

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

Wednesday 8 November 1978

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. G. R. Langley) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY**

A petition signed by 33 electors of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility to adequately control pornographic material was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

**PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES**

Petitions signed by 264 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences were presented by Messrs. Tonkin, Keneally, and Allison.

Petitions received.

**PETITION: VOLUNTARY WORKERS**

A petition signed by 157 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to take action to protect and preserve the status of voluntary workers in the community was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

**PETITION: SUCCESSION AND GIFT DUTIES**

A petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to adopt a programme for the phasing out of succession and gift duties in South Australia as soon as possible was presented by Mr. Tonkin.

Petition received.

**PETITION: TOW-TRUCK OPERATORS**

A petition signed by 219 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject clauses 61 to 75 inclusive of the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Bill, 1978, which relate to the operations of tow-truck operators and crash repairers, was presented by Mr. Millhouse.

Petition received.

**QUESTIONS**

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

**PORT ADELAIDE BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION**

In reply to Mr. **OLSON** (25 October).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: The possible use of the LeFevre High School facilities by the Port Adelaide Basketball Association has been investigated by the Regional Director of Education. It would appear that the

association has not approached the Principal of the school requesting that he make available the facilities to them. However, the Regional Director has pointed out that at present the hall is used regularly on two nights a week by fitness groups and occasionally on Sundays. As the hall was designed as an assembly hall, its shape and features may make it difficult for use for basketball. I suggest that the association contact the Principal to discuss the matter in detail, to see whether there is any way of overcoming these problems.

**SOLAR ENERGY**

In reply to Mr. **OLSON** (17 October).

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD**: In the present design of school buildings followed by the Public Buildings Department, the utilisation of solar radiation as an energy source is considered during the development of new building structures, and the redevelopment of older structures whenever possible. However, the final decision on whether solar radiation can be used is to be made on the basis of the minimum total running costs, the availability of funds, and satisfactory integration of the selected scheme within the total building concept.

In 1975 a conference on Education/Energy/Economy developed recommendations for a joint Education Department/Public Buildings Department policy on energy conservation in school buildings. These recommendations have been followed in two schools which have been selected for pilot studies. For the Thebarton Community High School, a New South Wales consultant on low energy architecture was involved which resulted in such features as: white roofs, white walls, buildings well insulated, no windows east and west elevations, effective sunshading to north windows, earth berms (earth mound) to ground floor window sills (increased insulation, planting on berms reduces heat reflection to windows), extensive planting, solar walls in certain locations.

There will also be some mechanical air-conditioning as a "top-up" facility in extreme conditions. A similar procedure has been followed with the Campbelltown Junior Primary School with the provision for cooling to be installed if "comfort conditions" are not achieved in extreme summer heat. The performance of both buildings will be monitored by Public Buildings Department engineers. Arrangements are currently underway to undertake an "energy audit" at a series of schools to establish accurate data on high use aspects of Government school buildings. Solar energy is but one aspect of low energy buildings which is currently receiving consideration.

**PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS**

In reply to Mr. **SLATER** (26 October).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: A tender has been accepted for conversion of the zebra crossing on the North-East Road adjacent to Windsor Grove, Klemzig. It is anticipated that the work will be completed early in 1979.

**TAXI PLATES**

In reply to Mr. **SLATER** (12 October).

The **Hon. G. T. VIRGO**: The Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board is not considering a change in the present taxi plate system.

### PROSECUTING COSTS

In reply to **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (18 October, Appropriation Bill).

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** This line was originally opened to take the costs incurred in prosecutions of overloading, etc., offences under the Road Traffic Act. At that time, it was also anticipated that such costs would be recouped as offenders paid their fines. These receipts were paid into general revenue.

With the advent of the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, work by the Highways Department has increased very considerably and costs have consequently increased. The type of costs now being debited against the line are as under:

Local Court fees—The Highways Department is required to pay the statutory fees in all Local Court actions.

Cost of documents—Required in both Magistrates Court and Local Court actions.

Expenses of Crown witnesses—In many prosecutions it is necessary to bring inspectors and other witnesses from country centres to Adelaide.

Counsel fees—In some defended cases the department is required to pay counsel fees to the Crown Solicitor.

Costs awarded—Costs awarded against the department in cases lost where the department is the plaintiff.

Costs incurred in company windings-up—Any costs or liquidators' fees which are not covered by realisations in company liquidations.

Consideration is being given to the retitling of this line as it is no longer confined to "costs payable by prosecuting officers" in the strict sense. It should be noted that Local Court fees, counsel fees, costs of documents, and expenses of witnesses are all recouped when the defendants pay the fines, costs, and contributions ordered by the court. There is, therefore, an offsetting credit in Part II revenue against the costs payable by prosecuting officers. This estimate for 1978-79 is \$6 000.

### DEPUTY PREMIER'S BIRTHDAY

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I should like to wish the Deputy Premier a happy birthday.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier):** I thank the member for Hanson and all other members of the House for their good wishes on my 50th birthday. Many times I did not think I would make it, but I did.

### QUESTION TIME

#### NEAPTR

**Mr. TONKIN:** Will the Premier say whether the Government will now extend the time for lodging submissions on its environmental impact study beyond next Friday, to allow for full and adequate examination of the proposals in the light of the Clarke-Casey Report released this week? The Adelaide City Council decided to release the Clarke-Casey Report on NEAPTR last Monday—a most responsible decision—and an advertisement appears in today's press announcing that copies of the report are available to the public. The report contains a number of views contrary to those in the Government's report, and these should be considered carefully by the

community. They include marked reservations about the effects on the Torrens Valley, the park lands, and the city itself.

The present closing time for submissions is in three days, and the statements by the Minister of Transport yesterday indicate that he wants to close off discussions as soon as possible. Many people, including the Walkerville and St. Peters councils, believe that NEAPTR has been an expensive and protracted public relations exercise, and that there can be no justification for a rapid closing off of discussion at this stage, when an important but adverse report has just been released.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** There is no need for further time for submissions in this matter. The City Council has had ample time to make its submission, and has made it. Indeed, now that its submission is in, I understand from the Minister that, in discussion with the Deputy Lord Mayor, the City Council is not now seeking a further extension of time because its submission has already been made, and the Government has said that it will take those matters into account, and that there will be discussions with the City Council concerning them.

**Mr. Tonkin:** What about other members of the community?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Leader has asked his question.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** They have had ample opportunity to make submissions. It is not the Government's fault that the Clarke-Casey Report took so long to be released: that was not in our hands at all. In actual fact, of course, a draft submission was made to the Government upon which we made a reply, and Messrs. Clarke and Casey promptly asked for an opportunity to rewrite their report. Given the material that was in their original report, that was not very surprising because it was absolutely chock-full of mistakes. In consequence, they took further time and have written a very different kind of report from their original draft. If the honourable member bothers to compare what has now been released by the City Council with the draft that was published in the *Advertiser*, he will see that fact. We will be responding to the City Council's submission.

In relation to St. Peters and Walkerville councils, they have made submissions and I have responded to them. They have been directly to me, and they have had direct responses from the Government. As to the St. Peters council suggesting that there should be further time for public comment, that is not what has been sought by residents in St. Peters, because the St. Peters and Joslin residents urged at the public meeting called by the St. Peters council that a final decision in these matters be made as soon as possible, and beseeched me that there be no long delay because they wanted certainty as to what the future was, and they said that they were being harmed by indecision in the matter.

I do not believe that it assists those people, and they certainly do not believe it assists them, to have constant extensions of time to make submissions. There has been ample opportunity for public submission. The City Council has made its submission. The St. Peters council and the Walkerville council have both made submissions to me to which I have replied, and I have given them information that has been in their hands now for weeks. In consequence, the Government sees no good purpose being served in extending the time for submissions. When all submissions are in, they will be examined and discussed. It is not difficult for us to proceed to meaningful discussion with people on the submissions before a final decision is made.

## REAL ESTATE

**Mr. GROOM:** Can the Attorney-General say what action he will take to strengthen the power of the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs by enabling investigations of real estate transactions in appropriate cases? Members will no doubt recall an incident reported in the *Advertiser* on 28 October. A number of Salisbury home buyers wrote mortgage payment cheques on plastic bags, mattresses and lavatory pans as a protest against the sales methods of Hollandia Homes. I understand that the Commissioner has been receiving complaints about companies in the Hollandia Group since 1973, and, although some assistance was given, much more could have been done if there had been authority to do it. Some people now in difficulties might not have been in that situation if the Commissioner had power to investigate such real estate transactions.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Government is concerned about the matters that the honourable member has raised, and I again state that the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, under the Prices Act, has no powers to investigate or receive complaints in relation to matters concerning land or real estate. I know that Opposition members, and certainly members of the Liberal Party in another place, in the past have claimed that the Commissioner has appropriate powers to deal with these matters, or that there are appropriate powers to deal with them under the Land and Business Agents Act.

That is not the case. The fact that the people to whom the honourable member has referred have received some assistance from the Commissioner is simply because he believes that, in his overall responsibility to consumers in this State, he has some obligation to ensure that people who complain to him about matters which clearly are, broadly, consumer complaints can have their complaints at least dealt with by him, even though he is unable to act or seek a remedy for them pursuant to any legislation. He does this partly as a result of the Government's policy that we should do this and partly out of concern to ensure that people who go with complaints to him are not turned away on what would be seen by them to be a mere technicality.

The fundamental point still exists: the Commissioner has no legal or legislative powers to investigate complaints dealing with real estate or transactions in respect of land. If that fact was widely known, the people of the State would be amazed by it, because people basically believe that any consumer matter can be taken to the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, and that is the way it ought to be. Many complaints concerning real estate and land have gone to the Commissioner and to other agencies throughout the community over the past few years. I am sure that most members, through their electorate offices, have received complaints from people about the way in which they have been treated or about other aspects of transactions they have entered into concerning land.

I think it absolutely vital that the Commissioner have power to be able to deal with complaints associated with real estate and land. Many members will be aware of the people who were savagely affected in their personal lives and the way in which they conducted their business, because of the collapse of the Amadio group. In other instances, contracts dealing with land have collapsed. Such people have been left without any remedy and, further, have been left without any Government agency to which they could properly complain about the matter. That appalling situation needs to be changed.

The Government has tried on three or four occasions to remove this anomaly, but on each occasion the Liberal Party majority in the Upper House has rejected the

legislation. Those members should be roundly condemned for that action, and I hope that, when I introduce the new prices legislation in a day or so, and it has been dealt with by this House and goes to another place, it will receive a much more sympathetic hearing on this occasion, a hearing that is due to it, considering the problems that confront many citizens in the community who have had difficulty in their dealings with land and real estate.

## NEAPTR

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** Can the Premier say what deficit increase is expected to be incurred as a result of building the l.r.t. system to the north-east suburbs? The Clarke-Casey Report refers to the cost of the system. It estimates the use of the system and the revenue it is likely to generate, and indicates that there would be a considerable increase in the State Transport Authority's deficit.

*The Hon. G. T. Virgo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister is out of order.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** At page 32, the Clarke-Casey Report states:

The currently proposed overall public transport system for the north-east area, based on the l.r.t., would tie up total capital funds of \$112 600 000 (estimated in 1977 dollars with no allowance for inflation) . . . The annual cost of having this capital tied up, at 10 per cent, would be \$11 300 000 a year. The annual costs of operating and maintaining the system (with one man l.r.t. operation) was estimated in 1977 at \$13 600 000.

On page 33, after discussing the likely revenue to be generated, the report states:

On the face of it, this appears to indicate that the system would increase the S.T.A. operating losses by between \$2 700 000 and \$5 300 000 a year and still leave the annual cost of capital of \$11 300 000 a year to be written off in Government accounts.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will have to refer to papers other than I have here to give the honourable member a specific answer about the amount of prospective added deficit from an l.r.t. system. I point out to the honourable member that any major extension of the public transport system will involve the State in additional deficits. The public transport system of Adelaide runs on a subsidy basis. There is no way today of running an effective public transport system in Adelaide, or in any other major capital city, without a subsidy. In these circumstances, of course, there will be an added deficit from a major extension to the public transport system; that follows very simply.

**Mr. Goldsworthy:** How much?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has asked his question.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I have told the honourable member that I do not have the specific figures with me at the moment; I will get him an answer on that point. I point out to the Deputy Leader that the studies showed that the l.r.t. system would result in a lower added deficit than would any other feasible alternative.

