LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

DRUG OFFENCES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When opening a conference in New South Wales on drug offences, Senator Greenwood said that there had been an increase of about 10 per cent in drug offences in Australia and that 87 per cent of such offences were committed in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. Can the Chief Secretary inform me of the position in South Australia and say whether there has been an increase in drug offences in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As I have not got that information with me, I will try to obtain it and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the use of Bolivar effluent, particularly in the Virginia area. Some time ago, I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding soil tests which are said to be necessary and which the Agriculture Department will carry out, and I understand it was stated last week that these soil tests were in fact in progress. The other information I had was that it would take some weeks for the two officers who were needed for this work to be selected and given the work they had to do. Will the Minister say whether it is a fact that this work is already in progress, as has been stated, or whether these officers are still being selected or are in training?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Although I believe an officer is still to be appointed, I assure the honourable member that work has commenced, I think early last week.

LAMBS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question relates to a short article in the *Stock Journal* last week, which quoted Mr. M. R. Heysen, South Australian Agriculture Department livestock officer, as saying that at one abattoir the bruising of fat lambs had been up to 50 per cent worse than in the previous year. This is probably a hardy annual but it causes concern to all primary producers engaged in lamb production because, whether or not a primary producer is careful in the handling of his lambs, nevertheless he is penalized, along with all other producers, because the buyer must necessarily make allowance for this type of damage to lambs. My own training was in New Zealand and I know that there the care taken is much greater than it is in any part of the handling of lambs in this State. It always surprises me that in this State, where we produce a very good product, we do not take greater care when the lambs are first drafted ready for sale, when transported, and when handled in the yard before the abattoir yards —in fact at all points. Will the Minister take up this matter, which is of even greater importance now that returns are falling, and see whether there can be a massive publicity programme directed at curing this problem, not only to the people involved in the latter stages of handling the lambs but also at the primary producers' end? I am not saying that at any one point more care is needed than at any other, but there is a need for it to be exercised.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not know what the Agriculture Department can do about organizing a massive publicity campaign. This is left to the individual: he knows the score. I was surprised to hear the honourable member say that on the sale of lambs the purchaser takes into consideration the percentage of bruising that occurs. I have never heard of this before. It is a matter for the buyer, purely and simply. Naturally, I am concerned, and so are all honourable members who market sheep, about bruising. This is a matter for the stock firms that take delivery of the sheep from the producer. It is the producers' responsibility to see that these sheep are handled with all possible care to benefit the producer, but I will see what advertising has been done along these lines. I know that in the past, when the lambing season comes, people have been notified to be careful in the handling of lambs. Just exactly what the department can do on that score I do not know, but I would say it would be very little. It is a matter for the industry itself but, if the

department can help in some way, it will be only too happy to do so. I will see what can be done and then inform the honourable member.

STATUTES

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked a week or two ago about reprints of Statutes?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Prior to 1962 some, but not all, reprints of Acts were included in the annual volumes. This practice was discontinued in 1962, probably because the volume of legislation was increasing and the inclusion of reprints would increase the size of volumes to an extent that would make them unwieldy. In the past few years the production of reprints of consolidated Acts has been increased substantially, so that to include them in the appropriate annual volume would mean that the annual volumes would become even bulkier than they are at present. It would also mean some additional cost in the production of annual volumes. The question of having all reprints, or some of the more important ones, included with future annual volumes will be investigated.

ENVIRONMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation, a reply to a question I asked recently concerning the report of the Committee on Environment?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: When the honourable member asked his question he was under the impression that this committee had delivered a report to the Government some months ago. The Minister of Environment and Conservation has informed me that the honourable member is incorrect in assuming that the Committee on Environment has provided the Government with its report. It is hoped that the report will be available by the end of this year.

MAIN ROAD JUNCTIONS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am sure that all people who travel north of Port Pirie would wish me to express their appreciation to the Highways Department for the alteration it has made to a road junction which by-passes Port Pirie and which was known previously as Georges Corner. I personally have been on a number of deputations over the last 15 years to have this junction altered, and I believe representations started even before that. Everyone is pleased at the alteration that has been made to this junction, and I believe it should emphasize to the Highways Department the necessity to alter other similar junctions. Over the years there have been a number of fatalities and quite a number of very serious accidents which, as has now been proved by this alteration, could have been avoided. Will the Minister find out from his colleague whether the Highways Department has any plans to alter many of the other 90 degree junctions on main roads?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am sure that my colleague will be very pleased to hear the honourable member giving him credit for doing something that the honourable member has been trying to get done for 15 years.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: It started some years ago.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when it is available.

KANGAROO ISLAND FREIGHT RATES

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: In the *Advertiser* of Saturday, October 9, the Chairman of the Dudley District Council (Mr. Trethewey) is reported as having said that Kangaroo Island farmers could have their annual incomes cut by $250 to $300 because of the 15 per cent increase in freight charges on the *Troubridge* announced last week by the Adelaide Steamship Company Limited. The Government promised to have a ferry in service by June, 1972, but it is now claimed that that will be impossible. The Minister of Roads and Transport has from time to time reassured the people on the island concerning the ferry service, but delay after delay has occurred. Now, transport costs have been further increased. The island people now want to know whether the Government will consider increasing the subsidy to the Adelaide Steamship Company Limited to cover the latest increase until the ferry is in service, because it is not the fault of the island people that the introduction of the ferry service has been delayed.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Because this is a policy matter, it will be determined by Cabinet. I am sure that my colleague will consider the honourable member's question and report to Cabinet on it.

