LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 19, 1965.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

MOONTA FORESHORE.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: During the weekend, when visiting constituents at Moonta, I discovered that in a recent storm the retaining wall and portion of the foreshore at Moonta just north of the jetty had been washed away. This may have an adverse effect on tourist traffic, which will become heavy in the next month or two. I understand that the Minister of Marine made an inspection when he was recently in the district and promised sympathetic consideration, and that the Director of the Tourist Bureau said that the matter needed attention. I understand also that since the Minister of Works visited the area a reply was received that money was not available to effect the necessary repairs. As the Moonta corporation is not able to finance the work from its own resources, and as the tourist trade plays an important part in the Moonta area, will the Minister of Labour and Industry, who represents the Minister of Marine in this Chamber, say whether special consideration can be given to this matter and whether finance can be provided to have repairs effected before there is another storm and further damage is done and before the tourist season commences in a month or two?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey this information to my colleague and ask him whether further consideration can be given to the matter.

GAWLER BY-PASS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to a question I asked on October 6 about the general reconstruction of the intersection of the Redbanks Road and the Gawler by-pass?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The plans for the proposed modifications to this intersection and adjacent roads are scheduled to be completed in December, 1965. The proposals will require two local roads to be closed off, and this will have to be referred to the council and be subject to objections from adjacent landholders. The work can be implemented as soon as the necessary agreements are obtained, provided that funds are available.

COPPER.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Mines, is in reference to the drilling exploration that has been taking place in the Burra area for some time. As a matter of fact, the drilling operations had been in progress for some time before the present Government took office, in an endeavour to locate copper in the vicinity of the old copper mine at Burra. I understand that this drilling ceased last week. Can the Minister say whether the drilling exploration has been successful? If not, will the Mines Department consider further drilling in this area?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I consider that the drillings in the Burra area for further supplies of copper have been successful and, at this stage, it is not anticipated that the department will proceed with any further drilling. I am preparing a full report on this matter and, as soon as it is prepared, I shall make it available to the honourable member.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I did not hear quite clearly the Minister's reply. Am I correct in assuming that this exploration has been successful?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: To repeat what I said, I visited Burra last Friday. I did state (and I repeat for the honourable member's benefit) that the operations at Burra had been successful, in the opinion of the Mines Department. I am having a full report made of my investigations last Friday and, when that is completed, I will make it available to the honourable member.

PARINGA BRIDGE.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: While conducting the Minister of Works through a portion of the Midland electoral district last Friday, I found it necessary to cross the Paringa bridge. The Minister will remember—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is not on again, is it?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This is as bad as the Hackham railway crossing!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The bridge is the link between the Midland and Northern Districts in the vicinity of Renmark. The previous Government did fully cement the top of the bridge and did away with the planking, but the movable span of the bridge that it is necessary to raise to allow the few river boats that now use the river to pass under it is at the moment paved with small blocks of wood. When I travelled across the other day, I noticed that these were out of place and badly broken up. Can the Minister of Roads say whether the department will again consider this matter, because the last reply I received was that it was investigating an alternative type of cladding for this section? Will the Minister have this section repaired? Can some better form of cladding be found as an alternative to these blocks of wood?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will get a report from the Highways Department about the bridge and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

HACKHAM CROSSING.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Can the Minister of Roads assure me that the Hackham crossing will get precedence over the Paringa bridge?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I can assure the honourable member that the Hackham crossing is receiving the full attention of the Highways Department and I hope that within the lifetime in this Chamber of the honourable member he will see the completion of the Hackham crossing, to his satisfaction.

YACKA BRIDGE.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of October 7 regarding the Yacka bridge?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The bridge at Yacka over the River Broughton was built in 1914 or thereabouts. For some years now there has been some deterioration in the concrete head stocks at the top of the piers resulting in loss of seating area under the ends of the steel girders. On six of the worst piers, remedial action to safeguard the seating of the girders has been taken. The erection of a 15 miles-an-hour limit sign is an additional safety precaution for the piers that are not, as yet, seriously affected. A new bridge to be located upstream of the existing one has been surveyed and included on the design programme for construction.

CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think we are all distressed by the industrial trouble that has arisen, particularly that in the Municipal Tramways Trust and the building industry, and I think we all regret that direct action has been taken in an endeavour to solve the problem. It is my view that this problem should be a matter for arbitration. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry make a firm statement that the Government is opposed to having these matters settled by direct action and, secondly, will he impress upon those concerned that the proper method of settling them is by conciliation and arbitration?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In reply to the honourable member, the policy of the Government is conciliation before arbitration and, in relation to the Tramways Trust dispute, I understand that at the moment conciliation is in progress before Mr. Conciliator Lyttleton. I hope that, as a result of the negotiations that are going on, there will be a satisfactory settlement and that the inconvenience being caused to the general public will cease.

MILLICENT HOUSING.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In 1964 Parliament passed the Pulp and Paper Mill (Hundreds of Mayurra and Hindmarsh) Act, in which the State undertook to complete 400 houses in Millicent or in surrounding districts to cater for the officers and employees of the expanding pulp industry. Another condition of the Indenture Act was that not more than 150 houses would be constructed in any one year. The waiting time for Housing Trust houses in this particular area 12 months ago was six months or less and now the time is considerably longer. In fact, I understand that it will be about 12 months. I have been informed that, when Housing Trust houses in this district become vacant and as tenants move out or build their own houses, those trust houses are being reserved for the future use of this expanding pulp industry. This makes the position extremely difficult for any person not engaged in that industry to obtain a house in the district. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Housing ascertain whether houses becoming vacant are being held vacant for the future use of employees of this company and whether it is reasonable to assume that the waiting time for any other

person for a Housing Trust house in the district will be longer than 12 months in future?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall draw the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Housing, to the honourable member's question and seek a report, which I shall convey to him as soon as possible.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 13 regarding drought relief in the northern areas of the State?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The Minister of Agriculture informs me that some time ago the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister asking that the Commonwealth contribute towards the cost of drought relief in the northern areas of South Australia. I understand that the request is receiving consideration.

