

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 30, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

THE SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. this day. I ask the mover and seconder of the motion and other members to accompany me to Government House for that purpose.

At 2.2 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.20 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech, together with other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on June 29, to which His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the first session of the thirty-eighth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray God's blessing upon the proceedings of the session.

QUESTIONS

AWARD PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Premier say what effect the award made in the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission yesterday will have on the State Budget, and whether the payment of increases to public servants will depend on some additional determination by a tribunal or whether they will be paid automatically, as in the case of service pay?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain the necessary information for the Leader, if possible by tomorrow.

HOUSING FINANCE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question about the investment of funds of the South Australian Superannuation Fund and he said he might have an answer by today. Has he now a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chairman of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Board states that the board expects to provide about £1,750,000 for housing loans during the

financial year 1965-66. In addition to this sum, the board expects to make a loan to the South Australian Housing Trust, so it will make a total contribution towards housing of almost £2,000,000 during the next financial year. The board is able to satisfy all applications for housing loans received from contributors to the fund provided, of course, that there is sufficient security in the property concerned to cover the amount of loan sought by the applicant.

GRAPES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The *Barossa News and Light Herald* of April 8, 1965, contains the following report:

The Wine Grapegrowers Council of South Australia, following on the refusal of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association to accept recommendations by the Prices Commissioner on prices for the 1965 vintage deliveries, has speeded up its efforts to establish a wine grape marketing board. Mr. R. L. Schulz, of Nuriootpa, now vice-president of the council, reports that a draft for legislation *re* the proposed board has been prepared by the council secretary (Mr. G. Lucas) and this is now in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Bywaters) for examination before submission to the State Government.

Will the Premier say whether the draft legislation, which was said to be in the hands of the Minister of Agriculture, has been submitted to Cabinet, whether it has been considered, and whether the Government intends to introduce legislation or to postpone its introduction pending the inquiry into the grape industry by the recently appointed Royal Commission?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If and when the matter mentioned by the honourable member is placed before Cabinet, it will be considered, but I do not know anything of it at this stage.

BERRI TRAFFIC.

Mr. CURREN: I understand the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, has a reply to a question I asked on June 16 about the Sturt Highway near Berri.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that traffic counts taken last year on the Sturt Highway adjacent to Berri gave a peak-hour volume of 429 vehicles. Duplication, with extensive land acquisition, of this section (which is already 24ft. wide) cannot be justified at present. The position will be checked by additional traffic counts from time to time.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My neighbour, who is a commercial poultry farmer, has drawn my attention to a circular being distributed by the South Australian Egg Board, which states:

With the coming introduction of the C.E.M.A. plan, an adjustment to the rate of levy paid by holders of a producer exemption has been made possible. As from Monday, June 28, 1965, the rate of levy will be 2d. a dozen and this must be submitted with a monthly return, as is done at the present time. This levy must not be confused with the bird levy, which is imposed by the Commonwealth and requires separate returns and payments on a fortnightly basis.

At the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities protest meeting at Murray Bridge recently, speakers supporting the C.E.M.A. plan said that the Commonwealth bird levy would replace the present per-dozen State egg levy. From the South Australian Egg Board circular from which I have quoted it seems that holders of producer exemptions will have to pay both the Commonwealth bird levy and a State per-dozen levy as well. Can the Minister of Agriculture explain this situation?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to explain this matter, because I know that it has caused a little confusion because of the statement that I possibly made earlier about the present egg levy being removed.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I think that the Minister actually made the statement in the House at one time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, I think that is so, and it was reported in the press. In the past an egg levy has been payable by all people forwarding eggs through the egg floor, but besides that there has been another levy which has provided for those in receipt of P.E. licences, and those are the people to whom the honourable member is referring. I understand that the egg levy was 5d. a dozen but those who had P.E. licences contributed 6½d. The egg levy of those selling through egg floors will not be applicable and the bird levy will apply in its stead, but those with P.E. licences will still be paying for that privilege, and it is considered a privilege by those people who have P.E. licences because they are able to grade their own eggs and there are no handling charges from the egg floors. Egg floors still have to be maintained and there is much expense in maintaining their operations. This contribution is for the purpose of the P.E. licence because of the privilege that they enjoy over other people who supply eggs through the egg floor. The situation will be that they will pay 2d. a dozen for this privilege. They can then sell to people by putting the Egg Board brand on the eggs and they can do their own grading. They do not have to pay any such thing as grading charges through the egg floors.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is based on 7s. a bird.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes, but they paid more than the other people sending through the egg floor before this came into operation. They are quite a bit better off than their counterparts in other States, who pay about 3½d. for this privilege. It has been recognized in the past as a privilege to have a P.E. licence and I believe all producers were happy to pay this sum over and above what was charged by the Egg Board in respect of those who supplied through the egg floors.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understood from the Minister of Agriculture that the 2d. levy is to maintain egg-grading floors, and I assume that the money is being paid to these floors. I understand that they are private enterprises and purely commercial. Can the Minister say on what basis the 2d. levy will be paid to these floors? Will it be upon a per-dozen basis? What will the 2d. levy be used for if it is not to be paid to the egg-grading floors, as I assume it will from the Minister's reply?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret that I gave that impression. It is not to be paid to the egg grading floors, as the Leader said. Costs have to be met. People were getting an advantage by grading their own eggs rather than through the floors.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The people who grade privately have to do the same work.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate that, but this 2d. levy goes to the Egg Board and will be used in meeting administrative costs of the board.

NORMAN TERRACE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Several weeks ago reference was made in the press to redevelopment to take place in the Unley District. Recently several constituents from Norman Terrace have approached me concerning talk of a freeway that will upset landholders. Will the Attorney-General get a report on whether this will affect landholders in this area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member knows, the report of the Town Planning Committee on freeway development has been the subject of a further investigation that is currently proceeding as to traffic control and freeways in the metropolitan area. This survey is not expected to be completed within 18 months. In consequence, in relation to a number of freeway developments in the metropolitan area it is by no means certain that the freeways will proceed in the manner originally recommended in the report of the Town Planning Committee. Indeed, an entirely different

system of freeway development may be recommended eventually. It is intended that certain freeway development shall proceed immediately, and land is being acquired for that purpose. I will consult with my colleague, the Minister of Roads, have the matter of Norman Terrace examined by the Town Planning Committee, and let the honourable member have a reply.

HASLAM SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I understand that tenders were called and that a contract has been let for installing a septic system at the Haslam school. Can the Minister of Works say when this work will be commenced?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Public tenders were called and they closed on May 25. One tender was received and that is being currently considered and I hope we shall be able to make a decision so that the work can be carried out promptly.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last week I asked the Premier and the Minister of Works questions about the Government's attitude to fluoridation, and I received a reply from the Minister of Works covering the points I raised except for the names of the members of the committee set up by the Australian Labor Party, which committee advised or directed the Government on its attitude. I understand that the Minister now has the names of the members of that committee. Will he give them to the House?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The committee referred to by the honourable member was set up at the direction of the 1963 Australian Labor Party Convention by the executive of the South Australian Branch. It produced a report in 1964. The executive appointed the following members of the committee: Mr. C. R. Cameron, M.H.R.; Mr. D. A. Dunstan, M.P. (now the Attorney-General); Mr. R. E. Hurst, the present member for Semaphore; Mr. G. T. Virgo, Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party; Mr. M. H. Nicholls, M.H.R.; and me.

WHEAT TRUCKS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago when members of this Parliament visited the Snowy Mountains, while we were waiting to rejoin the train at Yass we had the privilege of noting a New South Wales train conveying wheat in what are known as hopper-bottom trucks. As during the last harvest there was

a shortage in South Australia of railway trucks during the peak wheat delivery period, will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport whether the Railways Department has considered improving its rolling stock, whether any new proposals are going forward, and whether it will consider manufacturing hopper-bottom trucks for the carriage of bulk wheat in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from my colleague, the Minister of Transport.

DECIMAL CURRENCY.

Mr. COUMBE: Already classes are being held both for adults and for primary school-children to explain the new decimal currency system, and the general public, too, is being exhorted to educate itself about it. As a result, many commercial and business houses are now altering their correspondence and business forms to include both the pounds, shillings and pence system and the decimal currency system. As this Parliament will shortly consider the Loan Estimates and the Budget Papers and as decimal currency will be introduced in February next, in the year covered by these measures, does the Treasurer propose that the financial papers to be laid before members shall contain provision for both the sterling and the decimal currency systems? If not, will he consider this matter in an effort to facilitate the ease of working of this Parliament and of members individually?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Up to the present we have not considered the matter, although certain associated legislation to be introduced in this House is in the course of preparation. If it is possible to accede to the honourable member's request, and it is not too late, I will take up the matter with my staff to see how far we can go with it.

LIQUID FUELS.

