# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 13, 1965.

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

## QUESTIONS

### POTATO BOARD.

The Hon. D. N. BROCKMAN: When Minister of Agriculture, I undertook to have the boundaries for the election of members to the Potato Board set out in time for an election to take place by June 30 last. Although that undertaking was given, I know that following the change of Government the boundaries were not set. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what is the present position in respect of these boundaries?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: At present we are awaiting a definition of the boundaries by the Surveyor-General. When an alteration to the boundaries was suggested the matter was submitted to a committee. The defined boundaries were submitted to the Crown Solicitor, but they were regarded as not definite enough to define the areas in respect of eligibility for voting, and it was suggested that they be submitted to the Surveyor General for redrafting so that they would be recognized by all concerned. The present Potato Board is continuing to function, as it has the right to do, until new boundaries are defined and an election takes place.

Mr. Shannon: Does that require an amendment?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No.

### SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR.

Mrs. BYRNE: In view of the tragic drowning of a boy in South Para reservoir last Monday, will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the boundary of the reservoir is adequately fenced and covered by "No Trespassing" signs? Also, in view of the extensive boundary involved (at high-water level, 35 miles) will he consider supplementing the staff available for policing the boundary during holiday periods, not only to prevent similar tragedies but to prevent the risk of pollution arising from the practically uncontrolled access to the reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My department and I deeply regret the sad tragedy that occurred at the South Para reservoir last Monday. I have spoken to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and he has assured me that all possible precautions are taken to ensure safety at reservoirs. It would be impossible to provide personnel to staff the entire length of reservoir boundaries on a holiday because people would not be available in the necessary numbers. Nevertheless, I shall be happy to take this matter up with the Director to ascertain whether more warning notices are required at the reservoir, and whether further policing is possible.

### RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked last week, concerning alternative routes for the proposed standard gauge railway line from Port Pirie to Adelaide?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the consideration of the project to bring the standard gauge from Port Pirie to Adelaide, a route from Port Pirie *via* Crystal Brook and Merriton has been included as one of the possibilities. There is no doubt that this route would be more advantageous than the one *via* Crystal Brook and Redhill. Therefore, this latter route has not been considered. I should like to make it clear, however, that other alternatives are being considered, and a decision has not yet been reached.

### GEPPS CROSS SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked some time ago concerning the replacement of wood heaters at the Gepps Cross Primary School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that only this week I approved of the replacement of 19 wood heaters in the school with gas heaters at an estimated cost of over £900.

### MAIN NORTH ROAD.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some years ago the former Government purchased land on which a modern two-lane highway from Gepps Cross to beyond Gawler was constructed. However, travelling on the road from Gepps Cross into Adelaide is becoming progressively more difficult, and one of the worst bottlenecks in the metropolitan area has been created on this section. In 1962 the three adjoining councils initiated representations to the Government for work to be done on this road which, incidentally, not only serves the local district but is one of the main highways of the State. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads obtain from his colleague a report on the programme that has been drawn up by the Highways Department for widening and generally improving this portion of the road?

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

DARLINGTON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday, concerning the letting of a contract to build a new infants school at Darlington?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The successful tenderer for the new solid construction infants school at Darlington is Allan Tosolini Proprietary Limited. The report appearing in last Friday's *News* gave eight months as the expected completion time for the building, and this was an accurate report.

AUBURN CROSSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question concerns the road-railway crossing on the Main North Road just north of Auburn. The road approaches to the crossing are poor and, with the increasing traffic on the Main North Road, the hazard to motorists is becoming greater. Will the Minister of Education ask his colleague, the Minister of Roads, for information concerning the plans for the reconstruction of this crossing?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

FOSTER CLARK (S.A.) LIMITED.

Mr. CURREN: Following my recent questions on the future payments to growers who supplied fruit to Brookers (Australia) Limited and to Barossa Canneries Limited in the 1958 season, it has been brought to my notice that Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited, which took over the interests of Brookers, has not paid growers in full for fruit supplied in the 1962 season. Will the Premier have Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited investigated to ascertain the likelihood of future payments to growers in respect of the 1962 season?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up the matter with the Under Treasurer to ascertain whether there is any possibility of obtaining information concerning it, and I will report to the House as soon as possible.

MOUNT GAMBIER SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week regarding the letting of a tender for the construction of a boys craftroom at the Mount Gambier Technical High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that a contract was let on October 7, 1965, to Messrs. J. Grove and Son Proprietary Limited of Cumberland Park for the construction of a boys craft block at the Mount Gambier Technical High School. The contract period for the completion of the work is 36 weeks from the date of acceptance of the tender, and the contractor had been requested to make an early start.

OMBUDSMAN.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was reported on the wireless this morning that the United Kingdom is following the lead of many other countries in providing for an ombudsman (a Parliamentary commissioner) in that country. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet has considered this matter with a view to deciding whether to introduce legislation in this Parliament for the appointment of an ombudsman in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think the honourable member would be better advised to put his question on notice so that I shall not make any mistake in my reply.

PORT RIVER SAMPLES.

Mr. HURST: On August 3 I asked a question about seeking the co-operation of the Central Board of Health in the taking of samples from the Port River north and south of the causeway at Bower Road. Will the Attorney-General take up the matter with the Minister of Health and endeavour to obtain a reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates concerning the decrease in the amount of grants to residential colleges?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This provision covers the gross payment of State and Commonwealth grants to residential colleges. The Commonwealth grants as received are credited to Revenue. The decrease in provision this year is purely because of anticipated lower requirements for college building projects. Requirements for building purposes were somewhat higher than usual last year. There has been no change in the previous policy of the State normally contributing £1 for each £2 made available by the Commonwealth for approved projects.

BOOK SALESMEN.

Mr. HUGHES: For some years members of this House have been very much concerned with the tactics of high-pressure salesmen who go out into the country to unload volumes of

books on people who purchase them because they become desperate in an endeavour to get rid of the salesmen. It was in 1963, I think, that the honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) introduced a Bill in an endeavour to stamp out this type of thing. That Bill was accepted by both Houses and became law. However, this undesirable practice still goes on, and recently one of these high-pressure salesmen called on a young couple with a small family in my district. The salesman talked his way inside and eventually, in desperation, the couple signed the agreement, the books were left, and the full payment of £25 was made. The Act, on my reading of it, appears to have been contravened. If I supply the Attorney-General with the relevant document, will he have the matter examined with a view to having this money refunded?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should be glad to do so. Some complaints have been made this year and one has been investigated. We thought we had a case on which we could proceed for a breach of the Book Purchasers Protection Act, but, unfortunately, the people concerned were not willing to give evidence in the case so the prosecution did not proceed. At the moment the draftsman is preparing a comprehensive measure about unfair trading practices, including door-to-door salesmen of all kinds of chattels and services, and it is hoped that it will be possible to introduce the measure later this session.

## STRATHALBYN RESERVOIR.

Mr. McANANEY: Rumours are current in the Strathalbyn district that land is being acquired between Macclesfield and Strathalbyn for a new reservoir. Can the Minister of Works say whether there is any substance in those rumours?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department is at all times investigating sites for possible future reservoirs. The area referred to by the honourable member is certainly one of the sites that have been considered, but no definite decision has been made in respect of a site.

## SOLDIER SETTLERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: On September 28 I directed a question to the Minister of Repatriation regarding the living allowances for soldier settlers at Loxton and also the Commonwealth grant made to those settlers. The Minister promised to take this matter up with the appropriate authorities. Has he an answer?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. Information on this matter was given previously, *vide Hansard* of July 12 and August 4 of this year. The living expenses allowance is one item of a schedule of expenditure which the department deems necessary to meet the cost of harvesting and working the holding, together with the living expenses of the settler. It is applied only in those cases where income from the holding is insufficient to also meet dues to the department in full, or a settler fails to provide for such payments. Unit costs (exclusive of the settler's own labour) which are reviewed and amended from time to time, in keeping with changes in the cost of labour and materials, are applied to each individual settler concerned, according to the requirements of the holding. The amount allowed for living expenses is currently £800 per annum. Where justified by individual circumstances, additional expenditure of a special nature is allowed.

The full amount of expenditure thus agreed to is compared with the estimated (or actual where known) proceeds from the season's crop in order to assess what payments the settler should be expected to make to the department. Having regard to the expenditure which is allowed on all items, and the cost of living, it is considered that the living expenses allowance of £800 per annum is reasonable in most, if not all, cases. However, the department is currently looking into the question of grading this allowance according to the number of dependants in the settler's family, as a result of which it may be decided that the allowance be increased for some and decreased for other settlers. There is a free living grant made by the Commonwealth to war service settlers, for one year, during the assistance period. This grant varies as follows:

1. To a settler without dependants, £363.
2. To a settler with one dependant, £451.
3. To a settler with two or more dependants, £477.

Every settler who reaches the assistance period receives the free living grant which is forwarded by cheque in monthly instalments. Not in any case has it been withdrawn. However, the living expenses allowed from crop proceeds is reduced according to the amount of the free living grant and this has the effect of increasing the net proceeds after providing for harvesting, living and working expenses, against that year's crop. Such net proceeds are applied to the settler's commitments to the department. Furthermore, if the net proceeds of the assistance period crop are less

than the amount of the free living grant a special advance (not repayable by the settler) is made, to bring the net proceeds up to that figure. Therefore no settler loses the advantage of the free living grant. The question of an increase in the amount of the free living grant will be referred to the Commonwealth authorities for consideration, but in view of the fact that, since October 1957 when the present amount was fixed, the basis for the declaration of the assistance period has been progressively liberalized (including some retrospectivity), it is doubtful whether an increase can be justified.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A number of soldier settlers in my district continually draw my attention to the fact that their living allowance under the budget scheme is barely adequate to meet their commitments, and they point out that when they raise this matter with the department they are generally told that they have a substantial asset; but they say they cannot eat assets. When the Minister is having this matter reviewed, will he also take into account the arrangement made under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act in respect of living allowance requirements, whereby the allowance suggested was £800 for husband and wife, and £100 for each child? That allowance was for living expenses only, not for living expenses plus the other expenses which are added to the present allowance paid to soldier settlers.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I thank the honourable member for his suggestion, and I shall have that matter examined.

## DUCK-SHOOTING SEASON.

Mr. RODDA: Many of my constituents are interested in duck shooting in the South-East, particularly the gun clubs, some of which are arranging fixtures for next year. Can the Minister of Agriculture say when he intends to arrange to open the 1966 duck-shooting season?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the question because I know there is a club in the district of the honourable member that is interested in the opening of the duck-shooting season, so that it may publicize this information to interested people. I regret that I have not informed the honourable member earlier, although he has asked me this question several times. It is intended to recommend to Executive Council that a proclamation be issued soon.

## HAPPY VALLEY LAND.

Mr. SHANNON: After my private approaches to him, the Minister of Works was good enough to say that he would investigate the problem that has arisen around the Happy Valley reservoir, where the Engineering and Water Supply Department is acquiring land to preserve the purity of the water in the reservoir. My constituents are concerned that they cannot get any definite information, first, as to what land is to be acquired, and secondly, the price to be paid. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Resulting from the approaches made by the honourable member and the concern expressed by people in the area, the department has made arrangements to have two officers (Mr. Petherick and Mr. Maidment) attend the Happy Valley hall at 10 o'clock on Monday next, October 18, to answer questions concerning the department's decision to acquire land adjacent to the reservoir. I invite the member for Onkaparinga to go along and meet these officers who will give him, and other interested persons, any information they require.

## TRAMWAYS TRUST CONTROL.

Mrs. BYRNE: A proclamation was issued on September 30, 1965, extending the Municipal Tramways Trust control to parts of the district of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport why this step was taken, what area is to come under the trust's control, and when the control will take effect?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have this information, but I shall consult with my colleague and obtain it.

## UNIVERSITY GRANTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the debate on the Estimates, for the benefit of the Minister of Education I referred to university grants and fees concessions to students. Has the Minister information on these matters?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I was unaware until this moment that the remarks of the honourable member were made especially for my benefit, but I am pleased to be able to answer his queries. The grants to the university do not include a provision for fees concessions. There is a separate line "For scholarships and other assistance to students at University of Adelaide and South Australian Institute of Technology", for which the provision this year is £35,000 compared with £17,000 last year. It is from this special line that the cost of concessions will be met. The concessions will be in accordance with the procedures I have already referred to in a public statement.

AGRICULTURAL CADETS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Agriculture an answer to the question I asked yesterday about the training programme for cadets in the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: There are 15 cadets undertaking the agricultural science course at the University of Adelaide; four are undertaking the rural science course at the Armidale university in New South Wales and three are studying the agricultural economics course at the same university. At the Adelaide university, one student is studying for the Bachelor of Science degree, and at the Sydney university eight students are taking the veterinary science course. The total number of students is 31, and they are spread over the full term. Some students are taking a three-year and others a four-year course. If they pass their examinations, we can expect nine students to graduate this year and come to the department.

MURRAY RIVER WATER STORAGES.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning water storages on the Murray River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The water level in the Hume reservoir began to fall four days ago. That reservoir's present holding is 1,740,000 acre feet, compared with a capacity of 2,250,000 acre feet. Lake Victoria is full; its capacity is 551,700 acre feet.

LAMEROO SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I appreciate that priorities must be given in relation to the construction of new schools, but I think all honourable members will agree that certain of the older schools consisting of stone buildings and a multiplicity of timber frame structures sadly need rebuilding at the first opportunity. Lameroo Area School falls into that category, and the school committee has asked me to ascertain, if I can, from the Minister of Education his department's plans for the rebuilding of the school, and when it is expected that this work may be undertaken. Can the Minister report on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall examine this matter for the honourable member, and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

WAIKERIE-TRURO ROAD.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: After attending the Loxton show on the recent Monday holiday, I was travelling from Loxton on the road between Waikerie and Truro where reconstruction work is proceeding, and where motorists are obliged to detour from that road for a distance of about four or five miles. In the dry weather the holiday traffic naturally created much dust, which, in the evening seemed as though it was fog. Honourable members were alarmed to learn of the near tragedy that the member for Frome experienced when recently travelling in similar conditions on a dusty road. Right alongside this main road is the old bitumen road which is not in such a bad state of repair as to prohibit traffic from using it. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain from his colleague whether the Highways Department could allow traffic to travel on this old bitumen road which, I am sure, could cope with traffic, thus averting tragedy in this area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall refer that matter to my colleague.

PARKSIDE HOSPITAL.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the availability of staff for the Parkside Hopsital?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: While we understand that the Mental Health Section of the Hospitals Department is considering the need for additional clerical staff, there are at present no requests from that branch for additional staff. Action is currently being taken to appoint a senior clerk in the new Intellectually Retarded Children's Service, and a vacancy on the existing establishment for a shorthand-typiste is expected to be filled next week. Any requests by the department for the creation of additional clerical or administrative positions in the Mental Health Section will be considered when they are received.

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question prompted by the report tabled today by the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Last Wednesday you were kind enough to say that you would take up with the President of the Legislative Council the difference between the markings of the Notice Papers of the two Houses, showing the papers regarding which the Subordinate Legislation Committee did not intend to recommend any action for disallowance. Have you yet been able to speak to the President about this matter, Sir, in an effort to achieve uniformity and, if you have, have

you been able to make any arrangement with him about this matter?

The SPEAKER: No, I have not had an opportunity to speak to the President, but I shall report to the House as soon as I have had that opportunity.

## SERVICE PAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the debate on the Appropriation Bill I queried the purpose of inserting the last paragraph in the Bill, as it had previously been stated during another debate that the Government had paid over-award rates without the insertion of that clause. Has the Premier a report on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Under Treasurer reports:

There is in my view no contradiction between the explanation to the Leader regarding the authority to pay service pay when the Supplementary Estimates were introduced, which was to the effect that no special authority was required in addition to the appropriation sought, and the statement in the Budget speech regarding procedure with the 1½ per cent marginal additions. In the Supplementary Estimates appropriation was sought to provide sufficient funds to meet the major part of the anticipated cost of service pay. A minor part of the anticipated cost it was intended to meet by provisions for "excess" under Governor's Warrant available under section 32a of the Public Finance Act. Authority was not sought actually to determine and contract to pay service pay. Such authority already is available to the appropriate Minister or other proper employing authority, in as much as the Minister or authority is empowered to employ and to agree upon or determine the remuneration of such employment. The Supplementary Estimates were necessary to make provision for funds which were not provided in adequate volume from earlier votes for salaries and wages or as "excess" under section 32a of the Public Finance Act.

In the Supplementary Estimates only the major departments were listed in respect of supplementary financial provision for salaries and wages to cover service pay, and the only reason for omission of the departments which would require only minor provision was to save having a long list of minor amounts. Information was given to Parliament of the prospective cost of these but it was not thought appropriate in the circumstances or to serve any desirable purpose to list them in full detail in the Estimates as scheduled. With the 1½ per cent marginal increases it would have been quite in order for the Government to proceed exactly as with service pay. The Government had it so desired, could have authorized by appropriate action by Ministers and by such other employing authorities as may have been appropriate to the particular case, that the increase be paid to every employee or officer whether awarded by a tribunal or not. However, the Government decided, as a matter of policy, that it would pay that 1½ per cent marginal increase strictly as and when awarded by the appropriate tribunals and following the principles laid down by the Arbitration Commission. This, as I understand it, was a policy decision as to procedure, and the statement in the Budget speech quoted by the Leader sets out that "the provision in the Estimates will not in itself constitute an authority or decision to pay the increase, but it will constitute a provision to meet the additional costs if and when they are awarded or determined by the appropriate authorities."

Again, the Government could, if it so desired, have listed the prospective costs of the 1½ per cent additional margins only for the major departments, as was done with costs of service pay in the Supplementary Estimates. However, for two substantial reasons, this was not thought expedient. First, all departments necessarily appear in the annual Estimates, whereas relatively few are ordinarily necessary in Supplementary Estimates and accordingly the omission of the provision in minor departments would not have achieved any significant simplification of the annual Estimates. Secondly, the annual Estimates, as well as serving the primary purpose of being a basis for securing adequate appropriation, serve another important purpose of a forecast and plan of financial operations for the year ahead. Accordingly it is very desirable for the latter purpose that they be as complete and accurate an estimate as possible.