LAND BROKERS.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: On October 5 I asked the Chief Secretary whether the Government intended to discontinue the course at the Institute of Technology for land brokers and whether it intended to continue to license land brokers. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have a reply from the Attorney-General saying that the future of licensing of land brokers is still under consideration.

WILLIAMSTOWN AREA RESERVOIRS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am sure all members are concerned about the way in which the season is developing—or, should I say, not developing—and about the comparatively small intake into our reservoirs. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Works obtain for me the quantities of water at present stored in the three reservoirs in the Williamstown area—South Para, Warren and Barossa—in relation to their total capacity?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the question to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

HOTEL HOURS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to fall into line with all other States of the Commonwealth by legislating for 10 p.m. closing of hotels?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer is "No."

PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 2156.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): This is a short measure and, as has been explained by the Chief Secretary, is designed to raise the limit on the amount that can be spent by the Government or Parliament on public works without an investigation by the Public Works Committee. The duty of the Public Works Committee is to investigate any projects costing over £100,000, and it is proposed to increase this figure to £150,000. In the course of its duties the committee often takes extensive evidence throughout the State and sometimes in other States to investigate proposals or inspect projects of a similar nature. These inquiries can be extensive. Although the value of money has changed, £100,000 is still a large sum, and it will take only six proposals at the figure mentioned in the Bill to aggregate almost £1,000,000. It must be remembered that we are facing a period of increased taxation, as has been shown in the Budget and in Bills at present before another place. Because of this, a close watch on spending is more necessary now than it has ever been.

The Public Works Committee was set up to protect the interests of the State and therefore of the taxpayer. As we are in a period of increasing taxation—in some instances taxation will increase steeply—I think we should take an even greater interest in Government spending, and I do not think it is unreasonable to expect that any major project will be vetted by such a competent committee. I understand that the committee has not a great amount of work to do at present and that there is no appreciable hold-up in getting works approved. For these reasons, I cannot see any justification for increasing the figure to £150,000. If the committee could not handle the work before it and important projects were being held up pending investigation, I could perhaps understand the desire to increase the figure. Unless the Minister can give very much better reasons for the change than those contained in the second reading explanation, I cannot support the measure. I therefore oppose the second reading.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): Although it is true that the Public Works Committee is not overworked at present, it has been kept going on projects already before it. When the original Act was introduced in 1927, the committee had to inquire into any public

works estimated to cost more than £30,000; this amount was increased in 1955 to £100,000. In the early days of its operation the committee considered only about 12 projects a year, but it now deals with about 30. It is happy to investigate any number of projects—whether it be 12, 30 or 50.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Is the number increasing or decreasing?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It has been increasing. It is now about 30 a year compared with about 12 when the committee was first set up. The committee is not overworked at the moment, but this morning members were told by the Chairman that soon they would be in harness again for two days a week for some time, so apparently several projects are to come before them. There is no doubt that over the years the committee has saved the taxpayer and the Government a considerable sum of money. One suggestion it made to the Public Buildings Department regarding the double loading of corridors in schools saved about £10,000 on each school, which is a considerable saving when one considers how many schools have been constructed. It also made suggestions about keeping down the area in non-teaching rooms at schools. These suggestions were followed without any inconvenience to anyone and without any reduction in efficiency.

The proposed increase to £150,000 is in line with the increase in costs since the last amendment to the Act in 1955, when the figure was increased to £100,000. I, like the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, do not want to see any wastage of taxpayers' money. However, as the increase is only of 50 per cent and as the increase in 1955 was of over 300 per cent, I think the measure is reasonable. I therefore support the second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOT AND MOUTH ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to extend the application of the principal Act to the diseases of vesicular exanthema and vesicular stomatitis in like manner as it applies to foot and mouth disease. Thus, the Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund established under the principal Act may be used to pay compensation to the owners of animals that have been destroyed to prevent the spread of vesicular exanthema or vesicular stomatitis. The Bill gives effect to a recommendation of the Exotic Diseases Committee in April of this year that, owing to the difficulty of distinguishing between foot and mouth disease, vesicular exanthema and vesicular stomatitis, the three diseases be treated in the same manner in the legislation of all the States and of the Commonwealth. The two new diseases were proclaimed under the Stock Diseases Act in August of this year. The required amendment to the principal Act is made by clause 3 of the Bill, which defines "foot and mouth disease" as including the two new diseases. I commend the Bill to honourable members for their consideration.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2091.)

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): This is an important Bill. As we realize that much of our income comes from animals, it is necessary that we have competent people to care for them throughout the country. South Australian stockowners use the services of veterinary officers possibly less than other countries do, but there is no real reason why this should be so. Perhaps one reason is the high cost of veterinary services, while another is that these services have not always been available. There is no surplus of veterinary officers in this country. In fact, the immediate future for their services is not particularly bright from the stockowners' point of view because, under the new hygiene requirements of meatworks in Australia catering for the oversea export market, it is necessary for veterinary officers to be employed to inspect the animals before slaughter, which will mean that some veterinary officers who would normally be available for the treatment of stock will be required now for employment in the various meatworks throughout the country.

The present Bill sets out to strengthen the code of professional conduct to be observed within the profession. This is important. We must appreciate that under the Veterinary Surgeons Act two types of person are operating —the qualified veterinary surgeon and the person who is permitted to treat animals for various sicknesses and injury under permit. The number of veterinary officers registered in South Australia at present is about 60 to 70.

However, the number of people registered under permit is only six. Although these people are small in number, they play an important part in the treatment of stock in South Australia because they operate in parts of the State where it is perhaps not economic for a veterinary officer to set up business.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many qualified veterinary officers are operating?