SALISBURY FREEWAY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question about plans for the Salisbury Freeway?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague states:

Planning is well advanced for a new highway extending from the Port Wakefield Road to the proposed Dry Creek Expressway and thence to Grand Junction Road and Regency Road. Construction work for the first stage is expected to commence in about three years' time, subject to availability of funds.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The criticism has been made that the committee dealing with applications for rural assistance is making far slower progress in processing the claims than are corresponding committees in New South Wales and Victoria. If the criticism is fair, possibly insufficient people are working full time on processing the applications. Will the Minister consider this matter with a view to assisting the committee, if possible, to speed up this whole process so that the maximum aid can be given when it is needed to deserving primary producers?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not know whether I agree with the honourable member that progress is not being made as expeditiously as possible. Further, I do not know whether increasing the number of people dealing with the applications would make much difference to the speed with which they are processed. However. I shall consider the matter and see whether it is necessary to increase the staff in order to expedite the processing of applications for rural assistance.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It has been some time since it was announced that agreement had been reached with the Commonwealth Government to construct a new standard gauge railway line from Adelaide to a place near Crystal Brook, where it would link with the Indian Pacific line across Australia. People have raised this matter with me from time to time, asking what progress has been made since the Government made its announcement. Will the Minister provide an interim report on the present stage of planning in regard to that very large transport project? Also, are there any matters still to be settled with the Commonwealth or any matters of disagreement with the Commonwealth in connection with the project? When is it expected that work will commence on the project?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will be happy to convey the honourable member's queries to my colleague and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

ENFIELD HOSPITAL—ADOLESCENT UNIT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Enfield Hospital—Adolescent Unit.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Read a third time and passed.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PRESBYTERIAN TRUSTS BILL

Read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2036.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): On Thursday last, when I spoke briefly to the Bill and sought leave to conclude my remarks later, I pointed out that the Bill aimed to raise in stamp duties more than $4,000,000 additionally in a full financial year and about $2,250,000 in the remainder of this

financial year. I also pointed out that the magnitude of these increases must be viewed with concern by all members of this Council. I concluded on Thursday by saying that the present Government's spokesmen often referred to regressive forms of taxation (that is, a couple of years ago), and referred particularly to receipts duty (which is, in effect, a stamp duty) as one of the regressive forms of taxation. Despite this, the Council has before it a measure that will almost double the amount received in stamp duties, but there is no mention now of regressive forms of taxation. We must concur that stamp duties are a form of capital taxation, and any form of capital taxation is, in essence, a regressive form of taxation.

It was estimated that the return to the Treasury from stamp duties would be $24,626,000 in the 1970-71 financial year. However, actual collection totalled $21,033,000, the reduction being attributed to the removal of receipts duty, but the loss to the State Treasury in relation to receipts duty was made up by the Commonwealth Government. Since then, there has been a new agreement between the Commonwealth and State Governments regarding revenue matters, in which the Commonwealth Government transferred to the States the responsibility to collect pay-roll tax, due adjustments having been made by the Commonwealth Government in relation to its reimbursements to the States in this respect. The States have unilaterally agreed to lift the incidence of this taxation from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent.

The Bill is expected to increase the amount collected from stamp duties by $4,150,000 (I believe that is a conservative estimate) in a full financial year and $2,250,000 in the remainder of this financial year. However, the estimated return to the Treasury for this financial year is $21,400,000, as opposed to last year's receipts of $21,033,000, although the Bill before us increases the overall impact of stamp duty in the community by 20 per cent to 25 per cent. Somewhere along the line, these figures do not ring true. I realize that several explanations can be given but, without having any information available to them, honourable members can only guess at those reasons. It may be that the Government is expecting a down-turn in business activities in South Australia. There may be other reasons. One would naturally expect an escalation in the expected return to the Treasury when stamp duties are being increased by 20 per cent to 25 per cent. However, as I pointed out, there are no expected increases to the State Treasury from this source in this year's Budget. Perhaps in reply the Chief Secretary could explain the reasons for this interesting state of affairs.

I should like now to turn to the provisions of the Bill. Stamp duties are being increased in a number of areas; in one case (the section dealing with annual licences for insurance companies) a whole section has been redrafted. I have examined this matter closely and, although the section has been completely redrafted, it appears that only one part of it has been amended. In this respect I refer to the provision dealing with the annual licence fee payable by a company, person or firm engaged in the business of insurance. The Bill increases the annual licence fee from $50 to $100. Although I have examined the redrafted clause closely that is, as far as I can see, the only effective change that is being made. Why the whole section should be redrafted to make such a simple alteration, I do not know. It is difficult for one to identify any changes that are being made. I ask the Chief Secretary to examine clause 12, which amends the second schedule of the principal Act, and say, in reply, whether the only effective amendment is that in relation to the annual licence fee for insurance companies.

The increase in stamp duties is regressive taxation, irrespective of how one looks at this matter. I have done some work on looking at the increase in various sections and its effect upon the community. It is difficult to get any accurate interpretation, because there is now in some areas a graduated form of stamp duty that did not exist before. Therefore, it is difficult in any research to take total figures when there is a graduated scale in relation to the size of the transaction.

Let us look at the increased cost to house owners or prospective house owners. If a person wishes to buy a $15,000 house today (and most young people setting out in life would be looking for a house and land of about that value), the stamp duty on the transfer is at present $195; under the Bill this will increase to $240—an increase of $45, or 22 per cent to 24 per cent. Most young people setting out in life would arrange a mortgage on that property. The duty on a $10,000 mortgage is $25, but the excess over $10,000 will be dutiable at .35 per cent and not .25 per cent, as at present. So the total cost today in stamp duty alone for a person to own his own house and arrange for a mortgage is $265. This is not a large increase, although it is between 22 per cent and 24 per cent.

However, when we come to the larger transfers of property, we see the rapidly escalating duty returnable to the Government. In this matter, we are constantly putting before the Council the position in regard to the rural industries, but in that regard we are dealing with a group of people involved in heavy capital investment with, very often, little ability to pay. In other words, there is a heavy capital investment but little income. Also, so far as a living area is concerned, in most of the rural areas it is almost impossible for any person to have an income much above the basic wage with a capital investment of less than $50,000. Let us take as an example a person who is beginning in this field and wishes to go farming. He arranges to buy a farm worth $50,000, which is a bare living area today, and arranges for a $40,000 mortgage. The cost in stamp duty at present is $875; under the Bill the duty is $1,420, an increase of almost 100 per cent. In this area, as I have said, we are dealing with the person with an income, or a prospective income, not much above the basic wage.