**Mr. WILSON:** As the Premier has said today that no extension of the public participation phase of the NEAPTR l.r.t. proposal will be granted, thus stifling further public discussion, will he clarify whether Cabinet has decided that an l.r.t. system to Modbury will be built along the Torrens Valley subject to the final e.i.s., or has no decision been made? Some months ago, during the absence overseas of the Minister of Transport, the Minister for Planning announced in the press that Cabinet

had decided to build an l.r.t. system along the Torrens Valley, yet in answer to questions this week, and the week before last, the Minister of Transport has said at least twice that no decision has yet been made.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Cabinet was called on to make a decision as to the proposal it would put forward about transport for the north-east of Adelaide. That decision had to be made in order for an e.i.s. to be prepared. You cannot proceed to have an e.i.s. without a proposal. That was the decision to which the Minister for Planning referred. Inevitably, it is subject to consideration after the e.i.s. and the discussions on it come forward for further consideration by Cabinet; only then will a final decision be made.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** Does the Premier realise that in a recent circular to his constituents he provided what appears to be misleading information when drawing a comparison between the Government's proposed l.r.t. system to Modbury and the Northfield rail extension? I appreciate there have been numerous questions on this subject and it is in that area of conflict that I am most concerned. In a copy of the circular letter that the Premier sent to his constituents recently, in reply to the question, "Why is the extension of the Northfield railway line not a more attractive alternative?", the Premier said:

The Northfield rail line extension only caters for 14 000 of the 33 000 daily trips provided by the tramway.

The conflict has arisen between that claim in the circular and the claim in the Clarke-Casey Report on pages 45, 46, 61 and, in particular, paragraph B1 on page 74, where the consultants violently disagree with the subject material outlined in the circular from the Premier to his constituents.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I do not believe my information was misleading in any way.

#### NORTH HAVEN

**Mr. OLSON:** Will the Minister of Marine investigate the possibility of establishing greater security for boat owners using the public ramp at North Haven? Since 13 October there have been thefts of wheels from trailers, and eight winches have been stolen during the past three weeks. These thefts have been substantiated by the police. Owners have suggested that the installation of a public phone at the boat ramp might minimise the incidence of theft.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will certainly have the matter investigated and let the honourable member have a report as soon as possible.

#### LAND TAX

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** Will the Premier immediately examine the very large increases in some land tax accounts for the current financial year and, if necessary, withdraw all current accounts and reduce the taxing rate in the dollar? Owing to a change in the equalisation factor for the Burnside council area, all land values have been increased by 22 per cent, even though there have been no new valuations within the Burnside council area this year. For a typical small suburban block, the land tax went from \$57 up to \$79, an increase of 38 per cent for one year.

The land tax charged one elderly lady increased from \$1 005 last year to \$1 966 this year. A resident of Crafers with land in the hills face zone that cannot be subdivided (therefore he cannot sell part of the land, perhaps, in an effort to reduce land tax) had his land tax increased by 70

per cent to \$1 231, a sum representing 10 per cent of his income. I am sure the Premier can appreciate the financial hardship that is causing.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not want the honourable member to comment.

**Mr. DEAN BROWN:** In light of these large increases in land tax (the 38 per cent in Burnside is representative of the whole area and does not relate to the revaluation of only one property) in a period when Governments throughout Australia are looking at restraint and trying to reduce the inflation rate, will the Government look into this matter?

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** I will examine the particular cases to which the honourable member has referred. The honourable member will be aware that over a period of time the Government has endeavoured to reduce the effective take in land tax in real terms. We cannot continue to do that in the financial stringency of this year. In actual fact there will have to be some increased return from land tax this year, as was made clear in the Budget. They will not be enormous increases in proportion, but those necessary to cover the costs with which the Government is faced in providing services. As in particular cases of hardship we have always been concerned to examine matters, I will have a look at the matters raised by the honourable member.

#### YEAR OF THE CHILD

**Mrs. BYRNE:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare give a progress report on preparations for next year's celebrations of the International Year of the Child?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member, who has had a long involvement with the welfare of children since she came into this House, was kind enough to inform me of her desire to have this information, so I am able to bring to the House a full report. Preparations are now at an advanced stage, and a very comprehensive calendar of events is taking shape for next year. A feature of the calendar is that each month of 1979 will be given a theme from the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child. On 21 November this year, the United Nations special representative for I.Y.C. (Dr. Aldaba-Lim) will be visiting Adelaide to help publicise next year's activities and to meet members of the State's committee of children. South Australia is the only State that has so far set up a committee of children to ensure that next year's activities are not run entirely by adults, thus losing identity with children, for whom the year has been set aside.

Applications have been called for I.Y.C. grants to help local community groups arrange projects for next year and so far 15 have been received, with many more expected. A major effort is under way to involve local government in next year's activities. I am pleased to say we have received an excellent response from local government. A meeting with representatives of all metropolitan councils will be held next Tuesday. This will be followed by a further series of meetings.

Meetings are also planned shortly with representatives of business and industry, seeking their involvement in projects for I.Y.C.

I hope businesses and industry in South Australia will help with sponsorship and in some cases with finance further to expand the activities which will be carried out next year in relation to I.Y.C. The State Steering Committee for I.Y.C. will hold its fifth meeting early in December, and the committee of children will meet for the third time on 21 November. I have given a brief outline to show members that South Australia is well advanced in

this area, and our preparations are such that we look forward to an excellent continuing series of functions and celebrations throughout 1979 to publicise the International Year of the Child.

#### CITRUS INDUSTRY REPORT

**Mr. ARNOLD:** Can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government has considered the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Citrus Industry, which was presented some time ago to the Minister of Agriculture, and whether it will now be tabled for the benefit of all concerned in the industry? About two weeks ago, when I raised this matter in the House with the Minister, he indicated that he would discuss it with the Minister of Agriculture. Since this report is of great concern to the growers and to the industry, its tabling is eagerly awaited.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I think I recall mentioning, at the time the honourable member asked the question, that the report had not then been referred to Cabinet. It was referred to Cabinet on Monday, and the Minister of Agriculture has been given authority to release the report publicly. When he will do that I am not certain.

#### COOLING-OFF PERIOD

**Mr. DRURY:** Can the Attorney-General say whether amendments proposed to the Land and Business Agents Act include an extension of the cooling-off period for real estate contracts? Like several other members in this House, I have been approached by constituents regarding low-deposit package real estate deals, which have caused them great problems. One of the things they have found hard to contend with is that the cooling-off period is only two days, and they believe that that is not long enough to have the contract checked. I believe the cooling-off period should be extended.

**Mr. Becker:** Why doesn't he wait until the Bill comes in?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Hanson is out of order.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The short answer is "No". If they waited to hear the answer, honourable members opposite would find that the substance of the question was not about a matter to be dealt with by any Bill to come before the House. The Government's intention is shortly to introduce amendments to the Land and Business Agents Act to deal with a large range of matters concerned with that piece of legislation, matters which have come to notice both as a result of complaints to the Government and of representations by the various industry groupings since that Act has been in existence. One matter on which there have been many submissions is the cooling-off period. We have given some consideration to the need to extend the period, and we have also considered extending the benefit of the cooling-off period to various other people in the community who at present are denied its benefit, such as solicitors, land brokers, and other people who do not have that benefit.

**Mr. Millhouse:** They don't need your help.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It is not so much that they need the help. The honourable member should realise that much of the information that even a solicitor would need to be able to satisfy himself as to a contract for something as important as land is not available on Saturdays and Sundays. Consequently, there is quite a good argument for

saying that these people should have the benefit of any cooling-off period, in the same way as do other groups in the community.

**Mr. Millhouse:** When you say that, you overlook the Acts Interpretation Act.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not going to hold a debate with the member for Mitcham in Question Time.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I ask the honourable Attorney-General to answer the question.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** That is what I intend to do, Sir. It is the Government's view that in that particular aspect we will be extending the availability of the cooling-off period. However, I am not convinced that there is a strong argument in favour of extending the period itself. South Australia was the first State to introduce a cooling-off period and, I think last year, New South Wales introduced a cooling-off period. It is not a universal practice in Australia to have a cooling-off period. It has been of enormous benefit to consumers in this State purchasing real estate. I believe that it has worked very satisfactorily. The submissions that the Government has had on this matter indicate that the cooling-off period of two days has worked quite well. Certainly, to my knowledge, there have not been any complaints from people who have found that the two-day period has not been long enough. There have no doubt been people who would have preferred to have a longer period, for convenience sake, but I have not run across anyone who has said that he was unable to receive the necessary advice and information he required within the two-day period. At this stage, the Government does not intend to extend the cooling-off period.

#### BUSES

**Mr. BECKER:** I wished to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, but in his temporary absence I will address it to the Minister of Works. What action can the State Transport Authority take to ensure that students travelling on public transport do not inconvenience passengers? I received from a constituent a few days ago a letter which is similar to other complaints I have had on the subject in which it is stated:

It is very apparent that the whole business of seating on S.T.A. buses is out of control. Schoolchildren and students who travel at concession rates occupy seats, and sometimes the schoolbag or brief case occupy a seat also to the exclusion of full fare paying passengers. Vehicle operators are not in a position to do very much; they cannot be expected to do so. Will you please pass on to the Minister my comments, and please do not, repeat do not, be put off by his statement that he is aware of the problem. That is a brush off!

I think that typifies—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is commenting.

**Mr. BECKER:** It is similar to the comments that I have received from other constituents. This person came from Fulham, and I think it is appropriate for me to raise the matter. I ask the Minister who is representing the Minister for Transport to look into this problem.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I thought that the Minister would be back by now. I am sure that he is aware of the problem. I will ask him to examine the member's question to see whether or not something can be done. I am sure that the honourable member and his constituent would appreciate the great difficulty that one would have in controlling this situation, which is not capable of easy

solution. I will ask the Minister to examine the question and to give the honourable member a report later.

### WATER

**Mr. WOTTON:** Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government is concerned about the extremely dangerous level of chloro-organic substances known as tri-halo-methanes, which are present in Adelaide's drinking water, and the effect that such substances have on public health? Also, can the Minister say what work is being carried out by the Government to study and assess the presence of these chloro-organic substances in Adelaide's drinking water?

In answer to a question that I asked in this House on 12 September, the Minister stated that the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline water had been assessed by the E. & W.S. Department between 1973 and 1977 to contain 208 micrograms per litre of tri-halo-methanes. In an article entitled "Organic compounds in drinking water, and public health" which appeared in a British publication of the Institute of Water Engineers and Scientists, vol. 31, September 1971, and which was reprinted in the *Ecologists Quarterly*, in summer this year, these substances are described as "potentially hazardous". We are told that apparently they are formed during water treatment and do not depend on source pollution. The practice of chlorinating drinking water appears to be responsible for their presence, according to this article.

Their carcinogenic and mutagenic properties are at present being closely studied in the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. The Environmental Protection Agency in the U.S.A. has set the maximum acceptable level for tri-halo-methanes at 100 parts per billion (micrograms per litre). That standard is referred to in a paper entitled 'Chlorinated Hydrocarbons in the Lower Fox River of Wisconsin', prepared by the Natural Resources Department, State of Wisconsin. This paper investigates the widespread use of chlorine by paper mills and waste water treatment plants situated along the Fox River in Wisconsin. It concludes by saying:

"The dangers of toxic water pollutants are surfacing as our analytical capability improves and our understanding of the environment's subtle effects increases. There is no doubt that chloro-organics are formed by chlorination processes and that chloro-organics can be detrimental to health and ecology."

In view of these recent studies and the implications, will the Minister treat as a matter of extreme urgency the fact that the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline water has been assessed as having more than twice the maximum acceptable level of tri-halo-methanes, according to the E.P.A. in the U.S.A.?

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

### FISHING LICENCES

**Mr. BLACKER:** Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Fisheries whether, apart from natural attrition, the Government intends to take any further action to reduce the number of licensed fishermen in South Australia and, if it does, what action is proposed? Yesterday, I received a reply to a Question on Notice that indicated only two of the 446 class A licence holders had voluntarily relinquished their licences, and of the class B licence holders only five of the 378 had handed in their licence. Further, one B class fisherman failed to apply for

a renewal. This means that, of the total of 824 licence holders, there was a net reduction of only eight, or less than 1 per cent. If the present rate of reduction that applies to the class B fishing industry continues, it will take 63 years to phase out and restructure the present class A and class B licence systems.

**The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN:** I will consult my colleague and obtain a report for the honourable member.

### COURT HEARINGS

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I wish to ask a question of the Attorney-General, and not have a debate with him.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope that the honourable member will ask his question.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I hope the honourable member will do that.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I am about to ask my question. Will the Government now have additional permanent accommodation for criminal courts provided for the Supreme Court? My question is supplementary to one that was asked yesterday by the member for Todd, I think, concerning remarks made by Mr. Justice Sangster. I have now seen a transcript of those remarks, and I desire to quote just a few sentences from them to make clear the meaning of my question. In speaking on Monday in the Criminal Court, on what was known as arraignment day, His Honour referred to the difficulties of his list for November and said:

The most obvious feature is the lack of courtrooms. Indeed, the courtroom in which we are now is currently available to me only until lunch time, and if today's proceedings extend beyond lunch time I shall have to find somewhere else to sit after lunch and advise those concerned accordingly.

He went on to say:

In certain circumstances there will literally be no courtroom in which any trial from the November calendar may take place . . . I regret that this state of affairs will not enable me, even with the assistance of at first one and then two further judges, to make any real inroads into the long calendar of cases for November. There are 80-odd cases, less those who plead guilty, but most of them are expected to plead not guilty.