The Hon. L. R. HART: There are 73 registered in South Australia but I understand that about six of these are veterinary officers from other States who perhaps would work over the border. Quite a few of those 73 registered would be employed by the Stock and Brands Branch in the Agriculture Department, but some of them would be operating in meatworks, so the actual numbers treating animals in the country and in the city areas are by no means adequate. It must be appreciated that there is a lot of work for veterinary officers in the city areas, too, in the treatment of not only some of the larger types of stock but also cats and dogs, which work has become a remunerative part of a veterinary officer's job. When we set out to amend the regulations made under the Act, we must take care that we do not do so to the detriment of either type of operator. That is merely one thing that concerns me about this Bill. Clause 5 amends section 21 of the principal Act by striking out subsections (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof three new subsections. It also amends subsection (3) of section 21, so I take it that, as three new subsections are to replace the present subsections (1) and (2), the present subsection (3) will become subsection (4). The clause amends section 21 to facilitate the collection of fees. Veterinary officers do, of course, have to pay fees for registration and so do the practitioners operating under permit. This amendment of section 21 facilitates the collection of these fees.

Clauses 4, 6 and 10 set out to amend various sections of the Act by striking out the "fee" that is to apply in those sections and inserting in lieu thereof the "prescribed fee". In other words, previously Parliament has laid down the fees to be charged but by this amendment of the Act the Veterinary Surgeons Board will prescribe the registration fee to be paid rather than there being a set fee, as at present. It is not clearly stated in the Bill, but I assume that the board would prescribe these fees by regulation—at least, I hope so, because certain anomalies could arise if the board were allowed to prescribe the fees without reference to Parliament in any way. Will the Minister make that point clear at a later stage? As I have already said, there are two types of veterinary person operating in this State, and we would have to be careful that a fee charged to a veterinary officer was comparable with that charged to a practitioner operating in the same area. It will be appreciated that these two types of person can operate in the same area and the fee should not be detrimental to either one. Clause 9 sets out to give the board wider discretionary powers regarding the issue of permits. I understand that under the Act at present, if a permit holder has been operating for five years, he is automatically entitled to reregistration each year. I understand that that position will continue under the amendment but that any other person starting up under permit will be required to register in each year and, after he has served a period of five years, he will not be entitled to automatic registration. I have no particular objection to that clause.

Clause 12 amends sections 29, 30, 30a and 31 of the principal Act. This doubles the penalties in relation to those sections and the Minister said this was to bring the penalties into line with changing money values. We find that clause 15, which also deals with penalties under the regulations, increases penalties from £10 to £100. If the two charges in clauses 12 and 15 were in proportion previously, they must be completely out of proportion now and I think that this Council should be given the reason for an increase in penalty from £10 to £100 in relation to one section, as against an increase from £50 to £100 in relation to another section. I fear that clause 15, perhaps, sets out to place the permit holder at some disadvantage in relation to the breaking of any regulations and I should be pleased to hear from the Minister on that matter. The interesting clause in the amending Bill is clause 14, which amends section 31(a). I consider that the amendment, as printed in the Bill, is fairly correct. It reads:

> Section 31a of the principal Act is amended—
> (*a*) by striking out the passage "castration, spaying, or dehorning on any animal" in subsection (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "castration or dehorning of any animal or spaying of any animal other than dogs or cats";

If we read that amendment in conjunction with the Minister's second reading explanation, we find a contradiction. The Minister said:

Clause 14 is intended to limit the scope of section 31a (1) to the extent that an unregistered person may not advertise himself as qualified to castrate, etc. dogs and cats though he may castrate, etc., other animals. I do not think that this passage explains what the Bill sets out to do. It seems to me that the Bill will prevent the spaying of dogs and cats but not the castration of dogs and cats.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: A comma after "animal" would meet the position.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I thank the honourable member for his interjection. If we put a comma after the word "animal" the second time appearing the amendment will be put beyond any doubt, but we again have the difficulty of the Minister's second reading explanation and I think he should explain this clause at a later stage. We appreciate that an unregistered person may castrate any animal (the Act says that) but, according to the Minister's explanation, unregistered people cannot castrate dogs. Veterinary people are not always available to do this and, after all, it is not a job for which one needs professional training.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is fairly remunerative, though.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It probably is, but this work is done every day by laymen all over the country. We can appreciate that in some remote area Mrs. Smith's puss goes straying and she thinks that this is not in the best interest of puss so she decides to have him castrated. In terms of the Minister's second reading explanation, a person may not set himself up to do this but I do not think that is the intention at all. He may set himself up to castrate any animal, but not a cat or dog.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: The veterinary surgeons like doing those themselves.

The Hon. L. R. HART: That is possible. However, I consider that clause 14 should be looked into. We cannot have tom cats or dogs roaming all over the country just because there is no qualified person available to carry out the operation of castration.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think it refers to a permit holder as well?

The Hon. L. R. HART: The permit holder and registered veterinary officer may perform these operations but, under the Act, the particular operations of castration, spaying or dehorning of any animal, the relieving of an animal suffering from bloat or hoven, or the tailing of lambs can be carried out by an unregistered person. I am prepared to support the second reading at this stage but may have more to say on these particular matters at the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I do not think there is much left for me to say on this Bill, which has been thoroughly examined by the previous speaker. According to the Minister's second reading explanation, the amendments are being sought by the veterinary profession and I agree with any legislation that tends to raise ethical standards or to strengthen the veterinary profession. Some of the clauses make minor amendments to the principal Act. They bring up to date certain matters and remove anomalies. Clauses 4, 6 and 10 confer further powers on the Veterinary Surgeons Board and enable it to prescribe the fee to be paid for registration. I wonder whether this prescription of the fee will be done by regulation. I should like the Minister to clarify the position.