Mr. HUGHES: For some time I have been concerned (and it would appear from the report in this morning's *Advertiser* that some proprietors of petrol stations share my concern) regarding the loose manner in which some people purchase their power and lighting fuel, namely, by sending young children along with a can. In the interests of safety, will the Attorney-General examine this matter and see whether some legislation can be introduced to obviate the danger?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I will consider the matter.

CIVIL DEFENCE.

Mr. RODDA: Last week I asked the Premier a question concerning civil defence. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question raised by the honourable member concerned the non-establishment to date of civil defence organizations in the South-East of the State and of the selection of Murray Bridge, Nuriootpa, Mount Barker and McLaren Vale as optimum locations for the establishment of civil defence control centres. Whilst it is appreciated that there are many residents of the South-East who will support the development of civil defence organizations, it has not been possible with the present staff engaged upon this work to extend activities to this region, nor, in fact, to the Upper North or western regions. In the 2½ years that civil defence development has been progressing 63 local government authorities have formed local organizations, and the initial work involved in public meetings, instructional courses and organizational assistance has meant very long hours of work for the staff involved.

The importance of the South-Eastern region has certainly not been overlooked, and activities will be extended to the region as soon as possible. The selection of locations for an alternative headquarters and for group control centres for the three group areas of the Adelaide zone took into account many factors that could influence their successful operation, including distance from likely areas of destruction, transportation routes, lines of communication and local facilities. The criticism that they "could be highly dangerous in an atomic attack" could apply equally to any part of the State, particularly if the potential danger from the hazard of radio-activity is a prime consideration. The rapidity with which civil defence development can be extended to the South-East is dependent upon the staff position within the State civil defence headquarters, a report upon which was forwarded on May 10 last and which is the subject of a current investigation. I might also mention that, in addition, the Commonwealth Government has called for a meeting of State Ministers and the Minister for the Interior on civil defence. This meeting, at which this State will be represented, is to be held early in August of this year.

LEIGH CREEK FACILITIES.

Mr. CASEY: It has been suggested, and I have made the point many times, that a maintenance section of the Engineering and

Water Supply Department and a workshop be located at Leigh Creek. Has the Minister of Works considered this suggestion, and if he has not will he do so? Also, will he investigate the possibility of two or more graders being permanently stationed at Leigh Creek so that the main road in the Hawker District Council area to Leigh Creek, and thence to Marree, can be maintained by grading? At the weekend I was in the area and found that the state of the roads was particularly bad because of corrugation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: To date, as far as I am concerned, the establishment of a depot at Leigh Creek has not been considered. I understand the nearest depot is at Crystal Brook. However, the honourable member having raised the question, I assure him it will be considered. Capital cost of graders is considerable, and unless they are continually in use the cost becomes excessive. As the roads are in an unsatisfactory condition, according to the honourable member, I will have the matter investigated to see whether some early relief can be given.

STRADBROKE SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Stradbroke school committee, which states among other things that the committee is pleased with the progress that has been made at the school in the past year. However, the committee is concerned at present because two temporary classrooms are being erected in the grounds to cope with the increased number of students, although assurances have been given that these rooms will be removed as soon as the planned permanent infants school buildings are erected. It considers that, as permanent buildings have already been planned, the erection of temporary units could be unnecessary, although no definite date is available regarding the start on the permanent buildings. I know that the infants school has been planned, and I understood that it was to be erected in the near future. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOUSING.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my question of June 24 about the acute shortage of housing in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question of building flats at Mount Gambier was considered by the Housing Trust some time ago

and the conclusion was that a flats programme would be justified. However, because of the heavy housing commitments that must be carried out by the trust throughout the State it would be impossible for the trust, from the funds available to it, to contemplate the building of flats at Mount Gambier in the next financial year. When the trust considers that funds can be properly expended for the purpose, it will consider the building of flats at Mount Gambier.

EASTWOOD INTERSECTION.

Mrs. STEELE: Representations have been made to me concerning the desirability of installing traffic lights at the intersection of Greenhill and Fullarton Roads, adjacent to the Electricity Trust building. The traffic congestion and confusion on the part of motorists, particularly at peak periods, is real indeed. Can the Minister of Education, who represents the Minister of Roads, say whether this matter has at any time been referred to the Road Traffic Board, or whether it is currently under consideration? If not, will the Minister obtain a report on this intersection, which is becoming increasingly dangerous to motorists and pedestrians, with a view to having traffic lights installed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am aware of the difficulties at this intersection and will be pleased to get a report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORTATION SURVEY.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week on the progress and cost of the metropolitan Adelaide transportation survey?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the metropolitan Adelaide transportation study, which is scheduled to be of two years' duration, commenced in mid-February, 1965. The study is up to schedule at present, and the estimated cost is £200,000.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that projects to come before the Public Works Committee regarding the construction of new schools present problems. The Public Buildings Department building development in the demountable type of school has not been included. I understand there are four such school buildings, one of which is at Mount

Barker, in my district. Has the Minister of Education had time to look at them and discuss with officers of his department the growing problem of schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get the information for the honourable member. I have had the pleasure of inspecting this prototype school at Mt. Barker, and I was impressed with it, indeed. This type of school may offer the solution to many of our school building problems, and a public statement will shortly be issued regarding it. I do not wish to say more at present, but I assure the honourable member that I have great hopes of solving many of our problems.

PORT NEILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Harbors Board has installed at Port Neill in my district a device for recording the swell characteristics of the sea at the site of the proposed deep-sea terminal. It was installed early this calendar year, with the idea that its recordings would be observed over a period of six months, by which time the board would be in a position to give a considered opinion as to the necessity for a breakwater at this port, if the project went ahead. I know the Minister of Marine will not have the information today, but when the House resumes after the next adjournment will he make a report available, and will he let me see the graph being developed by the instrument, so that this matter can be further discussed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I know the honourable member, as the Minister of Marine in the previous Government, took an interest in the tests to be made. Indeed, I think he pressed the department into obtaining a report within six months, although it had been contended that it would take 12 months. Unfortunately, I think that at about the time the honourable member left his Ministerial office the instrument failed, and was brought back to Adelaide for repairs. They were effected, and the instrument is now functioning again. I will do my utmost to obtain a report for the honourable member, and I shall be happy to make a copy of the graph available to him.

UNIFORMS.

Mr. LAWN: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Supply and Tender Board supplies materials for uniforms?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Supply and Tender Board has a two-year contract to the end of January, 1966, with Floreana Frocks,

for the supply of complete uniforms for mental hospital nursing staff at Parkside, Hillcrest and Enfield. In this contract the Government does not supply the material. At the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals the material is supplied by the Government, and the nursing staff itself arranges for the uniforms to be made up. It is believed that Rich's Uniforms in Rundle Street make most of these uniforms, but some work could go to Floreana Frocks. In the case of office staff in Government departments, the material is bought by the girls themselves, who also arrange for the uniforms to be made up.

BARLEY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Minister of Agriculture obtain a report from the Australian Barley Board as to tests on the behaviour of barley stored in the board's transit and other country silos, for the purpose of ascertaining whether the moisture content of the barley has been reduced? Will he also ascertain the board's opinion of the tests?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

ROAD MAINTENANCE FUND.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Local Government, a question about sums to be made available to district councils this year out of the road maintenance tax. Has the Minister obtained a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Not yet.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I move:

That this House is of the opinion that in order to avoid further calamitous losses and to assist in the rehabilitation of the drought-stricken pastoral areas, proposals for assistance should be formulated and immediately put into effect to provide:

- (a) remission of lease rentals;
- (b) rail freight subsidies on the carriage of store livestock and fodder.

I open my remarks by quoting some rather dramatic words with which an article that appeared in the last issue of the *Sunday Mail* began; I think everyone who has some knowledge of the area concerned will agree that they are fairly apposite to the matter. They are:

Something must be done urgently to help the drought-stricken North and North-West of South Australia.

This article struck me particularly forcibly, as I had been questioning the Premier earlier this session about the possibility of taking some members of Parliament to these areas to examine the position at first hand. With modern transport, it is much more practicable to visit areas in the remote parts of the State and come back quickly with reports. In the old days it was quite a tour, but today it is much easier. This is evidenced by the fact that arrangements have been made for members of this House to visit Woomera in the next few weeks. Woomera is a long way from Adelaide, but it is now possible to visit such places easily, so it seems that it would be feasible for members of this House to visit drought-stricken areas.