Having canvassed the question of shifts and legal aid (and I think this is the most important point) he said:

Prisoners in gaol are not just numbers on a sheet of paper; they are people and, quite frankly, I am appalled at the idea of a man spending half a year awaiting the disposal of a case from the date of his arrest to the date of trial.

I have drawn attention to this matter before and stressed the urgency of providing further accommodation. Temporary accommodation has been provided over the road from the Supreme Court in the Magistrates Court (at a cost of about \$10 000, I believe). It is obvious from what His Honour said, and from what others have said, that permanent accommodation for Supreme Court criminal trials is urgently required; otherwise, the criminal list will simply go on getting longer month by month. I therefore put my question directly to the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I thank the honourable member for putting the question to me directly. I will answer him in the same direct manner. The situation is approximately as set out in the remarks Mr. Justice Sangster made on arraignment day, which was on Monday last. The Government is aware of the difficulties and has been aware of them for some time, as the honourable member knows. It has made arrangements to provide jury

accommodation in the I.A.C. Building further down King William Street, and I understand it is expected that that accommodation will be available in April.

That will make a further court available for the Local and District Criminal Court and at that time the Supreme Court will be given an opportunity to use the main criminal courtroom of the Local and District Criminal Court (which is known as No. 12). That will mean that the Supreme Court will have four courtrooms available to it which are equipped with jury boxes: Nos. 2, 3, and 12, which have security facilities.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Will there be security in the I.A.C.?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member has asked his question; he mentioned that he would not debate the matter with the Attorney-General.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Also available will be courtroom No. 1 in the Supreme Court, which does not have fully adequate security facilities. That makes it possible at that stage for four criminal courts to sit permanently without interfering with the business of other courts, which should provide at least a temporary respite from the present difficulties. I cannot at the moment say what is planned further into the future, because final decisions have not been made. As the honourable member knows, planning has been proceeding for a number of years for the building of a new Supreme Court building known as the western court building.

**Mr. Millhouse:** We initiated that when I was Attorney-General, but you scrapped it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think I have already called the honourable member to order. If I have not, I do so now. If he continues in this vein I will warn him.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** It is not correct to say that this Government has scrapped the plans for the western court building. It has not yet been able to find the funds to construct that building, but it is still very much under consideration by the Government. As soon as funds are available, I have no doubt that that matter will receive some priority.

The other suggestion made by Mr. Justice Sangster was that criminal trials (and he was referring particularly, of course, to the Supreme Court) should be heard one in the morning and one in the afternoon. As I pointed out yesterday, I believe that suggestion has some merit, and I have raised it previously. I think it needs to be carefully considered, and I can tell the honourable member that the Government is doing that. However, it will not be able to introduce any such modified system overnight.

A large number of arrangements will need to be made in advance so that proper procedures can be followed, appropriate staff will be available, and the necessary industrial arrangements and the thousand and one other details can be tidied up. These matters are being looked at, and I am hopeful that we will be able to make some decisions about rearrangements of this type in due course.

It is not a matter that I would want to run into without having thorough consultations and discussions with all of the people concerned, and certainly the Government will be doing nothing until I have had the opportunity to discuss the matter with the new Chief Justice. Even if the court is in favour, I am sure that it would be anxious to ensure that consultations had taken place with the Law Society, prison officers and the various other groups that will be affected by any changes.

#### SAMCOR

**Mr. RODDA:** Can the Premier say whether the Government proposes to give any special assistance in

relation to the servicing of the Samcor deficit, which was announced in its 1978 report? Concern is felt in the community at the size of this deficit. I do not know whether the public is aware of the restructuring that has taken place at Samcor in recent times, but at this early stage I believe it is proving to be a benefit to the industry. However, the works could face continuing problems with the servicing of such a big deficit, and it is therefore an important area of concern to the people of this State and to the rural industry. Last week calls were made to improve employment opportunities in this State, so I would like the Premier to inform the House of the proposals his Government has to ensure that there will not be any strictures on the progress that has been evident from the restructuring.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** Naturally, the Government is concerned about the size of the deficit which has occurred at Samcor. We are faced with a continued demand from the rural sector of South Australia, and there have been constant demands by members opposite (I have a table of them which extends over many years), by the United Farmers and Graziers and the Stockowners Association for an expansion of capacity at Samcor so that we would have sufficient capacity to deal with the peak level kill in a period where it was claimed that stock quantities were expanding in this State. In these circumstances, an increased capacity has been built up at Samcor that many people in the rural industry do not find any necessity to use if there is a more attractive proposition anywhere else at any stage of the proceedings.

In addition to this in the last period, the drought affected Samcor very severely because of the reduction in stock availability and the competition from other abattoirs for available stock. Also, the live sheep dispute lost Samcor about 14 000 man-hours through labour losses at the abattoirs, and 59 000 man-hours was lost through the withdrawal of stock from the abattoirs by stockowners. All of these things have contributed to a severe situation at Samcor.

Naturally enough, the Government cannot continue to support heavy losses at Samcor. If, in fact, the situation for the future is that we are to maintain a large export standard killing works for the service of the rural community in South Australia, we will have to make arrangements to ensure that that killing works is operating reasonably and that the taxpayers of the State are not paying a heavy subsidy to maintain a peak capacity works which is only from time to time used to that peak capacity. We may have to contemplate something of the kind that has already occurred in Western Australia.

Naturally, we are concerned about this. The metropolitan abattoirs was forced upon the Government of this State in the early part of this century upon the failure of the previously privately-owned works, and the rural community demanded that the community should provide a facility. It has done so, but it must not be forced into doing so to an unlimited extent of drawing upon taxpayers' funds. In consequence, I can assure the honourable member that, while we want to maintain a service to the rural industry, we also want to see that that bears some sensible relationship to the economics of that industry. In consequence, we will be having a hard look at further measures which may be taken in relation to Samcor.

#### ATOMIC WASTE

**Mr. WHITTEN:** Has the Premier received any assurance from the Commonwealth Government concerning the atomic wastes that are stored at Maralinga,



particularly about whether the potentially dangerous plutonium will be removed to Lucas Heights or repatriated to the United Kingdom? About one month ago I asked the Premier whether the Federal Government had kept the State Government informed on the situation relating to plutonium waste at Maralinga. The Premier said:

Naturally enough, we have inquired into—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is out of order. There is already a Question on Notice concerning this matter.

#### FIRE HAZARD

**Mr. VENNING:** Can the Minister of Transport say what action has been taken to defuse the fire hazard along railway lines in South Australia following the good season? I have been approached by landowners in the area between Caltowie and Gladstone who are concerned because fires have already occurred in that area. I have been in touch with the people at Peterborough. I believe that that section of line is receiving attention, and co-operation is being sought from the landowners and the Country Fire Services to do something about that area. As the fire hazard throughout the State is great, can the Minister say what is happening in this regard?

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO:** I did not realise that relationships between the honourable member and his erstwhile friend, the Federal Minister, Mr. Nixon, were at such a low ebb that he could not direct that question to him. I will direct the question to Mr. Nixon and, when I get a reply from the Minister, I will let the honourable member have it.

#### BELTANA POWER SUPPLY

**Mr. GUNN:** Can the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Electricity Trust of South Australia has plans to extend the 240-volt power supply to the Beltana area? The Minister will know that power lines go close to the old township of Beltana. Activity has started in that area, and in particular one person has spent a considerable sum renovating the old hotel. On 21 September the Hon. Mr. Foster asked a question in another place in the explanation of which he referred to a previous survey which was supposed to have been carried out in that area.

I have been contacted by responsible organisations and local residents in the area claiming that the information given by Mr. Foster is totally incorrect. It does not represent the views of the people in the area and was basically only the view of a former A.L.P. secretary, Mr. Hull. Will the Minister undertake that everything will be done to supply power to the properties of local landowners and those people in the town who wish to have it connected, and to exclude any person who does not require power?

**The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:** On behalf of the family of the late Mr. Hull, I wish to express some slight resentment at the attitude the honourable member has adopted in asking this question. I think any member of this House who is aware of what has happened at Beltana and the influence Mr. Hull and his family have had in that area in achieving preservation would appreciate a view expressed by Mr. Hull in relation to an environmental matter. While it might not necessarily be one with which one would agree, it is certainly worth listening to. To suggest that his views should be dismissed in the manner suggested by the honourable member I do not think it is appropriate. I certainly would not want to be associated with that in any

circumstances.

The matter involved in this question has been examined by the Electricity Trust, and I am waiting for further information to be obtained from the Minister for the Environment. When that information is available, it will be possible to obtain a detailed reply.

#### DRY LAND FARMING

**Dr. EASTICK:** Can the Premier say whether, in the provision of consultancy services to the dry land farming development in the Mediterranean area, care is being exercised to prevent costly duplication of already existing services? Having regard to the importance of export earnings from our established tertiary services, will the Premier provide at the earliest opportunity a full report of the arrangements which have been or are being negotiated for that area?

The Premier has said many times that it is important for us to make use of tertiary exportable potential which has been made available in the Mediterranean area. For some time, a consortium of private companies and Government services has been operating in the area. I believe a situation arose which broke up that consortium and that the total service will be provided by Government departments. It is along these lines that I seek information from the Premier and also having regard to the fact that the international students arrangement which currently exists at Roseworthy Agricultural College and which is integrated with this whole activity is an important one that I believe we should maintain in South Australia for as long as possible.

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:** The honourable member may be referring to a position which has arisen in relation to the Ksar Chellala project, where one private group of the consortium chose to withdraw from the proposals at a crucial stage when we were close to finality in the matter. That, of course, was embarrassing to the Government, and was regretted. The leader of the group endeavoured to put conditions on our use of Government services which I think are quite inappropriate and which he had never been assured would be the case. It left the Government in a position of having no alternative but to honour our arrangements by providing the services departmentally. That is not a situation which the Government sought in any way, but one which was forced on it. It is not the situation in relation to the Libyan arrangements, nor indeed in relation to any of the other arrangements that we had. So successful have been our negotiations in this area that the Deputy Prime Minister approached me on Monday to extend our operations in this field with the support of the Federal Government. I will get a report for the honourable member. There is no intention of interfering in any way with the international studentships.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BELTANA ELECTRICITY

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member seeks leave. Before he speaks, I must say that I have looked back at the personal explanations made during this session. I have found that, in most cases, they have been out of order. I have been very lenient. If the honourable member moves



away from making a personal explanation, I shall withdraw his leave.

Leave granted.

**Mr. GUNN:** During his reply to a question I asked concerning 240-volt power at Beltana, the Minister of Mines and Energy implied that I had cast a reflection upon an individual. In no way did I attempt, directly or indirectly, to reflect on the person mentioned by the Minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! During the course of his question, the honourable member did mention a person.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that a personal explanation is in order when a member believes that he has been misrepresented. Obviously, the member for Eyre believes that he was misrepresented today by the Minister of Mines and Energy; equally obviously, he is seeking to show the House that in fact he was misrepresented.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. I know that, during the course of his question, the honourable member mentioned a certain person's name. I urge him to stick rigidly to his personal explanation.

**Mr. GUNN:** The Minister, in the course of his reply, implied that I had reflected on a person, and that is grossly misrepresenting the matter as I raised it in the House. I want to indicate clearly that what I did was to inform the House of the present opinion of the residents of Beltana. In no way did I reflect on an individual.

*At 3.13 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

**The SPEAKER:** Call on the business of the day.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **OLD ANGASTON CEMETERY (VESTING) BILL**

Consideration of report of Select Committee.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 920.)

**The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer)** moved:

That the report be noted.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** I want to speak briefly to this motion, because it was at my request some two or three years ago that the Premier and the Government introduced the Bill. I want to read into the record a short segment of the evidence put before the Select Committee by one of the witnesses, the Rev. Mr. Kummerow, from Angaston, because it gives some interesting history of the background of the cemetery of which I think members would be unaware. I do not intend to read all the evidence, but merely some extracts. The Rev. Mr. Kummerow referred to the fact that one of the police constables had searched in the council chambers the records of the old Angaston cemetery. He said:

While compiling this brief history I came across work in the council chambers that had been performed by Constable Bart Ronald in searching out all the details of this property, which had fallen into disrepair and was a scandal in the town. His evidence continued:

I had this to say in that article:

Burial grounds are one of the most important parts of

the history of any people. This applies no less to the early history of Angaston. Whilst the site may have fallen into neglect over the years, it is fortunate that it has not been forgotten and that a number of people have interested themselves in it.

Tucked away behind the business and commerce of Murray Street, off Hannay Crescent, is the old original Angaston Cemetery. An excellent collection of well-kept records is available at the Angaston Council Chambers and State archives for historical research. A public meeting was held in Angaston on Thursday 4 May 1847, to consider establishing a cemetery.

He goes on to describe the establishment of the cemetery, and then makes the following statement:

The costs of interment were set later in the year at £1—6/8 to the sexton; 6/8 to the officiating minister, and 6/8 to the trustees. The cemetery was used until 5 October 1869, by which time 223 burials were recorded. Records showed that there was, at the beginning, considerable interest in the cemetery, but it gradually faded away and died.