Clause 8 gives the board power to cancel or suspend the registration of a veterinary surgeon or veterinary practitioner who is considered incapable of practising because of some mental or physical disability. These amendments give the board more power, as does clause 15, which the Minister said was designed to strengthen the authority of the board and improve ethical standards in the profession. Any move in this direction is in the interests of our veterinary services.

Clause 9 gives wide powers to the board in the issue of permits to unqualified people to treat animals. At present South Australia is the only State that issues permits of this nature. Under the Act a person who has held a permit for five years shall be entitled to a renewal of the permit, subject to certain conditions.

Although we should be doing everything possible to provide better veterinary services, the Bill does little in that regard. The Minister said its provisions enabled the board to encourage the establishment of qualified veterinary services in country areas where the number of livestock was capable of supporting a qualified full-time surgeon. One of the difficulties in South Australia is the sparse cover we have in veterinary services for our economic animals. We probably know less about sheep in the matter of veterinary science than we do about other animals. The reason is that the sheep is not an economic animal in the matter of treatment. We know much about horses, cats and dogs, mainly because veterinary surgeons have been treating these

animals over a long-period, but not much is known about the sheep, which is a tragedy. In the matter of animals like dogs and cats, which have an emotional value, a person will spend £20 or £30 in securing a veterinary service, but on the economic animal, like the sheep, the owner is not willing to spend so much.

The Hon. Mr. Hart said there were about 70 veterinary surgeons in South Australia, but most of them would be in Government departments. I think that in the country there would be a maximum of five in private practice. I do not know how many there are in Adelaide. Perhaps the ratio would be four or five to one in favour of the city. Mr. Hart said that the service rendered to cats and dogs was lucrative. We have many economic animals and there is not the same encouragement for veterinary surgeons to serve in country areas. If the Government is concerned about the establishment of veterinary services in country areas I do not think the Bill adequately covers the position. We should endeavour to provide perhaps a travelling allowance to enable veterinary surgeons to establish themselves.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Who asked for this Bill?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think that it was sought by the profession and that the Minister said that was so. An animal in the country requiring treatment may be 60 miles from the nearest veterinary surgeon. The cost of his going there and back could be £10, and then there would be the cost of his service. If the animal had no emotional value there would be little chance of getting a veterinary surgeon to go to that animal. That is why we know so little about veterinary services for sheep. I have some doubt whether clause 14 will do what the Minister says it will achieve.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I will correct those things for the honourable member.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I intended to oppose this clause completely. I may be accused of emasculating the Bill, but I am not happy about that clause at present. That is why I want to know what the Minister intends to correct. I will oppose the clause if the information he gives is not to my satisfaction. This matter concerns any persons not registered under the Act. A case can be made out for these people not being allowed to spay small animals like cats and dogs. It is an intricate operation, but there are many unregistered people capable of doing it, and I cannot see why an unregistered person should not be allowed to castrate cats and dogs. At this stage, I support the Bill.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I appreciate honourable members' comments on this Bill, especially in relation to the controversial clause 14. Because of the comments made and because of the wording used, I was not satisfied with the clause, and I asked for the matter to be adjourned so that I could obtain further information. Last week I agreed with honourable members that the clause did not do what it was claimed it would do. Honourable members have asked for a clarification in relation to fees. Instead of there being a set fee as at present, the Bill gives the board power to fix fees. I have been informed that this will be done by regulation, so if honourable members wish to comment on the fees they will be able to do so when the regulations are placed on the table of this Council. Clause 15 increases penalties to £100. The Bill gives power to lay down a prescribed code of ethics, which goes further than the provision in the principal Act. The present penalty for unprofessional conduct is a small one.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Can you give an instance?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: To do so I would have to cast reflections, which I am always loath to do. I am merely repeating information given to me. However, I assure the honourable member that there have been instances where the penalty has been too small, as it has not been a deterrent. The increase to £100, coupled with a definition of "unprofessional conduct", will act as a deterrent. Unfortunately, in my second reading explanation, a wrong word was used in relation to clause 14. This was neither my fault nor the Parliamentary Draftsman's. My explanation was:

> Clause 14 is intended to limit the scope of section 31a (1) to the extent that an unregistered person may not advertise himself as qualified to castrate, etc., dogs and cats though he may castrate, etc., other animals.

The word "castrate" should not have been used; the word "spayed" should have been used. That error has led to the comments we have had from various honourable members. I have received further information on this clause. I said previously that an unqualified person would be able to castrate dogs and cats.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You mean an unregistered person?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, but he could not hold himself out as being a qualified person, advertise, or receive any reward. The information I have now is that it was the intention of the Veterinary Surgeons Board in

seeking this amendment to prevent the spaying of dogs and cats by unregistered persons. This operation involves major abdominal surgery under anaesthesia, and its unskilled performance is attended with considerable cruelty. It is not proposed in this Bill to limit the freedom of unregistered persons in performing castration or dehorning of any species of animal or to limit spaying of domestic stock other than cats and dogs.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Did you say "dehorning"?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I did. They can do it now, as the Act provides for it. The only alteration to the Act is that the unregistered person will not be able to spay cats and dogs. Dehorning and other operations on other animals can still be performed provided that these people do not advertise themselves or receive payment.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Why restrict it to dogs and cats? Doesn't it hurt other animals? Are all other animals immune to pain?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not know about that, but does the honourable member think that no unregistered person should perform any operation?

The Hon. C. R. Story: I am wondering why people should be conscience-stricken about two kinds of animal when all the others are left out.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: I do not think spaying of cattle should be done by any Tom, Dick or Harry.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I would not know about that. The clause could be further clarified if a comma were inserted between the words "animal" and "or" in clause 14(*a*). That clause reads:

by striking out the passage "castration, spaying, or dehorning on any animal" in subsection (1) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the passage "castration or dehorning of any animal or spaying of any animal other than dogs or cats".

