HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 25, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.

"BLUE BIRD" BRAKING SYSTEM.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—My question concerns a railcar crash in the Adelaide Hills last Sunday night. I understand that an investigation will be conducted into this matter. The normal braking system operated just after the car left Mount Lofty but did not operate when next used. The driver applied full emergency braking, known as "dead man feature" and used the hand brake without effect. I have been told that about 18 months ago, when travelling on a level track, a 250 class rail car, generally referred to as "blue bird", travelled for 1½ miles, after the hand brake was applied at 60 miles an hour. In the interests of the travelling public and the operators, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Railways to request the Railways Commissioner to give special attention to the hand brake system on these cars?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes. I shall refer the Leader's comments to the Minister of Railways.

GOOLWA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. JENKINS—At lunch-time today I had a telephone call from a person at Goolwa who represents 12 or 15 produce growers in the Goolwa and Currency Creek area. He claimed that the water level was down to such an extent that water could not be pumped for the irrigation of crops. Will the Minister of Works have this matter investigated and see whether the logs can be put in at Goolwa to raise the water level sufficiently to allow pumping to be carried out?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes, I shall do so as soon as I can contact the Engineer-in-Chief, which I shall try to do later this afternoon, because I realize that this is an important matter to people using water for irrigation purposes at this time of the year. I will find out from him the position at the barrages and bring the honourable member's remarks to his notice to see what action, if any, can be taken to improve the position.

DOCTORS' FEES.

Mr. RALSTON—My question relates to the recent increase in doctors' fees throughout South Australia. I shall quote a short extract from the *Advertiser* of March 23 this year concerning this subject.

The SPEAKER—Is it in explanation of the question?

Mr. RALSTON—Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote it to direct attention to what the question is about.

The SPEAKER—It must be strictly relevant to the question.

Mr. RALSTON—The article deals with fees. It states:—

The British Medical Association's State President (Dr. G. T. Gibson) said yesterday that the minimum fees recommended were:—Surgery consultation, 17s. 6d. (15s. since 1953); home visits, £1 5s. (£1 since 1956); out of hours services £1 10s. (£1 5s. since 1956).

Following Dr. Gibson's announcement, the secretary of the South-East Medical Association (Dr. I. G. Campbell) three days later announced fees for the South-East. The *Border Watch* of March 26 lists the charges as follows:—Surgery consultations, £1 (15s. since 1953); home visits, £1 5s. (£1 since 1956); out of hours, £1 10s. (£1 5s. since 1956). It appears from these figures that the increase for surgery consultations was 100 per cent more in the South-East than anywhere else in the State. At the time it was stated that the increase was based on the cost of living, but I point out that the wage in Whyalla, where there was only a 2s. 6d. rise, carries a 5s. loading above the wage in the metropolitan area. The metropolitan area basic wage is £13 11s., whereas the basic wage in the South-East is 3s. lower. I therefore ask the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Premier, to take up the matter with a view to obtaining answers to the following questions:—(1) Is the Premier aware that everywhere else in South Australia, including Whyalla (where the basic wage is 5s. more than in Adelaide), the increase was 2s. 6d. a visit, whereas in the South-East (where the basic wage is 3s. less than in Adelaide), the increase was 5s. a visit? (2) Is the Premier aware that the total refund, including the Commonwealth refund, from lodges and benefit societies is 13s. 6d. a surgery consultation, which means that the patient pays 4s. a visit in the metropolitan area and everywhere else in South Australia except the South-East, where he is called upon to pay 6s. 6d. from his own pocket? (3) Will the Minister refer this matter to the Prices Commissioner or, failing that, to the executive of the British Medical Association for investigation and report as to

whether the increase in fee for surgery consultations in the South-East of 100 per cent over and above the increase for the remainder of the State was justified and, if so, on what grounds?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—The honourable member has asked a very long question and no doubt would like a considered reply, and I therefore ask him to put the question on notice.

"RED HENS."

Mr. MILLHOUSE—My question concerns the "red hens" that are now giving a good service on the main hills railway line and, I guess, on other metropolitan railway lines as well. However, nearly 12 months' experience as a passenger shows that the present vehicles seem to have three disadvantages: (1) they have no lavatories that I have been able to discover—and this on a journey of an hour or more can be an embarrassment for older people and the very young; (2) there are no luggage racks; and (3) there are no blinds on the windows, which makes the "red hens" very hot and the light glary in the warm weather, as I discovered yesterday to my own cost. I do not expect that anything can be done on the present vehicles about the first two matters I have mentioned, but will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, convey to his colleague in another place the three matters that I have raised in the hope that the first two will be remedied when new "red hens" are designed? Will he also take up with his colleague the question of having blinds fitted to the vehicles as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Yes; I will see to that matter.

BANK ADVANCES.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister representing the Treasurer further information on a question I raised last week regarding restrictions on credit to primary producers?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—I have a short reply from the Secretary to the Treasurer, which is that the honourable the Treasurer has made representations in this matter to the Commonwealth Treasurer.

HOUSING TRUST DISMISSAL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—During the discussions on the lines of the Estimates, I referred to certain happenings in the Housing Trust depot at Torrensville, where a man was dismissed. Is the report that I asked the Treasurer to call for available yet?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—There is a reply from the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust, who advises:—

The comment of the Auditor-General has not in any degree any connection with the termination of the services of a man at the Torrensville depot of the Housing Trust early in July. The trust endeavours to maintain its stores and storekeeping at as low a cost as is possible and an accurate physical stock-take is essential for this purpose. The officer concerned was particularly directed to check physically certain stocks and to record the result on a stock sheet. He did not make a physical check as he was directed, but entered on the stock sheet a figure which had been arrived at by clerical calculations. It was considered necessary by the General Manager to dispense with the man's services as the officer had failed to carry out a fundamental duty and a specific direction. At no time was the officer's honesty in question and there is no validity in the statement that he was responsible for the matters which called forth the comments of the Auditor-General.