The witness then stated:

My interest was aroused because they were all pioneers of the Angaston district. They were not of the German stock but were mainly Cornishmen.

That fact would not be widely known. The Barossa Valley has been settled in the main by German settlers, and we associate Cornish migrants particularly with the mining areas.

**The Hon. D. A. Dunstan:** I assure you they're everywhere.

**Mr. GOLDSWORTHY:** I realise that they spread everywhere and were fairly prolific in the life of South Australia; they have been fairly influential, as have the German migrants. I thought it was a point of interest that the cemetery had been used largely to bury people of Cornish extraction. The evidence continued:

Of the number buried there, 66 were under one year old and 128 under 10 years old, evidence of the high infant mortality rate and the hard conditions under which people lived.

It concludes:

In recent years there have been moves to restore and preserve this "pioneer plot".

That gives the background in brief of this site, which is of considerable historic importance. The Premier from time to time boasts of Cornish extraction, and the Leader of the Opposition and I can do likewise. I believe it is of interest that the cemetery is the resting place of many people who migrated from Cornwall, in the first instance migrating to Angaston. I support the Bill. Its provisions will help to preserve some important history in South Australia, the sort of activity we should encourage.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### **SPICER COTTAGES TRUST BILL**

Consideration of report of Select Committee.  
(Continued from 14 September. Page 920.)

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General)** moved:  
That the report be noted.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg):** I support the Bill. It updates the existing Act, enabling the trust to demolish, upgrade and mortgage property. The original Spicer declaration was made in 1870, and it laid down a rent of 3s. a week. The situation now is quite unreal. Some cottages that still exist are on large areas of land. It is intended to demolish

them and erect a greater number of buildings in their stead. I am pleased that the trust will remain intact and fully independent. I have no hesitation in supporting the Bill.

Motion carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 26 October. Page 1746.)

**Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra):** This is a very comprehensive Bill. I intended to deal with it at some length before, at the appropriate time, seeking to amend those parts of the Bill that the Opposition cannot support in their present form. I have spoken briefly to the Minister about this subject, and I think that he understands the course we intend to take. The Minister and his staff have demonstrated in this Bill's presentation that they have been working on it for a long time (I think they described the exercise as "exhaustive") to try to straighten up the Act.

The Minister proposes to amend not only the licensing and registration field but also substantially to extend the Registrar's powers to extend parking benefits to pensioners and disabled persons, to straighten out some of the undesirable activities reportedly occurring in the tow-truck industry, and to change the form of registration of articulated vehicles. All sorts of areas are parcelled into this massive Bill that we are required to debate.

The first three clauses are formal. Clause 4 deals with definitions. Clause 5 deals with definitions consequential to those contained in clause 4, and relates particularly to the definition of "Registrar". Subclause (2) of clause 4 relates to registering prime movers and trailers separately in future, bearing in mind that at this stage, under the terms of the principal Act, we do not require articulated vehicles to be registered in their separate parts, but that the prime movers only are subject to direct registration.

Clause 6 deals with the penalty for driving an unregistered vehicle, which it is intended to increase by about 400 per cent. Throughout the Bill, the penalties generally applicable to the Act are to be increased substantially; generally speaking, the increase is about 100 per cent, but in this case it is about 400 per cent. This particularly relates to an applicant's duty to register his vehicle before it goes on the road. We have no opposition to the principle incorporated in the increase of these penalties.

Clause 7 extends the registration exemption that is currently given to wheel chairs and other forms of invalid carriages. I understand that the Minister's action here follows a proposal put from this side of the House, and the member for Hanson will speak on this matter. Clauses 8 and 10 repeal sections 14 and 15 of the principal Act. Section 15 provides for vehicle movements under permit between rural properties. These movements are intended now to be covered by regulations. Members, certainly on this side, understand the benefits of permits currently available to primary producers to move their vehicles between paddocks or properties. Hopefully, it is intended in the regulations not to increase the costs of permit issue but simply to clean up the Act and avoid repetition of about six sections now in the Act that refer to these permit clauses.

Clause 9 deals with penalties. Clause 11 deals with vehicles registered interstate. This amendment makes clear that, whilst those vehicles are being driven in this

State, the drivers must comply with their respective interstate conditions. I believe that it is the first time that we, in this State, have acted or proposed to act as agents for the other States. We are putting into our legislation a requirement that an interstate truck or interstate vehicle operator must comply with the laws that apply in his own State. I do not know whether the Minister, at the appropriate time, might explain more about how he came to be involved in that sort of agency work and whether it is in conjunction with an interstate agreement or not, but it seems that we are taking on a quite acceptable responsibility to police the encumbrances or requirements of an interstate vehicle owner whilst the owner operates his vehicle within our State.

Clause 12 makes registration void if false information is given by an applicant. We welcome any tidying up of the Act that calls on an applicant to be reliable and truthful in every respect when furnishing an application to register and/or to be licensed in the various categories. Paragraph (iii) of clause 13 states:

where the applicant is the owner of a number of motor vehicles that equals or exceeds a number to be determined by the Registrar—for a period expiring on a day fixed by the Registrar as a common day of expiry in relation to those motor vehicles.

In that case, the owner may register on a fleet basis. That opportunity extended to the owner is also acceptable to the Opposition.

Clause 14 is consequential on clause 13. Clause 15 refers to a slight anomaly that has apparently arisen in the Act wherein, although in all other parts of the Act the word "solely" is widely used in that section of the Act which refers to the permitted movement of water-boring plants, it simply refers to vehicles used for the purposes of water-boring. In order to make the Act consistent with regard to the uses of the respective vehicles, it is proposed to insert "solely" to identify clearly the equipment as being used for a specific purpose, so that that particular type of equipment may not be used for other or multiple purposes, so allowing the owner to avoid the appropriate fee. "Solely" being inserted in that clause is simply consistent with the use of the word throughout the remainder of the Act.

Clause 16 gives powers to the Registrar to investigate interstate trade vehicles. There is no power apparently at this stage for the Registrar to be able to do that, and while it suggests that in the ordinary process of widening the powers of the Registrar this may well be a much wider power than would ordinarily be accepted by the Opposition for extension to an officer of the department, knowing the Registrar in South Australia at present, I have no doubt that he will exercise this power with the discretion it deserves, and hopefully his successors will act in the same way. It is appreciated that there is a need to have some power of investigation over vehicles which are based in the State but which operate interstate, and *vice versa*.

Clause 17 serves to repeal the section that deals with the registration of prime movers and trailers separately. As I said a moment ago, a fee will now be payable from the passing of the Bill on the respective trailers as well as on the prime movers. I can understand the Minister's explanation in this instance, and I can further understand the difficulty that must have applied in the past in trying to identify trailers with prime movers in the case of all articulated vehicles, because in the transport business one does not know from one day to the next when one might be hooking on to a different trailer to serve a different purpose.

Clause 18 deals with primary producers' vehicles; in

particular, it seeks to confine the benefits of the reduced registration rate on primary producers' vehicles to those vehicles which are owned and based in South Australia. It would appear that there is some abuse of the system, wherein interstate primary producers are bringing their vehicles into this State and seeking to register them under the primary producers' reduced rate scheme, thus enjoying a benefit to which they are clearly not entitled. Clause 18 seeks to eliminate that practice, or the chance of that practice occurring. Clause 19 refers to the same subject in relation to farm tractors.

Clauses 20 and 21 propose to amend the Act so as to extend the reduced fees for certain pensioners and concession card holders and, in particular, to those persons who are not subject to enjoying the benefits of their Commonwealth concession cards. In the interim period, the State appears to be prepared to breach the gap and provide the concession to those persons until they qualify for Commonwealth concession benefit cards.

Before referring in any detail to the other clauses, I will speak briefly about the proposal to amend the Act with respect to motor cycle licensing. My Party has discussed this subject at some length and, in order to furnish members with information about the various classes of licence that apply in South Australia, I will place on record the six licence class areas. Class 1 applies to a person seeking to drive any motor car or any other motor vehicle up to 3 000 kilograms in weight other than an articulated vehicle, a motor cycle, or a bus. The mention of 3 000 kilograms is significant as it relates to the Bill, because the Bill seeks to amend the Act within the category of class 1 in relation to a vehicle with a maximum mass weight of 1 780 kilograms and to extend that to 3 000 kilograms. Class 2 relates to any motor vehicle of any weight other than an articulated vehicle, a motor cycle, or a bus. The class 3 licence covers any motor vehicle other than a motor cycle or a bus. Class 4 is a full motor cycle licence. Class 4A, the new licence, applies to a motor cycle up to 250cc in engine capacity. Class 5 relates to the requirements of a driver of an omnibus.

As class 1, in particular, applies to the driving licence, in Committee I will move to amend the Bill in this respect, because we cannot accept that all persons should be restricted to riding a motor cycle with a maximum capacity of 250cc for two years. In those cases where a person may be able to demonstrate that he has had the practical experience in the past, although he may not have been licensed and registered, but in those situations where licences and registration are not required, for example, in the pastoral areas of the State, a practical test before the Registrar should be all that is necessary. In that category, those people should not be required to purchase, acquire or obtain a 250cc engine capacity motor cycle and go through the trauma of riding it for two years before they may qualify to get into the higher horsepower category.

Clause 22 amends a penalty. Clause 23 deletes certain provisions relating to the payment of registration fees by cheque. These provisions are included in a new section that appears later in this Bill. A penalty is also amended. Clause 24 deletes an out-of-date reference to load capacity of a vehicle, and so on.

Clause 26, which inserts a new section in the Act, provides for the issue of personalised number plates. This subject was raised in the House recently in the form of a question from this side and an answer by the Minister. On the matter of personalised number plates and the issue of trade plates my colleague, the shadow Minister of Local Government, will speak in due course.

I have one or two questions to ask about this matter. I hope that when the Minister replies to the debate he will

explain the purpose of having under clauses 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 the need to amend the sections of the Act that deal with the issue and use of trader's plates. He says in his explanation:

It is proposed that only one plate shall be issued in relation to a vehicle, as there have been several cases recently where a pair of trader's plates has been split and used on two vehicles. I would have thought that, if that had been the practice, the Act would be out of line with the law and that those persons would be subject to prosecution. I fail to understand why action has not been taken in those cases and, indeed, how the Minister proposes to fix a breach of the law by simply reducing the number from two to one. There should be some indication of where the single trader's plate will be exhibited on the vehicle (whether on the front, back or side of the vehicle), because neither the amendments to the Act, nor the explanation regarding that clause, indicates how the single trader's plate is to be used. The cost of the plates and the benefits to be derived from having a limited plate as against a full trading plate, or set of trader's plates, will be discussed by the member for Goyder, as will clause 38.

Clause 40 provides for a new class of motor cycle licence. I spoke about this earlier. It is the Opposition's intention to seek to amend that clause at the appropriate time. With respect to the licensing of a driver of a vehicle with a mass weight of 3 000 kilograms or more, the Opposition cannot agree that the age limit should be raised from 17 years to 18 years. I can appreciate the intent of the Minister and his officers in this matter. I read his second reading explanation, and I recognise that some risk factor may be involved in allowing a 17-year-old to drive a vehicle exceeding that weight.

This subject has been well ventilated, both in this House and in the other place. The member for Goyder, when he was a Legislative Councillor in 1972, had much to say about this subject. After the matter went to conference at that time, it was decided that a person of 17 years and upwards was able to handle and capable of handling a vehicle weighing above 3 000 kilograms, and that there was no need, at that time, to increase the age to 18 years, although it was a proposal by the Government of the day. Opposition members' minds have not been changed in the meantime about that issue. It is likely that a number of members on this side will address the House about this subject. I can cite examples, in primary industry, where young men up to 18 years of age are required to assist with harvesting and at the time of delivering grain to the silos, when drivers are held up for hours in their vehicles, it seems quite unreasonable that their employers or families should be required to employ an adult for the purposes of carting their products to the local silo.

It is not the Opposition's intention to seek to amend the Bill to give special provision for primary producers or any sector of the community, whether it be in the graingrowing, fruitgrowing or grapegrowing areas, or to identify the districts or that section of the community that will be affected by the clause in its present form. We simply propose to vote against that clause at the appropriate time in the hope that it will be dropped, thereby preserving the opportunity for 17-year-olds to qualify for a class 2 licence, thus allowing those persons to drive a motor vehicle of any weight other than an articulated vehicle, a motor cycle or a bus.

Clause 41 is a further amendment to the penalties section. Clause 42 removes a reference to the conditions to which a licence may be subject, as this matter is provided for in a later provision of this Bill. Clause 43 removes a reference to special conditions in relation to learner's permits. Clause 44 provides that the Registrar may issue a

duplicate licence to a person who surrenders his current licence. As the Act now stands, the Registrar may issue a duplicate licence only when the original document has been lost or destroyed. Clause 45 provides that a class 2 licence may not be issued to a person who is under the age of 18 years.

