister of Community Welfare gave me an answer from the Minister of Health relating to the organisation Heartbeat. As members know, this organisation collects funds for the cardiothoracic unit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to enable the organisation to do its very good work in that hospital. Some time ago, the Heartbeat organisation contacted the Minister of Transport requesting that the tax payable on small lotteries for charitable purposes be waived by the Government, as it seemed a little silly for the Government to be collecting tax on a lottery, for example, run by Heartbeat, when that money was coming out of the proceeds of running a lottery, proceeds that were going to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, anyway.

Heartbeat was successful to a degree: the tax on small lotteries for charitable purposes has been abolished. A retrospective period of 28 days applies. So, from 1 September no tax is to be paid by these organisations, and this goes back 28 days. The Heartbeat organisation has just concluded a lottery which raised nearly \$17 000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital cardiothoracic surgical unit. The tax on that was \$954; unfortunately it was held 15 days outside of the period of grace granted by the legislation. Will the Minister consider waiving for a further 28-day period the tax to be paid on small lotteries for charitable purposes. Will the Attorney-General also ask the Minister of Health whether she can obtain information of exactly what subsidies are available for the Heartbeat organisation, and whether any (and, if so, what) conditions apply if these subsidies are granted?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: As the honourable member has said, there have been some quite substantial reviews of the stamp duty payable on small lotteries, and concessions have been granted. Unfortunately, with all of these matters

there has to be some date on which a concession comes into operation. There will always be people advantaged or disadvantaged, whatever the date one picks. Certainly the substance of the question raised by the honourable member will be made known to the Minister of Transport. If there is anything that can be done, I will bring back a reply and will identify that course of action. I must say that I would be surprised if any change could be accommodated because of the real difficulty in this area of the law (or any other) as to the date of operation of such concessions.

CANNING FRUIT INDUSTRY

The Hon. Frank Blevins, for the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice), asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Who prepared the South Australian Government submission to the Industries Assistance Commission Inquiry into the Canning Fruit Industry?

2. Was the submission endorsed by the Premier and Cabinet?

3. Did the submission state that the expected cannery losses for 1981 would be \$1 500 000 and for 1982 would be \$2 500 000?

4. Why are these figures substantially different to the figures provided for the same periods in answer to a Parliamentary question on 10 August 1982?

5. Has any action been taken to inform the Industries Assistance Commission that incorrect evidence has been put before it by the South Australian Government?

6. What are the penalties under the Act concerning the giving of false evidence under oath?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. Presumably, the submission referred to is that made in January 1982. This submission was jointly prepared by officers of the Departments of Agriculture and Trade and Industry.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. The submission stated that the estimated loss on fruit processing alone against F.I.S.C.C. prices before interest and depreciation was \$1 500 000 in 1981, and \$2 500 000 in 1982. In my reply, given on 10 August, I said 'at this stage it would appear that the loss (for 1981) will be of the order of \$6 600 000 including interest of \$3 500 000 and depreciation of \$700 000'. I also said that 'for the four months to 30 April 1982, before interest and depreciation, the loss on 1981-82 fruit processing alone was more than \$2 000 000'. Some simple arithmetic will show that the figures quoted from the submission and the figures given in my reply are quite consistent.

5. Not applicable.

6. There are no penalties specified in the Industries Assistance Commission Act.

The Hon. Frank Blevins, for the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice), asked the Attorney-General:

1. Was the Riverland cannery put up for sale by tender?

2. If so, when and by whom?

3. How many tenders were received?

4. Were further attempts made to sell this cannery?

5. If so, what were they?

6. What price was put on the cannery?

7. Did the Government or the receiver receive an inquiry from Marubeni?

8. If so, when?

9. With what results?

10. Is the Government still trying to sell the cannery?

11. If so, what steps are being taken?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. February 1981, by the receivers and managers.

3. None.

4. Yes.

5. The cannery was advertised nationally at a fixed price and approaches made to any body which may be interested.

6. \$2 250 000. This price was derived after an independent valuation of assets.

7. Yes.

8. December 1981.

9. None.

10. Yes.

11. Continuing discussions are being held by the receivers and Government with interested parties as inquiries are received. There is, however, no strong interest.

The Hon. Frank Blevins, for the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice), asked the Minister of Community Welfare:

1. Who prepared the answer to Parliamentary question of 10 August concerning losses of the Riverland cannery for 1981 and 1982?

2. Was the answer endorsed by the Premier and Cabinet?

3. Why are these figures substantially different from:

(a) evidence given on oath to the Industries Assistance Commission Inquiry into the Canning Fruits Industry?

(b) figures appearing on balance sheets of the Riverland cannery for 1981 and the period ending 30 April 1982?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The replies are as follows:

1. The answer was prepared by officers of the Department of Trade and Industry in consultation with the receivers and managers.

2. Irrelevant.

3. These figures are not substantially different from either the evidence given to the I.A.C. inquiry or those given in reply to the question of August 10. I have already dealt with the evidence given to the I.A.C. inquiry in my answer to an earlier question.

The Hon. Frank Blevins, for the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice), asked the Attorney-General:

1. Has the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative issued commercial bills to finance its operations?

2. If so, how many are still current?

3. What is the amount of each bill?

4. What is the term of each bill?

5. What is the effective interest rate on each bill?

6. What is the date of maturity of each bill?

7. Are the bills guaranteed and, if so, by whom?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes.

2. Ninety bills.

3. \$100 000.

4. Fifty bills at 90 days, 20 bills at 88 days, 20 bills at 30 days.

5. \$4 000 000 at 17.715 per cent per annum, \$3 000 000 at 17.965 per cent, and \$2 000 000 at 18.865 per cent.

6. This information is confidential as it could influence the daily rate for commercial bills.

7. The Government has given indemnities to the State Bank of South Australia.

The Hon. Frank Blevins, for the Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (on notice), asked the Attorney-General:

1. What is the salary of the General Manager of the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative?

2. What rate of tax is paid on this salary?

3. What allowances are paid to the General Manager?
4. Are these allowances taxable and, if so, at what rate?
5. What superannuation is paid and, if so, by whom?
6. What other benefits does the General Manager receive?
7. Are these included in his salary package for taxation purposes?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The replies are as follows:

1. Details of the General Manager's salary package are private and confidential and a matter for the receivers and managers. I do not know the details but, even if I did, I would not be prepared to disclose that information.

2. The General Manager would pay whatever rate of tax is relative to his net taxable income.
3. See 1.
4. See 2.
5. See 1.
6. See 1.
7. See 1.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 25 August at 2.15 p.m.