KANGAROO INN SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Education anything further to report on the negotiations taking place for the purchase of a site for the Kangaroo Inn school? Since I last raised the question, I have been talking to the owner of the property, who has repeated that he is prepared to sell 16 acres for £30 an acre, which would involve an expenditure of only £480 which, in my opinion, is a fair price. There is no need to talk about compulsory acquisition in this regard.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have no information other than what I have already given the honourable member from time to time. I will convey his information to the Property Officer of the Education Department, if he is not already aware of it, to see whether this matter can be brought to some finality, because I am just as anxious as is the honourable member to have this land purchased so that a definite decision can be made as to the locality of the site for the ultimate erection of this school.

PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL.

Mr. McKEE—Can the Minister of Works say when work is likely to resume on the Port Pirie hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Speaking from memory, I believe that tenders are being called at present. I am not sure whether a tender has not been accepted for I was not at the Cabinet meeting yesterday, having an engagement in my electorate, but the way is clear

for tenders to be called, if they have not already been called, for a continuation of the work that was stopped when the contractor went into liquidation. The honourable member can expect a speedy resumption as soon as the matter of the successful tenderer is resolved. If he cares to ask me again tomorrow, I will tell him precisely what the position is.

HEADMASTERS' PROMOTIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Last week I asked the Minister of Education whether the headmaster of the Largs Bay primary school was to be appointed to Hectorville or whether the Hectorville headmaster was to be retained there. According to this morning's press the headmaster from Largs Bay is to be transferred to Hectorville and the Hectorville headmaster to Ferryden Park. Can the Minister indicate whether the transfers will take place this year or next?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I regret that, on the spur of the moment, I am not aware of the position, which I discussed last week with the Director of Education. I understood him to say that he would recommend that the headmaster of the Largs Bay school be transferred to Hectorville.

Mr. Frank Walsh—That is so, according to this morning's press.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Then it must have come before me on a schedule.

MOUNT BURR COMMUNITY HALL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Can the Minister of Works, in the absence of the Minister of Forests, make any report about the Mount Burr Community Hall, the building of which has been delayed pending supplies of suitable timber?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I regret that I have not that information, but as the honourable member has raised the question I should think that the responsible officers will see that I have it tomorrow.

HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—On March 3 the Public Works Committee submitted its final report on various schools, including the Henley high school, which was to be a solid construction building costing £263,750. Can the Minister of Works say whether tenders have been let for this work and when it will commence and, if tenders have not been called, can he indicate when they are likely to be called?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Without inquiring I am unable to answer the questions, but I shall obtain the information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

MITCHELL PARK BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—On September 21 I asked the Minister of Works a question about the construction of the Mitchell Park boys technical high school and the use of gyprock instead of local fibrous plaster sheeting. The Minister said he would have the matter examined. Can he say whether a tender by an interstate firm for the supply of linings, other than local fibrous plaster sheeting, has been accepted? If so, could the decision be reversed, particularly as the local industry is quiet at present?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I recall the honourable member's inquiry, but I have no report on it in my bag. I think I have indicated that it is Government policy to favourably consider the use of local materials provided the cost is not much higher than the cost of other materials. At one time there was a shortage of fibrous plaster which led the department to investigate the use of other materials in lining schools and other buildings. I think it is correct that the cost in this instance was about 10 per cent more than the cost of gyprock, which was the alternative tender.

Mr. Frank Walsh—About £600.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Although that is not a great amount when related to the total cost of the school, I think it must be measured against the relative cost of two alternative materials. It would not be a proper comparison to take the additional cost of plaster over and above the alternative material in relation to the total cost of the school. If this practice I suggest is adopted, as I think it must be, the honourable member will see that the cost of the plaster in this case was relatively high. It is always Government policy to encourage the use of, and to insist upon the use of, local materials where they give a comparatively favourable result at a price approximating that at which other materials from outside the State can be obtained. In this case I think the tender was accepted on the basis that the cost of this local material was above the limit of preference, which is generally allocated as a result of policy.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. STOTT—Can the Minister of Works inform me whether equipment has been purchased for the purpose of adding fluoride to the metropolitan water supplies and, if so, at what cost?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Definitely no consideration has been given to the purchase of machinery for the purpose of adding fluoride to any water supply. There may be some misunderstanding (although not on the honourable member's part) because we have, as a matter of policy, installed machinery for chlorinating water. There is, of course, a marked difference between the two substances. Chlorination is purely to make doubly certain that our water supplies are free from harmful bacteria, whereas fluoride, if added, is for another purpose—allegedly to reduce or prevent dental caries and to prolong the life of teeth.

Mr. Quirke—"Allegedly" may be correct.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think so. There are so many conflicting opinions, each of which is based on the most authoritative information (according to reports), for and against the proposal. It is Government policy that it should be satisfied beyond any reasonable doubt before fluoride is added to our water supplies. From time to time I receive letters from a certain section of the public adamantly opposing such a proposal on the grounds of principle—in some cases virtually on the grounds of religious principle. In the presence of so many sharply conflicting opinions about its use, no decision has been taken and certainly no machinery has been sought or purchased.

Mr. Stott—What about setting up a committee to inquire into the matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The quantity of water used for human consumption is extremely small in relation to the total quantity provided. It is estimated that not more than two per cent of the water supplied to a householder is used for culinary or drinking purposes. It must be remembered that fluoride cannot be added only to the water a householder uses for culinary purposes or human consumption: it must be added to all the water he uses for gardens, sanitary purposes and ablutions. Many factors must be considered before this step can be taken. Many sources of water supplied in South Australia contain fluoride in a proportion which, according to people who advocate its use, is the correct proportion that should be added to the supply.