That clause will be amended consequentially to the amendment to clause 40 that I talked about earlier, if we are successful. I hope we will be successful in that instance. I think that, if the Minister has time to refer to the debates of 1972, he will clearly recognise that there were adequate reasons for allowing a person aged 17 years and upwards to handle a vehicle of the type I have described.

Clause 46 provides that the number of questions to be answered in the written examination for the issue of a learner's permit or driver's licence is no longer limited to 12. We have no real argument about that, but it seems to me that the present number of questions in the theory test applicable to an applicant for a licence might be sufficient and it might be more important to make the practical test for an applicant more stringent, if there is a need for it to be more stringent at all, at the time of applying for a licence.

This would also apply in the case of persons above a certain age, who are required to renew their licences annually. A practical test is more appropriate and useful than are theoretical questions in helping the Registrar to determine a driver's capabilities, and it is also more satisfactory for applicants.

Clause 47 inserts two new sections. New section 79b makes it quite clear that the licence or learner's permit is void if it has been obtained on the basis of false or misleading information. New section 79c places an obligation on drivers to notify the Registrar of an illness which may occur during the currency of a licence or learner's permit. I have not examined this part of the principal Act in any detail, but it is my understanding that those requirements are already in the principal Act. If they are not, they should be; so we have no complaint.

Clause 48 again widens the powers of the Registrar and, as I mentioned earlier, I have no doubt that the current Registrar will apply himself responsibly and reliably to this role. However, it concerns me generally when Ministers announce Bills which allow for ever-widening powers to administrators and officers of respective departments, without rigid control. Hopefully, the Registrar's successor will deal reliably with clauses 48 to 50, which simply widen the powers of the Registrar and delete specific guidelines and requirements which are in the Act at present.

Clause 51 provides that the holder of a licence may seek a change of classification during the currency of the licence by producing it to the Registrar. The Registrar is given power to change the classification of the licence if he is of the opinion that the holder of the licence is no longer competent to drive a vehicle of a particular class.

Clauses 52 to 59 deal principally with the upgrading of penalties and the widening of the powers of the Registrar in the ordinary process of administering the Act. I do not propose to deal with these clauses in any detail, because sufficient information is already available to the members in the Minister's explanation of these clauses.

Clause 60 seeks to clarify the situation in relation to certain provisions of the points demerit scheme. This clause will apply the demerit point system directly after a conviction has occurred. At present, demerit points cannot be registered until the expiry of an appeal period. Clause 60 (1) (c) inserts new subsection (12a) in section 98b as follows:

Where a person who is disqualified under this section institutes (whether before or after the disqualification is

effected) an appeal against a conviction in respect of which were recorded demerit points that are included in the points resulting in the disqualification, or applies for a re-hearing of the proceedings that led to the conviction, the disqualification shall be inoperative until the appeal or application for re-hearing is determined or withdrawn.

For example, if a person has demerit points deducted from his total after a conviction, and before an appeal, and in the event of an appeal being lodged and upheld the matter is tidied up accordingly. I see no problem with that and it speeds up the process and avoids the delay which now exists, between the period of conviction and the expiry date of the appeal in all those cases where no appeal is lodged or intended to be lodged.

Clauses 61 to 74 deal with tow-truck operators. There will be an opportunity for me to speak at some length about these clauses in the Committee stage of this Bill. The Opposition has a number of amendments which it proposes to put forward and which hopefully the Government will support. We have had discussions with the tow-truck industry, and I have had specific discussions with the Chairman of the committee associated with the Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. Harold Shipp), and I understand from him that those involved have had a number of meetings. They recognise the benefits incorporated in the Bill and the importance of improving the tow-truck industry. This industry has some very responsible operators, but also has some operators who are regarded as being not very responsible. If my very limited experiences are any indication, from what I have seen at the scene of any accident, I am not surprised that the Minister has taken some action to curb the activities of these operators swooping on the scenes of accidents and seeking to capture business. In that respect I am therefore pleased that the Minister and his officers have gone to some length in an endeavour to improve the practices of the tow-truck industry.

It seems to me it is reasonable to place on record that these officers have some fears about the harshness of the action taken by the Minister in this instance. The Chairman of the committee to which I have referred, Mr. Shipp, attended a meeting on 6 November and with the permission of that meeting he gave me a copy of the minutes. The committee, which had the benefit of the Bill, the second reading speech of the Minister and some other information, discussed areas of concern. The Secretary tabled a document, including the complete tow-truck sections of the Motor Vehicles Act and the amendments proposed by the amending Bill. Each amended section of the Act was read and discussed in detail by those present at the meeting. Many of the proposed amendments were considered to be relatively minor, and other provisions would serve to clarify specific areas. However, concern was expressed at the meeting about certain aspects of the Bill, and it was agreed that action would need to be taken to ensure that the views were expressed and conveyed to all Parliamentarians.

Whilst the members of that committee appreciate that legislation is designed expressly for the protection of the public, the view was expressed that the Act should declare that, provided a tow-truck driver upholds the law, he should have the right to demand payment for his services and should have the right to exercise a lien over the rescued vehicle pending satisfaction of such lawful claim. Those remarks were associated with section 98j of the principal Act and amendments proposed to that section. Section 98j (4) (c) provides that an authority signed by a person purporting to be the person in charge of a vehicle, who is under the age of 16 years, shall be void and of no effect. This matter raises the question of whether or not a

driver below the age of 18 years is lawfully able to sign an authority to tow. I hope that at the appropriate time the Minister will clarify that point.

A further question of some interest was raised at that meeting with respect to the third party bodily injury cover that might apply to a vehicle after it was involved in an accident. The members of that committee want to know whether the vehicle suffering accident damage automatically ceased to be covered by compulsory third party bodily injury insurance.

Section 98l prescribes that a business, upon the client satisfying all lawful claims for the towing, storage and repair of a vehicle, shall deliver up that vehicle forthwith to its owner. It is noted that in the amendments the term "forthwith" is certainly widely used by the Minister, and it is that word that has caused some concern in the industry. The committee believes strongly that the Act should specify that such collection of the vehicle should be made within the normal towing industry trading hours (7.30 a.m. to 5 p.m.) with reasonable prior notification. I do not think it is unreasonable to seek to have the Bill amended so that the hours of the industry are respected with regard to the collection of a vehicle within reasonable hours, and not simply "forthwith" or on demand by an owner, crash repairer or agent at some unrespectable hour of the night.

Section 98o prescribes that the driver of a tow-truck shall not permit any person, other than the owner, driver, or person in charge of the vehicle that is being, or is to be towed, to ride in or upon the tow-truck while it is being driven to or from the scene of an accident. The penalty for an offence is \$200. The committee strongly believes this section should allow the occupants of a motor vehicle involved in an accident or breakdown and being towed by a tow-truck to be conveyed by that tow-truck. The Liberal Party supports the tow-truck operators in that regard, also. I had contact with the member for Mitcham earlier today on this subject, and I think that is the tenor of the problem he had in mind.

**Mr. Millhouse:** That's one of them.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I hope if we get his support on the particular amendment to tidy up that section we will also enjoy his support on the other suggested amendments.

**Mr. Millhouse:** You'll always get it if you deserve it.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I am sure there is no doubt about our deserving support on this occasion. It is not that I have done any great amount of homework on this Bill; I am thankful for the assistance given me by my colleagues the members for Hanson, Glenelg and Goyder, and I hope to be able to include the member for Mitcham. I certainly repeat my thanks to those of the tow-truck organisation who obviously have done much homework and gone to much trouble to investigate the Bill and to seek to amend it responsibly so that it is workable and acceptable to the industry, and at the same time upholds the intentions of the Minister's department to tidy up activities in the industry.

Section 98p is also subject to amendment by a clause in the Bill. That section provides in part that an inspector may, without a warrant, require any person to answer forthwith and truthfully any question that may be relevant to the investigation. Section 98p also provides:

A person shall not refuse or fail forthwith to answer truthfully any question put to him in the course of an investigation under this Part by an inspector.

This is another area in which we cannot agree with the Minister. Obviously, it is important that if information is required inspectors must have access to it. There is no question about that. We do not agree that inspectors should have access to private premises without being equipped with the ordinary warrant for searching. We do

not accept that inspectors should have access to such premises without extending proper courtesy. I think our attitude in that respect has been quite consistent throughout the period I have been here. The Opposition has never tried to correct or corrupt the intention of the Government to have the law upheld, but we object strongly to the extension of powers to inspectors of departments that we think are infringing on the rights of individuals, and certainly on the privacy of the individual. We do not think, for example, in this instance in the efforts to amend section 98p of the principal Act that the word "forthwith" should be used at all.

Certainly, the provision where an inspector may, without a warrant, require any person to answer forthwith and truthfully any question that may be relevant to an investigation is not acceptable in any form whatever. They must have a warrant. They must advise the person under investigation that he has ordinary access to legal advice. To suggest for a moment that a person should be intimidated or should run the risk of being intimidated by an inspector with such powers or with access to such authority under the Act would be quite frightening, and certainly would be unacceptable to members on this side.

**Mr. Millhouse:** Who are these inspectors?

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** They are appointed from time to time by the Registrar, and they have a duty to perform. We do not deny that there is a very wide duty to be performed in the policing of the Motor Vehicles Act. There is an extensive area of registration and licensing, when we talk about the registration and licensing of the many thousands of motor vehicles in the State, and we do not deny that much inspectorial work must be carried out. We do not propose in any way to interfere with, curb, or corrupt the activities of an inspector. However, when it comes to their thrusting themselves upon a section of the community or upon a person, whether on business premises or on private premises, we are concerned; indeed, we are seeking to ensure that it is done properly and responsibly in the ordinary course of the inspector's duties and that there is no fear or intimidation on what could well be an innocent party.

At the same time, we do not propose, in the amendments we intend to move in Committee, to indicate in any way that we condone the breaking of the law or, in this case, the covering up of illegal equipment under the telecommunications legislation or whatever other associated legislation applies to the equipment used by these operators. We recognise that there is evidence of breaches of that legislation occurring in this State, and we aim to co-operate with the Government in every way to see that such breaches are stamped out. However, that does not take away—nor should it—the right of the individual in relation to his personal privacy and his personal rights.

Going on with the proposed amendments to section 98p, the committee was strongly of the view that the inclusion of the word "forthwith" was oppressive and unreasonable. I am reading from the minutes of that meeting, so that I may properly and truthfully convey to the House exactly what the responsible representatives of the industry had to say on this subject. Further, the committee felt that the right of the individual to refuse to answer any questions that might incriminate him must be protected. A tow-truck driver, as with any other member of the community, should retain the right to legal counsel. The committee also stressed that, although an inspector needed an element of protection under the Act, it was not reasonable to absolve him of all responsibility for wrongful action taken under the Act, as was prescribed in section 98p (10), which provides that an inspector shall not incur any liability by virtue of any act or omission of his in the

exercise or purported exercise in good faith of the powers conferred upon him by the relevant Part.

We are concerned about that provision. If an inspector or any other officer of the law, or any officer authorised to carry out his duty in office, causes or incurs any losses or damage in the process of doing so, it should be automatic that the person concerned can claim against that officer or his employer. The Chairman of the committee said that the Bill was due to be presented in the House for its second reading debate this week and, before that time, he would convey his expressed views, hopefully, to those who were prepared to recognise the overall attitude of the industry, and indeed to those seeking to tighten up the practices in a reasonable and responsible way.

On behalf of that organisation, I am pleased to bring its desires to the attention of the House. It will be the intention of the Opposition, in Committee, to move the appropriate amendments to cover the requirements of the industry. I do not think that they conflict in any way with the overall intent of the Government in its presentation of the Bill.

Contact was made by a representative of a new association formed within the tow-truck industry. I have forgotten exactly what the association was called, but I think the people concerned purported to represent a significant number of tow-truck operators, and intend to incorporate an association of operator-owners of tow-truck companies within this State. I have not had the pleasure or the advantage of discussing this matter with their principal (I think his name is Mr. Morrison), or with any of his colleagues on the committee. Hopefully, the matters raised by Mr. Shipp's committee under the auspices of the chamber embrace the requirements of the whole of the industry; if not, I would think that the member for Mitcham, who I understand has had contact from Mr. Morrison directly, would raise any matters that he thinks fit on behalf of that association. Personally, I am not privy to any of its specific requirements. In the meantime, I am quite satisfied that the committee headed by Mr. Shipp has done its homework and laid down its requirements.

There is not much other material in the Bill on which I should like to speak at this stage. I hope that my amendments have been prepared. There was some delay, but I will not go into detail about the reasons for it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member should not refer to the amendments.

**Mr. CHAPMAN:** I hope that the material I require in Committee will be available. I do not suggest that I am blaming anyone else for the delay. This is an incredible Bill, embracing a whole heap of material in various forms, all applicable to the Motor Vehicles Act. The Bill requires a fair amount of homework; indeed, I have been flat out in the past few days trying to collect information to support those parts worthy of support and to prepare the necessary detail to fix up those parts that are not good. I recognise and respect your indication, Sir, that I must not refer to the amendments, and I do not intend to do so at this stage.