As to the final phrase (ii) of clause 6 of the Appropriation Bill, to which the Leader refers, I am inclined to agree with his questioning whether there is any real need for it or for the additional authority it purports to give. My understanding is that the wording of clause 6 was first inserted in 1936 because the Estimates by tradition purport to be for the service of a particular financial year and not any prior period, and yet it was desired at that time that the Estimates under review should, in fact, include some provision for payment of salary and wage increases retrospective into the previous year. The speech of the Treasurer of the day indicated a view that the appropriation authority might have been inadequate without the special section. The granting of retrospectivity has become a fairly common occurrence and accordingly the section which was, at first, a special addition has remained a normal part of the Appropriation Bill for 30 years. The only subsequent extension has been to provide that appropriation authority given by warrant, as authorized in section 3 of the present Act, shall likewise apply to cover retrospective payments. The final phrase (ii) appears to be little more than an elaboration of phrase (i), perhaps to make doubly sure that the provision of funds would cover retrospectivity for an increased rate of payment although the service had been already remunerated at a lower rate, as well as covering retrospective payment for services not previously paid for at all.

I have some doubt as to the necessity for phrase (i) and very considerable doubt as to the necessity for phrase (ii) even if phrase (i) is necessary. However, as they were drafted

by a well-experienced and competent draftsman and have been used substantially in the present form for 30 years without causing any impediment or difficulty in efficient financial administration, the Treasury has not sought their elimination from successive Appropriation Bills. As the matter has now been raised, and there may seem to be some other significance given to the clauses than that which they have hitherto been understood to have, it may be appropriate to secure in due course an opinion from the Crown Solicitor upon their meaning and effect and the necessity for their retention.

## UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. CURREN: Each week, as I travel to and from the city, I use the Kingston ferry, and last week I noticed that the team of men that had been carrying out tests on a possible site for the bridge at Kingston had left the area. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads whether testing has been completed and, if it has, will he ascertain when the proposal is to be referred to the Public Works Committee?

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

## HOSPITAL FEE.

Mr. LANGLEY: On September 29 I referred to a case in my district in which an elderly person in a private hospital had no means of support and, after receiving the Commonwealth benefit, was still a few pounds short of the hospital fee. I asked the Premier whether he would refer the matter to the Minister of Health to see whether appropriate legislation could be introduced to relieve necessitous cases. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Health reports that there are no sources from which financial assistance can be provided from departments under his control in cases such as the one mentioned by the honourable member.

---

## GREYHOUND RACING.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I move:

That in the opinion of this House a Bill should be introduced to provide for:

(*a*) the repeal of the Coursing Restriction Act, 1927;

(*b*) the amendment of the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1959 to allow the licensing of totalizators at greyhound coursing meetings; and

(*c*) the control of greyhound coursing in South Australia.

I move this motion because many people in the community desire greyhound racing to be allowed in this State on similar lines to those on which it is conducted in the Eastern States, and to end the discrimination against one section of greyhound owners that has been exercised in this State since the 1927 Coursing Restriction Act was introduced. The very wording of the Act creates the discrimination. To understand this one must first have some working knowledge of the various forms of coursing. There are four types of coursing. The first is open coursing, in which two dogs are placed in connected collars called slips, which will release the two dogs simultaneously. They are then walked across the open fields until a hare is located. The dogs are then released to chase the hare. The winner is decided on a points scored system recorded by a judge on horseback. It is significant to note that the dog which leads to the hare is able to score up to two points, and by turning the hare a further two points can be scored; from then on points are awarded to the dogs for turning the hare, and they vary according to merit of the turn.

The second type is enclosed coursing. This is the same as open coursing except that the two fields on which it is conducted are enclosed by wire-netting with an escape from one field to the other for the hares. This escape does not allow the dog to pursue the hare any further, and points scored up to that time decide the winner. The third type is Plumpton coursing. This is conducted on an enclosed field, usually 50 to 60 yards wide and 400 to 500 yards long. The dogs are held at one end in the slips and a hare is released from a box and driven up the field to an escape at the opposite end to where the dogs are held. When the hare is a suitable distance away the dogs are released. Points are scored in the same manner as in the open coursing. The judge is located in a tower on one side of the course. In this type of coursing speed is a big factor, as the dogs rarely reach the hare until it is close to the escape.

The fourth type is speed coursing. This is conducted on a race track similar to a trotting track. The races vary in distance from 300 to 900 yards. In all other parts of the world, when speed coursing or greyhound racing is conducted the dogs are enticed to race by a moving object controlled by a steel rail, a carriage and cable and propelled with an engine or electric motor. This object on some tracks is a piece of bag; on other tracks a football is used to allow it to bounce to give it more movement for the dogs to see; but in most cases an object similar to a hare is used, as the greyhound is a natural hunter of hares

and rabbits. As many as eight dogs compete in each race. It is considered a true test of speed and track sense to win a race on speed coursing.

The Coursing Restriction Act is directed only at speed coursing and only makes it difficult to conduct speed coursing by eliminating the easiest and most practical method of enticing a dog to race—the mechanical lure. Then we find in the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1956 Part IV, section 32, the following:

''Coursing meeting'' means any meeting for the hunting or coursing of hares but does not include any kind of speed coursing or dog racing.

This again is direct discrimination against one section of dog owners, namely, the city owners. The Coursing Restriction Act was introduced to restrict betting. Why then should it have been imposed on only one section of the community? Would it not have been fair to restrict all forms of racing, horse racing, trotting and coursing, rather than create this discrimination? Greyhound racing or speed coursing is generally accepted as the most modern and practical method of coursing greyhounds. The Coursing Restriction Act of 1927 states:

An act to prohibit the coursing of dogs with a mechanical or electrically controlled quarry.

Then under the Lottery and Gaming Act ''coursing meeting'' means any meeting for the hunting of hares and does not include greyhound racing or speed coursing. One Act restricts greyhound racing with a Coursing Restrictions Act, and the Lottery and Gaming Act says that greyhound racing is not coursing. Because of the Coursing Restriction Act, racing in South Australia has been conducted with the following procedure: a boy runs around the track with an object on a piece of string, usually a rabbit skin or piece of sheep's wool. When the object is pulled off the course a dog known as a pilot dog is released to run around the track. When this dog is a suitable distance around the track the field of dogs racing are released to race after the pilot dog. A cage of rabbits is usually located on the track past the winning post to give further encouragement to the dogs to race. Those honourable members who have witnessed this form of racing realize that this is a primitive and obsolete method of racing compared with mechanical lure racing conducted all over the world. Regardless of the method of enticing the dogs to race, if betting is permissible on three forms of greyhound coursing then betting on speed coursing should be permitted. I point out that this is not another form of betting but an alternate method, and perhaps the best medium of betting on coursing, as the result is determined by the speed of the dog and has no other factors governing the result of each race.

The 1949-51 Royal Commission in Great Britain conducted on lotteries and betting stated on page 30, paragraph 105:

It follows that among this ''hard-core'' of dog track patrons on which the industry depends for its prosperity, the average expenditure has been at a rate of about 26s. a week in the case of those who go twice weekly, or 13s. a week in the case of those who go once a week.

I point out some of the anomalies that exist because of this discrimination. At Murray Bridge, a Plumpton greyhound course is located 15 miles from the town. Greyhound owners can legally bet on the dogs competing, but should they take the same dogs on to the speed coursing track in Murray Bridge they cannot bet on them. The same applies in Adelaide at Waterloo Corner. The Adelaide and Freeling Coursing Clubs are going to conduct Plumpton coursing meetings on the Adelaide polo grounds throughout 1966. At Waterloo Corner, the same owners and dogs will have the same race at the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club's track at which there can be no legal betting.

At speed coursing there are usually eight to 10 races to wager on. At one Plumpton meeting during 1965 there were 125 individual events to bet on, with betting conducted on the final result of each of the three events decided. This meeting was run over two days with 64 dog stakes and two 32 dog stakes. To decide the winner of a 64 dog stake, 63 heats are run off to arrive at a winner, and it is possible to bet on the result of each heat and the final result. Greyhound racing people ask only to be able to conduct a totalizator at each meeting. Greyhound racing will at the most result in 10 events to wager upon. It is estimated that 90 per cent of the greyhound owners in this State would prefer to race their dogs at speed coursing, conducted on similar lines to that which is conducted in the Eastern States of Australia, rather than be forced to run at open coursing to be able to bet on their dogs. Surely greyhound owners should be free to choose which form of racing they will participate in with equal privileges. To quote an extract from the British Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting 1949-51, page 105, the last part of section 346 dealing with greyhound racing states:

It does not therefore seem reasonable to propose general restrictions on the freedom of

choice which the present Act allows, simly to deal with difficulties which have arisen and can only arise in a limited number of areas.

It is significant to note that speed coursing is far more popular throughout the world than any other form of coursing. In fact, in England and America more people attend speed coursing than attend horse racing. I quote the figures of the State of Florida: attendance at speed coursing for the year 1964 was 4.625,639; for horse racing in the year 1964 it was 1,484,799. The figures for Great Britain for 1964 were, greyhound racing, 11,493,607, and horse racing 4,500,000. The demand for greyhound racing is increasing every year in South Australia. More and more people from South Australia visit interstate tracks and enjoy the spectacle of greyhound racing.

My honourable friend, the member for Gawler, can substantiate that British migrants make increasing demands for greyhound racing. They have been accustomed to greyhound racing being conducted in every county in England, Scotland and Ireland—117 tracks in all. Migrants at Elizabeth have formed a race club and have built a racetrack at Womma Park oval with voluntary labour and public donations—a clear indication of their desire to conduct and attend greyhound racing. The South Australian greyhound racing fraternity should be given equality with their counterparts in the Eastern States. All that greyhound people ask is to be allowed to prove to this Government that they can conduct and control their sport as well as, if not better than, it is conducted anywhere else in the world on a non-proprietary basis. Since the introduction of greyhound racing on a non-proprietary basis in the Eastern States of Australia, it has progressed to that of the highest standard in the world. The governing bodies in Tasmania, Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland have confidence in greyhound racing in each State, and it is obvious that the betting on this sport has not been detrimental to their respective States. In fact, representatives of the New South Wales National Coursing Association appeared before the recent Royal Commission held on off-course betting in New South Wales. This Commission saw fit to recommend that greyhound racing be placed on equal terms with horse racing and trotting. Greyhound racing was included in the totalizator agency board's operations in New South Wales. This clearly indicates that betting on greyhound racing is not detrimental to the community.

The restriction of greyhound racing in South Australia has ruined the breeding industry in this State. Mechanical-lure racing has been bred into greyhounds in the Eastern States, and it is an established fact that dogs bred in the Eastern States can, and do, win many of the South Australian open coursing events, but rarely, if ever, does a South Australian bred dog win an event in the Eastern States at greyhound racing. The only South Australian bred dogs to win in the Eastern States in recent years were bred from dogs imported to South Australia from other States. Fifteen years ago South Australia was the leader in greyhound breeding, but today it is difficult to sell dogs from South Australian stud farms. Dogs in the Eastern States are being sold to America and have brought thousands of dollars into Australia. Another market for greyhounds has come from Macao, but both these markets are restricted to greyhounds adaptable to mechanical-lure racing.

Advantages can be expected from greyhound racing. The people who follow this sport can comfortably watch the thrilling spectacle of a night's racing and legally have small wagers on the dog they fancy. Charity will benefit: for example, the direct payments by the N.S.W. National Coursing Association to charities in 1964 were—Spastic Centre Mosman £3,713; N.S.W. Olympic Games Fund £2,300; and Knights of Charity (Cancer Appeal) £2,019, a total of £8,032. The Owners and Trainers Association, which races at Harold Park, Sydney, also contributed about £7,000 to charity in the same year. In addition, the National Coursing Association paid £77,768 tax to the New South Wales Government, and it is reasonable to assume that some of this was channelled to charity. The New South Wales Government receive a similar amount of tax from the Harold Park Greyhound Racing Club. In Victoria, the Melbourne Greyhound Racing Club donated £6,000 to charity in 1964, and the Government has received more than £161,000 from totalizator and bookmakers' turnover tax, much of which is channelled to charity.

Greyhound racing in the Eastern States creates full-time employment for many people. Harold Park and Wentworth Park, the two main tracks in New South Wales, employ 30 people full time, and there are another 39 racetracks in New South Wales. The National Coursing Association at Wentworth Park paid £23,000 in wages in 1964. The numerous training centres and stud farms which employ a large number of well-paid full-time employees,

increase the number of people to many hundreds, who are fully employed in what could be termed the greyhound industry. Victorian greyhound racing has created full-time work for many people. Many farmers in these States run boarding kennels and stud farms as a sideline to augment income from the farm.

The greyhound is often referred to as the working man's race horse. Surely the working man in South Australia can, if he chooses, race an animal of his own, and legally wager on this animal. The owner of a greyhound gets the same pride and joy in owning a winner as does the owner of any race horse or trotter.

A greyhound pup can be bought from £35 and kept until racing age for £1 a week. When a dog is racing it costs between £1 10s. and £2 to keep and train. A dog in the Eastern States can win as much as £3,000 in one race—prize money ranges from £65 to £3,000 a race at the metropolitan tracks in both Victoria and New South Wales. It is not to be wondered that several South Australian families are contemplating moving to Victoria to be able to enter their dogs in races in that State. Many greyhound racing enthusiasts travel to Ballarat or Broken Hill every other week to race, although the chances of winning are remote, because they have no training facilities in South Australia for mechanical-lure racing.

In September, 1965, a petition was raised in the towns of Murray Bridge and Tailem Bend. It was sponsored by the National Coursing Association of South Australia's promotion committee and the Murray Bridge Coursing Club. It requested members of Parliament in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council to support legislation to allow betting on greyhound racing. At least 1,000 people were approached and 920 signed the petition. The electorate of Murray was chosen as the area to conduct this petition, because people from all walks of life would be approached—people from the town, farmers, and railway workers—thus giving a reasonable picture of the demand for betting on greyhound racing.

Some honourable members will ask, "Does greyhound racing increase cruelty inflicted on small animals with the training of greyhounds for mechanical-lure racing?" Figures from other States prove that cruelty does not increase with the introduction of mechanical-lure racing. The New South Wales National Coursing Association has had no cases of cruelty relating to greyhound racing and training in the past five years, clearly an indication that this phase of the sport is well controlled, as New South Wales has 41 racetracks, 5,000 owners and over 10,000 dogs. Another indication of how free of cruelty the sport is can be gauged by the fact that greyhound racing at Harold Park is advertised in the monthly magazine of the Animal Welfare League of New South Wales. A letter received by the President of the State Greyhound Club of South Australia, dated September 22, 1965, from the New South Wales Animal Welfare League, stated:

I trust that you will be successful in influencing South Australia to come into line with New South Wales in this regard. With best wishes for success in your efforts—W. A. D. Piper (President).

These statements indicate quite clearly that this well-respected body of people supports greyhound racing. Mr. Collie, Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of South Australia has stated that his organization does not oppose mechanical-lure racing as such, but because of the adverse side effects that have been created in training of greyhounds in other States in the past five years. The South Australian National Coursing Association is asking for legislation in this State to give it better control over this phase of the sport than the control anywhere else in the world. There are 199 rules in Victoria to govern this sport effectively. The National Coursing Association desires legislation to cover the following points:

(1) To be allowed to operate a totalizator at its greyhound racing meetings.

(2) To allow greyhounds to race behind a mechanical lure. The National Coursing Association would prefer to be allowed to operate a totalizator at race meetings, if a preference must be made.

(3) The National Coursing Association should remain the controlling body of all greyhound racing in South Australia.

(4) The association should be the only body to apply to the Chief Secretary for licences for and on behalf of individual clubs, thus enabling it to design the areas for greyhound racing to be of the best advantage for the greyhound fraternity.

(5) The association will have a set of rules under which to race, similar to those in force in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and Queensland. These rules give a tight control over greyhound racing. In actual fact there are 199 rules in these regulations in Victoria.

(6) The association would operate the greyhound racing meetings to be held in the metropolitan area. This would be conducted by a management committee appointed by the association.

(7) Present indications are that the greyhound racing will be conducted at the Thebarton oval.

(8) The metropolitan area to be defined as an area within a radius of 15 miles from the General Post Office, Adelaide.

(9) Greyhound racing to be non-proprietary.

(10) All mechanical-lure training tracks to be registered with the association.

(11) All greyhounds on public property should be suitably muzzled.

(12) No person shall lead or be in control of more than four greyhounds at any one time.

(13) No person under the age of 14 should be in charge of or responsible for any greyhounds.

These suggested proposals will indicate to honourable members that the interested people are not only keen to have this form of greyhound racing established in this State but also keen to have it conducted correctly. I understand there are 1,800 greyhounds registered in South Australia, and I have no doubt that these dogs belong to respectable people. These same respectable people are at a loss to know why the law in this State is so severe in regard to greyhound racing. I understand a similar motion to this was moved by the former member for Stirling, the late Mr. Jenkins, but I believe it was defeated in another place. Did the Parliament at that time consider the people in this State to be different from people in other States? I do not consider them different; nor do the people concerned. Intelligent people do not just go on accepting indefinitely an outdated and ridiculous law; they want something done about it and they believe that they have a sufficiently strong case to oppose this restrictive law that prevents them from enjoying the same social activities being enjoyed by the same sort of sporting bodies in other States. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I hope that honourable members in seriously considering this motion will give this sporting body its just rights.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, Sir.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee (teller), Rodda, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hughes, Hutchens, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. I give my casting vote for the Noes; the motion thus passes in the negative.

## OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Casey:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria,

which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum,

and which Mr. Millhouse had also moved to amend by leaving out the words "this session" and by leaving out all the words after the word "totalizators" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament".

(Continued from September 29. Page 1822.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): It is rather unique that the business this afternoon should have followed the order it has. The member for Port Pirie took us for a run with the dogs, and I believe the motion now before the House is inclined to take the State to the dogs. By my saying that it becomes obvious that I oppose the motion. Three alternatives have been presented: first, that a totalizator agency board system of betting be established in South Australia; secondly, that the question be submitted to a referendum; and thirdly, that the *status quo* be maintained. It seems to me that all these proposals are in the form of a delicious apple. The first seems not a little rotten, the second seems to have a degree of codling moth, and the third is rather like a windfall; there is little choice. I have heard many interesting speeches on this subject but one I heard from Mr. Stewart Cockburn on Channel 7 (and it lasted only four minutes) put the position in a nutshell. He said:

I guess we all have our own ideas about hypocrisy, but for my money the hoary old subject of off-course betting—T.A.B.—is good for as much hypocritical bilge per furlong as any other public issue in South Australia. One of the few members of Parliament with the courage of his convictions on this subject is fighting Irishman Tom Casey, who threw down the Parliamentary gauntlet on T.A.B. in the Assembly yesterday. No-one else spoke, and the debate was adjourned so that all other members can see which way the cat of public opinion seems to be jumping before they commit themselves in the free vote which the Government has promised them in due course. South Australian racing interests have used every tear-jerking argument in the calendar to justify T.A.B. They say: "What a lot of lovely money it's going to raise for charity and good causes!" They tell you they're terribly worried about the extent to which S.P. betting encourages bribery of the police force. They weep over what they call the wicked social evil of having anti-S.P. laws which can't be enforced and which therefore encourage contempt of the law by young people. And finally, the breasts of these poor racing men heave with suppressed sobs when they think what S.P. betting has done to the noble sport of kings. Well, there's a little truth in most of these arguments, I suppose. But why can't the racing clubs and their supporters be honest and admit that their really big interest is in making more money for themselves and that charity, the welfare of the Police Force and the souls of young people are very much a secondary consideration?

I add to that, if they are any consideration at all. I have quoted sufficient of what Mr. Cockburn said to show that his was a commentary by an honest observer. I agree with what he said about the talk of bribery of the police, the evil of S.P. bookmaking that could be avoided by the establishment of T.A.B., and the good that the system would do by raising money for charity. Those are not the real issues, as Mr. Cockburn said. It has been said that this is a wowser State and has been for some time, but I submit that the State has a record in morals and in fair dealing that would take a lot of beating.

Mr. Casey: I do not think it is any different from any other State in the Commonwealth today.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is what the honourable member thinks but he may think what he likes; I am not obliged to agree with what he thinks, and I certainly do not agree with him on this question.

Mr. Casey: I was talking not about T.A.B. but about morals in general.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think this State is better off than any other State. The honourable member has said that he would not have a bar of poker machines—of one-armed bandits, as they are called. In one breath he says that we are not better off than other States in morals but in the next breath he says that he would not have a bar of things operating in other States.

Mr. Casey: Poker machines only operate in one State.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Well, operating in one State. Of course, that would be the next move here.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is already being canvassed.

Mr. Casey: You must be doing the canvassing.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Some people say they would not have the old betting shops back. However, will people be satisfied if they get T.A.B.? I submit there is good evidence to show that they would not be satisfied, because the people who have it are not satisfied. I have here a cutting from the Canberra *Times* of Wednesday, August 4, which puts forward a strong argument for paying out on the same day as the racing, and if that is not getting back to the old betting shop idea I do not know what is.

Mr. Casey: They do that in New South Wales now.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Those people want to hear the results and go on betting at the same time, while others are arguing that there is much virtue is not being able to collect on the same day. The worker who has to attend to his work cannot collect his money, so he hands his ticket to his wife to go and collect, and this is encouraging another person into the ring. That is the evil of T.A.B. Has it any morals at all? Of course it hasn't. In my opinion, there is nothing good about it. I said before in this place and I say it again: while I am free to vote I will never encourage an increase of gambling in this State, but if I think there is a substantial request for an amendment to the law I will accept the result of a referendum. Is there a demand for T.A.B.?

Mr. Freebairn: There doesn't seem to be.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In my district there is no demand at all. Not even one of my constituents has approached me asking for T.A.B.

Mr. Casey: What about the Gallup poll; doesn't that indicate something?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not in the betting world, and I do not know anything about the "gallops" at all. I have received petitions signed by 748 constituents

in my district asking me to oppose T.A.B., and in addition I have received numerous letters from constituents and people outside my district, but not once have I been asked by anyone to support T.A.B. Of course, some people say that it is going to be easy money for the Government. Well, I would prefer to be guided by the Scriptures and ask myself, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Many souls will be lost through the extension of betting in South Australia.

Mr. Casey: In what way?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Where there are no morals there is no consciousness of any lack of morals. If a man indulges in illegal gambling he risks losing his soul; there is no question about that.

Mr. Casey: That is the statement of the year.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In my opinion, it is a fact. The only people that can gain from T.A.B. in South Australia are the people interested in racing. I know that it is said that people now engage in starting price betting, that that is wrong, and that, if we cannot police the law and people keep on breaking the law, we should repeal that law; but is this to apply to stealing and the other offences against which we have passed laws? Of course, the argument is ridiculous. What I cannot understand is that a man with a Socialist outlook can support an extension of betting facilities. I joined the Labor Party believing that the Party was opposed to the uneven distribution of wealth, and if anything causes the uneven distribution of wealth it is betting.

Mr. Casey: Particularly S.P. betting!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A man is entitled to what he earns, and I do not believe we should encourage the idea that people can get rich by being in a game of chance. I believe that is morally wrong, and I oppose it with every ounce of energy I have. I strongly oppose the increase of gambling of any kind, and for that reason I oppose the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I was pleased to hear the vigorous speech from the Minister, for there was no two-bob each way in his attitude and we certainly know where he stands on the subject.

Mr. Casey: I suppose he converted you, did he?

Mr. HALL: I am pleased to see that this debate is lasting some time, after the swift progress of the previous motion. Regarding that matter, I certainly am not willing to vote on something I know nothing about, and I think every member will agree that he needs more knowledge of a complicated measure than he can gain merely by listening to a speech in support of it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You must not reflect on a decision of the House.

Mr. HALL: It was a very inept decision.

The SPEAKER: Order! I thought the honourable member would have taken the tip from the Deputy Leader. The honourable member must not reflect on decisions of the House.

Mr. HALL: I accept your admonition, Mr. Speaker; I meant to say "uneducated". I am sure that this debate has been initiated by the member for Frome at the instigation of his Leader. Knowing something of the discipline within the Labor Party, I am sure that the honourable member would not have moved his motion without the permission (and, in fact, possibly the direction) of his Party to open up the debate so that the matter could be discussed without the Government's being implicated as its originator. That is my view of it. However, I do not oppose the intention of this motion. The member for Frome has been written up in the newspapers as being the originator and the father of T.A.B., or he has been given some other imaginative description. T.A.B. has been a live issue for a couple of years, but we, as a Party, went to the last election stating that we would introduce a system of T.A.B. We could argue about the degree and extent to which it would have operated, but in my view it was not extensive enough. Perhaps other members of my Party may have thought it was too extensive, but we did have a scheme, and had we been in office today we would have introduced a Bill. We make a point of keeping our election promises.

Mr. Casey: That scheme was not acceptable to the racing fraternity of this State.

Mr. HALL: That is wrong, because leaders of the racing industry and the totalizator committee had approved of the scheme.

Mr. Casey: I have had correspondence dealing with this.

Mr. HALL: Perhaps the honourable member does not have the vital correspondence, but it could be produced.

Mr. Casey: If it can be produced I shall be pleased.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It will be on the Premier's file.

Mr. HALL: Yes. It was agreed to by both the parties last year, the totalizator committee and the previous Government, and was a plank

and promise in the election policy of the previous Government.

Mr. Casey: I should like to see the document.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is adept at raising unimportant frivolities about this question. Last year, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford said:

I shall read a communication that I have received from the off-course totalizator committee to show that it is unnecessary for me to give a sop to the racing clubs, as was suggested by some members. This matter is at a stage where a Bill is being drafted. This is not a simple matter and will take some time.

Mr. Jennings: We have heard that for many years.

Mr. HALL: The present Government has not been game enough to introduce a Bill. It sent one of its members to introduce the subject without taking the responsibility.

Mr. Hudson: That is not what the member for Mitcham said.

Mr. HALL: I am dealing with the member for Frome and members opposite who have refused to take collective responsibility as a Government, but who are flying a kite by means of a motion introduced by one member. The member for Frome gave me hope that he would be convinced of something if I produced a letter. Sir Thomas Playford continued:

I have been informed that in Victoria the Bill took exactly six months to draft. One or two Government members have asked how far I have gone in this matter. The communication from the committee states—

Does the honourable member want to hear this?

Mr. Casey: I have got it.

Mr. HALL: Well I shall read it. The letter states:

1. As chairman of the committee which has been appointed to negotiate with the Government on off-course betting facilities I would advise that the committee has further examined the plan put forward by you on behalf of the Government. The committee are prepared to accept the 14-point plan with the undermentioned four amendments. To distribute any profits upon a stake-money basis rather than attendance.

Mr. Hudson: What about the other amendments?

Mr. HALL: Following that letter, the Government undertook to introduce a Bill.

Mr. Hudson: Did it accept the amendments?

Mr. HALL: Yes. They were minor matters and did not affect the progress of the Bill. The Government promised to bring in a Bill and went to the people with this as a plank.

Mr. Casey: Did the Government of the day accept the amendments put forward by the racing clubs?

Mr. HALL: Yes.

Mr. Hudson: Including the amendment about more than one office in the metropolitan area?

Mr. HALL: Honourable members can try to obscure the matter if they wish, but there is no doubt we would have introduced, successfully, a Bill this year. However, we are not likely to get it from the present Government, and the racing industry is more than a year behind because of it. The member for Frome is not the originator of T.A.B. in this State.

Mr. Casey: I did not claim to be.

Mr. HALL: At least the honourable member moved this motion, and during the debate we are able to express our opinions fully. My opinion has not changed. I believe that, if the public wants this (and some sections have demonstrated that they want a certain type of T.A.B.), a Bill is necessary before a proper discussion can take place. I do not support things I know nothing about. If it were a Bill with reasonable conditions I would support it, and would support metropolitan cash betting offices.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: A limited number?

Mr. HALL: Yes. The Leader's plan was for a telephone system throughout the metropolitan area.

Mr. Hughes: The way you are talking you will have to support my amendment.

Mr. HALL: No, but I will support the amendment of the member for Mitcham. The Government is frightened to face up to this.

Mr. Jennings: The Government gave no undertaking about this matter.

Mr. HALL: No, because it was frightened and would not give an undertaking. In this motion, we need to strike out "this session" and "Victoria". I have examined the Victorian scheme although I am not expert enough to point out any defects in that scheme compared with the schemes in other States.

Mr. Casey: Have you seen any other States' schemes in operation?

Mr. HALL: If the Bill is introduced, I can approach it, uncommitted as to important details. There may be variations on the Victorian scheme, but it is futile to tie oneself to a particular scheme when discussing conditions in this State. Apart from these two matters (which could be met by the amendment of the member for Mitcham) I can support the motion. My advice to the member for Frome,

for what it is worth, would be to accept that amendment, and to facilitate the progress of his motion.

Mr. Casey: When you returned last year, after studying the Victorian system you could not speak highly enough about it.

Mr. HALL: I am not speaking derogatorily about it now.

Mr. Casey: After a fortnight with your Leader you changed your opinion.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member is talking absolute nonsense. He pretended he did not have a copy of a letter, but the member for Glenelg had it right behind him. Members opposite are putting over cheap tricks that are not worth twopence.

Mr. Casey: My advice to you is that you study T.A.B. a little further before you get up on your feet to speak about it.

Mr. HALL: I have had a first-hand look at the working of T.A.B.; I talked to the people concerned, as well as to those who knew about the financial success of the scheme. It was an impressive set-up, although, as I have previously said, betting is a mug's game. I do not pretend to tell other people that they should not bet if they wish to bet. If sufficient people wish to bet legally so that a scheme can be properly organized, and if such a scheme does not adversely affect the moral tone of the community, I see no reason why the scheme should not be implemented. Indeed, I cannot see that T.A.B. is adversely affecting the moral tone in Victoria. I cannot happily support the motion because it is a method of enabling the Government to escape responsibility. However, on behalf of my electors who desire to use this facility, I can support the motion only in its amended form.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I certainly have no personal interest in betting on a horse or, indeed, going to a place outside a racecourse for that purpose. I rarely attend race meetings, and I always return from them substantially the poorer. To me it is a vastly over-rated form of entertainment. I have not been to a racecourse since a memorable day about 6½ years ago (which, incidentally, was the day on which I was elected to this House) when some of my friends, thinking they would take off my mind a matter that was laying heavily on it, suggested that we go to the races. Arriving at the course some time before lunch, I must admit that I have never known the time to drag so much, nor horses appear all to run so slowly as they did that day. The day certainly took a long time to pass, and it seemed that one did nothing but climb stairs into the stand, having placed a bet at the totalizator, and wait for the horses to parade and for the race to eventually take place. I could not distinguish one horse from another, anyway, because I could not follow them at such a distance. After the race we would climb down the stairs and collect our winnings if we had been fortunate, and then the process would start all over again.

To me obviously racing is almost an unknown quantity. However, I know that many people in the community delight in this form of recreation and never miss a race meeting. Some even go to other States to attend meetings, and I imagine that they are the ones in favour of T.A.B. It is rather interesting to note the figures published in a Gallup poll on T.A.B. some time ago, which indicated that 46 per cent of those interviewed favoured T.A.B. and that many people were non-committal. I think those who had no opinion at all comprised 31 per cent, and I am probably in that category myself. However, it has been shown that many people in this State favour such a scheme. On the other hand, there must be just as many who abhor the thought of introducing T.A.B. into this State. We have received good reasons from people who are opposed to it and who think it would be detrimental to the community if it were introduced. Those people believe it is a social evil, that it is morally wrong, and that it has a bad influence on all sections of the community.

Those people for and against T.A.B. are, of course, entitled to their own opinions. Who am I to say what I think is the right or wrong thing in this matter, when in the final count every person in the community faced with this question is guided by his own conscience? I have asked people in my district to indicate one way or the other their opinion of T.A.B. Generally speaking, most people have had no real opinion at all about the matter. Obviously a hard core of people support it and just as many are against it. Like other members I have received petitions organized, in the main, by churches. In all, I have received 24 petitions containing 672 signatures. The petitions have come from the Methodist Church, the Churches of Christ, the Church of England, and the Baptist Church. Obviously they have been organized on a fairly wide basis because, in most instances, although the petitions came from different churches their wording was almost identical.

About 18 months ago, when discussions were taking place between the previous Government and the racing clubs, I went to Melbourne to have a look at T.A.B. in Victoria. My trip was arranged through the Chief Secretary of Victoria (Mr. Rylah). I was accompanied on my visit by Senator Ivy Wedgwood, who was also interested in having a look at the ramifications of T.A.B. I owe a great deal to Mr. Rylah for arranging the visit for me. I was treated with the greatest courtesy: I was met at the train, given breakfast, and then taken to the headquarters of the T.A.B. organization in Melbourne. Then I was taken to see the various types of agency in the city and brought back, when it was near to the time of the commencement of the races, to see how the telephone operations of the organization worked. I found this extremely interesting. I was also interested to find that most operators in the central system of the organization in Victoria were young teachers and university students who were only too glad to earn a few extra shillings on a Saturday afternoon to supplement their earnings, and who were obviously interested in what they were doing.

I will not go into the processes of how bets were laid because I believe most members are conversant with the fact that credit has to be established, and that one cannot bet on subsequent races if one has used up all the credit that stood in one's account on the T.A.B. books. After I had visited the various city agencies, I visited the inner suburban and outer suburban agencies. From there I went, as a guest of the racing club, to the meeting at Caulfield, had lunch at the course, and watched several races. I then went into the nerve centre of the totalizator system. All the information that had been correlated during the day from the country, suburban and city agencies had been tabulated at the T.A.B. headquarters and telephoned to the nerve centre, which was above the totalizator operating at Caulfield racecourse. In this way the odds were fixed for the races, and it was on this basis that dividends were allotted.

Altogether I found my trip extremely interesting and many aspects of the scheme impressed me very much. I found that the actual betting agencies in the city were attractive: they were well-kept shops; there was no broadcasting of races; and there was no pay-out (the pay-out on a subsequent day is one of the desirable features of the system). I was impressed with the efficiency of the operations of credit at the headquarters of the establishment, as this was in the interests of the bettors. However, I did not like the mushroom growth of the agencies in the city of Melbourne, and this growth has increased since then. I believe that agencies are now established not more than half a mile apart. This means that there is available to passers-by an easy opportunity to slip into a shop and have a flutter, as it were. Because of this ease of betting I believe that many people that probably have never previously had a bet indulge themselves in one of these betting shops.

Another interesting aspect is the question of subsidizing of sport by a Government. In what sport other than racing does this occur? If racing is such a popular sport, why can't it stand on its own feet? I imagine that the case prepared and the correspondence entered into with members of Parliament as well as with many other leaders of the community by the totalizator committee appointed by the racing clubs must have cost many thousands of pounds. Even though racing may be called the sport of kings it seems to me that if it is so popular it should be able to stand on its own two feet. I cannot see why it should require what almost amounts to a Government subsidy to keep it going. If this line of thought is pursued we could say that gambling is surely not the exclusive right of the racing industry. One could imagine the outcry there would be from the public if it were suggested that a totalizator be set up at Adelaide Oval so that people could bet on football or test matches, or at Memorial Drive so that people could bet on the Davis Cup tennis when it is played here. It seems peculiar that one sport should be picked out for this preferential treatment. I believe just as many people would be employed in industries associated with football, tennis and golf as are employed in the industries associated with racing such as the stables, jockeys and so on. Therefore, I see no reason why racing should be singled out to receive assistance from the Government.