Mr. Quirke—How do the people in country districts who drink only tank water have good teeth?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—That is an academic question. I was once advised by a dentist to throw a bag of lime into a tank, and probably there was a good reason for his advice. However, until we get some factual information on this matter and a widespread acceptance of the policy it is not intended to take the matter further, to procure machinery, or to add fluoride to our water supply, apart from the quantities it already contains that are gained from natural sources.

TROTTING BOYCOTT.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Last week, in reply to a question about bookmakers' charges at Wayville trotting meetings, the Premier said that he would refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner and that legislation was likely on the matter. Will the Minister of Lands, as acting Leader of the Government, try to obtain further information this week?

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS—Yes.

RESIDENT WELFARE OFFICER.

Mr. Clark for Mr. RICHES (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to appoint a resident welfare officer in the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department in the northern magisterial district as recommended by Mr. J. P. Marshall, S.M.?

The Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The matter is at present the subject of an investigation.

BIRTHS AND DEATHS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable a death to be registered in a case where an inquest is being held but has not been completed. The principal Act provides that where an inquest is held into a death the Coroner is to notify the Principal Registrar furnishing certain required particulars after which the Registrar is to register the death. It has been pointed out that the result of this and other provisions of the Act is that once a Coroner has commenced an inquest the death cannot be registered until the Coroner has given his verdict. Considerable difficulty is sometimes occasioned by the inability of the

Registrar to register a death pending completion of the inquest and this leads to delay in connection with winding up of an estate and in other directions.

Last year the principal Act was amended so as to permit registration and the issue of a cremation permit before a Coroner had given his verdict in cases where the Coroner certified that further examination of the body was not necessary. The effect of the amendment made by clause 3 of the present Bill will be to enable the death to be registered after notification from the Coroner after due inquiry. Should his ultimate decision or finding necessitate any alteration in the register, the Principal Registrar is empowered to make such an alteration. The Bill is thus a machinery Bill designed to avoid unnecessary difficulties and delays.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1483.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—This Bill contains two simple amendments which in my opinion are worthy of support. The first amends section 20 of the original Act by changing the word "usually" to "continuously". The word "usually" was found to leave a loophole by which outside itinerant traders could come into a town at intervals without being subject to the by-laws and regulations imposed on local traders. This was sometimes to the detriment of established traders who were subject to such by-laws and regulations, and who, through rates and other charges, contributed to the revenue of the town.

I remember from my experience on the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation (present members of that committee will bear this out) that several times by-laws came before us that attempted to control traders coming from outside a town who had the effect that this Bill seeks to prevent. I understand that such local by-laws, because of the looseness of their wording, were not always successful. The substitution of the word "continuously" should provide a more certain protection to local traders and give local government bodies more effective control over hawkers. These people could be called interlopers. The second amendment is surprising. It appears that when a previous amendment was made certain words that should not have been struck out were struck out. The provision in the Bill seems to me to be the only solution. When a Bill is before this House or another place, in the three readings it is dealt with in much detail, so it is surprising that this should have occurred. However, according to the Minister's second reading speech (which I take to be correct), when the Act was amended in 1948 too many words were struck out. That had the effect of making inoperative any by-laws fixing fees and fines on hawkers. I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I support the second reading. I have nothing to say on the first amendment, but I query the necessity for the second amendment. It is a good rule of legislation that Acts and provisions are not made retrospective. That is the general rule. If provisions are made retrospective they may adversely affect people's rights and position generally without our meaning to do so, and without those people knowing, at the time they took up that position or acquired their rights, that they would be adversely affected in the future. You, Sir, may well say that rules are only made to be broken on occasion, and that, too, is true. However, I cannot for the life of me see why we need to make this provision retrospective.

Mr. Quirke—Has any reason been given?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No, and that is why I query the provision. There is an explanation of how it happened.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Fees have been charged without legal authority.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Why, then, do we need any amendment? If everything has been going on all right, why do we have to take the thing back 12 years? There is no such explanation in the second reading speech; how the mistake occurred is set out, but why we have to put it right is not.

Mr. Clark—Wouldn't they be charging fees without legal authority to do it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—What adverse effect has that had?

Mr. Jenkins—It could be challenged.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Perhaps the Minister would explain the point in his reply, for he certainly did not bother to explain it in his second reading explanation. I suggest that when we are breaking a well-settled rule that is only commonsense after all we should have an explanation of why it is being done. The Minister has not explained why we have to remedy the position or what effect there will be if it is not remedied.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Your own ingenuity should answer that question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—It is the Minister's Bill, and I should like his explanation of why this has to be done. If there is no good reason why it should be done I do not think that we should break the general rule.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the Bill. Without reiterating what the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) said regarding the substitution of the word "continuously" for the word "usually", I think it will to some extent tidy up the practice for the local government bodies and also protect many local traders. I do not think there is any town in South Australia that has not at some time or another had hawkers coming into it and selling things like fruit and vegetables at less than current prices. When there is a glut these hawkers pick up produce, sometimes of an inferior quality, and sell it at reduced prices. Local traders have to pay council rates and water rates and contribute to charitable purposes and the welfare of the town, and they are therefore at a distinct disadvantage. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) queried the need for the second amendment, but that will give authority to the local councils who are now charging fees, whereas without such authority I should think there would come a time when those bodies could be challenged in this matter, and that would put them in an invidious position. This amendment should tidy up the Act and be all to the good.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I am not happy about this measure. The administration is, of course, in the hands of the district councils. This legislation applies to district councils, and the Bill provides that anyone who does not continuously reside in a district council area that is subject to the by-law cannot hawk in that area at all. A person living in one district council area is completely out of it if he goes into another district council area. The Bill refers to persons "who do not continuously reside". Anybody continuously residing in a district council area will be able to hawk there, but a person who resides outside that area will be prevented from doing so. What about the people who travel around and provide things that are not provided in the district? I have in mind a nurseryman who travels through the country and provides valuable service to districts where there are no nurserymen. An overall ban would exclude that man, and the council that excluded him would not be popular with the people. I support this Bill because I have great faith in local government, but to show something that could happen I shall read a letter which I received today. It states:—

In considering the proposed Bill to transfer the issuing of licences from the Commissioner of Police to district councils, may I respectfully suggest that consideration be given to hawkers who will be forced out of business if this Bill becomes law. In my own case I have been established for 29 years and have always endeavoured to give service to customers in outlying areas. I am a returned soldier from two World Wars, and at the age of 62 would be definitely unemployed if I am forced to discontinue my occupation. I would not be eligible for service, age, or disability pension, and as I am self-employed, not entitled to social services.