I shall seek leave to amend this passage in the Committee stages. I think my remarks explain the position adequately.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Additional qualification for registration of veterinary surgeons."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am not clear about this clause. I do not know whether or not I am reading it correctly, but it proposes that section 17a of the principal Act be amended by striking out "a fee of three guineas". I cannot find that passage in section 17a of the Act. I do not know whether the Minister can help me on that. Maybe I am wrong.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It is the 1957 amendment. The words "three guineas" appear somewhere in section 17a, I believe. I see that it should be "section 17" instead of "section 17a". Section 17 was amended in 1957. The wording was, "Section 17 of the principal Act is amended by inserting therein after subsection (1) the following subsection". However, this clause refers to section 17a, which is another section of the principal Act, so it would appear to me that clause 4 should refer to section 17 (1a).

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That is right.

The CHAIRMAN: Actually, it has been enacted in section 17 by the amendment of 1952.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Then it should be "17 (1a)"?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: There is a reference to the fee of three guineas being replaced by the words "prescribed fee". Can the Minister tell me whether this includes the registration of veterinary practitioners? Personally, I would have no objection to the board or the veterinary officers charging themselves a little more to be registered, as I have some idea of the financial success of most private veterinary officers, but I question whether the board should charge the same registration fee to a veterinary practitioner, who works only in an area (as the Hon. Mr. Hart has said) where it would not pay a fully qualified veterinary surgeon to set up business. Can the Minister say whether the term "prescribed fee" would enable the board to charge a veterinary practitioner what could be a reasonable fee for a veterinary surgeon but what might be an exorbitant fee for a veterinary practitioner?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): Clause 6 takes care of that.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I am sorry; I missed that.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I should be happy for this matter to proceed if we could amend clause 4 to read "Section 17 (1a)" rather than "Section 17a". It would then bring it into line with the amendment passed in 1957, which prescribed a fee. It is a fee for a registered veterinary surgeon; it is nothing to do with practitioners.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the Chair except that this clause be agreed to.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I move:

To strike out "17a" and insert "17 (1a)".

The CHAIRMAN: Would it not be better to move to insert the figure "1" between "17" and "a"?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I take it that is "1" in brackets?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think probably the best course is for the Committee to ask that progress be reported so that this matter may be examined properly, unless the Minister has an explanation now.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have tried to check this amendment with the Act but for the moment we cannot locate the relevant section. In the circumstances, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 2161.)

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN (Northern): In rising to speak to this Bill, I agree that it is essentially a Committee Bill. In my opinion, some of the amendments are desirable and some are not. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act regarding direction lines, signs and marks. For the motorist who takes notice of these guiding marks and direction lines, they make for safer and much more comfortable driving and in these days safe motoring is a matter we must keep uppermost in our minds.

In connection with direction lines and markings, I should like to refer to highway edge lining. Few highways in South Australia have been edgelined; we find that it is generally used only on blind bends, approaches to bridges and at steep culverts. I consider that this practice could be extended to great advantage. I wish to quote from the *Australian Automobile Association News Letter* of September 9, 1965. The source of the article is the *Highways Research Abstracts*, and it is as follows:

Highway edgelining, a relatively new tool of traffic engineering, is attracting growing interest throughout the world. Of 41 countries participating in the second international survey of edgelining conducted by International Roads Federation, only eight have indicated that they have done no edgelining and have no immediate plans to institute such a programme. The others have plans now under way, ranging from experimental applications to current use of 20,000 miles of edgelined highway. The majority of the countries use white painted edgelines, usually reflectorized. Solid, rather than broken, lines are employed in most instances. Studies in the United States have shown edgelines to be extremely effective in reducing accidents. In Kansas, for instance, a 453 mile section of high-accident two-lane rural road showed a 21 per cent reduction in total accidents and a 59.4 per cent decrease in fatalities after the application of edgelines.

Safety News, the official journal of the National Safety Council (South Australia) Incorporated had this to say in September 1965 regarding edgelining:

A new road marking system which may greatly reduce traffic accidents is being tested by the New South Wales Department of Main Roads. The system consists simply of white painted lines marking the outer edges of sealed roads. It is widely used in America, and is being tested in Britain. A spokesman recently said that, although testing of the edgeline scheme began in New South Wales in 1960, it was still considered experimental. About 25 miles of main road in Sydney and near country areas were now marked with edgelines, and the experiment would be extended, he said. American studies showed that night accidents generally were reduced. The edgelines also gave motorists greater confidence at night in fog or other bad weather. The lines discouraged motorists from driving on road shoulders, thus reducing road maintenance costs. The journal said that almost 135,000 miles of highways in America were now edgelined. All but two of the 50 States had adopted the system.

Even if this spectacular result were not duplicated here, I consider that an extension of this system of edgelining on our highways would be warranted. The death toll from road accidents is appalling and if edgelining on dangerous stretches of our highways saved only one life, who would say it was not worth while? I commend this suggestion to the Minister's attention.

Clause 6, which gives the Road Traffic Board an overall authority in the matter of advertising signs, will be a good amendment if it is carried into practice. Advertising signs of all descriptions are designed to attract attention and, therefore, they must distract the attention of drivers of motor vehicles. I am pleased to see on the file an amendment to clause 8, which amends section 32 of the principal Act. The amendment as it stands allows the board to fix speed limits but does not allow an appeal. However, the amendment filed by the Minister will allow a right of appeal to the board and to the Minister himself, and this overcomes the objection I had to the provision in its original form.