The drought is of terrible intensity, and I do not doubt that, while it is much worse in some areas than in others, inland Australia generally is facing the worst drought in history. By "inland" I mean Central Australia as well and a large part of the Eastern States. The northern parts of South Australia include some of the driest areas in the world. The Lake Eyre basin has an extremely low rainfall at any time. At this point I differentiate between conditions that may be considered normal in a dry year and what is really a drought. It is clear that with the uneven incidence of rainfall during the year in those areas it need not be considered a drought merely because the rainfall in one year does not match that of the previous year. The rainfall is always uneven and the fact is that there are very few patterns in which it can be expected that rain will fall. Some summer rain is considered necessary in those areas; it was almost completely missing last summer and no rain has fallen in most of these areas for a long time. The last substantial rains fell well over a year ago and by no means covered every part of the area, but at least they were handsome rains in some places. The rains a year ago looked good and they made country people optimistic and enabled them to build up their stock numbers. Today this stock is being taken out of the area as fast as possible—if it can be taken out.

Whilst I have visited these areas rather spasmodically, I have been in touch with the people throughout the northern districts more or less continually both in my capacity as Minister of Agriculture in the previous Government and through my acquaintances. For instance, I spoke to a station manager on a sheep property in the North-West of South Australia only 10 days ago and he told me that lambing is over on the property. Many lambs

there are dying and it seems that, if no further rain falls fairly soon, all the lambs will be eliminated. That is a desperate situation for any property. I cannot quote the stock numbers of all these properties and I shall not attempt to do so because for the most part these numbers are hearsay. So much stock is in weak condition that it is not always easy to determine what is alive and what is dead for counting purposes. I am afraid that we have a tendency to say that these country areas expect a drought and that there is not much we can do about it.

We have heard much about the drought in New South Wales and in parts of Queensland. It is a terrible drought, and there is no denying that. However, that does not alter the fact that there is a terrible drought raging in the north of South Australia at present. In the old days leases were very cheap; the properties were large and the tenure was long. In the last few years this Parliament has reorganized the control of the pastoral country by an Act it passed only two years ago providing for new leases. The Act provided for leases with a 42-year tenure and for the review of the rent to be made at, I think, seven-year intervals. In return for that long term, the lessees, at the time, were invited to surrender their present leases and take on the new leases. The new rentals were set at what would be considered a fairly realistic figure; they were low in the past but are not low under present conditions. They have been set at a realistic figure to cover varying conditions but they certainly would not cover the present conditions if they continued. So there is a special case for looking at this question of lease rents at a time like this.

I am not prepared at this stage to say whether one should approach the problem by declaring a drought area, as is done in other States and in the Commonwealth territories. For the most part, that is the common way of dealing with the problem. We have no such approach but at present we have to deal with the problem of getting away stock in a condition to travel and to be saleable at the end of the journey—at a high cost, I point out. The cost of getting the beasts to market from the cattle stations of the North-East would vary considerably but it would not be less than some £7 a head, counting the cost of transport and of sale. It is much higher under certain conditions. The distances that have to be travelled to the railhead are, of course, also important.

An examination of the present market conditions reveals an interesting situation. The price of beef is at its highest for many years. Choice beef is bringing about 260s. a cental, a very high figure indeed. That may mislead people into thinking that the cattle owner is not so badly off after all. Whilst that market is very high for beef, it is not high for store cattle, which at present just do not have beef on them. Some of them are not much more than walking carcasses. Some are in a better condition, but the price of beef has little relation to the price of store cattle at present unless it is through the optimism of southern farmers wanting to obtain cattle for further fattening. But those store cattle do not at present carry beef on them. For the next few weeks not only are sales booked in the ordinary cattle market but special sales are booked, once a week at least, usually in Adelaide. There are some big store cattle sales north of Adelaide; 1,500 cattle at a time are being sold and there are many large bookings for further cattle to be sold. This does not mean that all the cattle in that country are being sold. The cattle coming out are those strong enough to make this arduous journey. Those not strong enough stay there, and no doubt most of them will die.

When I was Minister of Agriculture, the complementary nature of the beef industry in South Australia was brought home to me forcibly. It is possible for the North in ordinary times to breed cattle that will later populate the pastures in the South, and the whole of the pleuro-pneumonia eradication scheme was aimed at making this feasible. The success of that scheme has made it feasible. Whilst the pleuro-pneumonia regulations and restrictions do exist, to a certain extent their inconvenience has been much reduced by relaxing them. It is possible now for store cattle from the whole of South Australia and from other parts beyond our borders to be taken to any part of South Australia so long as a blood test is made and it is satisfactory.

The incidence of pleuro-pneumonia in the last few years, even in places like Queensland, has been negligible. Although it has not been eradicated, much has been done and we have gone a long way towards beating it. There is nothing to stop cattle from the north being taken to the southern pastures if the pastures can hold them and if the conditions of transport make it possible. However, these conditions are extremely difficult. In most of the other States some provision has been made regarding assistance to drought-stricken areas.

Such provision has been made in Central Australia and also in Queensland and New South Wales. It has been freely mentioned in the press in the Eastern States that both New South Wales and Queensland have recently appealed to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in fighting the drought, and according to press reports the Commonwealth Cabinet is sitting to consider these requests. To my knowledge no such request has been made from South Australia, and I suggest that it should be. The stock actually on the properties is gradually being reduced, and those properties will shortly run out of breeding stock altogether. When I was Minister of Agriculture, and at a time when the pleuro-pneumonia regulations were much more strictly enforced, the owner of a station came to me and asked, "How are we going to get on re-stocking our property after the drought?"

Mr. Casey: What station was this?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I can tell the honourable member afterwards in private, but I do not see any reason why private people's business should be made public. I think the honourable member would be happy to accept that.

Mr. Casey: Is it in the North-East or the North-West?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is in the North-East. Arrangements were then made for any of these properties to re-stock under special conditions when such re-stocking was possible, and they went ahead and built up their numbers quite considerably. Following the influx of stock, they now have had to reduce them so severely that they are back to very few head. I emphasize the difficulty that those people are up against.

Mr. Casey: Could you explain those arrangements that were made?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Those people wanted to bring in cattle from south-western Queensland (which, under the regulations at the time, was not permitted) for re-stocking what was called the free area from pleuro-pneumonia. The free area at that time was west of a line running north and south through Quorn. They wanted to bring cattle into this free area from outside the free area. Arrangements were made for blood testing and observation of cattle on the move to ensure that those cattle that were brought in were free of pleuro-pneumonia. Some such testing and observation was carried out, and I might say that the officers of the Agriculture Department did a particularly good job in handling the position at the time. The fact remains

that re-stocking will become necessary in a far bigger way one day, and then the great problem will be the ability of the property owners to obtain stock and to pay for them.

Mr. Casey: Where do you think they will get this stock to re-stock this country?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have not considered the various places, but I fear there will be a serious rush to replace breeding stock and that they will be expensive and hard to obtain. We should be considering these problems and should not leave it to station owners.

Mr. Casey: Have you any idea where the stock will come from?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish the honourable member for Frome would leave me alone for a few minutes. I do not know why the honourable member keeps interrupting me.

Mr. Casey: You are making these statements.

The SPEAKER: Order! Order! The honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you, Sir. The honourable member for Frome seems to object to the statements, but I hope he will be patient. He will have an opportunity later to say something. It is necessary for fodder to be taken to those areas: not in large quantities, as it would be impossible to achieve anything like the drought-saving movements of fodder. However, quantities could be moved for the use of horses and for special conditions allowed for the movement of cattle, if this were possible. That point is included in my motion, and I hope it will have the attention of this House and of the Government.

I asked the Premier whether a visit to the North-East could be arranged, and he told me that the Minister of Agriculture and Lands and the honourable member for Frome were to visit this area within the next few days. I was glad to hear that, and I shall be interested in what they have to say when they return. I consider that it would have been a good thing for other members to have visited the area. The honourable member for Mitcham visited the area last year and, in spite of the rather uncomplimentary way in which he was referred to by the honourable member for Frome, I applaud him for what he did. He did not travel at Government expense: he paid for his own accommodation, food and other necessities. Although he drove a Government vehicle, he was under the leadership of the then Minister of Lands. I think he did a good job and learnt a lot, and I know his visit, was

greatly appreciated, as was that of the Minister of Lands. I have no doubt that the present Minister will be similarly welcomed in the next few days.

With the honourable member for Gouger I shall be visiting the northern pastoral areas during the adjournment to see for myself the conditions existing. It will necessarily be a limited trip as it is difficult to do it as a private tour, but we will get the best information possible. I wish there could have been an all-Party trip so that all members could have acquainted themselves with the conditions. That is not to be, however, and we must get what information we can in any way possible. In the circumstances, the Government obviously would not require members to deliberate on an important motion such as this without hearing the comments of the Minister of Lands after he has visited the area. I therefore ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1950. Read a first time.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should forthwith, as an administrative measure, put into effect the proposals in the policy speech delivered on February 18, 1965, for assistance to schoolchildren in the metropolitan area, travelling regularly to and from school by Tramways Trust vehicles, by rail, and by licensed private vehicles.