Is he the only one?

Mr. McKee—There would be several others.

Mr. QUIRKE—That man has worked up a livelihood, and he will be adversely affected if any district council can exclude him. What he is hawking I do not know, but we know, for instance, what the nurseryman whose case I quoted is doing: he gives a direct benefit to people in outlying areas. Is he going to be stopped in the interests of the people who trade in those areas? That man buys trees and shrubs in Adelaide and takes them to sell in those areas; he is a nurseryman in his own right, and yet under this Bill he could be precluded from carrying out that service. I think that we should do more than just give this measure a cursory glance.

Mr. Jenkins—He is more of a regular hawker, not a casual.

Mr. QUIRKE—It applies to all hawkers: it does not matter whether the hawker is regularly on the track or not. The Bill states that a hawker has to be continuously resident in a district council area that makes the by-law before he is exempt from that by-law. In other words, if he lives continuously in the district council area he can hawk only inside that district council area, and cannot go from one council area to another. Is there anything wrong with that interpretation? That is what I read into it, and I think it is defining the thing closely. The provision could do considerable harm in many instances. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1483.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill seeks to repeal Section

20 of the Mental Health Act, 1935-1959, which provides for six months' leave of absence each five years to various medical officers in mental institutions. This section was enacted when these officers resided in the institutions and were continuously on duty. These conditions do not apply at the present time and the object of the Bill is to allow to these medical officers the same long service leave conditions that apply to other public servants of the State. There is also provision for a transition period of up to five years for medical officers who were engaged under the old conditions to be granted one further period of leave of six months without affecting any other long service leave to which they may become eligible in the meantime. Therefore, I support the Bill.

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

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1484.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—In general terms, this Bill seeks to increase the benefits under the Act by 12½ per cent with a corresponding increase in contributions. As the Bill is based on a report by the Public Actuary and is acceptable to the Secretary of the Police Association, I am pleased to concur with the views of those gentlemen. The operation of the Bill is purely mechanical in that contributions are to be increased in approximately the same proportion as the increase in benefits which is rendered necessary by the falling money values in South Australia. It is with pleasure that I notice in the final clause of the Bill that present pensioners or those who retire or become eligible for benefits before the operation of the present Bill are to receive the same proportionate increase in their benefits as existing contributors will receive some time in the future. I support the Bill, but may I ask what has become of Order of the Day No. 11, the Salaries Adjustment (Public Service and Teachers) Bill, consideration of which is long overdue?

The SPEAKER—The honourable Leader will be in order if he confines his remarks to the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Very well. I am concerned about certain police officers who will contribute to the fund under this legislation. Are the new police uniforms to be worn in our outback areas? Would not other attire be more suitable? Should not the type of uniform suitable for the northern areas be reviewed? Is uniformity of dress throughout the State desirable? Should there not be a more commonsense approach to the matter of uniforms so that some police officers will not have to retire too early and so enjoy the benefits of this legislation? There is a need to review police uniforms, particularly outside Goyder's line.

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

WATER FRONTAGES REPEAL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1485.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—I support the second reading of this Bill, which is long overdue.

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

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1490.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—This Bill has been sent to this House from another place where it received a blessing. However, I understand that the Minister of Education intends making minor drafting amendments. I do not know how many members of this House are authorities on company law, but I would not be so bold as to claim to be an authority. In the interpretation clause, the following definition appears:—

> "investment contract" means any contract scheme or arrangement which, in substance and irrespective of the form thereof, involves the investment of money in or under such circumstances that the investor acquires or may acquire an interest in or right in respect of property which under or in accordance with the terms of investment will . . .

In this State we have always claimed to have had a benefit in respect of real estate—a "Torrens title", or a title to the land whereon we build. The average person who purchases land and builds thereon has a title to it. It does not matter whether the house is freehold or under mortgage. However, about 12 months ago I raised the question of the construction of flats which were purchased on a 999-year term, but in respect of which the purchasers did not gain a title to any land. I was informed that a conference of Attorney-Generals would tidy up this legislation, but

this Bill certainly does not. It has been suggested that this form of activity is all right because it operates in other States, but I regard it as a means of getting around our company laws.

The position is that companies are formed and the persons who invest therein get, as their share, a flat (or what is known as a flat). I do not know all the details, but if one asks who owns the land, the reply is that it belongs to the company and not to the individuals. The land can never belong to the individuals, in my opinion. People who have title deeds to land have a valuable asset, but the purchasers of these flats, who believe they own something, actually have nothing when the position is thoroughly analyzed. They certainly have no title to the land. I am concerned about the responsibility for maintenance. It may be that the company is responsible, but I believe that the company does not exist after it has sold shares in the form of units. Title deeds are of paramount importance, but how can a number of titles be given for buildings that probably cover the whole of the area?

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Enactment of Part IIIa of principal Act."

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I move—

After the words "Part XII" in new section 114a (1) to insert "and a corporation that is by proclamation declared to be a company for the purposes of this Part".