I support clause 10, which will ensure that a person injured in an accident receives assistance and places the responsibility on the other party involved in the accident. Perhaps

this assistance in the first instance could best be rendered by the obtaining of qualified assistance; for example, by telephoning a doctor or the ambulance, or by taking some such action. As has been pointed out, in some cases it may be dangerous for an unqualified person to move an accident victim. Though he has the best of intentions, he may give the wrong treatment. Clause 15 deals with turning lights and trafficators, and the maximum penalty of £50 appears to me to be out of all proportion to the seriousness of the offence of a failure by a driver of a motor vehicle to make sure that his turning lights are switched off after completing the turn. It takes one some little time to realize that trafficators are still operating after a turning manoeuvre has been completed and a slight slip on the part of a driver could involve him in a particularly heavy fine if a court decided to impose the maximum penalty.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Don't you think there ought to be a definite distance laid down?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Perhaps that would overcome the objection. As a matter of fact, this morning I saw a car travel for fully a mile along the Port Road with the turning lights blinking all the time. I can see no excuse for that, but it does take some little time after one has completed a turn to realize that the lights are still operating. In addition, some cars have the lever that actuates the turning lights extending unnecessarily and it is easy to switch on these lights accidentally. Then, it may take some little time for one to realize they are operating. Therefore, I suggest that, in the Committee stage, the Minister have another look at the maximum penalty laid down in this clause of the Bill.

Paragraph (*b*) of new section 88(1) is a good amendment. It provides that a person walking on a roadway must walk on the side of the roadway where he faces oncoming traffic. Paragraph (*a*) provides that a person shall not walk along a roadway if there is a footpath. This is a matter that could be further considered. With other speakers I believe that sometimes footpaths are so rough, boggy, dusty or slippery that pedestrians prefer to walk on the roadway. Also, at night some footpaths are not illuminated so well as roadways, and that is another reason why the pedestrians prefer to walk on the roadway. If there were a paved footpath the difficulty might be overcome, and in that connection "paved" would have to be defined. A paved footpath would attract pedestrians more than a paved roadway.

Paragraph (*c*) deals with one-way streets. This has been mentioned by previous speakers. Perhaps if we combined Sir Arthur Rymill's father's car travelling in reverse and Sir Norman Jude's pedestrian walking backwards we would have both parties complying with the amendment. Some clarification is needed here. Under the amendment we could have one-way pedestrian traffic as well as one-way vehicular traffic, because pedestrians could walk only on the roadway in the opposite direction to the traffic flow.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What do you understand by "two-way carriageway"?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I see no complications in that paragraph, although other members may see some. It could be a two-way carriageway where pedestrians could walk as near as possible to the right-hand side of the carriageway. Clause 25 deals with the width of vehicles and says that an agricultural machine more than 8ft. wide, or a vehicle carrying a load more than 8ft. wide, must use the roads only in daylight hours. I think that is reasonable in the interests of safety. I am still trying to work out what the Hon. Mrs. Cooper had in mind about this clause. To the best of my knowledge the wording of the amendment refers to daylight hours, but, of course, hours of darkness could come into the matter. Perhaps we shall hear more from Mrs. Cooper during the Committee stage.

I cannot agree with clause 27, which amends section 146 and which deals with maximum axle weight. It says that the weight on any single tyre must not exceed 5,000 lb. unless otherwise approved by the board. That would limit the front axle weight of any truck to 4½ tons (actually, 80 lb. under 4½ tons). The Hon. Mr. Story read an extract from a letter from the South Australian Road Transport Association, which outlined its main objection to the amendment, because it makes no difference between a light three or four-ton truck, with light tyres, and the heavy vehicles with heavy tyres. I think all vehicles would be covered by the amendment. The Minister said that a greater load than 4½ tons on the front axle would make a vehicle difficult to steer and could damage road pavements. I cannot agree that tyre limit is preferable to axle weight limit. Often the load on a truck cannot be evenly distributed, and sometimes there is a heavier load on one side than on the other. Agricultural machinery provides such a predicament. There could be an overload on one tyre and an underload on the other. To enable such a load to be carried legally, an axle load limit

is the only reasonable approach to the matter. The Minister said that a greater load than 4½ tons would make it difficult for the vehicle to be steered, but that is not borne out in practice. I quote the following from a letter from the South Australian Road Transport Association, which has had much experience in this matter:

It is correct to mention the high safety record for commercial motor vehicles operating in this State against that of the private motorist. This fact is on record in State Government statistical information. Statistics are readily available from the National Safety Council and the State Premiums Committee in verification of this.

This is particularly so with forward-control vehicles. One large truck operator in South Australia after converting from the conventional type of vehicle (the one with the engine forward of the cabin) to the forward-control vehicle immediately found a big reduction in the accident rate. That shows that, although the forward-control vehicle carried more weight on the front axle than did the conventional type vehicle, the accident rate dropped rather than increased.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We have no statistics on that matter.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I have not had time to get any.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Minister did not give us any.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Not to my knowledge. These forward-control trucks are becoming more popular. They have axle beams, springs, king pins, shackles, wheel bearings and hubs of a much more rugged design to stand the stress of the larger pay loads. The letter also states:

The world-wide trends in the automotive industry are continuously towards forward-control vehicles.

They have greater manoeuvrability, less overall length and a greater visibility. Statistical records prove that accident occurrence with this class of vehicle is considerably reduced. The letter continues:

They are engineered and built to spread more of the weight over the front axle than in the past with the vehicle with normal control. Their braking mechanism and steering mechanism is far superior, with power braking and sometimes power-assisted steering. South Australia, with its preponderantly flat area, in the main, is ideal for the use of the heavier vehicle, and owners have largely invested in these machines, with consequent financial benefits to the State generally by enabling cartage to be undertaken at prices well below those that would apply if otherwise was the case.