I turn quickly now to stamp duty on hire-purchase agreements. Recently, an increase in registration fees has been announced. If my memory serves me correctly, it was estimated in the Budget speech that this increase would bring in almost $3,000,000 extra to the Treasury. There has also been an increase in drivers' licence fees. For a new motor vehicle costing about $3,000, the stamp duty will increase from $30 to $55, an increase of almost 100 per cent. If a person buys such a car on hire-purchase and borrows $2,000, the stamp duty will increase from $30 to $36. So the total stamp duty, which is now $60, will increase to $91—an increase of 50 per cent in that area alone. This increase, added to the increase in registration fees and drivers' licence fees, will have impact on the smaller person in the community.

It is difficult to assess the actual impact on the Treasury, because we are here dealing with a graduated stamp duty. I have not the figures here but I think it is $1 on each $100 up to $1,000, and then it increases to $2 on each $100, and then to $2.50 on each $100. On page 47 of Parliamentary Paper 18 we see, under the heading "Return of stamp duties collected under various headings for financial year ended June 30, 1971", in respect of applications to register or transfer motor vehicles, that gross collections of stamp duty were $2,450,000. In this Bill, certain stamp duty increases on motor vehicles are of about 200 per cent. Let me quote one or two figures.

Stamp duties on registrations of motor vehicles have been recalculated. For a medium family car (for example, a Holden) costing $3,000, under the existing Act the stamp duty is $30; under this Bill it will be $55 (almost double). For a medium truck costing $10,000, the present duty is $100 and the new duty will be $230. I realize that we should have a break-down of the number of vehicles in each category before we can arrive at a total. Let us take, for example, a family car, a Holden, on which the stamp duty will increase from $30 to $55, and then let us look at the return to the Treasury last year of $2,450,000: we can see that the increase in duty in this field alone could amount to between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000. If the increase in duty on the family Holden car is almost 100 per cent, one can assume that the increase in the total returns to the Treasury, when returns last year were $2,450,000, will be of that order. As I have said, I have been unable to get from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles a break-down of the figures, so one can only make a guess in this matter.

The duty payable on the transfer of a business or a farm worth $100,000 is increased under this Bill from $1,250 to $2,790. The returns for last year show that stamp duty on conveyances on transfers or sales amounted to $5,000,000. As I have said, it is very difficult to get a break-down of the figures: I have attempted to find these figures but have been unable to do so. The only figure I can cite is that given for 1969, which shows that the value of property transferred in South Australia amounted to $320,000,000. One would need a break-down of these figures to know what the impact of the new stamp duties will be because, once again, we are dealing with a graduated scale, and the figure would depend on the number of transactions below $12,000 and the number above that figure. Once again, I submit that, with a return of $5,000,000 and a doubling of the rate for transactions involving over $12,000, one can expect that the return from stamp duty on conveyances on transfers or sales would amount to between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000. Indeed, I believe that it could be more. When one compares the estimates in relation to this Bill with the actual returns to the Treasury last financial year, one can see many areas in which the Government

has been more than conservative in its estimate of returns to the Treasury.

The Bill increases by 40 per cent the stamp duty on mortgages of over $10,000. Once again, without looking at the figures it is very difficult to say what the increase will be. Then we come to such questions as bills of exchange, cheques, credit business and shares. Here the increase ranges from 20 per cent in some cases to 50 per cent in others. I expect that here the return to the State Treasury will be between $1,000,000 and $2,000,000. As one looks at these figures, one sees that the Government has been more than conservative in its estimate. The Budget this year contains a statement that the Treasury expects only a minor increase in revenue from stamp duties compared to the previous year, yet in the large area of duty on the registration and transfer of motor vehicles and on conveyances on transfers or sales the increases will be of about 100 per cent, once again depending on the actual number of transactions of a value over the base figure.

I believe many areas deserve further examination. Over the weekend I tried to examine this matter in depth, but I found considerable difficulty in assessing the position because, as I have pointed out, the Bill before us alters the actual application of the duty. It introduces a new scale on a graduated basis, and unless one has available the actual sizes of sales in various areas it is difficult to make any accurate prediction. I believe that the increases in stamp duty are unwarranted. They are a regressive form of taxation. I do not think anyone would deny that we have a growth within the metropolitan area. I heard an interjection from Sir Arthur Rymill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: You weren't supposed to hear it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was using a term used by the Premier; I believe that the word "regressive" is just as applicable to this Bill as it was when he used it with regard to the receipts duty legislation. I share Sir Arthur Rymill's view on the meaning of the word "regressive".

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I thought it was "aggressive".

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That could be just as applicable to this Bill. If anyone does not believe that prices are rising in the metropolitan area, let him try to buy a house or a block of land. With the growth and with rising prices in the metropolitan area, there should be a natural increase in stamp duty to the State Treasury.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: We only have to consider the acquisition of houses for freeways.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Exactly. Perhaps the Chief Secretary would care to say in his reply whether or not we are proceeding with the acquisition of houses for freeways. The cost to business through the increase in stamp duty on the registration and transfer of motor vehicles will be heavy and will lead to an increase in costs in many areas of business. The increase in stamp duty on commercial vehicles will be between 100 per cent and 200 per cent. Both primary industry and businesses in the rural area will feel the impact of these duties.