Under new section 114f no person except a company or a duly authorized agent of a company will be permitted to issue or offer to the public for subscription or purchase in this State any interest. A company has been defined for the purposes of new Part IIIa, inserted by clause 5, as a public company or a corporation that is a public company under the law of a proclaimed State and registered under Part XII. Thus, a public company incorporated in a proclaimed State and registered in this State as a foreign company would be able to issue or offer interests in this State. But, although the other States and the Commonwealth have indicated their intention to introduce similar legislation corresponding with Part IIIa, it would not be expedient to declare any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth a proclaimed State for the purposes of this Part until such legislation had been passed in such State or Territory. This would have the effect of preventing a reputable company, though incorporated as a public company in another State and registered in this State as a foreign company, from issuing or offering interests in this State until the State in which it is incorporated becomes a proclaimed State. The Government is anxious to avoid such hardship being imposed on companies which, during the transitional period, through no fault of their own would fall into that category, and feels that some protection should be afforded to any such company that complies in all other respects with Part IIIa. This amendment is accordingly designed to enable such a company to be declared by proclamation to be a company for the purpose of this Part.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—Although I do not oppose the amendment, a long second reading speech was given on this matter and the Minister's explanation of the amendment was as long as a normal second reading speech. In most cases companies that desire to trade in a State other than the one in which they are registered are probably registered as foreign companies in the State in which they wish to trade. If that is what this provision means, I do not object, because reciprocal freedom between the States is desirable. Will a firm registered in another State but desiring to trade here have to be registered in this State as a foreign company?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As usual, the Leader's interpretation is correct. If he desires to have any further time to consider the matter, I shall be pleased to report progress, but I think he will find this will work as he desires.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I am concerned about investment contracts. If a person invests money to purchase accommodation he should be afforded better protection than he has had hitherto. If this provision is accepted nobody but the company will hold a deed in the case I have referred to, but I believe the company goes out of existence when it sells its shares.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—As I said in my second reading speech, perhaps the major investment phenomenon in recent years has been the rapid growth in Australia of unit trusts and vending machine operations. This Bill seeks to control those operations, and nothing more. A year or so ago Mr. Walsh raised the important matter of titles under the Real Property Act and referred to people buying flats or units in multiple dwellings. He was then told that the whole matter was

being considered in relation to the uniform Companies Act. Since then the Attorney-Generals, Crown Solicitors, and Registrars of Companies of each of the States have met from time to time and have gone a long way towards drafting a uniform Companies Bill. It was hoped that that Bill would be introduced into the several State Parliaments during this year, but it is now considered that that is impossible. However, it will be introduced and, we hope, passed in all the State Parliaments next year. That Bill will certainly deal with the important matter which has been raised by the Leader and which is exercising the minds of many interested persons. However, the Bill now before the Committee seeks to control the operations of companies dealing with unit trusts and vending machines, and not the important matter the Leader has raised.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Where are we going to finish with vending machines? What will be the position regarding the automatic selling of petrol? If we continue with vending machines the time will come when we will not need the labour to sell the commodities handled by those machines.

Mr. Jenkins—People will still have to cut the sandwiches that are sold through the machines.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Will the price of the commodity be less because it is sold from a vending machine? After all, the labour component is important. The fewer the opportunities for using labour the shorter will be the opportunities to transfer currency in the community, and when that position arises we will not have the money to spend on the vending machines. I support the principle of control, but I advocate passing on the benefits of these machines to the community in general.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I move—

After "interests in" in new section 114g (2) (*a*) to insert "or arising out of an investment in".

Subsection (2) of the new section 114g provides for the matters and reports to be set out in the statement to be issued before an interest is issued or offered to the public. Paragraph (*a*) of the subsection provides for the matters and reports to be included in a statement relating to interests issued or offered by unit trust companies, while paragraph (*b*) of that subsection provides for matters and reports to be included in a statement relating to other kinds of interests. Interests issued by unit trust companies could consist of rights or interests in or arising out of an investment in marketable securities, and not merely of rights or interests in marketable securities, and this amendment seeks to make the position clear.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I move—

In new section 114j (1) (*a*) (i) to strike out "are" and insert in lieu thereof ", or on such other day as may be approved by the Registrar, were".

Under the new section 114j (1) a company that has issued an interest in relation to which an approved deed is in force is required, *inter alia*, once at least in every calendar year, not more than 30 days after its annual general meeting, to prepare and lodge with the Registrar a return containing a list of all persons who on the day of the annual general meeting of that year were holders of the interests to which the deed relates. It has been brought to the notice of the Government that some of these companies have to prepare a list of interest holders at the time when each dividend is payable in respect of the particular deed, and this usually occurs at least twice a year, but the payment of these dividends does not always coincide with the time of the annual general meeting of the company. This amendment seeks to give the Registrar power to approve of the list being prepared as at some other appropriate day in cases where it would be unreasonable to require the company to prepare a special list as at the day of the annual general meeting.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC BOARD BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works)—I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the establishment of a Road Traffic Board, and contains new provisions about speed limits. It has been introduced as a preliminary to the consolidating and amending Road Traffic Bill, the drafting of which is nearly complete. If Parliament approves of the idea of having a Traffic Board, it will make a considerable difference to the bigger Bill, and it is desirable to have an early decision on this question. The management of road traffic has become a very large and complex task in industrialized countries throughout the world. Governments everywhere are faced with the need to take measures to deal with increasing traffic accidents and congestion on the roads.

In Australia more than 2,000 people are killed on the roads each year and more than 50,000 are injured. The total loss is enormous and perturbing. These casualties take place notwithstanding constant expensive campaigns of instruction and exhortation to road users. If any appreciable reduction in accidents is to be brought about, road users themselves will have to make the greater contribution to it by exercising care and restraint far above present standards. But traffic authorities and road builders can also play an important part in reducing accidents and congestion, and for this reason the Government has given consideration to the question of improving the administrative arrangements for the management of road traffic. It is important that scientific methods and the accumulating knowledge of traffic management and of the behaviour of traffic should be fully utilized in dealing with the problems that exist today and providing for the greater needs of the future. In South Australia the number of vehicles on the roads each year increases by about 5½ per cent of the number in the previous year. If this tendency continues, it means that the number of vehicles will be doubled in 13 years, and in seven years the increase will be approximately 50 per cent. Average speeds also tend to increase. It is, therefore, vital to look ahead and see that our traffic practices and laws as well as our roads are adapted to a very great increase in the volume of vehicles.