In Victoria phenomenal growth has taken place in the turnover of T.A.B. since it was established in 1960. Last year it had a turnover of £80,000,000, which was a £17,000,000 increase on the previous year. I cannot help making the observation that many more people must have become interested and encouraged to bet than had ever been the case before. Mr. Deputy Speaker, at this stage I want to declare where I stand on the motion, and I want to put my colleague sitting next to me out of his misery and tell him that I support his amendment.

Mr. Millhouse: That makes me very happy.

Mrs. STEELE: I was sure it would. It if, of course, an issue on which in one way or another the general public has had a good deal to say, and on which I am sure, from the spate of literature that has been disseminated, they must be pretty well informed by this time. The previous speaker, the honourable member for Gouger, mentioned that negotiations went on for a long time between the previous Government and the committee appointed by the racing clubs. We had reached the point at which the then Premier had been able to say that the 14 points he had submitted to the racing clubs had, in fact, been accepted by them, and in the short time that remained of that Parliament, following the acceptance by the racing clubs, he introduced a small Bill which I think gave some satisfaction to the racing clubs. That was the Bill that increased the turnover tax from 1 per cent to 1½ per cent. Had the previous Government come back, legislation would undoubtedly have been introduced early this year to establish T.A.B. as it had been substantiated in the 14 points over which negotiations had taken place.

I consider that had the present Government been really interested in seeing T.A.B. set up in South Australia it would have had the opportunity to introduce legislation this session. But what do we find? As the member for Gouger said, instead of the racing clubs proceeding to negotiate or to be happy with the 14 points that had been raised, because they had a new Government to deal with they started all over again, and again this year we have been treated to a great deal of correspondence of one type or another from the racing clubs, which apparently are going to try to see if they cannot make the points which they were unsuccessful in making with the previous Government. It would seem to me that this Government had the opportunity, as a responsible Government, to introduce appropriate legislation if it so desired. Instead, we have seen a Government backbencher move a motion. I was interested the day this was introduced, because if the honourable member's intention was known to his Party in general and to the Ministry in particular—

Mr. McKee: When you were in Government you had the opportunity, too.

Mrs. STEELE: I have just been discussing this point; the honourable member must have been out of the House recovering from the shock of his previous defeat.

Mr. McKee: You had an opportunity, and it is no good trying to hide your mistakes now.

Mrs. STEELE: That is the point the honourable member missed. The previous Government most certainly would have introduced legislation this session.

Mr. McKee: Then I presume you are supporting T.A.B.

Mrs. STEELE: I am supporting the member for Mitcham's amendment. The surprised looks on the faces of members opposite when the member for Frome gave notice of his motion were really worth seeing, a fact with which I am sure my colleagues on this side will agree. If Government members did not know about it, they were pretty good at bluffing. The point is that by the moving of the motion by the member for Frome it was hoped that members would be given the opportunity to indicate to the Government which way they thought public opinion was flowing. The Government then would not have to, on its own, take steps to initiate legislation for the introduction of T.A.B. It would in this way get some indication from members on this side whether there was sufficient support for such a Bill. To my way of thinking, a responsible Government does not have to wait on the moving of a motion by a back-bencher to make up its mind whether or not to introduce legislation.

I consider there is no need at all for a referendum. Apart from the cost to the Government and to the people of South Australia, I think that those who elect us to Parliament expect us to know our own minds on such a controversial question. Admittedly, social questions are the most difficult ones to which members individually have to face up, but that is a responsibility we accept when we come into Parliament, and if we can get no indication from the people we represent on how they want us to vote on such matters we ourselves, in the final count, must be guided entirely by our conscience. Actually, I do not think private members can win one way or the other, because it will be claimed by some that by supporting a motion we are instructing the Government to bring down legislation. Therefore, whichever stand we take we cannot win. In any case, whatever the outcome of the voting on this motion, the Government still has the responsibility of deciding whether or not it should be bound by the voting on a private member's motion to the extent of introducing legislation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not stand in the way of the introduction of a Bill for T.A.B. at all, because that is the only proper way in which members can decide whether or not they consider the legislation to be in the best interests. How we vote on such an issue depends on the conditions provided in the Bill. I do not stand in the way of a Bill for T.A.B. being debated and voted on in the proper place where every member will be able to declare himself or herself. Therefore, if and when the Government makes up its mind fairly and squarely whether or not to accede to the clamour of the racing clubs to legislate for the introduction of T.A.B., I shall declare myself on the matter. In the meantime, I support the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): At the moment we have the original motion of the member for Frome and the amendment of the honourable member for Mitcham, which both mean practically the same thing. The motion asked that the Bill be introduced this session, with an amendment by the member for Mitcham and a subsequent amendment by the member for Wallaroo. Surely, when T.A.B. is eventually introduced (and this is inevitable) it will be similar to the system operating in Victoria, but not the same. When such a Bill is introduced Parliament will be able to consider it clause by clause, as this is a right that cannot be taken from members of Parliament. However, at present, who knows what the precise form of the legislation will be? The motion asks that the Government introduce a Bill this session to have a scheme similar to that of Victoria, but the honourable member for Frome can give no written guarantee that, if the Bill is introduced, it will emerge as T.A.B. similar to T.A.B. in Victoria. This is a democratic institution: everyone here represents people; we are obligated to express the views of those people, and no member should be denied that right.

Mr. McKee: We had an exhibition of democracy a short time ago.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I will make my speech in my own way. The sooner the honourable member keeps quiet the sooner he will learn something.

Mr. Clark: I thought you said this was a democratic institution.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Only one speaker is allowed to speak.

Mr. McKee: Don't tell me to keep quiet.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: If an honourable member has a point of view he has every right to express it. This is a motion to express an opinion of this House: it asks that the Government introduce a Bill. Nothing can be done until the Bill is introduced and members can study its contents and consider it clause by clause. By supporting this motion or the amendment of the member for Mitcham, honourable members will have a Bill introduced. This does not mean that every member has to support the subsequent Bill in its entirety, but it does give Parliament the opportunity to determine the merits of the Bill when it is introduced. No private member can introduce such a Bill: it has to be introduced by a Cabinet member because it will bring revenue to the Treasury. Members who have opposed this motion are denying the right of Parliament to determine a social issue. That is wrong, because this is a democratic institution. When the Bill is introduced members may oppose it and express their views according to their conscience and belief. I do not deny them that right.

No-one can convince me that there is not a public reaction that something should be done by this Parliament to determine the issue one way or the other. But Parliament cannot determine the question until a Bill is introduced. Honourable members who have opposed this motion belong to a democratic institution, so they should not deny a member the right to express his opinion. When the Bill is introduced every member will have his democratic right to oppose it.

Mr. Hudson: He has a democratic right to oppose the motion if he wants to.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: A Bill should be before the House so that it could be considered; then we would know what it was about and, if they wished to, members could then oppose it. The only difference between the original motion and the amendment of the member for Mitcham is the matter of time and urgency. A T.A.B. system of off-course betting for South Australia is urgently needed, so a Bill must be introduced soon in order to bring this State into line with other States. A system of T.A.B. will correct an undesirable social anomaly in this State; it will provide revenue; and it will help save a great industry.

Mr. Hughes: You are giving your reasons why a Bill should be introduced?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes.

Mr. Hughes: Yet you deny another member his chance to say why it should not be.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The honourable member misunderstands my point. I cannot introduce a Bill, nor can the honourable member. I say we should have a Bill, and I do not deny any member his right to oppose it, but it cannot be opposed until it has been introduced.

Mr. Hudson: Some members are opposed to any form of T.A.B.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The motion does not give us T.A.B. even if it is carried.

Mr. Hudson: Why then introduce the Bill?

Mr. Jennings: All this is getting horribly confusing.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: If a member does not want T.A.B. he at least should allow Parliament an opportunity to discuss it and, if he opposes it, then he opposes the Bill. The usual procedure to rectify an anomaly is to introduce a Bill, but a private member cannot do that in this case. Victoria first introduced legalized off-course betting, and other States have since legislated to introduce a system which, in every case, can surely be described as "similar to Victoria", where T.A.B. has been well proven. Each State has moulded its legislation and has altered the Victorian system to suit its own requirements. That, of course, is what we shall do when a Bill is introduced. Being last, South Australia has the opportunity to be the best dressed in this matter. When the Bill is being drafted, and when it is later discussed in this House, we shall have an opportunity to mould and develop a system to suit our peculiar geographical and sociological needs. In other words, our system could be similar to that of Victoria, but it will be designed to suit our population requirements and other requirements that differ from those applying in Victoria. When referring to T.A.B., people naturally think of Victoria because it is the nearest system to this State and because it was the first in Australia. The Victorian system is substantially similar to the one that has operated successfully in New Zealand for the past 15 years.

Mr. Freebairn: When did Western Australia establish T.A.B.?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I think about two or three years ago.

Mr. Clark: I think it had it first of all, didn't it?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Western Australia had a system of betting shops before T.A.B. functioned in Victoria. When T.A.B. was introduced in Victoria many of its senior executives were imported from New Zealand, and the present General Manager and many of his key staff originally came from New Zealand where they had had experience in running an off-course totalizator right from the day it opened there. In his well presented and well authenticated speech, the member for Frome referred to the findings of New York investigators who had recently studied off-course betting systems in New Zealand, Australia, France and England. From a mass of detailed information, and with particular reference to New Zealand, those investigators reached the following conclusions:

The conduct of the various systems of legal off track betting is orderly and dignified. The amount bet on horses since legislation has risen at a lower rate than the rise in national per capita income and other related factors. Legalization of off-course betting has had no effect on consumer purchases generally and has not been a factor in any rise or fall in the rate of consumer credit defaults. It has had no effect on the number of people receiving welfare assistance or on the amounts paid out in such assistance. It has eliminated betting by minors, and illegal bookmaking has been largely eliminated. Betting on horses is accepted as something that people do. No amount of opposition has been successful in making it any less a way of life.

Members who do not support the motion for a Bill for T.A.B. will not stop people betting on horses. I differ from those members because I believe T.A.B. will control betting. Excessive betting is bad; anything carried to excess is bad. S.P. bookmaking is, of course, an illegal and immoral system, from which not even one penny goes into the Revenue of the State or back into racing. S.P. bookmakers are parasites wherever they operate, particularly in South Australia. People who bet with S.P. bookmakers often lose their original stake, play up, and chase their losses, but that cannot happen with T.A.B. It does not lead to excessive betting, but while we oppose it we shall encourage S.P. bookmaking. How can those who oppose T.A.B. say that that is logical? Surely, we must admit that many people desire to bet. All the opposition to their betting and to providing facilities for them will not stop that betting. Police Commissioner C. L. Spencer told the investigators that more than 90 per cent of all bookmaking had been eliminated and that the 3 per cent of the New Zealand Police Force exclusively occupied with law enforcement against bookmaking in pre-T.A.B. days had gone into other areas of work since legalization of off-course betting.

Of course, as the member for Frome also mentioned, these have largely been the conclusions of every Royal Commission that has

inquired into the matter in Great Britain, New Zealand, Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia, New South Wales, and even of the 1933 Royal Commission in South Australia. All of them have recommended an off-course totalizator. I hasten to say that they made these recommendations after hearing the detailed arguments of some of the churches. In most cases the Commissioners concluded that if the evils envisaged by the leaders of these churches were to be cured, the answer was in education and persuasion of the community by those who held these ethical and moral views, and not by recourse to the law to impose their views on the community at large.

Mr. Casey: It boils down to the fact that you must bring these things out into the open.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Quite so! Those well-meaning people should spend more of their time in persuading people that gambling is wrong rather than in simply telling them it is wrong and seeking to have it made illegal. As the member for Mitcham has said on several recent occasions in this House, nowhere in the world has it been possible to prevent people from gambling in moderation when they believe that nothing is morally wrong with this. Certain honourable members believe that gambling is immoral, and they are entitled to that view, but many thousands of people who do not agree with them can see nothing immoral in betting on a horse or in investing money on the Stock Exchange. I do not believe it is worse to have a bet on a racecourse than to have a bet on the Stock Exchange. People have lost many thousands of pounds through gambling on the Stock Exchange.

Mr. Hudson: That is respectable.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: And so is it respectable to have a bet at Morphettville. It is not immoral to have a bet within the confines of Morphettville, but it is to have a bet on the other side of the tramway lines. The antagonists of T.A.B., who do not bet themselves and want to stop everyone else from doing so legally, say that it is wrong to throw a cloak of legality over something that is a morally bad thing. They say, "You don't legalise murder, rape, prostitution or drunken driving just because some people do these things." The flaw in this argument is that these things are never legal at any time or at any place; however, betting on horses is. I will never be convinced that it is morally right to bet on one side of a racecourse fence and morally wrong to bet on the other. Nor will I be convinced that it is morally right to bet at Port Pirie and not at Whyalla. If the antagonists of T.A.B. are sincere they should seek the abolition of racing and trotting rather than turn a blind eye to the present anomalous situation that permits some to bet and makes it illegal for others to do so.

Some speakers have expressed alarm at the increased turnover on the Victorian T.A.B. and have interpreted this to mean that T.A.B. encourages people to bet. The member for Burnside expressed this opinion. If one examines this matter one finds that the opposite is the truth. The system is deliberately designed not to encourage people to bet: it merely provides a service for those who wish to bet legally. In other words, the objective is to control, not to stimulate, betting. Of course, T.A.B. undoubtedly gets some new clients each year just as the the illegal S.P. bookmakers used to obtain new clients under the old system. However, because it is designed to control and not to stimulate betting, the T.A.B. turnover will never equal the betting turnover that used to be enjoyed by Victoria's S.P. bookmakers. The turnover on the Victorian T.A.B. in the last financial year was £55,824,975, of which 91.33 per cent was in cash and 8.67 per cent was by telephone. Some members seem to place much emphasis on this point and have said that they would allow only telephone betting facilities. If they favour providing a modified system of T.A.B. with only telephone betting, then obviously there would be a system of T.A.B. that would probably prove to be an ineffective system, as these figures prove. In other words, they would provide for a T.A.B. system that would not be a success. If we introduce T.A.B., then let us at least enable it to be successful.

Mr. Hudson: What the honourable member said about the success or otherwise of a T.A.B. system would apply to the previous Government's 14-point plan.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am coming to that. The Victorian Royal Commission estimated the annual pre-T.A.B. turnover of illegal untaxed off-course bookmakers at £162,000,000. Inspector Healy, head of the the gaming branch in Victoria at that time, estimated the turnover at £190,000,000. The New South Wales Commissioner put the illegal annual betting figures in that State at £250,000,000. Many people scoffed at this figure until the S.P. bookmakers of New South Wales banded together and offered to

pay the Government £10,000,000 in advance each year for the right to operate off-course betting in that State. It takes a fair sort of business to justify that sort of annual rental. Of course, the Government refused the bookmakers' offer and has since legislated for a T.A.B. system similar to but not exactly the same as that in Victoria.

The growth of the T.A.B. turnover in Victoria is purely a reflection of the number of agencies operating and it is expected to stabilize at around £80,000,000 once the State is fully serviced. The growth in the number of agencies is governed largely by the availability of trained staff and of suitable premises. Members of the Victorian T.A.B. are men of great integrity and are highly conscious of their responsibility to the community and jealous of the objective of the board which, as I have said, is to control and not to stimulate betting. What they can and cannot do is laid down in the Act under which they operate. Most of the original opponents of T.A.B., both inside and outside Parliament, have disappeared.

Last financial year the State Government's commission amounted to £2,232,997. In addition the Government received a further estimated £450,000, being the remaining fractions after the calculation of dividends. Racing and trotting clubs received £1,821,780. This is money which was previously going to S.P. bookmakers who were as rife in Victoria as they are here now.

T.A.B. does not increase gambling—it decreases it. In New Zealand, where the system has stabilized after 15 years' operation, it has now been clearly demonstrated that totalizator turnover is almost exactly related to the level of business activity as determined by the volume of money in circulation. The figures used to demonstrate this were those of the Reserve Bank of New Zealand. The report that illustrates this is available for any member who wishes to see it. Some speakers have referred to the broken homes caused by people gambling beyond their means. I do not believe that there are as many cases of this as the antagonists of gambling make out. All the Royal Commissioners have concluded that excessive gambling is a comparatively minor cause of broken homes and hardship. One thing is certain: there is less gambling with T.A.B. than with our present undesirable and hypocritical system, which is not only illegal and contemptuous of the law but which allows people to bet by telephone and "on the nod" on credit, and to keep on betting. One cannot lose the next week's wages with T.A.B. However, one can do this with an S.P. bookmaker, and many people do. Therefore, all this talk about the hardship T.A.B. would bring is unrealistic. It may be true in some cases, but surely if we believe that betting and gambling does that sort of thing we must acknowledge that it is not T.A.B. but the S.P. bookmaker that causes it. People will bet with the S.P. bookmaker and they will collect their dividends and play them up again. A person cannot do that under T.A.B., so where is the logic of the argument that we should oppose T.A.B. for this reason? If we do not have T.A.B. this S.P. betting will still go on.