During the last few weeks many questions have been asked in this Council in relation to both rural reconstruction and aggregation, if I can use that term. In this field alone some property will be transferred, and probably it will be transferred at a slightly lower figure than would have been the case two or three years ago. As I have pointed out, the stamp duty payable on a property worth $100,000 will increase from $1,250 to $2,790, an increase of about 130 per cent. This will have a great impact on the rural and business enterprises in these areas. I shall support the second reading of the Bill, but I put these views before the Council because I believe the Government has been more than conservative in its estimations and that these new duties will return to the State Treasury much in excess of the $4,150,000 stated in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 1823.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern):: Last February the Chief Secretary introduced a Bill to abolish both the death penalty and various forms of corporal punishment. Today we have this Bill, the second of two separate Bills dealing with capital punishment and corporal punishment, the Corporal Punishment Abolition Bill having been passed by this Council last week. Last February I, in common with the majority of other honourable members,, expressed my views in favour of retaining capital punishment. What the Chief Secretary said last February, only eight months ago, in regard to capital punishment was repeated well nigh verbatim about a week ago, when he introduced the present Bill. I wish to recapitulate one or

two things said last February. Both then and in explaining this Bill the Chief Secretary said:

> The case against capital punishment rests primarily and basically upon the intrinsic value of the human person.

Last February I added to that remark "within the framework of society as a whole", and I add that again today. The Chief Secretary also said:

> It is not too much to say that the degree of civilization of a community is determined by its price of the worth of the human person.

Last February I emphasized, and I do so again today, that I can agree with such a statement only if the Chief Secretary is referring to the potential worth of a person. There are at liberty in the community far too many persons whose worth to society, as expressed by their actions, is nil and whose contributions to society are a millstone round its neck. Charity associated with a type of sentimentality causes many folk to think that every weak reed is a victim of circumstances. Such folk ignore the fact that society as a whole is being undermined and every citizen is being denied what abolitionists say should be available as a right to the supreme law-breaker. The Chief Secretary said:

> Carelessness of human life and disregard of its value are the marks of barbarism.

How absolutely true! Yet the strange thing is that that statement is used to imply that society is the perpetrator of viciousness, while the criminal is automatically the victim of society's brutality. The abolitionists' criticism of the present laws relating to murder completely ignores the fundamental worth and value and right of the human family as a group. I yield to no man in my desire to ensure that justice will be done for every person—even justice associated with mercy. Frankly, I get tired of seeing sentimental weakness, in the guise of all-pervading mercy for the evildoer (both corporate and individual), at the expense of the rest of the community.

Surely we, as legislators, have a duty to think of corporate responsibilities and perhaps spend a little less effort treating every little weed as if it were a blushing rose. I am sure that, following the experience gained earlier this year, more than one source will again stress that I and people holding similar views are lacking in Christian charity in our approach to this subject. For some strange reason credit for humanitarianism is denied those of us who still consider that cold-blooded bestiality divorced from mitigating circumstances (such as mental inability) should merit a sentence dictated by plain justice. The Chief Secretary said:

> When the State, as a deliberate act of policy, lays aside its power to punish by inflicting death, it demonstrates in a practical and striking way its conviction of the value of all human life.

I believe that that statement is incorrect. Too often, by laying aside the power referred to, the State is demonstrating its unwillingness to accept responsibility to provide protection for society against those who choose to live by vicious, brutal and selfish standards. I repeat what I said earlier in the year: in my opinion, some murderers, because of their fragile mental state, do not merit the death penalty. To sentence to death for his actions one who, because of some form of insanity, has no conception of the vileness of his behaviour would be barbaric indeed. But to say that every murderer merits consideration as a mentally aberrant personality is equally unreasonable.

When it has been proved that the act was committed knowingly, deliberately, for selfish gain, or as part of a preconceived plan, it is right and just that the supreme crime should be matched with the supreme punishment. I do not agree that "the only ground upon which the execution of murderers would be tolerable in a civilized community is that it could be shown to be a unique deterrent to serious crime and that its abolition would result in increased loss of innocent life". Bearing in mind the present high prison population and the constantly increasing crime rate, I believe that society must surely face the realization that excessive sentimentality could easily be the hallmark of decadence, not of human progress. In a speech not long ago a certain learned judge said crimes and their punishment should be related to the standards of conduct acceptable to the community in the age in which we find ourselves. This does not mean that every old standard is merely fit to be cast aside. Unfortunately, there is a tendency for many modern thinkers to cry automatically, "Off with the old! Nothing of the past is suitable or fit for this present day." How often we hear this from street rebels.

One facet of capital punishment which disturbs and worries many people, even some who accept it as a just penalty, is its finality. Recognizing the frailty of human decision as well as of human nature, they fear lest an innocent person, wrongly accused, be sent to the gallows. Once that has happened it is too late to recapitulate and reverse the effects of the sentence. Again, as in February last,

the Chief Secretary referred in his second reading explanation to the Timothy Evans case. As I mentioned at that time, there is still to this day considerable doubt whether or not he was guilty, bearing in mind that the only evidence upon which to base his innocence was the word of Christie, a man who was living in Evans's house and who was also a proven and confessed mass murderer, who had absolutely nothing to lose by making such a confession except to cast doubt upon the use of capital punishment and thereby perhaps seek to escape the gallows himself.

Sir John Anderson, former British Home Secretary, speaking in a House of Commons debate, said that the risk under conditions as they exist today in that country of the capital penalty being executed on anyone who was not guilty of the crime of which he had been convicted was so very small that that consideration might even be dismissed. How many unsolved crimes are there in which life has been taken cold-bloodedly and deliberately, or held cheaply? How many widows and orphans have resulted because of the perpetrators of such crimes? During the past 10 years, 171 murders or attempted murders have been committed in South Australia, and in 26 of these cases no culprit has been apprehended. These figures do not include such cases as the Beaumont children, because in that instance the children completely disappeared and what happened to them is unknown.