In recent years traffic boards or commissions have become a common method of co-ordinating the activities of the various Governmental authorities whose work affects the management and behaviour of road traffic. They are also a medium through which the relatively new science of traffic engineering is applied in an attempt to reduce traffic accidents and congestion. Traffic engineers are trained experts in the use of traffic control devices and in the design of road arrangements for safety and free flow of traffic. They are also trained to assess the effect of traffic laws and regulations as well as of control devices on the behaviour of road users, and in the techniques of traffic surveys. The great value of the traffic engineer is now generally recognized.

In the United States almost every State and most cities with a population of 50,000 or upwards have their own traffic engineers and the smaller cities commonly take the advice of consulting traffic engineers. The South Australian Government has two traffic engineers and I believe every other Australian State employs officers of this kind. I mention these points about traffic engineering because an essential feature of the scheme in the Bill is that at least one member of the proposed Road Traffic Board shall be a traffic engineer, and it will probably be necessary for the board to have the assistance of other traffic engineers. Another reason that has influenced the Government in proposing a traffic board is that the number of matters coming before the Government which need the advice of persons with scientific as well as practical knowledge of traffic and roads is constantly increasing. I am referring not to questions of general policy such as are suitable for the State Traffic Committee but to technical questions relating to traffic control devices, equipment and standards of vehicles, rights of motorists on dual highways, protection of pedestrians, and so on. These questions can best be solved by the joint efforts of traffic engineers, road authorities and police officers who are specialists in traffic matters.

This Bill, therefore, proposes a board of three persons to be appointed by the Governor. One must be the Traffic Engineer of the Highways and Local Government Department. Another member must be a police inspector or superintendent, who will be nominated by the Commissioner of Police. It is essential that the police should be represented on the board both because of their great practical knowledge of traffic and because of the need for securing co-ordination between the police and other traffic authorities. The other member will be a person representative of local government interests nominated by the Minister. The Governor will appoint one of the members to be chairman of the board. The board will take over a number of duties relating to traffic now being performed by the Commissioner of Highways, the Commissioner of Police and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Most of these duties relate to the control of the installation of traffic control devices and aids, such as lights, stop signs, pedestrian and school crossings, road markings, roundabouts, safety-zones and other like structures. The board will also take over the issue of permits for the use of over-sized vehicles, and vehicles above the legal weight. These functions are now performed by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Commissioner of Highways respectively.

The general provisions about the constitution and functions of the board are contained in

clauses 4 to 7 inclusive. The specific duties of the board in addition to those which it will have under the Road Traffic Act are set out in clause 8. They include the following:—

(*a*) recommendations to the Minister and public authorities for the prevention of road accidents and better flow of traffic;

(*b*) promoting uniformity in the design, location, etc., of traffic control devices and signs;

(*c*) research into accidents and other road problems;

(*d*) publication of information for the benefit of road users;

(*e*) technical help to authorities concerned with road traffic;

(*f*) reports on proposed traffic laws and regulations and other matters referred to the Committee by the Minister.

Nowadays the Government receives numerous suggestions and complaints about traffic matters and many of these will fall within the scope of the board.

Clause 9 of the Bill provides that traffic control devices placed on roads by the Commissioner of Highways with the approval of the board may be paid for out of any money voted by Parliament for expenditure by the Commissioner on roads. This clause does not authorize the Commissioner to pay for any class of road signs or signals other than those for which he pays now, but it will enable the cost of these items to be paid from and charged against whichever road fund is appropriate. Clause 10 provides that an authority which seeks the approval of the board for the erection or removal of a traffic control device must give the board any information reasonably required by the board, and that the board may grant or refuse any application or grant it subject to conditions.

Clause 11 provides that an authority which is dissatisfied with a decision of the board about the installation of a traffic control device will have the right to apply to the board for a review of its decision. The board must give its reasons for any decision on request, and consider and report on every application for review. There is further provision for the Minister to affirm or reverse the decision of the board. Clause 12 contains a provision on the lines of an existing regulation under the Road Traffic Act. It empowers the board to secure the removal or modification of illegal misleading or dangerous traffic control devices erected on roads. At present similar powers are vested in the Highways Commissioner but, as these powers have a direct bearing on the management of traffic, the board, if created, will be the proper authority to exercise them.

Clause 13 proposes an alteration of the law relating to excessive speed. The Government has recently given consideration to this question because of the fatal accidents that have occurred on country roads in some of which excessive speed appears to have been an important factor.

The present law as to excessive speed is in section 43 of the Road Traffic Act. The section makes it an offence to drive at an excessive speed, and provides that a *prima facie* case of excessive speed can be made out by proving that the defendant drove at more than 25 miles an hour in a municipality or town, or more than 40 miles an hour anywhere else. If a *prima facie* case is made out under these provisions, the defendant can escape conviction if he makes it appear probable that his speed was not excessive. In recent years there have been very few prosecutions under this section. For practical purposes it is obsolete. The speeds which it attempts to enforce are clearly too low for modern roads and vehicles and it is easy for motorists to escape conviction. The Government has therefore decided to repeal the section and to insert in its place a more realistic section which will create an overriding speed limit of 60 miles an hour, to be more strictly enforced. The proposed new section lays it down that, if a person is proved to have exceeded 60 miles an hour, he will be able to escape conviction only if the court is satisfied that his speed was not dangerous in the circumstances. The onus on the driver will be heavier than under the present law because he will have to satisfy the court—that is, to prove beyond reasonable doubt—that his speed was not dangerous.