This legislation raises many economic issues that are important to farmers, carriers, contractors, transport operators, and distributors of motor trucks. It will especially affect many truck owners who have purchased this later forward-control type vehicle. These trucks are capable of having their loads more evenly distributed between the front and rear axle.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the limits in the Eastern States are the cause of more expensive housing there?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I hope to prove that lower axle loadings will increase costs generally. The conventional type truck would not be affected to any great degree by this legislation, because it is not possible to load far enough forward in most cases to give a weight of over 4½ tons on the front axle, but all of the many thousands of forward-control vehicles would be affected to such a degree that the additional capital involved—and additional capital is involved in purchasing forward-control trucks to the extent of possibly £500 or £600 a vehicle—would be wasted. As so many operators have invested in these trucks in the last 10 years, they would experience economic chaos.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Do you agree that legislation in other States is out of date?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I do not think we can be guided entirely by the legislation of other States. These trucks are built not to interstate standards but to world standards. The operators who would be affected would include great numbers of people in many varying occupations—stock transporters, sand and metal operators, grain carters (including most farmers), superphosphate carters, grape carters, timber straddle vehicle operators, and fork lift operators. On the average 7-8 ton forward-control vehicle, the payload would be reduced by at least two tons, or about 25 per cent, if this legislation became law. I have a letter from the Chamber of Automotive Industries, which is a body of people who are authorities on these matters. The letter states:

Stock transporters, in the majority of cases, have double-deck crates, the top deck of which on a two-axle vehicle extends above the cabin, but when loaded would exceed 4½ tons on the front axle. Sand and metal carriers operating the average 7-8 ton two-axle tip truck would have to reduce its pay load by approximately two tons. Grain carters' effective load in specially constructed bulk bins not readily convertible would be reduced by 70 or 80 bushels a load, which is over two tons. Superphosphate carters and grape carters—the effective load would be reduced by approximately two tons. Wool carters—the load would be reduced by approximately six to eight bales per load.

This would have the effect of steeply increasing cartage costs in primary producing and other industries that rely on those transports.

For instance, stock transport costs from Eyre Peninsula to Adelaide would rise from between 10s. and 11s. a head on sheep to at least 12s. 6d. or 13s. 6d., and there would be corresponding increases in all other parts of the State. An increase of 25 per cent in cartage costs of sand, metal and bricks would substantially increase the cost of building. Because of increased hauling costs on metal and filling for road works, there would be increased costs in maintaining and building our highways, main roads and district roads. The increased costs of grain cartage would possibly have a more widespread effect than an increase on any other commodity would have, as grain is produced over such a wide area in such large quantities. Last year South Australia produced 50,000,000 bushels of wheat and 27,000,000 bushels of barley, every grain of which was carted by road to silo or bagged depot. This means that 1,351,351 tons of wheat and 600,000 tons of barley was carted, and, if oats are included, the figure exceeds 2,000,000 tons. Every grain of this was carried by road transport. Adding substantially to the cost of carrying such a substantial quantity of grain would deal a staggering blow to the cereal-growing industry.

The Northern District, which I have the honour to represent, is one of long distances. All commodities must be carried long distances, and most of the cartage is by road transport. This is mainly because rail transport does not cater for much of the area. Indeed, many producers and others in the area do not have access to the railways at all.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the Bill should exempt those areas?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Probably the Government would not be prepared to exempt the Northern District, Eyre Peninsula, or any other place, as it has already been bitten once in relation to a promise it made regarding road maintenance tax.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We could ask the Minister, though.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Possibly we could.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The Act provides for exemptions.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: It provides for exempting vehicles, not areas.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: What about the farmers on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: They were seriously bitten by the Government's promise on road maintenance tax and have not yet forgotten that bite; nor will they be likely to for a long time. This proposed legislation affects Eyre Peninsula particularly by reason of its lack of railways. For instance, in the Spencer Gulf coastal area from 30 miles north of Cowell to Port Lincoln there is a distance of 130 miles not served by railways, and it is all cereal-producing country relying solely on road transport. Similarly, on the West Coast of Eyre Peninsula there is a distance of about 270 miles between Ceduna and Port Lincoln, much of which is cereal-producing country. A great deal of traffic on the Flinders Highway carries primary produce of all descriptions, much of which is cereals. Even farther west, from Penong, which at the moment is the railhead, there is a distance of 60 miles to Nundroo. This is cereal-producing country that would be affected by this legislation.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It will be worse if the heavy vehicles smash up the roads through heavy loads.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I cannot agree that the vehicles would smash up the roads by normal, evenly balanced loading. The reduction to 4½ tons is too big a bite out of the previous 8-ton axle load. Had the Minister been prepared to come along with something like 6½ tons I think the objections now being raised would not have been raised. Yorke Peninsula is another area of the State vitally affected by road transport. Of the total cereal harvest of the State last year (50,000,000 bushels of wheat and 27,000,000 bushels of barley)—I have been speaking of Eyre Peninsula because it is isolated from the rest of the State, and we can see how much is produced in one area and how much is road-carted—Eyre Peninsula produced 18,000,000 bushels of wheat, 4,500,000 bushels of barley and 2,500,000 bushels of oats. That makes a total of wheat and barley of 586,486 tons.

A number of bulk grain silos on the east and west coasts of Eyre Peninsula are situated off the railway system, as I have previously mentioned. That is to be expected, because there is no railway there. At those silos at Cowell, Arno Bay, Tumby Bay, Mangalo, Witera, Streaky Bay and Elliston, all the grain has to be brought to the bulk installation by road as is the case with all silos, but in addition, it has to be carted a second time by road from these country silos to the terminal port. In the case of Cowell, for instance, grain will be hauled the 100 miles to Port Lincoln by carriers. The freight differential at Cowell at present is 15.53d. a bushel. That means it costs the Australian Wheat Board and then the grower about 1s. 3½d. a bushel for road

cartage from Cowell to Port Lincoln. The passing of this Bill would result in an increase in this differential of 3d. a bushel. I have been careful in working this out and conservative in that estimate. Similarly, at Streaky Bay grain is hauled by carrier from that silo a distance of 70 miles to Thevenard. The freight differential at Streaky Bay is at present 12.94d. a bushel (or just under 13d.), and under the terms of this clause that freight would be increased by about 2½d. a bushel. Therefore, it can readily be seen that the producers in these areas, who contribute much to the economy of the State, are to be hit twice—first, in the cartage from the farm to the silo, and then in the cartage from the silo to the terminal. Last year, 6,000,000 bushels of wheat on Eyre Peninsula was delivered by road direct to the bulk terminals and, of this 6,000,000 bushels, 2,000,000 (one-third of the total hauled to the terminal) had to be shifted twice—from farm to silo and then from silo to terminal.