The Government proposes within the Bill to extend opportunities for disabled persons to park their vehicles within the metropolitan area. Again, I understand that this principle, if not in detail then certainly in broad terms, was introduced into this House by the member for Hanson, who has indicated to me that he has been involved in correspondence and has sought further information about the practicalities of extending to the disabled section of the community some wider benefits for parking vehicles more conveniently in relation to their places of work or business. We, on this side of the House, are very pleased to see that the Minister (despite what they say from time to

time about his being an unreasonable, nasty old man, and all those things) is not totally inflexible. On this occasion, he has accepted what the Opposition initiated, and, has introduced, it among other things, in quite a responsible Bill.

With those few remarks, I indicate that the Opposition will support this Bill at the second reading stage, hopefully having the overall intent of the Bill in its various parts upheld and applied to the Act. This will apply more particularly if it incorporates the few responsible amendments that we intend to bring forward.

**Mr. MATHWIN (Glennelg):** I support the Bill generally. My remarks mainly relate to clause 40, which deals with motor cycles. I am particularly concerned about the new class 4A licence. In his explanation, the Minister states:

One of the principal objects of the Bill is to introduce a system of graded motor cycle licences similar to that existing in the majority of the other States of Australia. New applicants for motor cycle licences will be limited to driving a motor cycle with an engine capacity not exceeding 250 cubic centimetres for a period of two years prior to being granted a full motor cycle licence.

I believe that two years is too long for this type of licence. The Minister also states:

The new class 4A licence will entitle the holder to drive a motor vehicle with an engine capacity not exceeding 250 cc.

A person who holds such a licence for two years will then be eligible to hold a class 4 licence, entitling him or her (there are ladies who drive motor cycles, too, some driving very large machines) to drive a motor cycle. The period of two years may be shortened if the applicant passes a practical driving test approved by the Registrar. I hope that the Minister, in replying to the second reading debate, will give a further explanation of the type of test he expects, where the tests are to be held and whether there will be opportunities for these types of test to be taken throughout the State. I believe the period of two years is too long.

The Minister may be arguing on the basis of road safety, because he stated in his explanation that a number of accidents occur that involve younger people on motor cycles. Many accidents involving motor cycles are caused by motorists not seeing them because of the blind spot in their driving mirror. I am sure that every member in this House would have experienced that at some stage, and this factor probably causes more accidents than young riders on larger bikes cause.

I know that bikes over 250 cc, for instance, 750 cc and 1 000 cc, are very heavy, but it is only a matter of balance to control the machine. The weight does not matter very much. The heavier machines hold the road well. Provided one is able to balance them, one can handle them just as well as a lighter machine. If one cannot teach someone to be a good motor cycle rider in a month, and to be familiar with the machine within 12 months, one will never teach him. People get the hang of a motor cycle in a short period.

When I was in the Army, I taught a number of N.C.O.s to ride motor bikes. It gave me a great deal of entertainment, as an ordinary sapper in the Royal Engineers, to have in my clutches the sergeants and officers of my unit and others, and to see them going over the handlebars, disappearing over fences and trees. Within hours, these people could handle a machine, change gear, keep balance, and within days they were reasonable riders. Certainly, within a month they were very proficient. If a person is not an expert rider in 12 months, he or she will never be able to handle a motor cycle, no matter whether it is a 99 cc, 125 cc, 500 cc or 1 000 cc.

They can be proficient within 12 months, which is sufficient time for this type of licence.

The Minister has set on 250 cc machines, and I wonder why. We know that smaller machines go fast. A 250 cc machine could go almost as fast as any other machine on the road. Some of them are quite heavy. If lower speed is the main reason for stating 250 cc, I suggest that the Minister is on the wrong track. These motor cycles are used in many areas of racing. A person may wish to graduate to a motor cycle combination with a side-car. Fuel is getting expensive, and possibly soon will be scarcer still, and more expensive. More family people might wish to take on a motor cycle combination, which could carry the husband and wife, with one family member on the back of the cycle. Motor cycle combination riding gives a great deal of pleasure. I had one myself for many years. It is recognised as one of the best methods of touring. You do not go fast; you are in the open air; and you see everything about you. That is more than happens when driving a car. It could happen that someone wishes to buy a motor cycle combination to take out his family, but he or she will have to wait two years before being permitted to drive a machine of that size.

One cannot pull a combination of much weight at all or a sidecar with a 250 cc motor cycle; one must have a 500, 650, 750 or 1 000 cc motor cycle in order to pull a chair. Under the legislation, certain people will not have the opportunity to graduate to a larger cycle for two years. The correct way is for people to graduate from a smaller motor cycle to the larger types. Most people want to ride a larger bike so that they can travel faster or carry more, and I believe that they should be proficient and eligible within a year. We are not talking just about teenagers.

The member for Napier might want to hold a motor cycle licence one day and want to graduate to a larger machine and ride around in his mayoral robes. He will have to wait two years before he is able to ride around Elizabeth on a larger motor cycle. People between the ages of 20 years and 70 years ride motor cycles; many people enjoy this form of relaxation, others want to race them. Probably the most thrilling type of cycle-racing is that involving the sidecar combination, but anyone wanting to go into that sport would have to wait two years, although he would be able to fly around the track on a 250 cc machine that might be faster than a combination. I believe that the Minister has failed to grasp the nettle on this issue.

The main point in this area is the lack of driver education. I believe that more emphasis should be placed on educating people. As the Minister has been understanding in most matters relating to the Bill, I hope that he will reconsider this matter and place more emphasis on education. Nowadays, few people realise that the most important rule of the road is to keep to the left. That rule seems to have been forgotten by many people. I recall the Minister saying in a debate about six years ago that no lane was a slow lane, but that all lanes were equal. This has led to misunderstanding by the public. He said, in effect, that, if it is a three-lane highway, it does not matter which lane one is in, because one can drive at the same speed in all of them. That is a failure on the Government's part. In the written test in the United Kingdom, the question was asked, "What's the main rule of the road?" The correct answer was, "Keep to the left". People should be encouraged to keep to the left, thus enabling other drivers who wish to pass to overtake on the right. I hope that the Minister will introduce a worthwhile educational programme as regards road safety and the driving of motor vehicles and motor cycles, thus helping to bring about a reduction in the number of fatalities occurring on our

roads.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham):** Yesterday, a group of tow-truck owners came to see me and discussed the amendments to the Act contained in the Bill. Although I do not propose to say anything about the other provisions of the Bill, no doubt we will have the chance to do so in Committee. This afternoon, I presented to the House a petition signed by over 200 people asking that the clauses in the Bill relating to tow-trucks not be passed. I myself cannot go as far as that, but there are a number of points in the clauses dealing with tow-trucks which I think are unfair and should be amended before they are passed. Unless they are amended, the complaints which tow-truck owners are making that they are being singled out for special and, indeed, unfair treatment by the Government will certainly be justified.

I know that we have had much trouble in the past with tow-truck operators at accidents, and so on, but I do not think that the provisions we have now are inadequate, nor do I think that the provisions proposed in the Bill are justified. Let us look at a few of them, because these matters immediately appeal to me as being unfair. I am waiting to see all of the amendments to be moved by the member for Alexandra, and, depending on what he is going to do, I may move some amendments of my own. Let us look briefly at four or five of the provisions that stand out as being unfair. New clause 98da, to be inserted by the Bill, provides:

(1) Tow-truck certificates generally—

(a) shall be subject to the condition that the holder of the tow-truck certificate shall at all times comply with the provisions of the Wireless Telegraphy Act . . .

That is a Commonwealth Act, which provides penalties for those who do not observe its provisions; yet new subsection (5) of that provision states:

A person shall not contravene a condition on a tow-truck certificate.

The effect of that is a double penalty. Not only will an offence be committed under the Wireless Telegraphy Act of the Commonwealth but also the same action will be an offence under this Act. I do not think that is at all fair. I turn now to clause 72, which amends section 98m by inserting the following paragraph:

(ab) solicits, by any means whatsoever, a person who has signed an authority to remove a damaged vehicle from the scene of an accident, for a revocation or variation of that authority, or for a further or other authority so to remove that vehicle;

A person who does that shall be guilty of an offence. That means that, if a person makes an arrangement with a tow-truck operator to take a damaged car to his home and subsequently the driver suggests that rather than take the vehicle to the home he should take it to a workshop, technically he is committing an offence, because the suggestion could well be interpreted as soliciting, and a tow-truck operator is not allowed to solicit any variation of an authority. I do not think that is meant, but that is the result of the drafting of that new paragraph. Section 98n 4 (c) states:

An authority signed by a person purporting to be the person in charge of the vehicle who is under the age of 16 years shall be void and of no effect.

Does that mean (and I presume it does) that the tow-truck operator has to make certain that the person giving him authority is over 16 years of age? If he makes a mistake, even though the person may say he is over 16 years of age and may look as though he or she is, then the authority is void. Presumably, if the authority is void the tow-truck



operator is committing an offence. We have had many complaints from the member for Fisher and others that it is impossible to check the age of persons going into a hotel to drink, so how on earth is a tow-truck operator to check the age of a person who gives him an authority? It is an unfair onus to put on him.

New section 98ja gives a member of the Police Force or an inspector the power to require any person to leave the scene of an accident. Just what that means or how far he can go is not quite clear. He can also give such other directions as he sees fit to any person present at the scene of an accident. What does that mean? I suppose he can tell a person to stand on his head in the corner or in the middle of the road, and that is a valid direction. It is quite unfair to have authorities as wide as that. Perhaps members of the Police Force, who have some training and experience in general police matters, may be trusted with such a power as this, but who are these inspectors?

**Mr. Gunn:** I have heard complaints about them already.

**Mr. MILLHOUSE:** I have not received any specific complaint. Whoever appoints these inspectors can appoint anyone: the inspectors do not need to have any special qualifications and under this Act they will be protected. We are sliding more and more towards dictatorial powers. People can say that it does not matter a damn and that these tow truckies deserve all they get, but little by little these things can be extended. Next time there will be another justification for extending a power such as this, and I do not believe that we should do that. Section 98o of the principal is to be amended by inserting a new subsection (3) as follows:

An allegation in any complaint of an offence against this section that a towtruck was being driven to or from the scene of an accident shall, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be proof of the facts so stated.

In other words, that is an evidentiary provision which makes it easier for the prosecution. I do not like that. Worse still, under section 98p of the principal Act an inspector or member of the Police Force has to get a warrant to break into premises, but for anything else he can go in just as he likes. My strong advice, if this is passed, to tow-truckies is to lock their doors; at least then the inspector has to get a warrant to break in. In every other case we are giving power to an inspector to enter upon and search any premises or any vehicle or thing contained in those premises. Worst of all, new paragraph (v) requires any person to answer forthwith and truthfully any question that may be relevant to an investigation. That is a grave infringement of our liberty indeed.

At the present time the rule is that no-one need answer a question of anyone, whether he be a policeman or anyone else, unless he wants to. There are special provisions in the Road Traffic Act that persons have to give their name and address and say whether they are driving a motor car or not, but apart from that exception, and maybe one or two others, people are not obliged to answer questions put to them by anyone else, yet here we are giving inspectors the right to insist that a person answer questions, and answer them truthfully (whatever that means). That is subject to a great deal of interpretation, as every court knows. Unless that is done, an offence is committed. I will oppose that as strongly as I can. There is an evidentiary provision in subsection (6). Let us turn to new section 98p (10), which provides:

An inspector shall not incur any liability by virtue of any act or omission of his in the exercise, or purported exercise, in good faith of the powers conferred on him by this Part. This clause gives immunity to these inspectors, whatever they may do. Not even a police officer has that immunity in the exercise of his powers. Any person who is arrested

by a police officer and believes that he has been wrongly arrested may take action against that officer personally and obtain heavy damages for wrongful arrest if the court is with him.

Here we are giving these enormous powers to these inspectors and providing them at the same time with every immunity from any of the wrongful actions (if the action has been wrongful) that they may take under this Act. Ninety-eight (q) is a new clause which gives inspectors the power of arrest. It bears out what I have said: that an inspector can come along and arrest any person, not only a tow-truckie, whom he believes on reasonable grounds to have committed an offence under this Part, and a person cannot sue him for wrongful arrest.

One thing that could happen (because only the owner, driver or person apparently in charge of a vehicle can ride in a tow-truck at the present time) is that if a person happens to have an accident on the open road and has his wife and family with him he can leave the scene of the accident in the tow-truck, but he has to leave his wife and children behind. If they accompany him, technically an inspector can arrest the wife and children for riding in the tow-truck. There is no redress whatever against that arrest. These are powers which could be used quite tyrannically, and Parliament should be alert to make sure that powers are not used in that way by not giving those powers. I will not say any more at this time, as I will be able to say more in Committee, but these are the sort of things that in my view show that the provisions regarding tow-truck operators that have been complained about are, in fact, not proper and the complaints that have been made are justified. I hope we will be able to alter them drastically in Committee.