Clause 14 also deals with the law as to speed limits. It empowers the Governor on the recommendation of the Traffic Board to make regulations declaring zones, that is, specified roads or parts of roads on which a speed limit different from that now fixed by the Road Traffic Act will apply. On roads within municipalities, towns and townships where the limit is now 35 miles an hour the Governor will be able to declare a higher or lower limit. The present limit of 35 miles an hour is probably too high for some congested urban and suburban areas, and too low for portions of municipalities which are in more or less open

country. The Governor will also have power to fix speed limits on stretches of road on which under present law no specific limit applies. There are numerous precedents for speed-fixing laws of the kind proposed in clause 14, particularly in the United States. In that country, traffic authorities are commonly empowered, upon making engineering and traffic investigations, to determine whether a speed limit greater or less than the normal speed limit would be reasonable and safe under the conditions found to exist upon a particular road or part of a road, and to make declarations accordingly. A scheme on the same lines is also in force in Victoria, while in New South Wales the Minister of Transport can introduce a 30 mile an hour limit on any road or part thereof. A requirement of the scheme set out in the Bill is that signs shall be displayed on the roads to mark the zones in which the special speed limits apply.

The remaining clauses of the Bill (clauses 15 to 25) are for the purpose of transferring to the board certain powers now exercised in connection with traffic control devices and other traffic matters by the Commissioner of Highways, the police and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. Approval for the erection of traffic lights, the marking of pedestrian and school crossings and right-turn marks and traffic lanes, and the construction of traffic islands and safety zones must under present law be obtained from the Commissioner of Highways. The power to grant permits for the use of over-size vehicles now rests with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles, while permits for the use of over-weight vehicles are issued by the Commissioner of Highways. It is proposed that all of these powers shall be transferred to the board. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Commissioner of Highways concur in these proposals and agree that a Traffic Board is the appropriate authority to exercise powers of the kind to be transferred.

In commending this Bill to Parliament, I should like to make it clear that it is not the object of the Bill to take away powers from local or other authorities. In other States, in the interests of securing uniformity in traffic control, there has been a much greater measure of centralization of traffic powers than in this State. In South Australia the councils still have control over parking, routeing of traffic and the erection of traffic control devices although, as I said, in connection with traffic control devices there is now some over-riding State control in the interests of uniformity. I think it is correct to say that this Bill does not extend the present ambit of control, except possibly in one respect. In the past there has been some doubt whether median strips on roads are traffic islands which are subject to control of the Highways Commissioner under section 358 of the Local Government Act. The Bill clarifies this point by putting median strips in the same category as traffic islands. The Bill is submitted to the favourable consideration of honourable members in the confident hope that it will prove to be a valuable contribution towards the solution of the traffic problem.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 1485.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler)—I support the Bill. Normally, on principle, I am not in favour of increasing penalties, but on this occasion I am happy to adopt a different attitude because I believe that increased penalties are justified here. The Bill doubles the penalties on those found guilty of ill-treating animals and increases the fine from £5 to £10 a day for those continuing to ill-treat them. The maximum term of imprisonment will not be increased, although that could have been considered. A new provision is inserted to cover the protection of captive birds. It provides a fine of £50 or six months' imprisonment for proved offences. I notice from the debates in another House that there was some discussion about the cruelty involved in keeping budgerigars in cages, but from general experience I believe these birds would be most unhappy out of cages.

Mr. Quirke—What is meant by "stretch its wings freely"?

Mr. CLARK—I do not know. I am doubtful about that myself. The original Act has been amended only twice in 30 years. Most members will remember the more recent amending legislation which was instigated by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) to provide penalties for releasing captive birds to be shot at. The original Act was designed to increase humanity towards birds and animals and this Bill strengthens it. Unfortunately, cruelty to animals, whether accidental or deliberate, is always with us. We like to think

that we have advanced a long way from barbarism and that our code of humanity is high. For example, we could not imagine tolerating such so-called sports as bullfighting and bearbaiting, although some so-called civilized countries do. Although we like to believe that we are not as barbarous as our forefathers were supposed to have been, we still find reported proven cases of cruelty, which sometimes makes us wonder whether we are so far from barbarism after all. So, of course, do many of the happenings of the world today.

I believe that the exemptions provided in this legislation are obvious and just. They refer to conveyance of birds and animals to exhibitions of birds and animals and to places for veterinary treatment. Those of us who have been associated with farm life appreciate that some things must be done to animals of the farm—things that might be regarded as cruel by persons lacking knowledge of farm life. I understand that the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has sought the reforms contained in this Bill and I am glad that its requests have been acceded to. Although the society is sometimes unjustly criticized by thoughtless people (frequently persons with an axe to grind), it has performed a humane and necessary function in the community. We regard with horror cases of people who mis-treat children and I believe we should have the same attitude to those who reveal a similar type of cruelty to animals. The proposed penalties are warranted and I give the Bill my unqualified support.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside)—I support this Bill because the proposed amendments are desirable and humane. The first will bring this State's legislation into line with similar legislation in some other States, although in Queensland and the Australian Capital Territory the penalties are double those envisaged here. In Queensland, for instance, the penalty is a fine of £100 or imprisonment not exceeding six months, while in the Australian Capital Territory there is a £100 fine or imprisonment for six months. Indeed, for aggravated cruelty, (which is defined as cruelty resulting in death, deformity or serious disablement) a fine of £200 is imposed and on indictment the person charged is sentenced to imprisonment for two years. Considering the abhorrence of most of us to any form of cruelty to dumb animals, one questions whether our penalties are sufficiently severe.