As an honourable member mentioned a few minutes ago, perhaps the Government would promise a special dispensation to exempt Eyre Peninsula as it did with the road maintenance tax.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It didn't make any difference to the voting there. Didn't they return the men who supported the previous Government?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: They did and they will continue to return Liberal and Country League members. I cannot see that the Minister will make any promise in this regard because he would find that such a promise would have to be broken anyway, which would only add another broken or unfulfilled promise to the list. Tip trucks would suffer more from this proposed amendment than any other type of truck, because of the increased tare weight of those vehicles. The average 7-ton forward-control type of tip truck has a tare weight of up to 2 tons greater than the same truck fitted with a standard tray top. Many tip trucks are used by farmers for wheat and superphosphate cartage, in addition to the much greater number used by sand and metal carters, district councils, Highways Department contractors and many others. If I am incorrect in this assumption, I hope the Minister will correct me, but I think that a tractor is termed a motor vehicle under the Road Traffic Act. I have checked the axle weights of many of these larger types of tractor and find that many of them are up to, and some are over, 6 tons on the rear axle. The owner of such a tractor would be unable even to cross the road dividing his property to go into other paddocks, let alone take it to a service station at a country town.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think a permit system would overcome the difficulty?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: It would be completely impracticable, because in other directions we have had as much as we want regarding obtaining permits. I consider that to get a permit would take a considerable time and it would not be practicable for people situated long distances from the city. Other people who are particularly interested in the matter I have raised are those who are using four-wheel trailers. In the grain cartage industry throughout the State, at least 80 per cent of the transport people and farmers own and operate large heavy capacity four-wheel, two-axle trailers. These trailers carry up to 12 tons gross and, under the proposed amendment, their carrying capacity will be drastically reduced.

Other vehicles affected will be the straddle lift carriers of Timber Transporters Co. Ltd. and most of the big timber merchants in Adelaide will be seriously affected. Timber Transporters' carriers have a tare weight of 7 tons; their vehicles have four road wheels, each with a single tyre. The carrying capacity, as recommended by the maker, should not exceed 30,000 lb. on the carrier, exclusive of the tare, and their average load is about eight or nine tons. The tare alone represents approximately 4,000 lb. a tyre, giving a mere 1,000 lb. of payload a tyre, which will be quite unrealistic.

Another type of vehicle that comes within the ambit of this legislation is the fork lift. The larger fork lifts have a tare of about 10 tons, with the main weight component on the front axle. There are normally four front wheels and, if these are limited to 5,000 lb. a wheel, they will have a gross load of 20,000 lb. on the front axle, the equivalent of about nine tons. Assuming the tare over the front axle was six tons, it would give a payload of only three tons for equipment capable of lifting 15 or 20 tons.

Such reductions in carrying capacity, of course, mean only one thing—added costs. If substantially increased costs of cartage are to be added to increased water rates, heavier land tax levies and crippling succession duties, the reaction of country people will become evident to the Government in no uncertain terms. To

return to modern forward-control trucks, we must bear in mind that these trucks, which are used for the purposes I have mentioned, cannot be modified easily or economically; they are what they are. They have been designed and built to world specifications and requirements and about 10,000 of them have been sold in South Australia in the last 10 to 15 years. Prices range from £2,000 to £13,000. These trucks have been purchased because of their superior specifications and load-carrying characteristics. Therefore, I do not agree that a safety factor is involved, or that our roads suffer more than those of most other countries.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about every other State in the Commonwealth?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: It is important to realize that in Great Britain (where a majority of the trucks used in South Australia are manufactured) a general front axle load of five tons is allowed and, in the case of a rear axle with dual tyres, the maximum is nine tons. I understand that legislation has been introduced in the United Kingdom to bring that country into line with the Common Market countries by providing for a six ton front axle and a 10 ton rear axle load limit.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Therefore, we should do it here?

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Why not? Is the engineering of our highways so far behind that we do not even approach the standards set by these countries? Of course that is not so. Our highways are built as well as, if not better than, the general run of European roads, with the exception of the autobahns. Provided that these loads are evenly distributed (as they are on modern vehicles), I do not think that they will have any serious effect on our roads. I shall not say that I support the Bill; I support it in part. Naturally, as an amending Bill, it is disjointed. However, I reserve the right to debate in Committee the clauses I have mentioned.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday next.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): The Opposition is prepared to co-operate with the Government and agree to the adjournment. I have looked at the Notice Paper in another place and can see that it is becoming very crowded. I also see that some of the legislation to come before us will require careful consideration and I ask the Chief Secretary for his assurance that, when that legislation is introduced, we shall be given adequate time to consider it carefully, as has been the custom in this Chamber and as this is necessary in the interests of democracy and the development of the State.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The only reason why we are not sitting tomorrow or Thursday is that the Notice Paper is short. There is not very much of importance on it now and I am given to understand that there will not be anything ready from another place until Thursday. I give the assurance that it is not my intention to curb debate on any subject that may be brought forward, within reason. If need be and honourable members require the necessary time to discuss these matters and to speak on them we shall be prepared to sit in the evenings. However, I do not think that that will be necessary next week or the week after. I would be the last person to say that legislation had to go through without receiving the consideration of honourable members.

Motion carried.

At 4.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, at 2.15 p.m.