Emotion is a dominant passion in considering the whole subject of capital crime, and there is nothing wrong with that, but emotionalism, when that enters the picture, overshadows practical and logical consideration. May I draw to the attention of honourable members that, on the last day of 1958, one named Joseph Chrimes broke into a bungalow in England, battered an elderly woman to death with a tyre lever, and stole a clock, a cigarette lighter, and a number of other small items. In March, 1959, at the Old Bailey he was convicted and sentenced to death. The case aroused no public interest. There was no agitation for a reprieve, even from confirmed opponents of capital punishment.

At the same session of the Central Criminal Court one Ronald Henry Marwood stood trial and was sentenced to death for murder. A well organized and highly publicized campaign for his reprieve was immediately put into action. "Poor Ron Marwood", as he became known, was only 25 years old, it was emphasized; no-one seemed to emphasize that his victim was only 23 and that he was in fact a policeman. Public emotion, therefore, could be easily and furiously whipped up by the abolitionists. Petitions were organized. Groups gathered outside the gaol the evening before and the morning of the execution, but no such sympathy and support was shown for Chrimes. He had only battered to death an unknown elderly woman, not a policeman.

The Chief Secretary made the point that the abolition of capita! punishment might not save many lives but that it would be an affirmation by the Parliament of South Australia of its belief in the worth and dignity of human beings. The actual number of lives saved or lost by our treatment of this Bill is surely not the criterion; the real measure is whether it is an expression of justice and fair legislation in the interests of the community as a whole, the people whom we represent. None of us has an easy decision to make and it must be made with a belief in the worth and dignity of human beings, both as a community as well as individually. I personally can do this only by considering the well-being and protection of the community group. My conscience is searched as deeply and my beliefs are held as honestly as those of any abolitionist. This Bill we are considering, once clause 2 is accepted and passed, is little more than a series of consequential alterations. Clause 2 provides for the abolition of the death penalty and substitutes life imprisonment.

Eight months ago we considered this same subject. What has happened in those intervening eight months to cause a change of opinion from the decision we reached at that time? As far as I am concerned, numbers of police officers in this country, in the United Kingdom, and elsewhere in the world have lost their lives in the performance of their duties. Murders, it is not too much to say, have almost abounded. For all these reasons I shall cast my vote, exactly as I did in February last, for the retention of capital punishment with its present safeguards to ensure fair trial, a just sentence, and, where necessary, the full expression of mercy.

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

JUVENILE COURTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1876.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading of this somewhat lengthy Bill, which contains 45 pages and 79 clauses and which sets out fully the suggested law for the constitution and jurisdiction of

juvenile courts in this State. Honourable members will recall that a similar Bill dealing with the constitution and jurisdiction of juvenile courts was before this Council in 1966, when it was claimed (and rightly so) that it brought up to date the powers and procedures of the Juvenile Court. If honourable members will recall, some of the pioneering work on that Bill was done by the then magistrate of the Juvenile Court (Mr. John Marshall, S.M.), and later the Parliamentary Draftsman added considerably to his original draft of the Bill.

We were justified at that time in saying that the Bill brought the various procedures up to date. However, it remained essentially a Bill instituting a judicial system of dealing with juvenile offenders rather than a system involving counselling and help of that kind. That is the real difference between the Bill now before the Council and the 1966 Bill. If one carefully compares this Bill with the 1966 Bill, one will see that there is not much difference in the wording of many clauses. Essentially, the difference is in the new concepts of dealing with juvenile offenders. Indeed, it can be said that the changes being made, although they are important changes in principle, are not great in number.

When the last Liberal and Country League Government was in power in this State, a report on ways and means of up-dating the juvenile courts system was sought from the Social Welfare Advisory Committee, it being recognized that, although these changes in procedures had been introduced in the 1966 Bill, the system was still not satisfactory because increasing numbers of children were coming before the courts and being dealt with according to the way in which the different magistrates viewed the cases. Some cases were dealt with in a manner that was considered not to be in accordance with the best psychological views obtaining at present.

The Bill now before the Council arises entirely out of the report that was sought from the Social Welfare Advisory Committee, which submitted its final report to the Government in about May last year. Before the report was finalized, investigations into the advances that had been made in juvenile court work in other countries were carried out. It can fairly be said that this Bill envisages the setting up of a system of counselling. This is a comparatively new concept, which has crept into many spheres of life today. We have counselling for education purposes; school counsellors to help people with their problems; marriage guidance counsellors, who try to help people in a specific area of need; and people are being counselled for employment opportunities and matters of that kind. It is, therefore, very much a feature of our latest idea of social services to have counselling in one form or another.

However, counselling is no good and will not be effective unless those engaged as counsellors are the best people for the job and are highly trained and skilled for the purpose. It is intended in this legislation, as one of the radical departures from the provisions of the principal Act, to set up what will be known as juvenile aid panels, which are to be constituted by two persons. The purpose of such panels will be to deal with children up to 16 years of age, without those children being charged formally with an offence in the first instance, and to ascertain what was the cause of the offence in the first place, the background of the person involved, his parental difficulties (if any), his home life, and generally to assess the child's whole situation. The interests of the child are to be given paramount consideration in all circumstances.

It is intended that these juvenile panels should be constituted by two persons: either a police officer to be nominated by the Commissioner of Police or a special justice of the peace to be nominated from a panel of persons specially drawn up for the purpose, and an officer of the Social Welfare Department. The latter would obviously have the expertise to analyse the social background of the offender, whereas the other person (and I understand from what the Minister has said that it will invariably be a police officer, when one is available) is to represent the section of the community that has been involved with the detection of the offence in the first place. This is indeed a worthwhile experiment.

I do not object to the panels being constituted in the manner suggested. If care is taken in the selection of the police officers to take part in the activities of these panels, the officers so selected will represent the community as well as anyone else. If care is taken in nominating persons in this respect (and I am sure the Commissioner will be circumspect when nominating persons to take part in this work) there is every possibility that the panels will work as intended.