As honourable members will realize, this motion deals with a most important matter. It seems a long time since I gave notice of this motion. It is, in fact, some few weeks, but this is the first opportunity I have had to debate it because, until the Address in Reply debate was completed, private members' business or any other business could not go on. When I gave notice of the motion, I received much encouraging comment, not, I hasten to say, from honourable members opposite, but from many people dotted all over the community and I only hope that those who expressed their interest in the matter at that time do not think I have gone cold on it and let it drop. This matter concerns people living in all parts of the metropolitan area. If I may say so, it is of particular interest to those living in my district, because, as most honourable members will be aware, the main hills railway line runs through the electoral district of Mitcham and several Municipal Tramways Trust buses and privately

conducted buses serve the area as well. I mention first the hills railway on which boys and girls travel to such schools as Mitcham Girls Technical High School, Goodwood Boys Technical High School, Blackwood High School, Scotch College and Walford House. I mention those few to show that the railway is used by pupils of a number of schools, both Government and independent.

Three or four bus routes extend from the Glen Osmond route to the Colonel Light Gardens route but, unfortunately, Adelaide's bus routes are like the spokes in a wheel: they all run through the centre of the city, and there is no circumferential route running right around the outskirts of the city. We are badly off, and this applies particularly in my district for cross-country bus routes, because no M.T.T. buses run across country in my district. There are a number of privately run bus services also used by children travelling to and from various schools, one school that comes immediately to my recollection being the Presbyterian Girls College at Glen Osmond which, although outside my district, is attended by pupils from (or coming through) my district. I do not know whether honourable members are aware of the precise fares at present charged schoolchildren by the railways, the M.T.T. and private bus operators, but the railways coaching book contains the railways passenger fare tables. If any honourable member has ever tried to find out from that book what precisely the fares are, he will realize it is a difficult job.

Without referring to the particular fares in the coaching book I can perhaps tell honourable members of my own first-hand experience of fares. By coincidence, Dad will have to dig into his pocket tomorrow to buy new quarterly passes for the children. The coaching book lays down (and this is the accepted norm) that student concessions are one-third of the adult fare between any two stations. In the case of the Millhouse family, where two return tickets from Eden Hills to Belair are required, the quarterly ticket costs £2 1s. 6d. That is not a school terminal sum, but a quarterly sum, because for some reason the railways has never issued to students anything other than monthly and quarterly tickets and, obviously, the quarterly tickets do not fit in precisely with the school terms. That means that, although these concessions are already substantial, they are not as great as one might think. As to the M.T.T., students receive a monthly concession, and the present rates are set out in the *Government Gazette* of June 25, 1964.

The M.T.T. works out concession fares on sections. For one or two sections the ordinary rate is 10s. a month and the special rate 12s., for three, four, five, six or seven sections the ordinary rate is 17s. 6d. and the special rate 19s. 6d., and so on. I am not aware of any of the fares on private buses, but I believe they are at least on a par with those charged by the M.T.T. I quote these figures only to show that the cost of travel for schoolchildren in the metropolitan area by either bus, tram or railway is quite substantial, and it is an added burden which parents of schoolchildren must bear.

The cost of maintaining schoolchildren, as I guess every member of this House knows, is a pretty heavy burden, and anything that can be done to lighten the burden should, in my respectful submission, be done. I believe that both Parties would agree to that. If one looks, as again I guess every member of this House has done, at the proposals put up in the two policy speeches before the last election one will see that both Parties are agreed that concessions should be given to school children and, through them, to their parents. I now come to the policy speech referred to in the motion and delivered on February 18, 1965. That was the policy speech delivered by the present Leader of the Opposition—the leader of the Liberal and Country League. I propose, so that all members will be aware of what our proposals were at the last elections, to quote the proposals put forward by Sir Thomas Playford in that policy speech on this particular matter. He first of all set out (and this is not entirely germane to the present motion but I mention it for completeness sake) that the then Government proposed, if returned to office, to provide for all children desiring to travel on established bus routes to independent schools in the country the same conditions as applied to children travelling to departmental schools. He then went on to deal with the matter that is the subject of this motion. This is what he said on that occasion:

The Government also proposes to undertake considerable obligations for the transport of schoolchildren in the metropolitan area. At present some concessions are available for schoolchildren on the railways and tramways but no concessions whatever on privately operated buses.

I have dealt with the present concessions as far as they are relevant. He continued:

If returned to office my Government proposes to make early arrangements to extend concessions for regular travel of children to and from school by Tramways Trust vehicles, by rail, and by licensed private vehicles. It is proposed that

for all scholars under 19 years of age the periodical pass for Tramways Trust travel up to seven sections of one mile each shall be £1 per term, and the comparable rates will apply to rail and licensed private vehicles. Should the journey be more than seven sections or miles but not more than 14, the rate will be £2 per term. These proposals, as applied to scholars using Tramways Trust vehicles, will mean a further 45 per cent discount for up to two sections of travel and about 66 per cent if for more than two sections.

I pause here to emphasize that these proposals were per term and not per month or per quarter, which is now the practice in the tramways and the railways respectively. He continued:

For scholars travelling regularly by private vehicles which do not at present issue passes, the concession will be greater still. On the average the latter would get concessions of about 70 per cent. The additional concession for rail travel will be much the same as for travel by bus, but as railway fares differ for scholars over and under 18 years of age the new concessions will be greater for the older scholars and a little less for the younger. In making this arrangement the Government will, of course, provide the funds to reimburse both private licensed operators and the public transport authorities for the estimated difference between the concession rates now proposed and the normal fares. These concessions, together with the cost of school buses in the country, will mean that over £800,000 will be spent this year on school transport in this State. Here again, the concessions will apply to all children attending independent as well as departmental schools. Only one other State provides the type of concession proposed for the metropolitan area, and in that case the amount to be paid by the child is double that proposed for South Australia.

These were our proposals for travel concessions for schoolchildren, as presented before the last election. The Leader went on to deal with education benefits, the living-away-from-home allowance and certain other matters. These are the paragraphs relevant to this particular proposal. I believe that, in spite of the result of the election, they were widely welcomed throughout the community. That was as it should be. I am comforted by what the then Leader of the Opposition said on the following night when he delivered his policy speech. When I say that I am comforted I mean that I am comforted to the extent that his remarks then make me entirely confident that this motion will be unanimously supported in the House.

I have the advantage of having a full copy of the policy speech as delivered at the Westbourne Park Memorial Hall, Goodwood Road, Cumberland Park, on Friday, February 19, 1965, by the then Leader of the Opposition,

who is now the Premier. I will quote from that document also, because, as I say, there is a reference in the speech to the proposals made by the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford on the previous evening. The then Leader of the Opposition said (and although I begin in the middle of a sentence I do not think I can be accused of simply taking a quotation out of context):

... we promise only that which can be fulfilled. I want to make it quite clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

That was a definite straight-out statement at the beginning of the A.L.P. policy speech.

Mr. Nankivell: It was made over television, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and to a pretty crowded hall. These were not off-the-cuff remarks; it was something that was written out for the then Leader of the Opposition beforehand, and it was in his text. Lest it be suggested that this was not one of those administrative decisions and, therefore, does not have to be honoured, the Premier went on to give examples of the things that would be honoured by a Labor Government. This is what he said: "for example,"—and then follow a number of examples, one of which is—"extra concessions for school travel and boarding allowances." So he, in fact, referred in his policy speech to the very proposals for extra concessions for school travel that had been put up the previous night by Sir Thomas Playford. One could not link the two together more firmly than that. That is what makes me entirely confident that the Government—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That was repeated subsequently on a number of occasions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have no doubt about that. I am sure, therefore, that the Government will be only too willing to honour these proposals put forward by the Leader of my Party.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: They cannot oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and that is why they are listening with such interest and obvious approbation. Even the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) is straining at the leash (or, at least, at his microphone), no doubt to interject helpfully, but I know that interjections are out of order so I will not encourage him to make them. But what saddens and perturbs me a little is that the Government has now been in office for nearly four months and, so far as I am aware, nothing has been done about this

matter; nor was it, unfortunately, even mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. Paragraph 12 dealt with education matters but, alas, there was no suggestion, nor has there been any suggestion by public statement either outside or inside the House, that the Government was doing anything about these proposals. It is about time it got on with the job. That is why I have moved this resolution asking that something be done forthwith about the matter.

Mr. Jennings: You mean a motion, not a resolution.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am always glad to take lessons from the member for Enfield.

Mr. Jennings: You will take another one soon.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I observed what the honourable member said last night and am equally pleased to do so now: this is a motion. I move this motion because it is about time the Government implemented its election promises, or at least stated when it was going to do something about them. In his election policy speech the Leader of the Labor Party spoke of education, although only two matters were referred to in that speech. I quote again from it.

Mr. Jennings: It is freely available.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; I have a copy and I croon over it often. It states:

I take this opportunity of again reminding you that our policy provides for free school books to all schoolchildren, also for the replacement of the present dual system of high schools.