We have only to look at the space and time devoted to racing and trotting by newspapers, radio and television, and to consider the tipping contests. These organizations do not devote this space and time for fun or just because they themselves happen to like racing and trotting; they do it because of the great public interest in these sports. Because people go to the football it does not mean that they are not also interested in the races. Fields are listed and numbered in the *Football Budget*, and results are posted on all metropolitan grounds. Many thousands in the city and the country listen to the races on portable radios as they watch other sports. Many people in South Australia have their little flutter with the S.P. bookmaker before they go to football, bowls or other sport, and if they are at the football they turn on their transistor radios and listen to the results or wait for them to be posted on the board. These are the ordinary people—the people who want T.A.B. and want to be treated like their brothers in other States. I have heard much about being "my brother's keeper", but what about our brothers in Victoria? People today in 1965 will not be treated as children, or not for long anyway. Many of them bet, and a good many of those who do not bet have no objection to others betting. The problem of illegal betting and the desires of ordinary people will not go away just because we ignore the problem or bury our heads in the sand like ostriches or put our heads in a bag by refusing to bring in a moderated T.A.B. system that will control and not stimulate betting. We will not do away with this betting: it will still go on; and just because people do not talk to us about it it does not mean that they are not interested or that they do not bet. People will mostly tell you what they think you want to hear, and if they know that you are

strongly opposed to gambling it is unlikely that the subject will be mentioned.

The views of the member for Wallaroo are well known, and it is unlikely that many people would bother to discuss gambling with him. This applies to other members on both sides. Their attitude is, "My mind is made up, so don't bother me with facts." It is no wonder that not many people bother to discuss the subject with them. On the other hand, I, too, have made myself clear on this. People know where I stand and they have always known it. Over the years, not hundreds but thousands of people have spoken to me and said that they want T.A.B. Many people have asked me all about it, and they have said that they are a little confused. They say they do not like excessive gambling, but when the system in Victoria is explained to them they come around and say that the system has much logic, and they support it.

Like other members, I have received petitions against T.A.B. However, I ask honourable members: what is the value of a petition collected outside a church on a subject such as this? Only a courageous person would refuse to sign when a petition was thrust under his nose by the local minister in front of other members of the church. I have petitions here from the two main towns in my district against T.A.B., with 141 signatures in all. In other words, throughout the district 141 people signed a petition against T.A.B. On the other hand, I have the signatures of 233 people from one town and 223 from the other, making 456 people who are anxious for a T.A.B. system to be established. I think the member for Adelaide said he had over 5,000 signatures. The point is that many people who are not great gamblers or punters like to go to the races on special days: they like the glamour of racing, and they like to have a friendly bet, and their attitude is that if other people like to have a bet legally through an off-course betting facility they can see no objection to it. In other words, they cannot see why another person who wants to bet should be stopped from doing so. To indicate just how easy it is to collect petitions, the Off-course Totalizator Committee, of which I have the honour to be a member, recently collected 5,600 signatures in two days, without really trying; and there was certainly no great inducement to sign. In fact, people had to seek out the petition. Some who signed it said they welcomed the opportunity to do so because they had signed a petition opposing T.A.B. in circumstances that made it difficult for them to refuse. Therefore, I place no great store on petitions on such issues.

The member for Wallaroo said that T.A.B. was the first step on the road back to betting shops. He did not demonstrate the connection or show that it is happening elsewhere. He referred to Western Australia, but he refrained from mentioning that T.A.B. and betting shops were operating side by side there and that T.A.B. was gradually winning. On the subject of South Australian betting shops, the member for Wallaroo quoted Sir Chester Manifold, the Chairman of the Victorian T.A.B. When I say "quoted", he quoted only part of Sir Chester's remarks; he conveniently refused to go on with the rest or to say what the conclusion was. Now is this an honest way to argue? It is insulting to members to be treated to such a naive explanation. Sir Chester was speaking at the annual presentation dinner of Adelaide metropolitan racing clubs at Morphettville on August 16, 1962. What he said, of course, was that South Australia had, in introducing betting shops, done a wonderful job for racing by showing how not to handle the off-course betting problem. His actual words were:

I want to congratulate South Australia on the wonderful job they did for racing in Australia by introducing betting shops . . . That might make you laugh and wonder why I say that. The introduction of betting shops in South Australia had such a disastrous effect on racing in Australia that everybody in Australia is quite convinced betting shops will not be tolerated in any circumstances whatsoever. If it had not been for the experiment in South Australia, where you tried it out and showed what a complete failure it was, and so courageously got rid of it, it might have spread into other States.

That is where the member for Wallaroo conveniently ended the quote, although in reply to an interjection he said he had quoted Sir Chester in full on the subject of betting shops. However, Sir Chester went on to say:

In this fight to get T.A.B., betting shops are one thing that has always been brought up. The critics say, "You are introducing betting shops." It has taken a long time to persuade people that that is not so.

He had much more to say, and later on in his address he described the success of T.A.B. in Victoria and how it had cleaned up a social evil and was an ideal way to conduct off-course betting. He concluded by saying:

It is dam silly to say that you can stop off-course betting. Give the people something that will not encourage them to bet, something that is going to return revenue to the Government and revenue to the racing clubs.

So much for the half quotation of the member for Wallaroo, who also quoted

from letters received from various Methodist synods—no doubt in full in that case. Although I respect the view of these gentlemen and their right to hold such views, I do not believe that they speak for all lay members as they profess to do. These people are not running the country. I believe that we, as members, have a duty to represent all the people, not a selected few who would seek to impose their view on others, views which cannot be justified when all the facts are considered. The member for Wallaroo's suggested remedy to off-course betting was to gaol the S.P. bookmakers. The next logical step would, no doubt, be to close the hotels and gaol those who sold liquor. Then we would be right back to Chicago in the prohibition days of the 1930's. Is this what the honourable member wants? It is beyond me how anyone can close his eyes to what is going on, and to the success in all ways of off-course totalizators in other countries and other States.

The member for Wallaroo is entitled to his view, but he does not believe in gambling of any description and would close down racecourses. How long will South Australia tolerate being the out-of-step laughing stock of other States? The simple facts are these: S.P. betting is rife here and increasing; the Government is losing much needed revenue; and racing and trotting are going downhill. T.A.B. is the only cure—a cure that has been well proven elsewhere. In places where it has been introduced, none of the terrible things prophesied by some members has happened. The Leader believes that the agency system encourages betting. This cannot be proved. If one speaks to some of the agents and suggests that they have time to canvass clients, or that time spent in this way is worthwhile, one will find they do not have time to do so even if they were so inclined.

Last financial year, the Victorian Totalizator Agency Board operated on 540 meetings, that is, more than 10 a week and more than two a day. For each event, not only must bets be recorded but they must be collated, checked, totalled for each horse and submitted to the central agency or the on-course totalizator at the appropriate time. Apart from win and place betting, there are daily doubles, feature doubles and quinella betting to be treated in the same way. If members do not consider this to be a full-time and demanding business, when there are often more than eight events in a single programme, they should visit an agency in Victoria and watch. The suggestion that busy agents have time to canvass bettors is laughable. In Victoria there are penalties for so doing, and agents can have their licences removed, as there is stringent control and discipline of agents.

Not that a system of agents is strictly necessary. This is a detail which need not be considered here, but could be considered when a Bill is introduced. I said a moment ago that racing and trotting were going downhill. This is happening in many ways—not only is a great revenue-producing industry being threatened, but the problem of keeping it straight, honest, and clean is increasing when costs are rising, and stakes are largely stationary, and, even to "crack square", owners, trainers and jockeys have to punt or receive support from someone connected with betting. To race for the stake alone does not cover costs in South Australia except with the rare exceptional horses.

Of the 2,000 or so racing and trotting horses in South Australia, only a handful pay their keep from the stakes they win. In these circumstances, there is always the temptation to influence the odds by interfering with the conduct of races. This is particularly true when a great deal of "behind the scenes" power is concentrated in the hands of a few large, illegal, but difficult to apprehend S.P. operators. More than anything else, racing and trotting supporters want to see good horses that always run up to their ability. T.A.B. removes any fears that there could be interference in the conduct of races because of personal gain to individuals from heavy off-course wagering. No-one knows the extent of illegal betting in South Australia, but it is rife and increasing. It could amount to £50,000,000 a year.

On a population basis based on figures elsewhere, eventual T.A.B. turnover in South Australia could amount to £20,000,000 annually. Of this 5 per cent, or £1,000,000, would be the Government's share. This would be in addition to the £750,000 that the Government already receives each year from racing and trotting. Here we have an industry that employs thousands, gives interest to hundreds of thousands, and is worth nearly £2,000,000 each year directly to revenue. How many other industries directly contribute so much? If an industry only half this size were threatened, would it not be the duty of every member of this House to do something about it? T.A.B. is the answer on all counts, and

it is a matter of urgency that a Bill concerning it be introduced as soon as possible.

When this is done we shall have the opportunity to debate the issue in detail. As to a referendum as suggested by the member for Wallaroo, this would be time-consuming, costly, and buckpassing. We have the power, indeed the obligation, to decide this matter here. I do not fear the results of a referendum, but I am strongly opposed to such a course. Freedom of thought and freedom to please oneself is part of the Australian way of life and surely nobody would wish otherwise. Unfortunately, some vocal people seem to oppose almost any kind of rational social reform on "moral" grounds.

If these citizens had their way they would ban altogether such things as drinking, gambling, lotteries, dancing, etc., in fact, most of the social activities in which ordinary people take pleasure. Gallup polls in all States have shown that a majority favour legalized off-course betting. In a 1956 Gallup poll in which people were asked, "Do you think off-the-course betting should be made legal or not?" three out of four people said "Yes". The poll disclosed that legal off-course betting was favoured by big majorities of Catholics, Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists. No-one will deny that there should be moderation in all things, or that some people will at times over-indulge. But this is the fault of the person, not the system.

At present, S.P. betting is largely associated with drinking and the encouragement to keep on betting and not go home. Public sympathy is with the S.P. bookmaker rather than with the police who try to catch him. This situation would be reversed if people could bet legally. It is all very well to say that the police do not agree. They will not commit themselves. Honourable members, with a wide and broad knowledge of Australian conditions, know that, if one visits an average Australian hotel on a Saturday afternoon where an S.P. bookmaker operates and the police ask someone if he knows about the bookmaker, the person will walk away and say that he does not know anything about it. That is why it is difficult for the police. I do not set myself up as an expert, but I have studied the opinions of Royal Commissioners. On the moral question, Mr. Justice Kinsella (N.S.W. Royal Commissioner into off-course betting, 1963) said:

Unlearned as I am in theology, I do not believe it is an immoral or sinful act to make a bet or take a ticket in a lottery.

The South Australian Royal Commission on Betting, 1933, stated:

The view we take is that betting is not immoral in itself, that there is nothing immoral or sinful in making a bet that is within one's means and does not injure one's dependants or one's peace of mind.

Chairman of the Victorian T.A.B., Sir Chester Manifold, said:

The attitude of the churches has changed considerably. T.A.B. has cleaned up all this betting around hotels and cleaned up a lot of underworld activity, so their attitude to it has changed. They appreciate what we have done. The T.A.B. is a social reform and a force for good. It should be encouraged and supported by all clear-thinking citizens.

As for thrift, until 1960 South Australia had led other States in volume of savings *per capita*. In the last three years Victoria has had a higher *per capita* saving rate than any other State's. No-one would suggest that this added saving rate is a direct result of Victoria's decision to introduce T.A.B. But, however we measure it, T.A.B. has proved that it is not harmful to savings.

Wagers could be made in three ways—by cash, by postal note, or by telephone against pre-established funds. They could be transmitted from the sub-agencies to agencies and then to collating centres for transmission at regular intervals to the totalizator operating at the meeting, where either racing or trotting was being conducted. Modern means of communication would make it reasonably easy to transmit the wagers. As the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) said, many of his constituents have credit facilities in Portland and Casterton, and telephone their bets through on a Saturday morning.

Unit of investment would be 5s., and if experience showed there was a demand for wagering at a lesser unit, provision could be made accordingly. Dividends on cash investments would be paid in cash, or by cheque on the first week day following the race meeting. Telephone or postal investments would be paid by cheque or money order or bank draft posted on the first convenient day after the race meeting. There would be no credit betting to encourage people to go beyond their depth. No finance will be required from the Government. All necessary finance to establish the T.A.B. will be provided by all racing bodies (including trotting and racing). T.A.B. would greatly help country racing and trotting; clubs would receive enough from profits to enable them to increase stakes and to improve facilities to an extent not possible at present. There are 67 racing and trotting

clubs in South Australia, and they are the backbone of an industry that employs thousands, and gives pleasure to many more.

With the exception of those at Port Pirie, the many thousands of country people now interested in racing have to break the law to make a bet. Of course, many do this each week. Country people are becoming fed up with the unfair discrimination. At least 25,000 adults attended the last Adelaide Cup meeting, and at least another 100,000 listened to the result, or had an interest in the race. More than 50,000 attended Oakbank this year, and more than 40,000 were present on the final night of the Inter-Dominion Trotting Championships at Wayville. An Australia-wide Gallup poll showed that 47 per cent of the questioned cross section bet on races. Most of these favoured some form of legal off-course betting. Only about one-third of the non-betting 53 per cent were actually against off-course betting. Apart from the moral and democratic unjustness of making people break the law to do something they do not consider is wrong, the present situation is wasteful.

If the money now going to S.P. operators were diverted to legal channels, millions of pounds in revenue would soon become available to build more and better schools and hospitals, and benefit the State generally. Investors would receive better odds, and would always be paid. Racing clubs would have more revenue to lift stakes and to improve facilities for the industry and those who support it. The exodus of good horses and riders to other States would be halted. Naturally, the thousands who attend racing and trotting have no objection to T.A.B. Many of those who play or watch football, cricket, bowls, tennis, etc., would welcome the opportunity to make a wager through the local agency before going on to their respective sports—without being classed as criminals. In fact, who in South Australia would not benefit from T.A.B.?

Those whose livelihood depends on the racing industry, those who enjoy the sport, and those who desire to have a modest wager on a galloping or trotting race by telephone or with cash all demand the right to bet legally. Off-course betting can never be completely suppressed. T.A.B. aims to regulate and control it for the good of the industry and the community as a whole. Why force people to be immoral by making them bet illegally?

People in this State are becoming fed up with the "everybody-out-of-step-but-our-Jim" attitude on social issues. Citizens in most States of the Commonwealth can bet off-course and enjoy other social facilities not allowed in South Australia. Legislators must be told to stop burying their heads in the sand and to start treating their electors like adults. After all, who runs who? The following is what I consider should be embodied in legislation to introduce T.A.B.: A board should be appointed by the Governor in Council to be called the "Totalizator Agency Board" (hereinafter called "the Board".)

Mr. Heaslip: You are only surmising all this.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Government has to provide this in a Bill. I am suggesting the line that should be taken. The board should consist of six members nominated by the following bodies and appointed by the Minister: (*a*) one by the South Australian Jockey Club Inc.; (*b*) one by the Adelaide Racing Club Inc.; (*c*) one by the Port Adelaide Racing Club Inc.; (*d*) one by the South Australian Trotting Club Inc.; (*e*) one by the governing body of the S.A. Country Racing Clubs' Association; (*f*) one by the governing body of the S.A. Trotting League Inc. It is desirable that representatives of the abovementioned bodies should constitute the board as they will be supplying the capital for its establishment and responsible for its successful administration. The board should annually elect one of its number to be Chairman of the board for a period of two years. He will be appointed by the Minister. The board should have full power to manage the general business and affairs of the totalizator agency board. It may appoint and at any time remove a manager, a secretary and any employees it may think necessary for the purpose of carrying out its objectives.

The board should establish at least 10 cash and telephone offices or agencies in country areas, a telephone betting service, and an absolute minimum number of cash offices in the metropolitan area for a trial period. It will be appreciated that, in the public interest, and to ensure the success of T.A.B. and the development of a system that will suit South Australian conditions, the board must have discretionary powers to open a minimum number of additional agencies or offices (or to close them) where it is deemed to be in the public interest.

If this discretionary power is not provided for in the Act now, another amendment to the Act would have to be made by Parliament at a later stage. It is considered that it would not be politically expedient to be frequently opening the Lottery and Gaming Act. The

overall objective of the board should be to control and not stimulate betting, and to conduct off-course betting in a manner not detrimental to the public interest or offensive to the non-betting public. The board should be able to make arrangements to provide the finance for the cost of establishment and staffing of offices and agencies. All bets made at the offices or agencies of the board should be transmitted to the course totalizator and be subject to the ruling tax payable under the Stamp Duties Act, 1923.

Section 28 of the Lottery and Gaming Act should be amended to provide 13 per cent of money paid into the totalizator in respect of each race. Of the money deducted, 8 per cent should be retained by the board and the remaining 5 per cent should be payable under the Stamp Duties Act, 1923. After payment to the Treasurer of the tax under the Stamp Duties Act, the club should forthwith pay to the board the commission received in respect to all bets made through the offices or agencies of the board, and the board should apply the amount so paid, first, in or towards paying the costs and expenses of the operations of the board in carrying out its functions; secondly, in or towards in such proportion as the board shall decide, to meet the preoperational or establishment costs of offices or agencies or for making additions to or improvements to existing offices or agencies; thirdly, in deducting major charges being reimbursement costs associated with the administration of racing and trotting generally in South Australia (any such deductions under this provision to be approved by the Chief Secretary); and fourthly, in annual or other periodical payments to the participating racing and trotting clubs on an assessment basis of prize money paid by such racing and trotting clubs. Racing and trotting profits should be separate accounts and calculated in the proportion that investments with the board on either racing or trotting bear to the total moneys invested respectively.

All offices and agencies should operate on local and interstate mid-week and week-end racing and trotting meetings, at the discretion of the board. Offices and agencies should remain open to the public at the discretion of the board. The offices should provide for both cash and telephone betting. No cash or telephone investments should be made later than 40 minutes before each event. No waiting room or seating accommodation should be provided for members of the public at such offices or agencies. No broadcast, telecast or other description of any event should be provided or available for members of the public at such offices or agencies. In fact, there are some penalties for this in Victoria. No announcement, notice or information should be made or given to the public at any office or agency in respect of any event before it is decided, except the name, starting time and location of the event and the names and numbers of the starters in the event.