There are safeguards in the Bill, as cases can be referred by a juvenile aid panel to the Juvenile Court when it is considered that, because of the offence that has been committed, the child needs care, training or treatment of some kind. Then it is possible to have the child brought before the Juvenile

Court by a new form of procedure set up by the Bill, the child not being charged with any formal offence. That is an important and valuable change in procedure. It is, of course, mandatory on the aid panel to refer the case to the court if it is requested so to do by the offender. That, too, is important. Therefore, if a juvenile charged with an offence claims he has a defence to the charge, he should then justifiably present that defence to the Juvenile Court and not be involved, perhaps unnecessarily, in counselling procedures in a juvenile aid panel situation.

It is important that honourable members realize that this juvenile aid panel system will deal with children up to the age of 16, and it is to operate in no way as a part of the judicial system, under the Act. It is not, as it were, to be regarded as a part of the court. The panels are to be conducted or the sessions are to be held completely away from the court atmosphere. There was even some hope expressed by the Chief Secretary that in time these panels could be approached by parents who were having specific problems with their children, to seek their help. I do not know how soon that will occur, particularly if everything is to be kept, as it were, under the wraps of confidentiality. It is important that the work of these juvenile aid panels be kept confidential. I do not know whether the people who will comprise them are not to have their names made public; I do not know precisely, and the Chief Secretary did not indicate in his speech, how these panels could be approached voluntarily by parents having difficulties with their children.

Apart from that aspect, it will be difficult for such panels to function in that kind of way, because, as I see it, they will be fully engaged in their sessions as juvenile aid panels from day to day. I imagine that one of the important things about this panel work is that one should gain same expertise in counselling and, in order to do that, it would not be desirable to have the personnel changing frequently from one day to another. Consequently, if policemen are to be nominated by the Commissioner, they will soon find that their time is almost fully occupied in this type of work. I do not think that will worry them unduly if they have an aptitude and a liking for that work but, once nominated to a panel, they should at least be allowed to carry on with that work for a measurable period of time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In New Zealand they change them frequently.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I think it is a good idea to change them; on the other hand, we must balance change with a certain continuity of work.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is for 12 months there.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I imagine that 12 months would be long enough for anyone doing this kind of work. It is all very well for social workers; they are trained for the work and are used to it. They can do that kind of work indefinitely; it is their life's vocation. But lay members of the panel such as police officers need to be changed from time to time, although not too frequently.

I mention what I consider to be the major change that this Bill introduces—the setting up of these aid panels. As a Parliament we must go hand in hand with the Government on this issue and give it a fair trial because, after all, it has been recommended in the report. It has been tried in one way or another overseas. I can vouch for this myself, because I made some inquiries, although brief, about the operation of juvenile courts generally in the United States and found that in one or two places where these juvenile courts have been set up they have been successful. The impression I have gained is that they have been successful largely as a result of the personality and status of the judge appointed to look after that jurisdiction. It is a fact that an individual who has an aptitude for and specializes and acquires expertise in this branch of the law can make his imprint upon society in his treatment of juvenile offenders in a way that somebody else cannot.

In this legislation, it is proposed for the first time to appoint someone to be the judge of the Juvenile Court. It will, of course, be raising the status of the court to that of a local or district court. Under the Bill, the judge will be the judge of that court sitting in the juvenile jurisdiction. That is a good move; I see no objection to it. After all, I suppose it can be said that people under the age of 18 are entitled to be dealt with in the same way (some of them, of course, do commit serious crimes) as people who are over that age. If it is an established part of our law that people over 18 are in certain circumstances only to be dealt with by a judge of the standing of a local or district court judge or a Supreme Court judge, that should be extended to younger offenders.

Of course, a difference arises in that there are many minor offences committed by juveniles and perhaps we may wonder whether they should come before a judge; but the setting up of a juvenile aid panel and the fact that no child under the age of 16 is in future to be charged with any formal offence is again a new aspect of the whole matter. We must go along with the experiment. There are, of course, some different procedures available for juvenile offenders between the ages of 16 and 18. These offenders will be dealt with by the court but opportunities will be given for a fuller assessment of the circumstances and behaviour of the children in this large group before they are finally dealt with by the court, and a much wider range of punishments of summary orders will be available in future for the court to deal with people who come before it. They may be discharged under recognizance under supervision; they may be directed to attend a youth project centre; or they may be placed under the care and control of the Minister for not less than one year.

All these are amplifications (in some ways, very important ones) of the existing powers of the court. Of course, we do not know very much about the proposed youth project centres that are to be set up under the new Community Welfare Bill, which I gather will be placed before us later. In some ways it is perhaps a little unfortunate that that legislation is not yet ready to come before us, because we would then know a little more about what is proposed. I think the Minister gave sufficient details in his second reading explanation to indicate what is in mind. Of course, honourable members will know that this Bill is not to come into operation at all until the Community Welfare Bill has been passed by this Parliament and its provisions have come into operation.

The Minister pointed out the great difficulties that the Juvenile Court has experienced in connection with the matter of fining juveniles and how the imposition of a fine has always introduced difficulties for the court because of the necessity to provide for a long period for the payment of the fine if it is to come from the child himself. Also, parents sometimes pay their children's fines for one reason or another, and this is inflicting no penalty whatsoever on the child. It is interesting to note that it is not proposed in future to fine any child below the age of 16 years. Fines may be imposed on children between the ages of 16 years and 18 years. I read in the newspaper over the weekend that, in connection with the proposed restricted film classifications that are to be included in a Bill to come before us shortly, the Attorney-General said that no-one should worry about the question of children being admitted to undesirable or restricted films because they would be subject to a very heavy fine, I think about $50, if they were caught in the cinema. Of course, that does not exactly tie up with the provision in this Bill that sets out that a person under the age of 16 years cannot be fined. Therefore, the great sanctions to be imposed in that other legislation perhaps do not carry the weight that he tried to give to them. It is just another facet of this measure that fines can now be imposed only on children over the age of 16 years.