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** From the outset I say that I agree with the comments made by the member for Mitcham relating to the powers of inspectors. I think it is a disgrace that any Minister would put powers of this nature before any democratically elected body. People in my constituency have recently lodged strong objections to the actions of Highways Department inspectors. The Minister is aware of this because I have complained to him. It was recently pointed out to me that 12 inspectors were stationed in Hawker and Quorn to carry out a blitz on truck operators. It appears that the Highways Department has a policy of deliberate harassment of truck operators. The moment people get in a truck it appears that an army of these inspectors begin harassing them in the country, yet most of these people are far better drivers than is the average motorist. If we allow this type of legislation relating to tow-truck operators to pass, the next step is that it will flow over to other sections of the transport industry. I have had many complaints from very responsible citizens in the Ceduna area about the activities of a Highways Department inspector there. I have discussed this matter with the Minister, and I am not satisfied that this person is carrying out his duties in a proper fashion. I hope this Bill gives me the opportunity to raise this matter, because I am very concerned at the current attitude towards people engaged in the transport industry.

Unfortunately, Governments have for too long set out to make it as difficult as possible for and to interfere with the proper operations of an efficient industry, which is vital particularly to those in isolated areas of this State. The powers contained in this legislation, as the member for Mitcham quite rightly pointed out, give the inspector quite dictatorial powers. I am aware that there are some villains within the tow-truck industry, but that certainly does not give the Government the right to implement legislation of this kind. Inspectors already have wide

enough powers. In recent times we have passed far too much legislation giving improperly trained people powers of entry. We have been reversing the onus of proof and have placed various other obnoxious provisions in far too much legislation. In my view, these powers should not even be made available to police officers, except in exceptional circumstances. At least police officers are properly trained and are supervised by very experienced officers. In many cases, inspectors employed in relation to the transport industry are not sufficiently trained, and their superior officers are not trained in administering this type of law. This is one of the worst pieces of legislation that I have seen in the eight years I have been a member of this House. On every occasion I can recall, I have opposed the increasing of powers of inspectors and these other provisions I mentioned earlier.

Why has there been a blitz against transport operators in recent times? Why are armies of people suddenly dragged, at great expense, to Hawker and Quorn to carry out a blitz on transport operators? I understand these officers were living it up in the hotels, obviously at great expense to the taxpayer. It is about time the Government laid down a set of regulations and let the transport industry get on with its job.

Unfortunately, the Government sets up numerous boards and committees, which then try to justify their existence, so they continue to bring up pieces of legislation and regulations, making it more difficult for the industry to continue to operate. In discussions I recently had with people in the industry there was mention of the regulations suddenly brought down affecting forklifts. Examiners were sent around who had little or no experience in operating this equipment, and in fact they did not know half as much as the people who had been operating forklifts for years, yet the operators were examined and cross-examined by the inspectors.

The Road Traffic Board has done much good work in the past, but I am concerned at the current attitude it has adopted towards the transport industry. We have too many boards and committees which are trying to justify their existence. It is time we closely examined the operations of many of these committees. All of them should have a seven-year expiry date, so that Parliament would have to consider their reappointment and the taxpayers would be able to see they were getting value for their dollar. I make no apologies for what I have said today, because I have strong views about inspectors and their operations.

I sincerely hope the new regulations in relation to use of trade plates are exercised with some degree of discretion, as some ridiculous situations could arise if on a Friday night a person drove a vehicle home using a trade plate and was suddenly called down the street on a Saturday morning. Technically, that person would be committing an offence by using trade plates. This often happens in country areas where people are often called out on a Saturday night and sometimes hop into the first available vehicle. It would be most unfortunate if this regulation was implemented without a great deal of common sense applying.

I agree with what the honourable member for Glenelg had to say about motor cycles. I have not had his experience of riding motor bikes, but I have had some experience.

**Mr. Keneally:** A bikie, eh!

**Mr. GUNN:** Not a bikie, but I have enjoyed riding around the farm and I have occasionally ridden one down the road in the past. If anyone has not got enough experience to qualify in 12 months, he should not have one at all, and might as well give up. You only need ride a

motor bike for a week in rough conditions and you will either learn to ride it properly or you will not get on it again because you would have lost enough skin and have enough bruises to learn a few tricks of the trade.

I will have a number of comments to make in Committee in relation to the various clauses of this legislation. However, even though there have been some very bad practices taking place in relation to the tow-truck industry, I do not believe that any section of industry should have to be hit over the head with a set of regulations and provisions in any Act of Parliament such as we have here. I cannot understand why the Minister would put provisions such as this before Parliament. There are other far more democratic ways of doing it.

Much has been said in the past by the present Labor Government about the rights of individuals, and we have heard loud criticism of other Legislatures in Australia that have prevented people from marching in streets. That legislation is only chicken feed compared to the powers given to inspectors under this Bill. I do not believe any inspector should have the right to enter anyone's home without a warrant. It is a disgraceful provision, and any reasonable democrat would be opposed to it. I wonder how much further the Minister will go. It suits people who have to administer the legislation; they can sit back and say, "We need this authority." We have heard all that before. It is the responsibility of the Minister to say to those people, "Brighten up your ideas a bit."

The industry concerned should not be hit over the head with legislation like this. Unfortunately, most of the people who draw up these sorts of regulations have had little or no experience in the industry, so they are setting out to clout people with regulations based purely on academic experience and not on practical experience or an understanding of the industry. I sincerely hope that those people in the Highways Department will take note of what I have said about the activities of one inspector in Ceduna. I would also like to know what the exercise in the Quorn and Hawker area was all about if it was not deliberate persecution of the transport industry.

**Mr. BLACKER (Flinders):** I wish to speak only briefly to this Bill because it is a Committee Bill. I support the general principle of the Bill, and the reasons for the various measures being introduced. Criticisms are to be made on various aspects of it, particularly the inspectorial provisions. The measures concerning motor cycles leave room for improvement.

I speak on this occasion to put my personal view on parking permits for disabled persons, because I could be one person involved in that aspect of the Bill. Speaking generally from the point of view of disabled persons, I think this is a worthwhile measure to create an avenue which will enable handicapped persons to apply for special permits to help them carry on their duties and to help them get to and from gainful employment. One problem handicapped persons face in endeavouring to rehabilitate themselves and get themselves well established again in the community relates to the opportunity to be able to enter into a normal work life and pattern. If this measure gives more handicapped persons that opportunity it will serve a useful purpose. I support the second reading.

**Mr. BECKER (Hanson):** I support the second reading and commend the Minister for raising and incorporating in the legislation provisions for disabled persons. On 16 August 1977, I asked the following question of the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the Government considered a disabled persons parking authority similar to New South Wales and, if not,

why not?

2. What action, if any, does the Government propose to take?

The Minister of Transport replied:

1. In recognition of the various difficulties encountered by disabled persons, the Government recently set up a committee on the Rights of Persons with Handicaps which is chaired by Mr. Justice Bright. Other members of the committee are Ms. Barbara Garrett, Chief Social Worker at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Mr. Donald Simpson, Neurosurgeon. One of the committee's first tasks is to have a look at the mobility and access problems as they relate to persons with handicaps.

Being involved on the State Committee of the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled, I am pleased that at long last the Government has seen fit to introduce legislation to provide facilities for disabled persons. It also offers the opportunity to those who drive vehicles and have a disabled person as a passenger to park in an area which is accessible for that disabled person, who may have to visit a doctor to receive special treatment. It will be of benefit to disabled persons as well as to the parents of disabled children and those who care for and look after the disabled. I have been concerned for many years with road safety and the many unfortunate victims of road accidents who are now disabled people.

We have to show a greater concern in our legislation for road safety. I have supported proposals and recommended to our Party that our policy should include restrictions on the size of motor cycles that young people are permitted to ride. On 1 September 1977, the Minister of Transport provided me with figures concerning motor cycle fatalities from January to June 1977. Amongst riders aged 16 there were three fatalities; for 17-year-old riders there were three fatalities; for 18-year-old riders there were five fatalities; for 19 year-old riders there were three fatalities; for 20-year-old riders there were two fatalities; and for 21-year-old riders there were four fatalities. Fatalities to pillion and sidecar passengers for the same period amongst 15-year-olds was one; amongst 16-year-olds, three; amongst 18-year-olds, one; and amongst 19-year-olds, one. In 1974, 46 motor cyclists and six pillion and sidecar passengers were killed; in 1975, 30 riders and five pillion and sidecar passengers were killed; in 1976, 41 riders and two pillion and sidecar passengers were killed; and in the first six months of 1977, 25 riders and seven pillion and sidecar passengers were killed.

There is a need to bring about enforced legislation in this regard. It is regrettable that from time to time Parliament has to introduce regulations and legislation such as this to endeavour to protect the community from itself. I think every member who has spoken on this Bill has said it is a Committee Bill, and I believe it cannot be considered in only one session. It needs a tremendous amount of research and study. I do not think the members who have spoken so far have touched on all the benefits of the various clauses.

In every industry something goes wrong occasionally. I believe the tow-truck industry is the last bastion of free enterprise. I feel sorry for these people who will be subjected to such intense discussion and debate, and I hope that the debate in Committee will be an informed one. At this stage, I support the Bill.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I support the second reading of what I believe is a Committee Bill. A matter that especially concerns me relates to a person who wishes to remove a vehicle that has been involved in an accident and is in a dangerous position. The matter has been raised with me by a constituent, who found a young man who had

been smashed up in a motor accident. He got the lad out of the car and into the ambulance, by which time the police had not arrived. He telephoned a tow-truck operator and, although he really had no authority to do so, he got the operator to move the vehicle from a dangerous position on the road, and he then informed the lad's family. I should like the Minister to say whether that situation can be covered.

The Minister of Labour and Industry recently put out a circular to businessmen saying that every attempt should be made to find jobs for young people. Many young people have learned to drive heavy vehicles at the age of 18 years. They do not have bad accident records, and in any case they are under the control of their employers. I hope that we will do nothing to jeopardise the chances of young people moving into the industry at an early age, rather than having to hang around until they are 18. I do not support the concept of changing that provision.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)**

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

#### **DEBTS REPAYMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1 to 3, 8, 16, and 33, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

#### **ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENTS BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 4, 20 and 21, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

#### **LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1 and 2, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

#### **HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### **INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### **HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport)** moved:  
That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr. EVANS (Fisher):** I wish to comment on one or two matters, the first of which relates to the Engineering and Water Supply Department and its attitude to individuals who live within the water catchment area. I had a letter from the Minister of Works, dated 31 October, telling me that the department will not allow an individual at Aldgate to continue keeping his horse in close proximity to Aldgate creek. Likewise, recently a person near Stirling South, in the Mount Lofty railway station area, told me he was also informed that he was not allowed to keep a horse within the township's water catchment area.

Yet, the department and the Government allowed a large caravan park to be developed at Hahndorf where tourists are encouraged to stay. Most organisations head to the Hills for their recreation on weekends. Some ovals and camps created for people's recreation are not fully serviced with proper toilet facilities. Even where they are, people, after a few beers, do not always use the toilet facilities. They use any spot where there is some cover available to partly hide behind while they relieve themselves. Government departments own property in the area and encourage people to go into the water catchment area for their recreation.

Recently, I discussed with the Minister of Works a property at Cherry Gardens to which water was connected, although it lies within the catchment area, and the previous owner had been advised that water could not be connected because of its position. It is within the catchment area for the Clarendon Valley weir, which feeds the Happy Valley reservoir. Some people living in the area between the end of the old existing line and the new properties were told they could not get water connected. Instead, they created their own water supply by installing tanks. However, they now have mains water passing their door, and I understand they will be liable for water rates. When people in the Aldgate, Mylor, Longwood, Bradbury and Heathfield areas applied for similar facilities they were refused. I have waited for almost four weeks for an explanation of this from the Minister and have not yet received one.

The department's attitude to water connection inside the water catchment area is bad. There is no justification for saying that people with water connected to their homes through a main are more likely to pollute the reservoir catchment area than are properties with connected rainwater tanks, but without adequate septic tank systems. I cannot understand why the department refuses to change its policy, because people are building on the vacant allotments whether there is water or not. The same number of homes will be built and the same number of people will live there. A health hazard and a grave fire hazard will be created because people will not take heed of warnings that they could be burnt out. They will not have a reticulated water supply that will be adequate to give them a reasonable chance of saving their property. It will be impossible for the C.F.S. to protect every home when a major fire rages through the area.

Why was water connected to the Cherry Gardens property, which is inside the catchment area? I can

understand why water was connected to houses on the other side of the road. Why did the department change its policy in one area, and refuse to give it to people who requested the same sort of facility in another area?

Will the Minister examine the question of people keeping horses? The man at Aldgate to whom I referred has owned his horse for a long time and has given a guarantee that he will leave the area by next June. For two years or longer the Minister and the department have been negotiating about his leaving and he now says he and the horse will leave by next June. This gentleman has been there since the last war as an operator in a business. Other people in the Hills own horses and are allowed to keep them. The department has stated that, if a proper shed is built in which the horse can be housed and in which it can be kept away from the creeks, it can stay.