No dividend payable in respect of any bet should be payable at any office or agency on the day of the event or be available as a credit account for any further bet on that day. A credit account could be established with the board for any amount of not less than one pound and could be maintained by the payment of further moneys or the crediting of winnings to that account. No person under 21 years of age should be permitted to establish credit or bet at any office or agency. Progressive opening for T.A.B. in South Australia should be as follows: A central telephone betting service for Adelaide and suburbs; control offices or agencies (a minmum of 10) at main country centres with provisions for both cash and telephone betting.

Mr. Hudson: How many agencies would there be?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: That would be left to the board to decide in the public interest. I am putting forward the type of system that would be ideal. My third point in the progressive opening of T.A.B. would be the establishment of an absolute minimum number of agencies in appropriate parts of the metropolitan area at first, with further offices and agencies established as deemed fit in the public interest. The above agencies and offices should operate on week-end and mid-week racing and trotting meetings at the discretion of the board, and provide a skeleton betting service throughout the State.

Mr. Nankivell: Is this system similar to that in Victoria?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It would be similar but that does not mean it would be exactly the same. The system that should be introduced should allow for conditions in South Australia, in respect to population and so on, that are different from those in Victoria. The overall objective of the board should be to control and stimulate betting, and to conduct off-course betting in a manner not detrimental to the public interest or offensive to the non-betting public. A T.A.B. system would thus help to eliminate S.P. betting and gain much needed revenue for the Treasury and the industry.

I have had the pleasure of witnessing racing in France, England, America and Canada. In France, which is one of the richest and probably one of the greatest racing countries in the world, contrary to general belief the Pari Mutuel is not State-run, but the State gets a big rake-off of 22 per cent. There are no bookmakers in France.

Mr. Nankivell: Are there any S.P. bookmakers?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, S.P. betting has been practically eliminated, as it has been in New Zealand. The Pari Mutuel is a private company set up by the racecourses themselves. The turnover at Longchamps on the day the Grand Prix was run was 41,000,000 francs or about £3,000,000 sterling. In 1964, the Pari Mutuel's turnover was 4,415,000,000 francs (more than £300,000,000), which ranks it as the tenth biggest business in France. About 9 per cent of the Pari Mutuel's receipts goes to the French racecourse companies and is used as prize money for winning horses, and for maintenance and running costs of the courses. This one fact alone accounts for the extraordinary prosperity of French racing, and the high quality of French racehorses.

In 1964 this 9 per cent share of the Pari Mutuel's receipts enabled the courses to give 135,000,000 francs in prize money (about £10,000,000). With money like this at stake there is great competition among owners to seek the best available stock. The Pari Mutuel has 2,000 offices throughout France, nearly all of them in cafes. The cafe owners provide a cubicle, and clerks to take the bets, and in return they get 1 per cent of the money they take. Of the 4,415,000,000 francs turnover in 1964, 3,845,000,000 francs came from the cafes and 570,000,000 francs was actually bet on the courses. The State's share of the total betting turnover is, on the average, 22 per cent (it varies, according to the price of the winning horse, between 14 and 27 per cent), and in 1964 the French Government's slice of the betting cake was 980,000,000 francs. Of this total the State got 540,000,000 francs, gave 31,000,000 francs to the national stud (which helps breeding in making stallions of high quality available to small breeders), and 409,000,000 francs to the racecourse companies, as provided by law. The racecourse companies also collected 36,000,000 francs in admission charges in 1964. They thus had a total income of 445,000,000 francs. The prizes for owners amounted to 135,000,000 francs, and premiums for breeders totalled 11,000,000 francs. (The breeder of a winning horse also received one-tenth of the prize-money, even if the horse did not belong to him, unless the horse was born outside France.) A total of 119,000,000 francs was allocated to the cost of maintaining the courses and training centres, and 180,000,000 francs was for administration expenses. Last year the racecourse companies used all their resources, but this is not always the case: they have reserves amounting to about 200,000,000 francs, and they own land to the value of between 300,000,000 and 400,000,000 francs.

In New Zealand, before 1920 bookmakers and totalizators operated. In 1920 a Gaming Act was passed to make bookmaking illegal, and on-course totalizators and S.P. illegal bookmakers operated from then on. In 1946 a Royal Commission that was held recommended the legalizing of off-course betting. Following a 1949 referendum, in which more than two-thirds favoured an off-course totalizator, the necessary legislation was passed and T.A.B. started in 1951. The T.A.B. in New Zealand operates both offices and commission agencies, and there is no credit betting and no pay-out until the next day. Telephone betting has remained at around 5½ per cent to 6½ per cent of the total.

The point I make is that some members argue that they favour only a telephone betting T.A.B. system in the metropolitan area. Those members should study the figures relating to the small percentage of telephone betting that takes place. Victoria has found that only about 8 per cent is accounted for by telephone betting. From the figures it is obvious that telephone betting is really only just a dribble compared with the total betting. It would not be a proper system if only telephone betting operated.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There are no bookmakers in New Zealand?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No. All my information from New Zealand is that S.P. bookmaking has been practically eliminated there. The totalizator tax to the Government there represents 5 per cent, the retained income for the board is 7½ per cent, and the capital levy is ½ per cent, leaving 87 per cent to be distributed in dividends. The Government also collects a dividend tax of 5 per cent, leaving the balance available for distribution in winning dividends of 82.65 per cent of the total. The amount payable to each club is assessed as follows: 15 per cent of the total is divided equally among all clubs, and the remaining 85 per cent is divided in the proportion that the total of on-course plus off-course totalizator

turnover for each club bears to the total of all clubs for the year.

Turning to New South Wales, on September 6 there were 49 cash agencies, 33 being in Sydney and eight in Newcastle and the Coalfields areas. They have planned a branch rate of six a month. Some delays have been caused because placement of offices must be subject to town planning schemes. The development was financed by £1,000,000 contributed by metropolitan racing and trotting clubs, which will ultimately be recouped from 1 per cent turnover placed with the trust account. This £1,000,000 will shortly be exhausted, and it may be necessary to finance further expansion from profits. At present the T.A.B. is operating direct offices, but there is provision in the legislation for other agencies. These have not been established, but probably they will be.

Turning to Victoria, the 1964 turnover on racing in the metropolitan area was £20,836,214. In 1965 it had risen to £25,006,063, an increase of 20.01 per cent. In the country, the 1964 figure was £10,405,140, and in 1965 it had risen to £14,397,381, an increase of 38.37 per cent. On interstate racing the 1964 figure was £3,156,329, and had risen to £6,320,710 in 1965, an increase of 100.26 per cent. With regard to trotting, in 1964 the metropolitan figure was £3,460,000, and in 1965 it was £4,413,601, an increase of 27.54 per cent. In the country, the 1964 figure was £2,735,421, and in 1965 it had risen to £5,651,000, an increase of 106.6 per cent. The total investment was £40,593,788 in 1964 and £55,824,975 in 1965, a total increase of 37.52 per cent.

The point I wish to illustrate is the division between cash and telephone betting. In 1964 the cash betting amounted to £36,642,257, and in 1965 it had risen to £50,984,867, an increase of 90.27 per cent. The telephone betting amounted to £3,951,531 in 1964 and in 1965 it was £4,840,000. The percentage of the cash betting to the total was 91.33 per cent, and the telephone betting was only 8.67 per cent. That shows how little is accounted for by the telephone betting system. In other words, experience has shown that people are not very keen on that type of thing: they would sooner go up to the office and make their cash bet.

The State Government commission of 4 per cent of net turnover amounted to £2,232,997. In addition, the Government received a further estimated £450,000, being the remaining fractions after the calculation of dividends. From March, 1961, to July, 1961, the Government commission was £76,522; £19,130 was repaid for establishment costs, and the balance for the Hospitals and Charities Fund amounted to £57,392. From August, 1964, to July, 1965, the Government commission was, as I said, £2,232,997; the establishment repayment was £139,000, and the amount paid to hospitals and charities was £2,093,434, making the Government commission since T.A.B. started in Victoria £5,541,667; the establishment repayment, £594,559; and the balance for hospitals and charities, £4,947,108.

I have a list here which I think may be of interest, particularly to rural members, for it shows the distribution of the available funds, being a division of £1,821,780 for the year ended July 31, 1965. I do not want to weary members by reading out all those figures. The system shows how it has improved racing, and the list indicates the increases from 1964 to 1965. As the list is a long one, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABLE FUNDS.

| | 1965. £ | 1964. £ |
|---|---|---|
| Administration Costs (Payable to V.R.C.) | 213,250 | 173,059 |
| Metropolitan Clubs: | | |
| Victoria Racing Club | 225,015 | 189,388 |
| Moonee Valley Racing Club | 196,031 | 151,964 |
| Victoria Amateur Turf Club (incorporating M.R.C.) | 352,430 | 289,730 |
| Country Clubs: | | |
| Special Non-Totalizator Fund | 31,974 | 24,907 |
| Apsley Racing Club | 292 | 280 |
| Ararat Turf Club | 1,167 | 765 |
| Avoca Shire Turf Club | — | 190 |
| Bacchus Marsh Racing Club | 773 | 552 |
| Bacchus Marsh St. Patricks Race Club | 328 | 152 |
| Bairnsdale Hibernian Racing Club | 272 | 209 |
| Bairnsdale Racing Club | 2,425 | 1,462 |
| Ballan Jockey Club | 1,108 | 914 |
| Ballarat Turf Club | 41,612 | 28,292 |
| Benalla Racing Club | 2,054 | 1,952 |
| Benalla St. Patricks Race Club | 510 | 361 |
| Bendigo Jockey Club | 39,769 | 27,682 |
| Brim Springs & Rosebrook Race Club | 297 | 218 |
| Bungaree Turf Club | 239 | 147 |
| Burrumbeet Park & Windermere Race Club | 661 | 423 |
| Camperdown Turf Club | 1,041 | 850 |
| Casterton Racing Club | 2,165 | 1,534 |
| Chiltern Racing Club | 1,142 | 1,135 |
| Chiltern St. Patricks Racing Club | 233 | 161 |
| Cobden Turf Club | 794 | 788 |
| Colac Turf Club | 10,198 | 5,287 |

| | 1965. £ | 1964. £ |
|---|---|---|
| Coleraine Racing Club .. | 3,573 | 2,132 |
| Cranbourne Turf Club .. | 34,199 | 22,860 |
| Donald District Jockey Club .. .. .. .. .. | 1,931 | 969 |
| Dunkeld Racing Club .. | 236 | 166 |
| Echuca Racing Club .. | 1,499 | 1,197 |
| Edenhope Race Club .. | 1,171 | 841 |
| Elmore Racing Club .. | 629 | 427 |
| Garvoc Racing Club .. | 444 | 389 |
| Geelong Racing Club .. | 31,250 | 26,056 |
| Geelong St. Patricks Race Club .. .. .. .. | 697 | 465 |
| Goulburn Valley Turf Club .. .. .. .. .. | 1,416 | 1,168 |
| Great Western Race Club | 256 | 228 |
| Gunbower Race Club .. | 463 | 247 |
| Hamilton Racing Club .. | 5,987 | 3,811 |
| Hampden Racing Club .. | 384 | 503 |
| Hanging Rock Race Club | 1,012 | 551 |
| Hawkesdale Racing Club | 281 | — |
| Heathcote Racing Club . | 1,187 | 949 |
| Horsham Race Club .. .. | 441 | 522 |
| Horsham St. Patricks Racing Club .. .. .. | 280 | 204 |
| Kaniva Racing Club .. | 307 | 237 |
| Kerang Turf Club .. .. | 1,042 | 1,182 |
| Kilmore St. Patricks Racing Club .. .. .. | 368 | 319 |
| Kilmore Turf Club .. .. | 5,368 | 4,038 |
| Koroit Racing Club . .. | 621 | 461 |
| Kyneton District Racing Club .. .. .. .. .. | 21,503 | 14,407 |
| Lake Bolac Race Club . | 312 | 242 |
| Lockhart Racing Club .. | 250 | 233 |
| Macarthur Racing Club . | 537 | 456 |
| Manangatang Racing Club .. .. .. .. .. | 518 | 446 |
| Mansfield District Racing Club .. .. .. | 826 | 793 |
| Marma Turf Club .. .. | 277 | 416 |
| Marong Racing Club .. | 776 | 478 |
| Mildura Racing Club .. | 2,837 | 1,553 |
| Minyip Turf Club .. .. | 335 | 280 |
| Moe Racing Club .. .. | 13,434 | 8,743 |
| Mornington Racing Club | 34,158 | 25,910 |
| Mortlake Racing Club .. | 679 | 323 |
| Mt. Wycheproof District Racing Club .. .. .. | 474 | 347 |
| Murtoa Racing Club .. | 1,289 | 708 |
| Newstead-Maryborough Turf Club .. .. .. .. | 829 | 902 |
| Nhill Race Club .. .. .. | 729 | 423 |
| Pakenham Racing Club . | 34,445 | 24,836 |
| Penshurst Racing Club . | 628 | 446 |
| Penshurst Boxing Day Race Club .. .. .. .. | 388 | 370 |
| Purnim Racing Club .. | 473 | 557 |
| Quambatook Racing Club | 253 | 204 |
| Rochester Jockey Club .. | 953 | 670 |
| Rosedale Racing Club .. | 503 | 470 |
| St. Arnaud Turf Club .. | 1,292 | 1,026 |
| Sale Turf Club .. .. .. | 10,472 | 7,126 |
| Seymour Racing Club .. | 19,659 | 15,018 |
| Sheep Hills Turf Club . | 346 | 275 |
| South Gippsland Racing Club .. .. .. .. .. | 249 | 285 |
| Stawell Amateur Turf Club .. .. .. .. .. | 1,611 | 1,244 |
| Swan Hill Jockey Club . | 2,352 | 1,850 |
| Swan Hill St. Patricks Race Club .. .. .. .. | 305 | 190 |
| Tatura Turf Club .. .. | 760 | 684 |
| Terang Racing Club .. | 1,857 | 1,508 |
| Towong Turf Club .. .. | 626 | 632 |
| Traralgon Racing Club | 2,539 | 1,635 |
| Trentham Racing Club . | 358 | 349 |
| Wangaratta St. Patricks Racing Club .. .. .. | 307 | 266 |
| Wangaratta Turf Club . | 5,334 | 3,949 |
| Warracknabeal Turf Club | 1,314 | 1,368 |
| Warrnambool Racing Club .. .. .. .. .. | 21,830 | 12,982 |
| Watchem-Birchip District Race Club .. | 1,362 | 992 |
| Werribee Racing Club .. | 39,933 | 33,056 |
| Wodonga Turf Club .. | 1,502 | 1,185 |
| Wodonga St. Patricks Racing Club .. .. .. | 241 | 171 |
| Woodend Race Club .. | 8,891 | 5,112 |
| Woodford Racing Club . | 503 | 634 |
| Yarra Glen Racing Club | 30,349 | 21,263 |
| Trotting: | | |
| Administration Costs (Payable to T.C.B.) . | 19,000 | 19,000 |
| Metropolitan Club: | | |
| Trotting Control Board . | 137,797 | 101,644 |
| Country Clubs: | | |
| Ararat, Stawell & District Trotting Club . | 3,447 | 1,071 |
| Ballarat & District Trotting Club .. .. .. .. | 18,211 | 11,201 |
| Bendigo District Trotting Club .. .. .. .. | 17,809 | 10,261 |
| Boort Trotting Club . .. | 364 | 221 |
| Charlton Trotting Club . | 1,149 | 741 |
| Cobram & District Trotting Club .. .. .. .. | 450 | 240 |
| Cranbourne Trotting Club | 13,502 | 5,215 |
| Echuca Trotting Club .. | 1,084 | 1,285 |
| Geelong Trotting Club . | 20,946 | 12,575 |
| Goulburn Valley Trotting Club (Shepparton) .. | 16,029 | 9,915 |
| Gunbower Trotting Club | 281 | 139 |
| Healesville Trotting Club | 3,109 | 679 |
| Kilmore Trotting Club . | 11,236 | 7,561 |
| Maryborough Trotting Club .. .. .. .. .. | 2,363 | 635 |
| Mooroopna Trotting Club | 1,557 | 300 |
| North Western Trotting Club (Stawell) .. .. | 7,958 | 3,696 |
| Ouyen Trotting Club .. | 1,753 | 724 |
| St. Arnaud & District Trotting Club .. .. .. | 1,143 | 450 |
| Sunraysia Trotting Club (Mildura) . .. .. .. | 12,738 | 2,361 |
| Terang Trotting Club .. | 12,349 | 7,641 |
| Wangaratta Trotting Club .. .. .. .. .. | 5,868 | 1,946 |
| Warragul & District Trotting Club . .. .. | 16,223 | 10,004 |
| Wedderburn & District Trotting Club .. .. .. | 558 | 277 |
| Wimmera Trotting Club (Horsham) . .. .. .. | 2,636 | 792 |

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The list is particularly interesting to country members because it shows what happens in Victoria. I support this motion, and I hope I have set out a case so that honourable members will support the motion and so that a Bill

will be introduced. It is the duty and obligation of the Government to introduce a Bill, and then it is the duty of each honourable member to support or oppose it according to his view, as this establishes the principle, of which I am in favour, that Parliament shall determine the issue one way or the other. I commend the motion to the House and hope that a Bill to establish T.A.B. in South Australia will be introduced.

Mr. HUDSON secured th adjournment of the debate.

## M.T.T. FARES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

That the by-law of the Municipal Tramways Trust, in respect of increases of fares, made on August 11, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on August 24, 1965, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1977.)

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the motion and congratulate the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) on bringing this matter before the House. No doubt it was inspired by the action of the Tramways Trust in making a by-law dated August 11, 1965 and which was laid on the table on August 24. Pursuant to this by-law, fares were increased for the third section from 1s. to 1s. 6d.; for the sixth section from 1s. 6d. to 2s.; and for the 10th section from 2s. to 2s. 6d. The motion seeks the disallowance of this by-law. I consider, too, that it may have been certain matters referred to by the Premier in his policy speech that also provided an inspiration, as no doubt the member for Torrens was seeking to give effect to what was said by the Premier in his policy speech in February last year. Honourable members will be mindful that in that speech the Premier said, when referring to tramways trust buses:

However, the usage is also very important and increased fares are not the answer concerning the use of buses.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: What was that in?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Your policy speech.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: It must have been a good speech, because everyone reads it and quotes from it.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The Premier continued:

A job of work awaiting a Minister is to set a policy in motion to make use of the buses by encouraging people to travel by bus.