I suppose one might also say that the question of what is cruelty is relative. For instance, some months ago I received a letter from a constituent who grazes sheep in the foothills near Mount Osmond. His flock was one of those severely ravaged by dogs roaming unrestrained. I approached the Premier and, as a result, the assistance of the Commonwealth was sought and trained dogs, which I believe belong to the Weapons Research Establishment, were used to track the dogs that were attacking these sheep. Perhaps the owner or owners of the dogs responsible for the attacks felt that it was cruel to keep their dogs chained in a confined space. On the other hand if they had been chained, obviously the sheep would not have been ravaged.

Mr. Quirke—Are you allowed to keep dogs chained?

Mrs. STEELE—Many dogs that are employed to keep people away from the transports that travel between States are chained for long periods. I hope this Bill will have the effect of rectifying what is a grave abuse of those dogs. References have been made to budgerigars being kept in cages. I contend that many are kept in cages that are far too small, but I do not see any reference in the Bill about what constitutes a cage sufficiently large in which to keep birds in captivity. On the other hand, once again referring to the question of relativity of cruelty, we know that if some birds were released they would be attacked by other birds when flying in the open.

Incidentally, on the subject of dogs, many large dogs, mostly Alsatians, are kept in my district, in many instances by New Australians. Questions have been asked in this House about what can be done to restrain these dogs from attacking children and people. I believe that a contributing factor is that these dogs are trained to obey orders in the language of the owners and that when a person enters a property where such a dog is loose and speaks to it in English the dog does not understand and attacks. They are trained in a foreign language and do not appreciate orders given in English.

We frequently hear of dreadful maltreatment of animals and not long ago my own cat was the victim of a savage attack. I only wish I could have discovered the perpetrator of the act because he had obviously set a trap to catch cats in the neighbourhood. I came outside one morning to find my cat lying on the doorstep with its hind leg almost completely severed. It was obvious from the

wound that the cat had been trapped and had dragged its leg from the trap and crawled home. Ultimately, after being taken to a veterinary surgeon for treatment, it died, which was probably the best thing that could have happened under the circumstances. It was a dreadfully cruel thing to do to an animal. If I could have discovered the identity of the person responsible I would unhesitatingly have charged him with cruelty, an act which would be penalized under this legislation.

The second amendment proposed in the Bill relates to the keeping of birds in captivity. Some weeks ago I received a letter from a woman who drew my attention to the fact that a wedge-tailed eagle was being kept in captivity while being trained for a television appearance. In her letter, she stated:—

> There he stands—on the narrow edge of a plank, instead of a rounded bough—all day, at least for 30 days since I saw him, in a miserable prison, scarcely any sunshine, no freedom, no company of his own kind, nothing to do, his wonderful wings useless.

She took this matter up with the R.S.P.C.A. which advised her that under the present law these people were doing nothing wrong. She then took it to a solicitor to see if something could not be done about prosecuting these people and having this bird released from captivity. Her letter continued:—

> The bird spreads its wings to fly, then looks up at the piece of iron on top of its wretched prison, and knows that he cannot get free. He dashes himself against the netting in front of the cage. It is a heartbreak to see it.

I believe that the second amendment will most certainly protect birds that are being kept in captivity for such purposes, although I wondered, when I saw the proposed exemption, whether this bird or birds in similar conditions would be protected from cruelty.

Mr. Quirke—What does it mean by "permit the bird to stretch its wings freely"?

Mrs. STEELE—The provision merely states:—

> If any person keeps or confines any bird whatsoever in any cage or other receptacle which is not sufficient in height, length and breadth to permit the bird to stretch its wings freely he shall be guilty . . .

Mr. Quirke—A 6-inch cage would be sufficient for a finch to stretch its wings.

Mrs. STEELE—It may be necessary to define the area in which a bird can freely stretch its wings. Perhaps the Minister will indicate whether there will be different-sized cages for different birds. I know that budgerigars are often kept in cages that are too small. The Bill does not define sizes of cages and I do not know whether this matter should be left open or whether sizes should be defined. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens)—Like most other members, I am intrigued at the wording of clause 4. The member for Burra asked what was meant by a bird's being able to stretch its wings freely. I suppose a canary cage six or seven inches square would comply with this clause. The member for Burnside said that steps should be taken to prosecute people keeping wedge-tailed eagles in small cages. I think anyone, except the Zoological Gardens authorities, who keeps these birds should be prosecuted. They could not really be called pets. I take it that the birds referred to in this Bill are house birds.

I have a large aviary 20ft. x 8ft. x 4ft. in which I keep a considerable number of mixed finches and canaries, and they are well cared for. I would be the last to see any bird or animal cruelly treated, and I subscribe to the clause that increases penalties. However, although I do not reflect on our Parliamentary Draftsman, I think clause 4 should be reconsidered to provide for a person who keeps a budgerigar or a canary. If these birds are kept in cages 12in. square, I think that is cruel.

Although I have much respect for the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, on whose recommendations I believe the Government has acted, some of these organizations have a tendency to be hypocritical as they concern themselves with matters like this but never complain about the way sheep and cattle are transported long distances to the markets and kept over the week-ends and longer in railway trucks with practically no care or attention. That is utterly cruel. In this State and other States, particularly during the summer, herds of cattle and flocks of sheep can be seen in paddocks where there is not a blade of grass for them to eat. I know it is difficult to provide feed in paddocks but every step should be taken by those responsible for transporting sheep and cattle to see that they are properly cared for. If they are not, a heavier penalty should be inflicted. I support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—A cage measuring 12in. x 12in. x 12in. could be subdivided into four smaller cages and, if a small bird were put into each section, the cage would comply with this Bill, as the birds could spread their

wings. As some clarification of this matter is necessary, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ORDER OF THE DAY No. 12.

The TREASURER to move—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to establish a Road Traffic Board and to make certain amendments of the Road Traffic Act, 1934-1959, and the Local Government Act, 1934-1959, relevant to the functions of the said board and for other purposes.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS (Minister of Lands)—I move that this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 26, at 2 p.m.