I welcome the fuller assessment of circumstances and behaviour of children by a proper assessment centre. I think this is absolutely essential. Of course, some of this has already been done up to the present by means of reports which come from departmental welfare officers. Indeed, I think in the case of every person who appears before the court (except perhaps on minor traffic charges) these reports are prepared and handed to the court by a welfare officer. This Bill proposes an extension of that. However, the reports are to be much wider in scope, and they will be compiled by professional people over the whole spectrum of background of an individual offender. These assessment centres are to come later, and until they are set up and able to work the legislation is not to be proclaimed.

The Bill emphasizes a major principle that was at one time in our Juvenile Courts Act. This is that the interests of the child are to be given paramount consideration above any other responsibilities that the court or the panel thinks it may have. I do not object to this. I think this is the philosophy behind the Act itself, and I think it is probably a good thing that it is now put back into legislative form. It is a principle that is well known to the courts. In the matrimonial causes jurisdiction, when divorces and separations are being granted by the court, it is an established principle enshrined in that legislation that the interests of the children are to be considered above everything else when it comes to a question of whether the father or the mother or someone else is to have custody. Again, this is only in line with the principle that is now set out in this Bill.

I think there are one or two problems which remain for discussion and which I think will

occupy the attention of this Chamber in Committee. There are two such problems, and I think they are in a way not actually separate from each other. The first is the question of what publicity should be permitted in a juvenile court. I emphasize that clause 71, which deals with this matter, is in no way altered from the existing section of the Act. That provides that there shall be no reporting at all of any proceedings in the Juvenile Court unless ordered by the court before which proceedings are held. Clause 75 (1) states:

> Unless otherwise ordered by the court before which the proceedings are held, the result of any proceedings in a juvenile court or the result of any proceedings in the Supreme Court . . . may, subject to this section, be published or reported in a newspaper or by radio or television.

Clause 75 (2) states:

> Unless permitted by virtue of an order of the court ... a person shall not publish or report . . . the result of any proceedings in a juvenile court or of any proceedings in the Supreme Court on an appeal or committal from a juvenile court revealing the name, address or school, or including any particulars calculated to lead to the identification of any child concerned in those proceedings.

This gives the Juvenile Court power virtually to exclude from the hearing any representatives of the press, although it does not, of course, restrict the press having access to the final result of any particular case. However, that would be of little use in compiling any report on what happened in the Juvenile Court. That information would not in any way give a picture to the public of what actually went on in the Juvenile Court. There is to be no change from the provision in the existing law in this connection, so I suppose the Minister may confront us with the argument that, if we are troubled about it, something should have been done in 1966. However, since 1966 changes in the reporting of Juvenile Court cases have been brought about by the attitudes of magistrates appointed to that court.

At the time of the 1966 legislation Mr. Marshall was the Juvenile Court magistrate; he was succeeded by Mr. Wright, and the present magistrate is Mr. Beerworth. Difficulties arose when Mr. Marshall was the Juvenile Court magistrate. He, of course, played an important part in drafting the 1966 legislation. He kept pretty well to the letter of section 64 of the Juvenile Courts Act, as he would not permit the press to be present in court on all occasions and would not permit anything more than the section allowed. Certain controversy arose, and public debate occurred as a result of his attitude. After Mr. Wright was appointed to the court, he changed the procedure and allowed newspaper reporters to be present in court to report the facts concerning individual cases but not the names of the persons concerned. Indeed, he went further than that; he permitted the publication of the actual names of some offenders (in shoplifting cases, I think) and on one occasion he permitted the name of a school to be mentioned.

Mr. Beerworth has, I think, followed more or less the line set by Mr. Wright, although I do not think he has used publicity in quite the same way as Mr. Wright thought fit. I stress that this publicity on what has been going on in the Juvenile Court has occurred purely and simply as a result of the policy adopted by the individual magistrates. With the appointment of a judge and with the changes being made in the legislation, the question arises whether in future, if clause 75 of the Bill is applied as it obviously can be applied, there will be any public knowledge (or only infinitesimal public knowledge) of what is going on in a court in our State. I think that it would be very undesirable for there to be no such knowledge at all, but I recognize that there are special aspects relating to the Juvenile Court.

It is obviously true that there should be no reporting of names and addresses of offenders or witnesses and no reporting of names of schools that would in any way lead to identification. It is no part of the new judicial process for the juvenile aid panels to be invaded by publicity. However, whether a court should work in a kind of star chamber way (although the court is far from a star chamber) and be entirely self-contained, so that no penetration whatever of its work can be made, will cause some honourable members considerable disquiet. Although I recognize the difficulties involved, I believe that they might be overcome to some extent by providing for a report from the Juvenile Court judge to the Minister or to this Parliament.

As honourable members know, it has been the practice of the Juvenile Court magistrate in Adelaide (but only in Adelaide) to report to the Minister annually. Indeed, that report is one of the papers that has been placed in honourable members' pigeonholes every year; we have been able to read the annual reports until this year. Honourable members may correct me if I am wrong, because a change was made while I was away; I believe that this year it has been announced that the report will not be made public. It is claimed that

the report does not have to be made public; in fact, it does not have to be made at all. However, obviously there are reasons why the Government has thought that on this occasion the report should not be made public.

From what the present magistrate has said publicly from time to time, I do not think it is any secret that he would be somewhat critical of some of the proposals in this Bill. Whether he has any special expertise in this field may be a matter of argument. I have said before that sometimes too much attention is given by honourable members to the opinions of judges about some subjects, and I sometimes doubt whether the opinions of judges should be held in the awe in which they are sometimes held because, after all, judges have a pretty narrow field of operation. They deal with people who come before them and they gain their knowledge purely and simply from the cases they deal with. The mere fact that they sit in court, hear criminal cases and make judgments does not necessarily mean that they are great experts on the psychological problems and social problems of the day.