On August 19 this year, the member for Mitcham, after asking the Premier a question about this matter, received this answer:

If this Government can do anything to encourage people to travel on this form of transport, it will leave no stone unturned.

I was expecting honourable members opposite to support this motion, particularly in view of what was said in the Premier's policy speech. I support it on two grounds, first, I consider that the increases referred to in the by-law are unwarranted and too severe; secondly, that as a result of these increases there is likely to be a reduction in the number of passengers carried by buses, and this will result in a greater use of motor cars by people in the metropolitan area, consequently there will be a further vehicular congestion in the city of Adelaide. The increases are severe, and for the third section are 50 per cent, for the sixth section, 33⅓ per cent, and for the 10th section it is 25 per cent. Obviously, as a result of these severe increases there will be a considerable reduction in the number of passengers carried on buses from now on. As stated in the Tramways Trust reports, it is well known that there has been a progressive decrease in the number of passengers carried by the trust since 1951. In 1950 the population of the metropolitan area was 430,000, and now it is 612,200. In the year ended January 31, 1951, the trust carried on its trams and buses 78,141,465 persons; for the year ended June 30, 1965, there were 56,434,000 passengers carried. Although there was an increase in the metropolitan area population of 182,200 between 1950 and 1965 (an increase of 42 per cent), nevertheless there has been a decrease in the number of passengers carried by the trust during those years of 21,770,465, or 28 per cent. I consider that this decrease can be attributed to two factors—the increase in the number of motor cars in this State and the increased fares charged by the trust.

An increase in fares was imposed in August, 1959, and in 1959-60 the trust carried 1,445,000 fewer passengers than in the previous year. This was a decrease of 2.4 per cent. In 1960-61, 2,013,000 fewer passengers were carried than in the previous year, which was a decrease of 3.46 per cent. In 1961-62 the decrease from the previous year was 1,062,000, or 1.89 per cent. In 1962-63, when the increase in fares had perhaps been forgotten to some extent and there had been an increase in population, 89,000 more passengers were carried than in the previous year, and in

1963-64 there was an increase of 532,000 on the previous year.

There was a further increase in fares on July 5, 1964, and again there was a considerable decrease in passengers. In 1964-65, the year after the increase, 56,434,000 were carried, which was a decrease of 2,137,000, or 3.65 per cent, on the previous year. I realize that this has applied not only to the tramways but to the railways as well. It is interesting to note that in 1913 the railways carried 19,382,330 passengers and that in 1963 only 14,922,211 were carried, despite the fact that over this period the population had more than doubled. These figures give use cause for concern. The big decrease in the number of persons using Tramways Trust services has been brought about by more and more private cars being used to carry people from the outer metropolitan area to the heart of the city. Not infrequently a person owning a car brings two, three or four people to their work in the city or metropolitan area to the detriment of the trust's patronage. As I mentioned earlier, through the greater use of cars by people living in the metropolitan area, a greater tendency for vehicular congestion in the city occurs, which must be avoided. It is necessary, as was mentioned by the Premier in his policy speech, to encourage people to use the railways and Tramways Trust services rather than their own cars. One way to obviate congestion is not to increase fares but to reduce them. Indeed, I agree with the suggestion made by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), in that we should perhaps follow the example of oversea countries and make a small overall charge of, say, 6d. or 9d. for a person to travel throughout the metropolitan area.

When I visited some of the larger cities in the United States, such as Washington and Los Angeles, I noticed that small charges were made for people to travel anywhere in the inner metropolitan area. That could well be emulated in this State. Such a small charge could apply between the hours of, say, 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., or during the off-peak period. I support the motion which, I trust, will also receive the support of members of the Government.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

*[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]*

## REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2056.)

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of recommendations.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

This morning, in a telephone conversation, I said that it might be possible to hold a referendum on either November 20 or November 27 but the statement in the press this afternoon is different from my statement. At no stage did I refer to conscientious objectors.

Regarding yesterday afternoon's conference, I am pleased to say that, although the matter was controversial, there was no undue feeling or heat engendered. The conference managers were there to do the best they could in the interests of both places. It was a really good session and I give full marks to the managers. I am pleased to ask honourable members to agree to the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I support what the Premier has said. In my opinion, the conference was one of the best that I have attended since I have been a member. Usually, a certain amount of heat is engendered in the discussions, but in this case the conference got down to doing good work. Although there was only one clause in dispute, and that did not leave much room for compromise, in my opinion a fair compromise was arrived at, one that gave honourable members on this side some provisions they desired to have in the Bill. Therefore, I strongly support the Premier's request that the recommendations be agreed to. Two agreements were made at the conference. The statement that has appeared in the press does not correctly state the meaning of the first amendment agreed to at the conference. I believe that when the Returning Officer examines the amendment he will find that the statement attributed to him in the press is not in accordance with it. Clause 14 (11) of the Bill states:

> Every elector who fails to vote at the referendum without a valid and sufficient reason for such failure shall be guilty of an offence.

The amendment to that clause accepted by the conference was to add after the word "offence" the words:

For the purposes of this section it shall be a valid and sufficient reason for a failure to vote if an elector has a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum.

Conscientious objection is therefore not restricted to objection on religious grounds as is the provision in the Electoral Act. A valid reason for conscientious objection could be an elector's deciding that insufficient information was available on which he could form a proper judgment. This provision is much wider than the newspaper report would lead one to assume. The Attorney-General may not agree with me on this, but I have taken legal advice of some standing on it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am not suggesting that it is confined only to religious grounds.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is all right. It can be any objection that a person sincerely believes is a conscientious reason why he should not vote, that he regards as a valid reason for not voting according to the agreement reached at the conference.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It has to be a genuine matter of conscience.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, but my point, which the Returning Officer appears to have overlooked in his statement, is that it is something that the elector, and not the Returning Officer, decides. The Returning Officer will find that he is unable to make a decision on this under this clause because this is all tied up with this clause. There is nothing in it that states that the Returning Officer is the authority to decide whether or not it is a conscientious objection.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is in subclause (4).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No; this is tied to this subclause.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. "This section" means section 14.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: However, I merely raise the question, not to oppose the recommendation but to say that the statements made publicly on this matter are statements that will not be found valid when properly analysed. The other provision, in my opinion, does something that the other place has been requesting: it gives a clearer definition of the proposal to go before the people. I support the Premier's view that the results of the conference are satisfactory to members here, and I agree that they should be accepted.

Mr. SHANNON: Having taken an active part in the debate on this Bill and criticized the form of the question, I want now to read a statement that I have carefully prepared. The result of this conference between the two Chambers highlights the successful working of the bicameral system. My long experience in this place has taught me to respect the review that the Legislative Council gives to Bills emanating from the Assembly. In this instance the compromise arrived at by the managers has overcome a disability in Standing Orders that prevented the amendment to the question which would be put to the elector on this matter. If the Government decides to accept the managers' decision, it will be necessary for the Governor by proclamation to amend the question so that any lottery that may result from a majority vote will be conducted by the Government of the State. On the question of compulsory voting, provision has wisely been made for the abstention of a voter on conscientious grounds. This means that the penal provisions provided in the Bill will not apply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I, too, have pleasure in supporting the Premier's recommendation that we accept these amendments agreed to by the conference, but I support my Leader in pointing out that the terms of the first amendment that we are making to clause 14 seem fairly wide. I do not know of any precise definition of the phrase "conscientious objection". I suppose that, in the ultimate, that will be left to an interpretation by the court if any prosecutions are launched. With very great respect to Mr. Douglass, I do not think that the interpretation which appears as his in the *News* this evening is correct. It seems to me that that is far too narrow an interpretation of the phrase. It certainly is a far narrower interpretation than the one I would put on it, and narrower than the intention of the amendment which I am prepared to support. It seems to me that a conscientious objection could be of almost any kind. It could be an objection to voting, and it could be an objection to voting on the referendum because a person felt he or she did not have sufficient information to make up his or her mind.

Those are merely two examples of the conscientious objection a person could validly have. It could be a conscientious objection to being forced to go to vote. All these things, in my view, could be covered by this amendment, and it is a little perturbing that the Electoral Officer (Mr. Douglass) should so quickly put an interpretation on the amendment which we are, I hope, accepting (and which the Premier has moved we should accept) which does so constrict it, because I

do not think that is the interpretation of the phrase at all. Also, as the Attorney-General pointed out, this amendment refers not only to subclause (11) but to the whole of clause 14, because the first part of the amendment states "For the purposes of this section", not "of this subsection". Therefore, I believe it also applies to subclause (4), the proviso to which, in part, reads:

provided that the said Returning Officer need not send a notification in any case where he is satisfied that the elector has a valid and sufficient reason for his failure to vote.

Now that particular subclause would import that the elector should have already notified his conscientious objection to the Returning Officer, and no doubt that would be a proper course to follow; but I do not think, looking at subclause (11), that it is necessary for the elector to notify the Returning Officer before the referendum is actually held. It seems to me that the proper interpretation of subclause (11) is that when the elector receives the notification consequent on his failure to vote he may therein (at the foot thereto, I think, is the phrase used) set out the reason why he did not vote; and provided that that reason shows a conscientious objection—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Genuine.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Provided that reason shows a genuine conscientious objection, that elector will be absolved. As the Attorney-General prompts me, it must be genuine; but that does not restrict the width of the objection that may be taken, and I think that, when we are confirming the compromise that has been reached (and which has been recommended by the Premier and supported by the Leader), we should be very sure and we should know the breadth of what the Premier is recommending to us. As I say, it seems to me to be pretty wide.

Mr. QUIRKE: I led the objection to compulsory voting on a social question such as this, and I am extremely gratified at what has evolved from the conference. I never thought it was possible for such a conclusion to be arrived at, and I consider that it will be most helpful. It says a lot for the wisdom of a few managers prepared to reach a solution of a problem that appeared at the outset to be insoluble. I congratulate those who took part. It would be a conscientious objection if I were to say that I conscientiously objected to being forced to vote on a social question.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I don't think you would.

Mr. QUIRKE: That could be tried, and perhaps will be. However, I congratulate all concerned.

Motion carried.

## PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

## CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its object is to increase the number of Ministers of the Crown from eight to nine, and clause 3 so provides. By paragraph (*b*), the consequential provision is made increasing the maximum number of Ministers in the House of Assembly from five to six. No provision is made for payment of the additional Minister, this having been already made by the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1963.

Honourable members will be aware of the increase in Governmental activities during recent years and the consequent increase in the duties and responsibilities of Ministers. It is, however, to the policy of the Government that Ministers should be directly responsible to Parliament for the administration of departments that I particularly refer.

The Government has already introduced legislative amendments designed to remove administration from statutory boards of one sort or another and to place the responsibility for policy decisions in the hands of the appropriate Ministers. This, of course, entails greater burdens upon the Ministers available. The present number of eight is too small to cope with the amount of work involved. It is also desirable to provide that one Minister does not have the duties of both the Lands and Agriculture portfolios. It is not possible, in view of the new work undertaken by other Ministers in the present Cabinet not undertaken by Ministers in the previous Administration, to provide relief among existing Ministers. The policy of the Government is the provision of a larger Ministry in an enlarged House; the last mentioned matter is already provided for in a Bill now before the House.

I frankly admit having opposed similar legislation last session, and I gave as a reason then my belief that executive control should not be extended further without an increase in the number of members of Parliament. Although I do not object to criticism of the Government on account of the amalgamation of the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture, I do not want it said that I have overloaded one Minister to the extent that his health must suffer. I still believe that the number of members in this House should be increased, but I should not care to say at the moment how many members there should be.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

## LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 12. Page 2052.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill on the face of it has only two purposes. First, it increases the charges made under the Land Tax Act in respect of more highly valued property. Secondly, it makes a small amendment concerning decimal currency so that the Land Tax Commissioner will have no problem in converting his quinquennial assessments from standard currency to decimal currency. The Opposition has no objection to the provisions that enable easy conversion to decimal currency. As the quinquennial assessment will still be in force five years after the conversion, this provision will save subsequent alteration of the Act, and I think it is wise and desirable. However, I am in serious disagreement with the Treasurer—

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Not serious!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I am in serious disagreement with some of his other statements. He said:

Its principal object is to effect a revision in land tax rates. The Bill is an essential part of the 1965-66 Budget and makes one of several revenue adjustments designed to reduce the gap between revenue and proposed expenditures to manageable proportions. During 1964-65 the State collected land tax amounting to £2,485,000, or about £2 7s. 6d. per head. The collections of land tax in that year in the five other States averaged about £2 17s. per head. This means that the average yield elsewhere in Australia was 20 per cent above that in this State.

In this afternoon's *News* appeared a statement by the President of the Real Estate Institute that land tax rates in this State were 20 per cent lower than those in other States. He was obviously following the fallacy that had been stated by the Treasurer. However, the Treasurer's figures cannot be substantiated anywhere, and I ask him to say where he obtained this knowledge, as it is not in any official document or in accordance with the Commonwealth Grants Commission's report or the Budget results in other States; in other words, it is an estimate provided from somewhere, but it is not in accordance with any fact that can be determined.

Mr. Lawn: He probably got it where you used to get your information.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not discussing my Estimates now; I know the weaknesses of those Estimates.

Mr. Ryan: Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It was stated not as an estimate but as a fact that South Australia was 20 per cent below the other States in this regard and that this increase would bring this State up to the level of others.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: You have not proved one of the stories you have raised in respect of financial measures this session.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will quote the source of my information. The statement made by the Premier last night that this State's land tax was 20 per cent lower than that of other States has certain weaknesses that will show on examination, and I intend to show these in due course. This year's Grants Commission report, although it may be out within a day or two, is not yet in the Parliamentary Library and has not been released to the public. I can give the figures only of the last report of the Grants Commission tabled in the Commonwealth House, but I can also quote the Treasury figures in respect of the other States, because they are issued in the same way as those issued in this State each year. Therefore, I can bring the figures up to date with a relative degree of accuracy, to show just how far short of the picture was the Treasurer's statement yesterday. I shall quote the figures on a per capita basis, because that is the method used by the Treasury. I shall also give the total sums collected by the States to illustrate the large disparity that will exist in respect of the Treasurer's proposals. The sums collected per capita and set out in the Grants Commission's report are as follows:

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| New South Wales | 2 | 10 | 6 |
| Victoria | 2 | 16 | 7 |
| Queensland | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| South Australia | 2 | 9 | 2 |
| Western Australia | 1 | 13 | 4 |
| Tasmania | 1 | 14 | 8 |

The average was £2 6s. 1d., and South Australia's figure is 3s. a head above the average of the other Australian States.

Mr. Hudson: Would that be for 1962-63?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Those figures are from the 1962-63 report. I hope that the next report will be available within a week or 10 days, but in the meantime we have to use the Treasury accounts of the other States, by means of which I shall show what the figure was for 1964-65 in each State. The comparison of total collections is as follows:

| | 1962-63. £ | 1964-65. £ |
|---|---|---|
| New South Wales .. | 10,144,000 | 14,858,000 |
| Victoria . .. .. .. | 8,545,000 | 9,862,000 |
| Queensland . .. .. | 1,655,000 | 1,900,000 |
| South Australia .. | 2,457,000 | 2,485,000 |
| Western Australia . | 1,276,000 | 1,450,000 |
| Tasmania .. .. .. | 628,000 | 839,000 |

That means that the charge per capita in respect of each State is now as follows:

| | £ | s. | d. |
|---|---|---|---|
| New South Wales .. .. .. .. .. | 3 | 11 | 5 |
| Victoria .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| Queensland .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| South Australia .. .. .. .. .. | 2 | 7 | 7 |
| Western Australia .. .. .. .. .. | 1 | 16 | 8 |
| Tasmania .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 1 | 9 | 2 |

The all-States average is £2 5s. 1d. The figure has never been given as a weighted average.

Mr. Hudson: It has in the Grants Commission report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not given that way. With due deference to the honourable member, he must have another look. The Grants Commission figure is a simple average of the State figures, as were the figures given by the Treasurer last night. It is merely the average of the taxation levels in the various States. Although the average of the Australian States is £2 5s. 1d., South Australia's level is already £2 7s. 7d., so we do not need the addition of 20 per cent to bring us up to the average. The Treasurer forgot to mention last night the important point that a quinquennial assessment was now due. I do not know exactly by what amount the Commissioner of Land Tax will increase the rate at the assessment but, in my opinion, it will be at least 30 per cent.

The Commissioner works back from current sales to unimproved value. The last quinquennial assessment gives some idea of the great distortion that arises from these adjustments and I probably would not be popular if I said that the assessments should take place more frequently. The last such assessment, five years ago, raised the amount of tax collected in this State by 71 per cent, from £1,415,000 to £2,425,000. It could be claimed that that was in a period of inflation, when values were changing quickly, but the Treasurer imposes punitive taxation by the means to which I referred. In due course, it will be so severe that it will be a destructive taxation. In certain respects it is already destructive. Although I do not put it forward as a political argument, I know that the Labor Party has always claimed that it would be advisable to split up large estates by the imposition of high land taxes. This was Labor policy in the Commonwealth sphere. However, this is not a question of splitting up large estates but of the imposition of a punitive and destructive tax on certain elements of the community.