Anyone who understands the Hills area knows that wherever animals are kept in an area with high run-off and high rainfall there will be some pollution of the streams. However, I do not believe that is our main pollutant problem for water supplies. Detergents, insecticides and pesticides are the main problem, along with spray used for agriculture. People should be given a reasonable time to leave an area and, if they say they will go in a certain time, six months is not long to wait. What is six months for one horse or 200 horses in that kind of area? I hope that the Minister, and particularly his department, will take note.

One other point I raise is that I recently received a copy of a letter from the Minister of Labour and Industry (I do not know why) regarding the matter of business men trying to employ one more young person in order to help relieve the unemployment situation. The letter is similar to the letter sent out earlier this year to every business man by the Federal Youth Task Force that had been set up. I do not condemn the action, but at no time did the Minister say, "We're really doing the same thing as the Federal Government is doing and backing what it is doing," thus making it a second bite of the cherry with the same type of appeal.

I will relate the story of a departmental officer going to a small businessman in the Hills, whom I will call Mr. X, and saying, "We know you have a business, and you work long and hard hours." X said, "Yes, about 14 hours a day, at least 5½ days a week, sometimes six." The officer said, "You have enough work for two people." X said, "Yes". The officer said, "What if we found a young man who would work for you?" X said, "I have a better idea. I'm moving on towards 60. You find a young man who wants to work, and I will sell him the business. You go back to your Government department and get it to guarantee the money at a reasonable interest rate. I will work for him for 12 months and, at the end of 12 months, he will know the business, be able to buy it, work hard, and be able to employ someone else, and you will have two more people employed. I will be happy, and I'll sit back and enjoy some years of relaxation after 40 years of hard work." The officer said, "That's an insane suggestion." X said, "Of course, so is yours, because, although there's enough work in the business for two people, there's not enough money."

That is the problem we have, when talking about businessmen employing more people. We, through Government legislation and action, in this State have priced businessmen out of the Australian and world markets, and our young people out of job opportunities, by fighting for extra holiday pay, for penalty rates for annual leave, for additional sick pay, for conditions that are prohibitive for some businesses to work under, and for workers' compensation ranging as high as 27 per cent and 28 per cent of salary in areas where people do much

manual work. We have priced the young out of the job market.

I do not deny the benefit of appealing to employers to employ the young, but the administrators, the legislators, and regulators in this State have priced our young people out of the job market. Let us recognise that, and that the Federal Government commenced this kind of appeal earlier this year and has been conducting an advertising campaign on exactly the same basis for most of the year asking businessmen to take on young people. I hope that it is successful, but I hope that the Government recognises the part it has played in destroying job opportunities in this State. There is no doubt that it has done it successfully.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member for Albert Park.

**Mr. HARRISON (Albert Park):** I highlight a few problems in my district that, fortunately have been solved. First, the traffic lights that have been installed at the intersection of Tapley Hill Road, West Lakes Boulevard, and Frederick Road have brought great relief to the traffic problems at the intersection. The pedestrian lights now incorporated with the traffic lights at the West Lakes Boulevard and Tapley Hill Road do not require school monitors from the Hendon Primary School, to the great relief of the schoolchildren themselves, because of the problem that existed there, and to the relief of their parents and teachers. I am pleased to see that this has solved a major problem at that busy intersection.

At last, after many years of representation to the Education Department, we saw the opening last Thursday of the open unit at the Woodville Primary School. It has been operating since last May, but it was opened last Thursday by the Minister of Education in order to coincide with the school's centenary celebrations.

Honourable members will understand the feeling of relief experienced by teachers, the schoolchildren, their parents, the school committee and the welfare organisation existing in the school. Indeed, I congratulate them on the way in which they were tolerant towards both the Education Department and those handling the problems for them.

The open-space unit houses class 2, 3, 4 and 5 students, so that members can realise the size of the project that was completed. Furthermore, I was most pleased to hear from the Minister that the West Lakes Shore Primary School was almost completed. However, he was rather concerned because of a previous announcement made during the latter part of first term that it was hoped that the new school would be opened by the beginning of third term.

After the parents of the children involved heard this statement a survey was taken that showed that they objected to their children having to leave the school they were attending, because of the zoning provisions, to enrol in the new school in the third term at such an important part of the year; that is, at examination time. However, this new school will now open its doors in the first term of the next school year, much to the relief of many parents.

The provision of other amenities in the Albert Park District has been greatly appreciated by constituents. First, I refer to the number of bus shelters installed to afford protection to pensioners and schoolchildren. Several more bus shelters are to be built to meet the needs of everyone, but we were pleased to see that some effort has been made.

Secondly, I refer to the upgrading of many bus routes within the area. Although this was needed, the lack of suitable buses was caused by problems at the bus motor-body-building works where the provision of new buses was

held up because of problems beyond its control. Now that buses are flowing more freely off the lines of the motor-body-building works, we find that not only Albert Park but also other districts in the metropolitan area are being assisted. I have been pleased to see such improvements throughout the metropolitan area as well as in country areas resulting from the speeding up of production and the freer flow of buses from the motor-body-building works.

**Mr. Gunn:** Who wrote your speech for you?

**Mr. HARRISON:** That is the sort of comment one would expect to hear from the honourable member. I do not know what the honourable member is going on about. Certainly, no-one takes any notice of him whether he is reading, standing, or sitting. Renovations have recently been made to electorate offices for the protection of both members and their secretaries. From what I can gather, I understand that some protection has been necessary, and I hope that the installation of such safety measures will prevent the need for future renovations. However, the fact that they have been installed has caused some relief.

I was pleased to receive an invitation from Delhi-Santos to view the Cooper Basin recently. Among the party that attended was the Speaker and the Hon. Mr. Geddes from the other place. The managers of several financial concerns also attended. I appreciate having received that invitation. If any member has the same opportunity I recommend that he accept it because he will see something worth seeing and return with much knowledge. I was amazed, having not seen but heard of the works, at the magnitude of the project. I can assure honourable members that amenities and conditions in that area are worthy of note.

**Mr. Mathwin:** From those multi-national bogey men.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order.

**Mr. HARRISON:** The position is worth reporting. We saw people who were going about their tasks in a way that showed me, and I think other people on that inspection, that they were well satisfied. Being well satisfied, they were showing that in the jobs they were performing. I was amazed to hear that 75 per cent of the gas produced in that area is piped to the Electricity Trust of South Australia to be turned into electricity to supply the needs of our State. The other 25 per cent supplies gas for domestic purposes. A great relief will be felt by the people buried in those vast open spaces now that the big black cloud hanging over Redcliff has lifted. This will allow feasibility studies to go ahead. Let us hope that those studies will soon show that not only South Australia but Australia is going to benefit from this project.

**Mr. GUNN (Eyre):** I want to add to what I said during Question Time and comment on what the Minister of Mines and Energy said when he cast some aspersions on what I had said. I received a telegram on Friday, as follows:

Beltana Progress Association Committee concerned delay on power connection. 1974 survey results not applicable now.

Proposed business enterprise in jeopardy.

The telegram was signed by a Mr. Regless, who is the secretary. That clearly indicates that what I said this afternoon was correct and that what was said in another place by the Hon. N. K. Foster was his own view and that of one or perhaps two other people, certainly not the majority of people. I think it was unfortunate at that time that those views were put forward. I think it is also unfortunate that the Hon. Mr. Foster continues to promote a view which is not the view of the Far Northern Development Association, not the view of the majority of people in that area, and I do not believe it is the view of

the Electricity Trust or the majority of people at Leigh Creek.

Having said that, I now refer to another problem that concerns the transport field. It is interesting to note the editorial relating to Samcor in today's *News*, part of which is as follows:

With the news that Adelaide's unemployment is now the highest of any Australian capital, it is obvious that the Government has to start rethinking its policies to restore confidence and promote initiative in the private sector.

The Samcor performance shows it is not leading by example. Is it any wonder the business world's attitude to the Government is one of cynicism?

I have been approached by many constituents who have cattle to truck down from the North of the State. Unfortunately, the railways does not at present have the capacity to provide sufficient vans and, because of the very good season that has been experienced in the North of the State, cattle are weighing well. When my constituents load what they consider to be a reasonable freight on their trucks, so that the freight bill is not too much, they find they are overloaded. This applies particularly to people with tri-axes.

This matter has been taken up publicly by the Secretary of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia, Incorporated (Mr. Grant Andrews), reports have been made to me, and I have taken up the matter with the Minister. I understand that it is now awaiting a decision to be made by the Road Traffic Board, which decision has been put off until 17 December. However, the matter should have been cleared up before that.

I now refer to a report headed "Job threat over cattle load limits" in the 31 October issue of the *News*, part of which is as follows:

Bureaucratic red tape is threatening job opportunities in South Australia and the supply of cattle for South Australian markets, according to farmers.

United Farmers and Graziers Association of South Australia Secretary, Mr. Grant Andrews, said today road restrictions were causing the problem.

These were preventing fully-laden cattle trains from the Northern Territory and the Far North of South Australia bringing their loads to the Gepps Cross abattoirs.

Certainly the Gepps Cross abattoir wants as much throughput as it can get. The report continues:

Producers were now looking at alternative markets in Queensland and New South Wales.

The association asked 10 days ago for weight restrictions on tri-axle vehicles to be waived for a temporary period to allow vehicles to travel south of Port Pirie with full loads.

The board met yesterday but deferred a decision until it next meets on 17 November. Mr. Andrews said, "The situation is critical—about 1 500 head of cattle a week are scheduled to be moved from the north of Adelaide throughout November and early December."

Ministers would be aware that only a limited number of vehicles is available on the old Ghan line, and that the new standard-gauge line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs is not yet fully operative. Therefore, many problems are involved.

**The Hon. Hugh Hudson:** It's partially operating.

**Mr. GUNN:** A number of stations are using it, but unfortunately not enough vans, particularly from the Oodnadatta area, are available to provide the required service. I expect that the Minister would like to see these cattle processed at Gepps Cross and that he would not want them to go to Queensland or New South Wales. I have been approached by many constituents who are concerned that delays are occurring and that, when the vehicles are reasonably loaded, inspectors are enforcing

the law and booking people. I understand that one person was charged with carrying more than seven tonnes.

I pointed out earlier today that it was about time that a little common sense was used by Highways Department inspectors and that this deliberate harassment of people legitimately engaged in enterprises that are vital to this State should be stopped immediately. I have received a letter that clearly demonstrates the problems being experienced by my constituents. A couple of weeks ago, a cattle producer wrote to me as follows:

As you are no doubt aware, large numbers of cattle are being moved to market using double-deck cattle crates. In recent months large numbers have been sent out of the northern pastoral areas by this method, due partly to the fact that the railways cannot cope with the large number of stock to be moved and partly to the speed with which cattle can be got to market. This method has worked well for us over some few years with a big saving in cost on the single-deck units.

The problem is that, with the excellent condition of the cattle and their subsequent increase in weight, it is almost impossible to load these crates with anything but calves and yearlings and stay within the law. Where this is especially unfair is with those units fitted with bogey drive and tri-axle trailers, as they are not allowed to carry any more than a bogey drive with bogey trailer or a single drive with tri-axle trailer, due to the 32 tonnes behind the pin limit.

One has only to drive behind a tri-axle or bogey trailer on our rough roads to realise that as far as safety goes this is ridiculous. My request is that approaches be made to the appropriate authorities to have a load limit on tri-axle bogey drive stock plates raised to 40 tonnes to take into account the increased safety. It seems to me to be an exercise in cynical fund-raising for it to be legal to register a trailer and freight, but be penalised heavily financially for loading it to anywhere near its carrying capacity, especially when one considers livestock being loaded far from any scales or weighbridges. This matter is causing great bitterness among carriers and producers who end up paying for it through increased charges or having to load their stock with enough room to dance and consequently costing more per head to get them to market. If you can do something to remedy this situation a lot of people would be very grateful. Perhaps a special permit for livestock may be the answer.

The Government can do something; the Minister is in a position to do something. At least he can use his influence with the Road Traffic Board to smarten it up a bit and to take into account the unfortunate situation that is arising. I believe the situation will be alleviated in the future when the new standard gauge railway line is operating between Tarcoola and Alice Springs.

However, it is especially important that these cattle reach the abattoirs while they are in prime condition. For many years, stations in my electorate were not able to get cattle out of the country because of the tuberculosis problem, or the cattle were not strong enough to muster. Now they are able to muster these cattle and get a return on the very large investments they have. Many of them had difficult economic conditions for a number of years. The carriers are now getting penalised and the freights are increasing because of the action of the Road Traffic Board, in not agreeing to the granting of permits at this stage.

I sincerely hope the Minister will intervene. I have sent him a copy of this letter and made approaches to him. I have raised the matter on this occasion, since we have been discussing other matters relating to transport. We should do everything to ensure that stock are processed in South Australia. The editorial in the *News* today clearly indicates that it is about time the Government smartened

itself up a bit, put its philosophy behind it and got down to some hard sensible thinking on the right economic policies to benefit every section of the South Australian community.

Motion carried.

At 5.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 9 November at 2 p.m.