Further on there is a promise that "a Labor Government would institute the fullest inquiry into these problems"—that is, the integration of the two sorts of high school—"immediately on taking office." I quote this to show that the Labor Party has realized, apparently (and certainly for the purposes of the election, as we all do) the heavy burden that parents have to bear in educating their children, whichever school they happen to attend. We have been rather dismayed that progress has been pretty slow on the question of free school books for schoolchildren. According to the Labor Party rules—

Mr. Hughes: You haven't got that again, have you!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: After what was said last night, I feel I am under an obligation to do my homework. I was told by the member for Enfield that I do not do my homework. This copy of the rules that I have is the one I paid for long before the election and received after the election. This is what the Labor Party said about free school books in its platform:

Extension of free education to all citizens of the State up to and including the university. All school books and requirements to be free.

Well, that is what was referred to in the policy speech. However, the next bit is the bit about which we have heard jolly little, if anything:

Pending the introduction of free school books, all State primary school text books to be standardized, and to the maximum extent possible the printing of such books to be carried out by the Government Printing Office.

That is something we have not heard much about since the election. I refer to this only to show that both Parties are agreed that it is desirable to extend the maximum concessions possible to parents of schoolchildren. I cannot resist referring to one other section in the plank of education, after what the member for Enfield said to me last night. I took to heart his chiding about my not doing my homework, and it was a bit comforting this morning to find that no less a person than the honourable member for Glenelg, who was lauded by the member for Enfield last night, had not done his homework very well, either, so I am in extremely good company, as the member for Enfield would admit. I remember that during the Address in Reply debate the member for Glenelg suggested that Bedford Park, when it becomes a separate university, should be called "The Kingston University", yet it is laid down in paragraph 19 of the policy on this matter that it shall be called "The University of South Australia". So apparently the member for Glenelg is breaching Party rules in making this suggestion, and no doubt runs the risk of expulsion from his Party. However, that is, I say quite frankly, an aside; it merely arose out of the remarks made by the member for Enfield last night and the suggestion made, quite out of order so far as his Party was concerned, by the member for Glenelg.

There is only one other matter that I desire to mention in moving this motion. I said that I have had much encouragement from bodies outside the House since it was found that I proposed to move as I have. One particularly interesting and encouraging letter, I may say, came from a resident of the district of Edwardstown, but I will not quote that. There is, however, one other set of correspondence from which I do desire to quote. I refer to a letter of May 24 from the Treasurer of the Parents and Friends Association of the Salesian School at Brooklyn Park. I have obtained permission to quote from this letter, because it does refer to another kindred problem which perhaps is not entirely included in my motion, but

which is of such importance that I desire to raise it with the Government in this debate. This is what Mr. Mitchell wrote:

A large number of boys of this school live in areas between which and Brooklyn Park there is no direct transport. To cater for these boys the college charters a bus to bring the boys to and from the college. The boys pay a fare which does not nearly cover the daily charter fee. Necessarily, the fares are much higher than would be the case if M.T.T. monthly school concession rates applied. In view of your reported intention to move in Parliament for the extension of school bus subsidies to cover all schoolchildren, my association respectfully requests that your motion be so worded as to cover charter bus services such as this school's.

I replied explaining that I had already given notice of the terms in which I would move, and was not able to alter them at that stage. Subsequently, I received another letter from Mr. Mitchell, dated June 2, amplifying what he had already written:

Thank you for your courtesy in answering my letter of May 24, referring to this school's charter bus. Briefly, the position is as follows. This school is a Catholic Boys College offering both academic and technical courses from grade 4 to leaving honours. The present enrolment is 60 boarders and 315 day boys. The enrolment is being increased by 70 or so a year, consequent on the decision to double the number of secondary classes. Eleven additional classrooms and laboratories are being built this year. The majority of the day boys come from the southern suburbs approximately in an arc from Mitcham to Brighton. Many boys were travelling under difficulties as no direct or communicating transport catered for them. Some were using taxis in small groups, others spending up to three hours daily travelling. In order to alleviate the problem, the school has, since February, chartered a bus from Thomas Tours Ltd. of Colonel Light Gardens. In the morning the bus travels from its depot to Seacombe Gardens, along Morphett and Marion Roads to the school. The boys are returned in the afternoon. Some 70 boys use this service at present. Next year, it appears that some 120 to 140 will require transport, necessitating two buses. The charge of 10s. weekly made to each boy is insufficient to pay the charter cost and my association makes up the deficit.

It is clear from that letter that the boys who pay 10s. a week, or about £6 to £7 a term are paying far more than if they could use public transport provided by the Railways Department or the Tramways Trust, and far more than they would have to pay under the proposals set out by my Party in its policy speech. I hope, therefore, that when the Government moves (as I hope it will forthwith) to put into effect the proposals made by Sir Thomas Playford in his policy speech it will consider

this and other similar problems, as I am confident that throughout the metropolitan area other schools would be in much the same position as the Salesian school at Brooklyn Park. I know, even though the Premier has in terms said the Government will honour our proposals, that they do not altogether coincide with the Labor Party's platform, because the Labor Party has as part of its platform State-owned transport for children attending school by bus service. I hope that on this occasion it will ignore its own platform, and that it will honour the specific promise made by Mr. Walsh in his policy speech on February 19 and introduce these concessions. Perhaps once or twice while debating this motion we have enjoyed some levity, but this is a serious matter and one of great concern to many people in the metropolitan area. It would be a boon to those who have children travelling as I have described.

Mr. McKee: It is a wonder you did not think of it while you were in Government!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We did. It was in our policy speech.

Mr McKee: It took you 32 years to think about it!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is good to hear the honourable member for Port Pirie coming in so spiritedly to support me. It does not always happen. I am encouraged by his support and by what I know will be the support of all members on the other side in honouring the promise made during the election campaign by their Leader. I, therefore, confidently commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I speak in support of the motion. Although this is perhaps a little irrelevant, the honourable member has limited his motion to the metropolitan area and I would have preferred that that limit be not included, because it has enabled my friends opposite from the country to show a considerable amount of levity, as the motion does not apply to their districts. In point of fact, what was set out in the policy speech also proposed to give to children in the country travelling by bus to private schools the right to occupy seats on those buses. For a number of years the position has been that such children occupied seats only by good grace and had no right whatsoever in the matter. My Party, however, was not going to have in this State some second-class citizens and some first-class citizens. We believed that what we had been doing by administration (and that could easily be taken away by administration) should be made a right established by law.

As I said, the motion created levity with my friends opposite, some of whom have been smiling and yawning, and I noticed particularly the honourable member for Glenelg. I shall touch on the position at Glenelg in a moment, because that is one area that would benefit from this motion. There is a great amount of hardship there and most of the representations on this matter came from that district, because of the particular circumstances of the Education Department's schools and private schools in that area. To deal with the topic from the point of view of the policy speech, honourable members will realize that any Government going to an election desires, first, to present a policy that can be fulfilled, not one that consists of a lot of promises that will be repudiated immediately after the election; and, secondly, a policy that gives a proper balance and as much benefit as possible to the community.

Mr. Jennings: What about your promise to increase workmen's compensation payments from £3,250 to £6,000!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member can make a speech on this subject if he likes. We would very much like to hear whether he is going to stand behind his Leader's policy, not as a catch theme but as a written document. If he wishes I shall quote from the official document. In the first place, when a Government goes before the people it tries to outline a policy that can be put into effect; secondly, it outlines a policy that will be in the best interests of the community as a whole. We had two proposals with regard to education before us, both of which could not, in my opinion, be accepted outright. Whether the conditions would later change and enable them to be accepted was something I could not say but, as the financial position appeared to me at the time, it was not possible to accept them.

One proposal was the one we are considering here this afternoon, and the other concerned the issuing of free books. Much information was provided in respect of both proposals, but when we examined them carefully we found that the weight of evidence was strongly in favour of giving extra assistance to children compelled to travel to school. Those particular children are at a distinct disadvantage compared to children who, through no action of their parents, live closer to schools. Taking the position further, we find that over a long period of time the State incurred a substantial cost in transporting children to schools and, indeed, I gave the cost in the policy speech at £800,000. Including the new concessions, it is interesting

to note that even then about £600,000 of the £800,000 relates to country travelling and that the sum for city children—although they comprise the majority—was only £200,000.

In the country no charge is made at all, and I am not suggesting for a moment that a charge should be made, but if it is to be equitable we must at least put up a case for free travel on the facilities available in the metropolitan area. I am surprised at the attitude and lack of interest, if I may say so, on the part of honourable members opposite in connection with this motion. The Premier pointed out in his policy speech that these matters had been urged by his Party over a period of years; he pointed out, too, that the things we were doing were what his Party had been advocating, but, what do we find? This was one of the first promises made in the Premier's policy speech, and it was claimed to be an administrative matter which did not need to be held up by having to pass legislation. Indeed, it could have been given effect to immediately, for Cabinet could have made a regulation, passed a proclamation or decided to have it put into effect.