Of course, I am not in any way criticizing magistrates and judges in general, but obviously there must be some reason why the Government has not made public the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate this year. Obviously, it must contain some criticism of the proposals in this Bill. I believe that Parliament must go along with this new system for dealing with juvenile offenders and see how it works.

I emphasize that we must know how the system works in the future: we must know how the great experiment we are making works out. I have used the term "experiment" because it is an experiment to say that in future no-one under the age of 16 years will ever be charged formally with an offence. Furthermore, it is an experiment to say that people aged between 16 years and 18 years will be dealt with in a reformative way, not a punitive way. Consequently, I believe that a very good case can be made out for requiring the Juvenile Court judge to report to the Minister on the working and administration of this legislation. Unless we have that report, we will not know whether the experiment is successful. We must have some sort of publicity. If we are not to allow the press access to this court except in special circumstances laid down by the judge, we will not know how the system is working. There is no alternative to having a report submitted to the Minister and to Parliament of how the experiment is proceeding and how successful or unsuccessful it is.

In some ways we will find the new procedure a great success; I am sure, however, that there will be some aspects in which there will be disappointing results. That is inevitable. I know sufficient about the counselling process to know that it works successfully in about one-third of the cases, reasonably well in another one-third, and in the remaining one-third it does not work at all. We cannot expect that under this new legislation everything will be all roses. There will be disappointments, and some aspects will not work as well as it was hoped they would.

Something must be done about the question of giving publicity to the work of this court. This must be done either by allowing the press access or by requiring the court to report to Parliament on the working of the Act. I support the second reading, and I will listen with interest to what other members have to say on the two important points I have raised in the latter part of my speech.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2030.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): The Industries Development Act gives power to the South Australian Housing Trust to build factories on trust land outside the metropolitan area. As amended in 1961, the Housing Improvement Act empowers the trust to build factories inside and outside of the metropolitan area.

Apparently, there has been some confusion because in one respect there is duplication within these Acts. Whilst they are similar in some respects, each has its main specific purpose, and the main purpose of the Act which this Bill seeks to amend centres around the work of the Industries Development Committee, the powers of the committee, and the control Parliament gives it to report as it thinks fit upon proposals for industrial development in South Australia.

The Government is now saying it prefers by amendment to have the provision dealing with the trust's powers regarding building factories removed from the Industries Development Act and, by amendment to another Act, centred elsewhere. It is proper, to avoid the confusion that has resulted from this partial duplication,

that it should be taken out of this Act and that this Bill should cause the Act to concern itself only with the work of the Industries Development Committee.

The Government has raised the matter with the Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, and he has said he is quite satisfied provided the powers of the committee are clearly set forth. This is done in clause 2 (2), which inserts the following new subsection in section 10:

The functions of the committee shall include the investigation of any matters referred to it under or pursuant to any Act and the making of such reports and recommendations thereon as the committee thinks fit.

Accordingly, I can see no objection to the Bill, and I support it.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2031.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): The Housing Improvement Act lays down that the South Australian Housing Trust may build factories inside or outside of the metropolitan area, and also that the trust may buy land for purposes other than housing. In the past the trust has taken this to mean that it has power to buy factories already built.

The legal interpretation of land apparently is taken to mean both vacant freehold land and improvements erected upon it. However, the whole question of the power of the trust to buy factories is arguable. Some years ago the trust was looking into the matter to see whether its powers could be clarified, and this Bill does clarify the position.

It is under the Housing Improvement Act that the Government obtains its funds to build factories and therefore I agree with the Minister that it is proper that the matter should be made clear under this Act. The Bill provides specifically that the trust will have power to buy factories in the metropolitan area and outside of it.

If this Bill is passed, the trust, quite clearly and without any challenge, will have power to build factories and also to buy factories within and outside of the metropolitan area. The safeguards put forward on the trust's entering this field of operations are that the consent of the Governor (and by that we know the Minister means the Government itself) and the approval of the Industries Development Committee are necessary. To a certain extent, I think those safeguards are effective.

The Minister in his second reading explanation has said that there is no express power at present for the trust to make additions to factories. This position has been rectified by giving that power and by making such developments subject to the two consents to which I have referred.

I support the Bill, but I make it clear that I am doing so only to clarify the existing practice. We get into very deep principles if we start asking whether or not the trust should have this kind of power. I believe that, if the Government is careful and prudent, there is nothing wrong in the trust's having this power, provided that it uses it in special circumstances only.

There are times when those involved in industry encounter severe financial hardships, and it is reasonable in those circumstances that factory owners might turn to the Government to see whether any help might be forthcoming before the financial position of their operations deteriorates further.

In relation to the purchase, sale or building of factories, the Government should ensure that the trust tries to satisfy two main criteria: first, that the individuals involved with the factory operation in South Australia (and by "individuals" I mean the workers in the factory, the people on the benches, the foremen and the management) will benefit by the trust's becoming involved; secondly, that private enterprise will make every effort to ensure that it can make a go of it before turning to the Government for aid.

If these two criteria are fully satisfied, I believe that in the circumstances obtaining today the trust should have the power to help factory ownership by becoming involved in its operations. Once it is involved in an operation, I believe the trust should get out of that sphere as quickly as it can. Short-term involvement is vastly different from the State's becoming involved in the long term and wanting to gain an investment return from an area of operation that should be left to private enterprise.

The purpose of the Bill is not to introduce an entirely new power or alter the previous policy of the Housing Trust but to clarify a practice that exists at present. Because it is only a clarification of an existing practice, I support the Bill.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 7. Page 2031.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): Three Acts involve the South Australian Housing Trust: the Industries Development Act, the Housing Improvement Act and the South Australian Housing Trust Act. The amendments to the former two Acts, which the Council is considering, involve the South Australian Housing Trust.

The purpose of this Bill is simply to give the trust the right to exercise any power conferred on it by or under the other two Acts to which I referred and, as it appears to be a necessary machinery measure, I support it.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.25 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 13, at 2.15 p.m.