Mr. Jennings: In regard to what?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In regard to this particular travelling concession. I am pleased to see that the honourable member is at least trying to learn. This measure could have been provided for in the Supplementary Estimates, and it could have now been put into effect, without Parliament's passing any law at all. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, said it was an administrative matter and that it would be dealt with as such, but nothing has been done about it, and I can only add that when something is done it will be less than what was promised because, ultimately, if the Opposition keeps some pressure on the Government, the Government will provide a subsidy for the private bus services to bring fares down to the equivalent of the tramways and railways fares. Some discussion on this has probably taken place already, but that is not what was promised and it will fall short of the promise by about 50 per cent. In other words, it will be a slight alleviation in respect of a small section of people. We proposed that, for up to seven sections of each mile, the quarterly fare be £1 for children up to 19 years.

Mr. Jennings: That didn't get you very far, did it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It got us this far: the next day the Leader of the Opposition was pleased to jump on the bandwagon and say, "We will also do it."

Mr. Jennings: But it didn't get you far on March 6!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is the honourable member repudiating that promise?

Mr. Jennings: Certainly not!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Constituents in the District of Enfield are interested in this question, for there are travelling problems in that area, and I am only sorry to think that the honourable member would take so lightly what was an attempt by the previous Government to give expression to a request it had received from honourable members of both sides of the House. True, in the last Parliament honourable members then in Opposition strongly raised this question on many occasions.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The member for Port Adelaide was very active on it.

Mr. Ryan: What did I get? Absolutely nothing! Look up *Hansard*!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The fact remains that the Premier, having heard a precise statement of what was proposed by the Liberal Party, said that he accepted it and that he would treat it as an administrative measure. More than that, he said it was one of the ideas that we had borrowed from honourable members opposite. We were always prepared to accept good ideas, but we also strongly advocate that when a promise is given, an attempt should be made to honour that promise. One other matter that arises is the ability of the Treasurer to find the money to honour this promise. That is a problem that every Government and Parliament must consider in relation to every proposal. I will not traverse the rather unusual methods advocated for obtaining the finance to honour some election promises, but the estimated cost at the time when I made this a policy plank was £200,000.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We expected to have to provide it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, we did, and at that time we did not know that this State was to be so generously treated by the Commonwealth Government on tax reimbursements. Since the election the Commonwealth Government has been much more generous in its approach to the subject of tax reimbursements, so much so that the Premier has said publicly that he is most satisfied with the allocation he has received. I have not the precise figures before me, and no doubt the Premier will give them in his Budget speech, but last year the tax reimbursement provided to this State was about £39,500,000 whereas this year it is about £44,250,000. The Minister

of Works will correct me if my figures are far out. An election promise has been made which does not require men or materials, which will cost about £200,000 and which is well within the financial resources of the Government. The conditions were set out, and I am surprised that it is necessary for this motion to be moved to remind the Government of something that is so obviously in the interests of the community as a whole and certainly in the interests of the children of this State.

Possibly one reason why some members opposite do not favour this motion or have some qualification about it is that it applies to children attending private schools as well as to those attending public schools. I know some members opposite have some qualification about whether we should assist children attending private schools, but I believe we should assist all children trying to get education. I believe there is no case whatsoever for discriminating against a child merely because that child is attending a private school. I admit that many children who would benefit from this proposal attend private schools, because the private schools have not been able to establish a close network in the metropolitan area in the same way as public schools have done.

I hope this motion will be considered by the Government and that the Premier will make an early announcement that provision will be made for what is sought. The cost would be moderate but the alleviation of hardship arising from passing this motion and its acceptance by the Government would be very great in many instances. I strongly support the motion.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHURCH PROPERTIES.

Mr. COURCE (Torrens): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government, early this session, should introduce legislation to implement the proposals in the policy speech delivered on February 18, 1965, for the exemption of church properties from State rates and taxes.

At the outset, I should explain that this is a sincere effort on my part to obtain relief from State taxation for certain bodies to which I shall refer in some detail later. If the Government will agree to the motion and the proposals I shall submit in moving it, I shall certainly be content, but if it does not I shall continue to fight for the justice of the claims I shall make.

Mr. Lawn: That was in the Liberal Party's policy speech, wasn't it?

Mr. COURCE: If the honourable member contains himself he will learn a lot in the next 10 minutes. I may have all the answers he seeks.

Mr. Lawn: But that policy was rejected by the people.

Mr. Millhouse: Rejected! Have a look at your Leader's own speech.

Mr. Lawn: Was it in the Premier's policy speech?

Mr. Hall: It was accepted by the present Premier.

Mr. COURCE: If I may be permitted to continue, Mr. Speaker, I say that the best way to deal with the motion is to explain it section by section. I wish to trace the history of some of the State taxing laws and compare them with corresponding laws in other States. In answer to the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), whose memory I hasten to refresh, let me say that the previous Government had for some time been aware of many anomalies in the State taxing legislation and the various regulations that affected those laws. Being aware of those anomalies, it appointed a special committee to investigate the position and, even further, to investigate the whole incidence of taxation, including water, sewerage and land tax rating under the Local Government Act. This committee, headed by Sir George Ligertwood, became known as the Ligertwood committee. It took much evidence from private persons and a number of official bodies. The report was printed and laid on the table of this House on October 1, 1964, and honourable members should have a copy on their files. This matter is of such wide importance that possibly it will be the subject of some legislation introduced later this year by the Government on aspects other than those I am discussing today. The report contained many important recommendations, and on the rating of church properties in particular the committee had this to say:

In relation to properties owned and used by churches, the general effect of the legislation is that buildings used exclusively for public worship are exempted from rates and taxes but there is no exemption for ministers' residences or for vacant lands which are held for future erection of places of public worship. In all other States, both ministers' residences and vacant lands held for the erection of future churches are exempted, and it was strongly submitted that South Australia should step into line in this respect and that there should be no disability on account of State boundaries. A further argument was urged in relation to vacant lands, namely that in recent years

there has been a very great number of subdivisions into new townships and that the township plan provides for allotments upon which churches can be erected in the future. The churches, it was urged, are morally bound to take the opportunity of acquiring such allotments and will have to hold them until the extended population justifies the starting of a religious cause in the township. The burden of rates and taxes on such vacant land can become very heavy and the churches have submitted that relief should be given to them. This is a question of policy and the committee makes no recommendation upon it, but draws the attention to the argument addressed upon the subject. The example of other States shows that the relief to churches from rates and taxes can be based upon a general principle.

Looking at the report and this section in particular, one sees that it was disclosed that evidence was given to the committee, apart from individuals, on behalf of the various Christian churches in our community, namely, the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, the Congregational Union, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, and the South Australian Baptist Union. The deputation to the committee was led by His Grace Archbishop Gleeson, and all the churches were united in the submission they made to the committee.

In relation to the point raised by the member for Adelaide, the Liberal and Country League Government had been concerned about this matter for some time. That is why it specifically set up the Ligertwood committee to investigate all these anomalies and to make recommendations upon them so that they could be corrected. As a result of the committee's report, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, as Premier, then took notice of this section and included it in his policy speech, speaking as the Leader of the Liberal and Country League Government. His policy speech was delivered at Woodside on February 18, 1965, the date to which I refer in my motion. In his speech, to overcome the position, the Premier said:

Last year the Government received a report from a committee which it had appointed to investigate anomalies in rating assessments. The committee's report has been studied, and particularly a submission which was made by almost all church denominations relating to the rates and taxes levied on church property. Whilst the committee made no recommendation on these submissions, as such was considered to be outside its terms of reference, it did specifically draw the attention of the Government to the arguments presented on this matter. These arguments appeared to be valid, and, if returned, the Government proposes to amend existing legislation to exempt from rates and taxes not only churches but also residences of

ministers of religion owned by churches, and vacant land held by churches for the erection of future churches or minister's residences. The Government greatly appreciates the work churches are doing and desires to help their activities in new housing areas.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford amplified this statement further during the election campaign. A meeting was held at Peterborough on March 1, 1965, and in reply to a question the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford said:

The proposed exemptions would include churches, schools and playgrounds, buildings associated with churches and religious orders, and land held by churches for religious purposes. Income-producing properties owned as an investment would not be subject to the exemption. The remission would apply to water and sewer rates, land tax and council rates. Charges, however, would be made for excess water.

Therefore, I am submitting that it is clear and beyond any doubt whatsoever that, had the Liberal and Country League Government been returned to office at the last State election, it would have introduced legislation this session to amend the Statutes and to give exemptions to church properties along the lines I have just mentioned. This was a definite election promise and would have been honoured if the former Government had been returned.

It is in consequence of this that I am now moving this motion urging the new Government to take action along the lines promised by Sir Thomas Playford on the occasions to which I have referred. I move this motion to see if the Government will introduce this type of legislation and give effect to these changes early this session. Honourable members know that I cannot do any more than seek the approval in principle of the House because, as a private member, I cannot move for the repeal, remission, alteration or regulation of taxation. Under the Standing Orders only a Minister can do that. Therefore, I am limited to seeking approval under the Standing Orders of the House in a motion in the form that I have moved. As I said earlier, I shall be content if the Government agrees to the proposal in the form of the motion, and if the Government promises to implement early this session the proposals that I am making.

Speaking generally about the incidence of taxation regarding churches, there are many laws of this country that reflect the importance which the people attach to their religious beliefs and practices. It is not fitting that I should dilate upon that unduly. Honourable members recognize the unique position of churches, and the properties and organizations that they

control, inside our community. I also sincerely believe that the churches are fully aware that every service to the community (water supply, sewerage, rates and so on) must be paid for by the whole community if it is not to be directly charged to any individual property owner, because, after all, there is no such thing in this world as free water, milk, books, hospital benefits and so on. I believe that this is clearly recognized, just as it is recognized that Government buildings, hospital services and properties have to be paid for by somebody in the long run. I further believe that because of the nature of the work of the churches in our community, which enables their supporters to worship in their own way and assist in charitable and educational work, the community should be willing to share the cost of the services to these church properties. This is a fundamental belief, and some relief at the moment is given in South Australia, but only on a very limited scale. Some States go further and give almost complete exemption from taxation on church properties.

I now draw the attention of honourable members to a new condition in church properties that did not exist five or 10 years ago, and I trust that all members are aware of this condition. The rate of development and population growth in South Australia has been extraordinary (in fact, phenomenal in some places), especially in the last decade. Large new districts and subdivisions have been opened up almost overnight by the Housing Trust and other private subdividers. At Elizabeth, Modbury, Tea Tree Gully, Christies Beach and many other places, sites for churches, halls and schools are planned, purchased and financed many years before they are used. If this action was not taken, this land would be lost for ever for that particular order or denomination, because either no land would be left or the value of land would be inflated to such a high figure that the church concerned would find it impossible with its limited resources to purchase it from the subdividers and the developers. The price would be prohibitive.

Having been forced to buy these sites years and years before they are used, the various churches are then faced with having to pay taxes on them until they become places of public worship. This does not seem fair. They will be paying council rates, land taxes, and water rates, although they may never use the water on the blocks. The burden of raising moneys to eventually build a place of worship on these blocks is severe enough to the church concerned without its having for many years to

meet the ever-rising costs of State taxation in the interim period from limited financial means—which, incidentally, could restrict its evangelical work in other areas.

This land must be bought at once or the opportunity will be lost for ever and the communities will remain unserved by the various denominations wishing to go into that area. For the consideration of the new Government I point out that, if exemption is granted, as I trust it will be, for these future church blocks and if they are subsequently sold by the denomination concerned for some reason or other, then deferred charges would become payable. I believe that to be fair. If a church decided to quit the property and sell it and it made a profit because of an appreciation in the value of the land, deferred assessments could be made. Similarly, if churches bought lands or properties purely as an investment, those churches should not be exempted but should bear the full incidence of taxation. It would be a normal business transaction. Dealing specifically with the various taxing powers of the State and their incidence upon churches, I turn to land tax.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I do not know very many churches with the kind of money to invest in land, as the honourable member suggests. They are mostly hard-pressed to fulfil their financial commitments.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with the honourable member for Flinders but point out that, if the Government agrees to this motion and frames legislation accordingly, some provisions should be incorporated in that legislation to take care of this eventuality, should it occur.

Mr. Lawn: Supposing a church bought land with the intention of erecting a church on it at some future date and after some 20 years, either because of a change of population or for some other reason, the church decided not to build and sold the land, should it be exempt during that time from rates and taxes?

Mr. COUMBE: If land is bought definitely to erect a place of worship, it should be exempted, but there should be a provision that, in the future if some adjustment was made in the ownership of the property or in the purposes for which it was being held, deferred assessments could be made. I am merely putting forward now a principle. Concerning land tax I point out several anomalies. According to the Land Tax Act, 1936-1961, Part III, section 10 (1) (c), "land used solely for religious purposes . . ." and (d) (i) "land which is owned by an association whose objects are or include the supplying to necessitous

or helpless persons of living accommodation", etc., and then (g) "land which is owned or occupied without payment by any person or association carrying on an educational institution otherwise than for pecuniary profit", etc., is exempt from taxation. But we also find under the same Act partial exemption from taxation. Section 12a (1) (a) states:

that land is used or has been acquired for the purpose of being used and is intended to be used wholly or mainly for any purpose which in the Commissioner's opinion is a charitable, educational, benevolent, religious or philanthropic purpose . . .

Paragraph (c) is in similar terms and then subsection (2) states:

The land tax on any land which is so declared to be partially exempt shall be three farthings in the pound.

The application of that subsection results in land tax being paid on clergy residences, church and church school recreational areas and sites held for future use by religious organizations at the rate of three farthings in the pound.

New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia (I am taking only the mainland States now) grant total exemptions from land tax in this connection. I quote here comparisons for the benefit of honourable members and to illustrate and highlight my contention that these properties should be relieved of State taxation: in New South Wales—complete exemption on churches, schools, charities, and land used for the support of clergy and dependants; in Queensland—churches, schools, charities, places of residence for clergy and religious bodies; in Western Australia—churches, schools, charities, places of residence for ministers, and so on. So it is clear that in those States they receive relief from State land tax. It is a fact that under the land tax laws (perhaps a throwback to the dim past and some of the archaic rules that from time to time crop up in our legislation) if a church wants to claim complete exemption for a block from land tax, all it has to do is four times a year to hold a religious service on the vacant block. I do not believe for a minute that any member of this House would subject any religious order to the indignity of being forced, in the middle of winter or summer, for instance, to hold a religious service on a vacant block just to claim exemption from taxation. Rather I believe honourable members would support exempting it from taxation. So the obvious solution is to give a blanket exemption and to classify those categories now listed for partial exemption as totally exempted from taxation.

Because of the non-profit-making purposes for which these lands are held or used, they should merit special exemptions. I point out that besides land tax (which is, after all, one of the minor taxation problems in many, though not all, districts) the State levies water rates, service fees and sewerage rates, whilst under the Local Government Act councils also rate certain church properties, only some of them at a reduced assessment.

In regard to water and sewerage rating, the other States of the Commonwealth exempt churches, charities, clergy residences, religious order residences and all schools, playgrounds, etc. In South Australia churches and charities whilst exempt pay a service fee of £1 a year on each cistern and a service charge of £6 for water. Here I am quoting the figure that was applicable until a week ago, when the Minister of Works announced a variation in these charges. We get the peculiar position that here in South Australia State schools are exempt, whereas private or church schools are ratable. I have before me the position in all the other States, and we find once again that these other States give much greater exemptions than are applicable in this State. I suggest that to achieve uniformity and to grant necessary relief residences occupied by ministers of religion and members of church orders, as well as the church schools, should be treated in the same manner as churches and charities. I have mentioned the position in the other States. I again emphasize the anomaly that, whilst private schools in South Australia are ratable, in the other States they are exempt.

Turning now to local government rating, the position in this State is that churches and charities are exempt, whilst schools receive a one-quarter rating. I will mention the other States for the purposes of comparison. In South Australia churches and charities are exempt from council rating, in the same way as they are in the other States. However, our private and church schools pay one-quarter rating, whereas those schools are exempted in the other States, as also are the residences occupied by the clergy and members of religious orders. I suggest again that for uniformity and in order to give relief in this connection there should be a blanket exemption.

We have a peculiar situation applying when a church has a school attached—a church school. There are many of these in the metropolitan area and various parts of the country, and they are growing in number year by year.

The church itself is exempt, but its surroundings, including the playground and the school, which may be either attached to or immediately adjacent to the church, are ratable. The property in which the minister lives (whether it be a rectory, a presbytery, or manse, or whatever it is called) is ratable. Where members of a religious order teach in the school where they reside, they pay full council rates on their property, and this does not seem to me to be fair or equitable when one considers the position in the other States. I emphasize that the former Government was aware of this position, and that is why it undertook to correct these anomalies. I do not believe the present position is fair, especially when we realize the purpose for which these lands are held and used. The principle is, of course (and I believe all honourable members agree with this), that these lands are used in connection with religious, educational or charitable works. They are used to promote the causes that I have enumerated, and I emphasize that the organizations using them are non-profit-making in nature.

I now turn to another facet of religious work undertaken by the churches that has developed so tremendously in recent years. In fact, it is a comparatively new facet, because prior to the last war little of this work was done compared with the extent to which it is flourishing today. There were, I freely admit, certain institutions run by various religious organizations for the relief of children, the care of orphans, and the relief of the indigent and the elderly. Since the war we have seen the remarkable mushroom growth of benevolent homes for the care of the sick, the needy, and especially the elderly. I believe all members laud the advances that have been made in this work in the care of the aged and the sick (especially those in receipt of pensions), and those without homes in which to live. I speak with some personal knowledge of this, because I am on the boards of two of these homes and I know the work being done in this connection. This has been accelerated, in my opinion, because of the greater awareness of the need of the aged and elderly persons in our midst, and the community's responsibility in this direction. I believe there has been a new awareness of this responsibility. It has come about also because of the modern housing trends of the nation. We find that more and more elderly folk cannot live with their married children because there simply is not room for them as the married children, in turn, have children of their own.

There is no room even for a widow or widower to live with a young married family in their new home. This, unfortunately, is all too true, and no doubt all honourable members have come across this problem from time to time. This is one of the reasons why these benevolent homes have sprung up. Many religious orders and institutions and benevolent societies have erected homes for the aged where these folk can pass the remaining years of their lives being cared for in comfortable and congenial surroundings, and in the company of their contemporaries.

Both the Commonwealth and the State Government recognize this work and accept the position, so much so that they actively support it with substantial capital and expense grants on a subsidy basis to these various organizations. This Parliament agrees year after year to the payment of a number of these subsidies, as also does the Commonwealth Government. In many of these homes the pensioner pays over part of his pension income to the home towards his upkeep. I emphasize to the House that most of these homes are run at a loss. As I said, I have personal knowledge of this, having the privilege to serve on the boards of two of these homes. They are run at a loss, and they depend to a large extent on the donations and bequests from church members and from the public, from badge days and from special appeals. They receive a contribution (a pittance) from the pensioner, who pays as much as he possibly can towards the upkeep of the home. Such a person is very limited in the amount he can afford each week, and consequently the amount he can pay each week towards the cost of his maintenance is only nominal. I am not suggesting for a moment that those people should be forced to pay any more.

With the added burden of water and sewerage rating (which we heard last week will be increased in many instances) the management of these homes is faced with the problem of greater losses being incurred. They will have to reduce the amount spent on the upkeep of the homes or the service they give to the pensioner, or take more each week out of the pensioner's meagre income. I believe all honourable members will agree that this is completely undesirable and that we should look at some other way to assist these worthy homes.

The Ligertwood report, on which I am basing my comments, referred specifically to the rating on this type of home, because there is a definite anomaly here that I believe could easily be rectified. In fact, it should never have been

there in the first place. The committee outlined the difficulties that the homes were facing, and made certain recommendations, which are contained in paragraph 41 of the report, as follows:

By the Waterworks Act and by the Sewerage Act and by a number of special Acts, certain lands and premises are exempted from water and sewerage rates on assessment. In the case of consumers whose premises are so exempted and are supplied with water by measure, the Minister makes a minimum annual charge of £6, for which the consumer is entitled to use up to 48,000 gallons of water, any excess above that figure being charged at 2s. 3d. per one thousand gallons. In addition, for exempted premises there is a sewerage service charge of £1 per annum for each W.C. in the premises. Among the exemptions for water and sewerage rates on assessment are premises used exclusively for charitable purposes. A problem was submitted to the committee with respect to water and sewerage rates on homes for the aged erected by a benevolent institution. This institution was treated by the Minister as charitable so that its premises were not liable for water and sewerage rates on assessment. Originally the home which provided for 40 inmates or more was so organized that prior to 1962 it was assessed as one occupation on a community basis and was charged a £6 per annum minimum rate for water and £48 per annum for the sewerage service at £1 per W.C. About 1961 the institution acquired additional adjoining land and erected a block of two hundred self-contained flats, each of which was assessed as a separate occupancy but was treated as exempt from rates on assessment. Thereupon the minimum charge for water became £6 per annum for each flat and £1 per annum sewerage charge for each W.C., increasing the total charge by £1,200 per annum for water and £200 for sewerage. The institution bears water and sewerage charges and does not pass them to the tenants.

A strong submission was made to the committee to recommend that in the case of a block of unit flats for the aged, there should not be a minimum charge for water per flat but the institution as owner of the freehold should be charged by measure for the water used, leaving however, the sewerage charge at £1 per W.C. The committee thinks that effect should be given to this submission. If each tenement was subject to rates on assessment, a rate of £6 would represent a capital value of £1,600. In a block of flats provided for old people by a charitable institution it could well be that the capital value of each flat could be assessed at a value up to £1,600. So that in the case of a £1,600 flat the charity would be exempt from rates on assessment to the extent of £6 for each such flat but would be charged the same amount (£6) as a minimum charge for the water service in respect of each flat, that is, for 48,000 gallons of water whether used or not. This would seem to be a serious anomaly which can be corrected by charging for the water actually used for the flat as measured by its meter, or if there is one meter for a block of flats, by charging the charity as the owner of the block for the water

which goes through the meter. Similar considerations could apply to other bodies treated by the Minister as charitable, whose lands are used exclusively for charitable purposes, such as some tenements of the Boy Scouts Association.

The committee accordingly recommends:

(a) That where a tenement is exempted from rates on assessment on the ground that it is used exclusively for charitable purposes, that tenement shall be charged by measurement for the water actually used therein and shall not be subject to a minimum charge and

(b) that where there is a block of such tenements serviced by the one meter, the charity as the owner of the block shall be charged by measurement for all the water actually used through the meter.

I quoted that section of the report to highlight the problem facing many religious and benevolent society homes that have been erected on a non-profit making basis for the purpose of caring for old, aged and indigent people. Most of the homes are run at a loss, and, apart from the small amounts paid by the pensioners or inmates towards the maintenance costs, the institutions rely mainly on gifts from the public and charities, as well as bequests, badge days and other special appeals, which are the only sources of income. At present many institutions are faced with the problem of greatly inflated and artificial charges, and although the law has operated for many years it should be altered.

Mr. Ryan: Would not Housing Trust pensioner cottages be in the same position?

Mr. CUMBE: There may be some connection, but I doubt whether they would come into the category of charitable institutions.

Mr. Ryan: Not charitable, but they would be in the same position.

Mr. CUMBE: If the honourable member agrees with my motion he can promote the idea to his Party, as it would be worth considering. I speak particularly of charitable organizations, as some pensioners in receipt of a pension have other income. I am emphasizing church or benevolent society institutions, the number of which has rapidly increased in recent years. St. Laurence's Homes for Aged at Grange is one of the largest of its type, and there is a large one at Payneham, while many are spread throughout the community. This growth will continue at an accelerated rate in the next few years. Two or three are situated in my district, particularly Padre Strange's set of homes at Westering in North Adelaide.

This is a serious and sincere effort by me to correct anomalies that are apparent in the various taxing laws in the State in regard to church and religious properties. Injustices

are occurring to a worthy section of the community, and these should be corrected immediately. This section enjoys and deserves the respect of all members of this House and of the community, as it is working for the furtherance of Christian worship, education and charity. The necessary benefits would have been implemented by the L.C.L. Government had it been returned at the last election. That Government had specifically set up the Ligertwood committee to advise it, and it had publicly stated on two occasions its intention in this regard. I repeat that, if the present Government agrees to my motion and undertakes to implement the provisions I have outlined, I shall be completely happy and content. I do not for a moment believe that the Government should quibble over this matter. However, if it does not agree to this, I promise that I shall continue to fight for what I believe is the justice of this cause. It is unfortunate that this situation has gone on for a number of years. To the credit of the previous Government, I will say that when this matter was brought to its notice a special committee was set up to investigate it and the Government said forthrightly and publicly that, if returned, it would implement its recommendations. I commend the motion to the consideration of honourable members.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will second the motion.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. HALL (Gouger) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Town Planning Act, 1929-1963, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wills Act, 1936-1940. Read a first time.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Companies Act, 1962-1964.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Juries Act, 1927-1937.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

CAPITAL AND CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to abolish capital and corporal punishment and in connection therewith to amend the Children's Protection Act, 1936-1961, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1957, the Evidence Act, 1929-1960, the Juries Act, 1927-1937, as amended, the Justices Act, 1921-1960, the Juvenile Courts Act, 1941, the Kidnapping Act, 1960, and the Prisons Act, 1936-1963, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to assure to the family of a deceased person adequate provision out of his estate. Read a first time.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House of Assembly request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present session of a Joint Committee to which all Consolidation Bills shall stand referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Order No. 18, and to which any further questions relative thereto may at any time be sent by either House for report.

That, in the event of the Joint Committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, two of whom shall form the quorum of the Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolutions.

That the Attorney-General (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) and Messrs. Hudson and Millhouse be representatives of the Assembly on the said committee.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering

the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act, 1915-1962.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, July 1, at 2 p.m.