I shall refer to the proportion of land tax revenue to the total revenue for 1962-63. I do not have later figures because I have not had sufficient time to ascertain them. The figures I shall give are a better example of the effect of taxation in this State compared with that in other States than the Treasurer used in his submission. In 1962-63 the proportion of land tax revenue to total revenue in New South Wales was 13 per cent; in Victoria, 14 per cent; in Queensland, 6.1 per cent; in Tasmania, 12.39 per cent; in Western Australia, 11.19 per cent; and in South Australia, 17.7 per cent. On those figures, how can the Treasurer claim that South Australia is lagging behind in this regard? The figures show that 17.7 per cent of the State's tax revenue came from land tax.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: And yet this was the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that the Attorney-General does not worry about these matters, but I do.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not what I said, and the Leader knows it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Contrary to general belief, land tax is paid substantially not on country lands but on city lands. I cannot give the precise percentage (although the figure would be readily available from the Treasury) but I believe that about 60 per cent of the total land tax is paid on land close to the metropolitan area. South Australia has already reached the stage where the centre of the city is being taxed out of existence.

Mr. Lawn: It doesn't look like it to me.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One ordinary city hotel today pays £4,000 in land tax. That makes one realize how destructive

this tax is. No capital city will be a good economic organization if we tax the heart out of it, as this Bill will do in respect of Adelaide. When land tax was first introduced in South Australia there was little progressive increase in the rate of taxation. In 1927 land tax was at the rate of ¾d. in every pound sterling on the value of taxable land, and also at the rate of ¾d. for every pound sterling exceeding £5,000. So it was ¾d. in the pound at both levels. Over the years, however, we have progressively widened the scope of the tax in respect of the larger estates. If a property is today valued at £10,000, land tax is payable at 1.1d. in the pound; for property valued at £100,000 it is 5.5d. in the pound; and above £100,000 it increases to 9d. in the pound. Those figures illustrate the destructiveness of the increases, because a block of land in the city today, at unimproved value, does not need to be very favourably placed to be worth £100,000. But this is only the beginning, because progressively steep water and district council rates, too, are imposed at substanially the same levels. So today the taxation is destructive, and steps must be taken to bring it more into line with what is fair. I have been the Treasurer and know that the Treasury has to get sufficient revenues to maintain the State's services, but revenue should not be gained in such a way as to penalize one section of the community. Not only that, but the penalty imposed is not fair. I oppose this Bill.

Mr. Lawn: I thought you would.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I oppose the reasons given by the Treasurer for the Bill. I have looked through the accounts of the other States but can find no justification for the assertions he has made. The quinquennial assessment will bump up the taxation considerably, and, even apart from that altogether, South Australia already has taxation which in this respect is exorbitant.

Mr. Lawn: Who imposed that taxation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did, and the last time I brought legislation down I made some exemptions, too. I want to compare this State with the other States that are in a relative state of development. It is unreal to compare South Australia with New South Wales. We would normally expect to be somewhere in the bracket between Queensland (which has 500,000 more people than we have) and Western Australia (which has 250,000 less people than has South Australia). I have figures here which show that in 1964-65 Queensland will collect £1,900,000 and Western Australia will collect £1,450,000. South Australia, without this added impost, will collect £2,485,000, and if this Bill goes through (which I hope it will not) it will collect £2,890,000—£1,000,000 more than Queensland. Can that be justified?

In addition, when the quinquennial assessment is made this £2,900,000 will probably increase to such an extent that South Australia will be paying twice as much in land tax as does the whole of Queensland, an area rich in land, vastly larger in size, and with a population 50 per cent higher than ours. Can any honourable member here justify that state of taxation?

I wish to say two or three things about this taxation in a general way. When the original taxation legislation was passed in South Australia the Commissioner had dual functions, and he had to report to Parliament. We had an annual report to Parliament not only with regard to the collection of taxes but also with regard to such matters as amendments that could be made to correct injustices or to close loopholes. There would be a general report to Parliament on the functioning of the department. When the Commonwealth Government took over uniform taxation, the Land Tax Department became a separate department, and at that time it was held that the Commissioner being no longer a State officer, did not have to give a report. Today, if members want information about the Act and its workings it is not available from any source. I do not blame the present Treasurer. It is probably due to no member of Parliament having raised the question, or that I did not notice it when I was Treasurer. Parliament should have a report from the Commissioner before it each year.

I ask the Treasurer to consider this matter, because I believe such an important part of the State's affairs should be the subject of a report to Parliament. Authorities of less importance report to Parliament, and authorities not actually under the control of a Minister are obliged to report to Parliament. This department, which will have an increasing effect on the economy of the State, does not do so. It would be appropriate if the Treasurer arranged to amend the present Bill or introduced another giving effect to my suggestion. I refer to sections 15 and 16 of the Taxation Act, because I believe a grave injustice is being done in their operation. They have been operating for many years, at least as far back as 1927. No doubt they were inserted in the original Act for the convenience of the

department, and although they may have caused some disability to taxpayers it could not have amounted to much, because there was a margin of only ¾d. in the pound between the lowest and the highest rates. The disparity probably was not noticeable at the time the amendments were made. Section 15 states:

Where more persons than one are owners of any land the same amount of land tax shall be payable in respect of that land as if only one person were the owner thereof.

Putting that simply, if three brothers jointly owned a farm with an unimproved value of £30,000 they would pay taxation at the rate applicable to this valuation, but if they divided the farm and there were three separate titles they would each pay only on the basis of £10,000. Members will see that in land taxation the main principle is that all properties owned by one person are aggregated. That means that if a person owned five blocks of land in the city the value of each would be added together and the rate payable would be that applicable to the aggregate figure. If that is so, why, if a block of land is owned by three separate persons, should not the rate payable be applicable to the value of each person's interest in the land? In the case mentioned, why should the rate apply to the £30,000 when, in fact, not one of the persons owned £30,000 worth of property?

Mr. Hudson: If the three brothers formed a company in which each held one-third of the shares it would be difficult to make your suggestion operate satisfactorily.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member is referring to shareholding in a company I doubt whether there would be grounds for altering the Act. A particular piece of property owned by a company cannot be assigned to an individual. In any case, there is in a company probably a large reciprocating advantage because a large amount is paid in company tax, and land tax has its effect. Section 16 deals with aggregation of property in relation to trustees, and subsection (1) thereof provides:

Where any persons are the owners of land as trustees under the same trust, whether those persons have or have not a beneficial interest in the land, the same amount of land tax shall be payable in respect of the land as if one person were the sole beneficial owner thereof; but that land shall not be taken into account in computing the amount of land tax for which those trustees, or their beneficiaries, are liable in respect of any other land.

Where a trustee is in charge of land that he has to divide later, and there are five owners, this land incurs the same taxation as if it were owned by one person. If there is aggregation on one side there should be segregation on the other, as it is grossly unfair to the taxpayer at present. In one case that came under my notice land tax took the whole proceeds of the estate, because as the trustees held the land for several persons it was taxed under section 16 as if it were one property. This section does a grave injustice, and I shall ask the House to allow sections 15 and 16 to be considered, because I think both should be repealed. I think the owner should pay tax on the land he owns and not on some hypothetical value put upon it by these two sections.

I believe this Bill is very ill-timed. Because of the quinquennial assessment hanging over the heads of all landowners in this State, the tax will increase automatically because the values will increase, without there being this additional impost. Some members opposite smile, as they think that this is a tax their supporters do not have to pay, so they do not have to worry about it. However, no matter what the tax is, it ultimately affects the whole community. Obviously some people can pass the tax on to the consumer, but others cannot. In any case, no tax should be levied that is destructive in its incidence, and this tax is destructive to primary production in certain instances and to the development of the centre of the city. I say that without any fear of contradiction. It is particularly destructive in relation to some land in the country. Some years ago the Government realized how destructive it was and made some concessions, but those concessions are more than wiped out by the increases proposed by this measure. They come at a particularly unsuitable time because landowners today, apart from the problem of rising costs, are in a grave position because of the unfavourable season. The provisions have not been designed with any real insight into the economic issues involved. They are particularly destructive from the point of view of the primary producer, and particularly this year when the season is opening so unfavourably. Without this impost the land tax paid in South Australia is already £2,485,000, whereas in Queensland it is £1,900,000. When this new impost is levied the figure for this State will be £1,000,000 higher than that of Queensland.

Mr. Shannon: The quinquennial effect has to be guessed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If we consider the previous quinquennial assessment, we shall be paying land tax in South

Australia double that of Queensland. If anyone can justify that, I am prepared seriously to consider giving him a garden party. It cannot be justified. In the first place, the Treasurer's statement that we are below the Australian average is not accurate.

Mr. Hudson: It is accurate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not. I know how these estimates are prepared, and I would say it is most inaccurate and not in accordance with the actual position. South Australia's development cannot be claimed to be more favourable than that of Queensland. In fact, at present it appears that Queensland, with all its natural resources, is forging ahead. As long as honourable members opposite think they do not have to pay, or that their supporters do not have to pay, it is all right, but I say the Bill is wrong because of the political philosophy behind it. This State cannot be excessively taxed without industries and businesses being driven away, which will seriously affect our economy. Why, in the early days, did Victoria make so much more progress in establishing industry than did New South Wales and Queensland? Those two States had all the advantages that Victoria had, and more. However, for a period Victoria forged ahead of New South Wales and Queensland because it set out to be a low taxing State. Victoria had a State company tax of 2s. in the pound. In Queensland, under the Forgan-Smith Government, the State company tax was 8s. in the pound. If it had not been for uniform taxation, Victoria would have been so crowded with factories that there would not have been sufficient space to build a house.

Is it the desire of the Government to drive industry and commerce from South Australia? That is what will happen, because all these charges have to be borne by industry and commerce. As soon as the consumer has to meet the additional costs, a wage adjustment must take place. If we get on the wrong step, it is hard to get back again, and I say that this proposed tax is not only undesirable and unfair but is destructive in its incidence, and I shall oppose it to the best of my ability.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I thought that the honourable member for Glenelg might have risen at this stage of the debate. He has engaged in a running fire of interjections, and I wondered whether this was some kind of volcanic eruption foretelling his making a speech. I hope that he puts his views to the House, because he has been interrupting the Leader. The honourable member made his mark in a debate not long ago when he said that a £20,000 investment in a farm would enable a man to make a good living. That remark will live for a long time. It indicates a theoretical approach to the question.

This Bill represents one of the first hard policy decisions resulting from the change of Government feared by a large section of the community in South Australia. It is a tax grab, as the Treasurer has said in other words. He said in his explanation:

> The Bill is an essential part of the 1965-66 Budget and makes one of several revenue adjustments designed to reduce the gap between revenue and proposed expenditures to manageable proportions.

In other words, it is a tax grab to fill a gap. It shows the socialistic attitude towards the ownership of land. Does the honourable member for Glenelg suggest that his colleagues from the university should pay a tax on their earnings in addition to their income tax? Why should the honourable member single out people who make a living from the land, the thousands of people who make a living inferior to that of his colleagues? Why should these people pay a class tax? He belongs to a class Party, and this is class legislation. It has been said that Socialism is the policy of failure and the gospel of envy, and I consider that the Bill illustrates the saying extremely well.

We have been given a comparison of the rates applying in the various States as some justification for raising our taxation levels. The Treasurer compared £2 15s. (which will be the figure when this increase goes through) with the figure of £2 17s. for other States, but he did not tell us whether the other States have made reassessments in their values or whether they are about to make them. The figures for the other States have no meaning unless we know the progress of assessments in those States. People continuing farming operations close to the city are amongst the hardest hit by this proposed tax. Several years ago the then Government became aware of this problem and enacted section 12 (*c*) of the Land Tax Act to cover people whose farming properties had greatly increased values because of subdivision. Section 12 (*c*) gave them great relief. However, the section failed to assist people a little farther out from the subdivisional activities. At Virginia, and in places adjacent to market gardening areas, completely fictitious values have been placed on land used for primary production. We have thousands of acres of land that are, in some instances, inferior for purposes of wide-scale primary production, yet it is

valued for land tax purposes as being comparable with market gardening land. I do not know how this is justified.

It is impossible to sell all this land at the one time. The water table is falling and it is physically impossible to irrigate all the land, yet it is valued on a market gardening basis. People in the area pay £1 an acre a year and are trying to carry on normal farming activities. Individuals can sell but this does not alter the fact that people coming into the district cannot change the form of production because the water is not there. The present Government is going to see that the bores that service the area are regulated, but that will probably double the land tax. The Commissioner has no power to alter the tax. Where it is physically impossible to use this land for the purpose for which it is valued the Commissioner should take note of it and reduce the valuations. If he does not do that a great injustice will be done to the area. There is no hope of subdivision for building purposes. There is a gradual division into 10-acre blocks. The increased valuation may be all right on individual properties but they all cannot be dealt with that way. Some people on a 300-acre property might be able to bear £1 an acre. Going farther afield, adjoining the Light River is land inferior to other normal farming areas on which people will pay greatly increased land tax. It will be raised by this Bill and raised again by the re-assessment. No provision is made here to rectify the position. Not only does this pick on a section of the community but a section of that section is penalized at a fantastic level. The representations made by honourable members over the years resulted in the enactment of section 12c, which gives good relief to those threatened with subdivisional values but gives no relief to false values placed upon open farming land by reason of nearby intensive farm culture. It is a serious problem. The Government will have no choice, if there is any justice in its administration, but to do something about it. It is all the more urgent because of this two-pronged rise that will result—one from this legislation and one from the new assessment unless the Land Tax Commissioner finds some way of reducing the assessment from what it has been in previous years.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I rise to speak strongly against the imposing of land tax as proposed in this Bill. The rate of land tax has increased excessively over the last 10 years. In 1955-56 it was £567,000, and now it has increased to nearly £2,500,000. I see no justification for this huge increase. Nobody objects to a tax based on ability to pay or on some firm foundation of valuation, but land tax is not based necessarily on ability to pay or on a sound basis of valuation. Valuations vary too much between areas. It is far too difficult to assess what are the unimproved and improved values of a property.

If the Government needs more money for its projects or more money for the splitting up of the cake, it would serve the community better if it eliminated all losses on Government undertakings. The money raised by land tax will meet only about half of the loss incurred on the railways. There is no doubt that, if the railways provided an efficient service, they would be used more, and their losses would not be so great, but no effort has been made over the years to provide an adequate service for the farmers. The Government has pursued a negative policy in that respect, and now we are taxed more or less to make up for the deficiencies in that undertaking. As the railways are State-owned, there is not the drive and incentive to make them pay, and we have to levy taxes to make up for losses on undertakings like the railways. I should have thought that, if anything, the Labor Party would increase taxation to a greater extent on the larger properties, yet on a property valued at £20,000 there has been a 32 per cent increase and on a property valued at £50,000 there has been a 29 per cent increase. When this legislation was before Parliament five years ago speakers from the Labor Party stressed the fact that there were no exemptions for small landowners. In this Bill the Government might have introduced a provision to cover that.

There is some talk of interstate comparison, that because they do something in one State they should do it in another. Government members, with little experience of the land, do not fully realize that South Australia is a State poor in natural resources and that most of the increased production has been effected by improving the condition of the land. The poor mallee country is deficient in minerals and requires much clearing. Queensland has been mentioned, but there has been very little improvement to the land in that State. The tree country there has not been cleared and cattle are grazing on the natural country. In the Darling Downs people do not have to put any superphosphate on the land; it is just there in its natural state, and its worth in its unimproved condition is great.

The position in South Australia is entirely different, for most of the increased production has resulted from the efforts of farmers in putting on at least a half a ton of superphosphate to the acre (in some cases a ton to the acre), clearing mallee, and clearing stone off the land. The unimproved value for primary producing purposes is more of an improved nature compared to what it is in some of the other States. An inquiry was held into this question of valuation, but nobody seems to have taken much notice of the committee's report. However, there are some glaring anomalies in this. For instance, I pay about nine times as much in council rates as I do in land tax; I am one of the fortunate ones, because my valuation is fairly low. However, a person in an area north of Adelaide has told me that he pays more in land tax than he pays in council rates. That is the point I endeavoured to make earlier—that the basis of the valuation is more or less guess-work. Therefore, I maintain that this is a bad tax.

I think I mentioned when speaking in another debate that the unimproved value in the country is only a small part of the valuation of the land. The only possible justification for this tax exists where the land improves through people congregating in an area and the unimproved value soars to large proportions. One can put up quite a weighty argument that that value should belong to the people, and I am inclined to agree that it should. Where land values increase through no direct effort of any persons other than that they congregate together, some of that value should belong to the State or to the people. Just how that value should be collected I do not know. Perhaps it could be done in the first stage of subdividing that land, although at that stage it does not have such an increased increment. If we try to tax that land when we get to the developmental stage it is a tax that is passed on.

The big businesses in Adelaide work on a certain margin of profit. If we go back over the last 10 or 20 years and analyse the profit margins of the companies we find that they do not vary much and that they bear a relation to interest rates at the time. Therefore, if we increase land tax it is passed on through the incidence of taxation to the general consumer. This might take a year, but ultimately it is passed on and the result is greater inflation. If anything is causing delay in the development of Australia it is the fact that we have inflation to the extent that we cannot compete on the world's markets. Of course, that is perhaps more a Commonwealth than a State problem. However, it becomes a State problem if, by increasing land tax to the extent that businesses and manufacturers in Adelaide have to put up the cost of their goods to maintain a margin of profit, it reduces their chance of trading on interstate markets, to the detriment of everybody in South Australia.

If costs increase as a result of this tax and additional wages have to be paid to cover the increase, the resultant inflation is harmful to everybody. Once our costs in South Australia go above those of the other States (where the costs have been kept down by wise Government and husbandry of resources over the last 30 years), this State will run into unemployment and quite a deal of trouble. That is why I strongly oppose this Bil. It is a vicious tax on one section of the community that either cannot be passed on or can be only to a limited degree. The prices of milk, wheat and bread could be increased because they are in the cost of production index. This is a bad tax because it is based on values that are difficult to determine, and a tax that must increase the cost of production.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE ERADICATION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1990.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support this Bill, the purpose of which is to increase the number of diseases listed for which compensation can be paid, so as to include two other diseases, one affecting cattle and the other affecting pigs. The diseases are vesicular stomatitis and vesicular exanthema. In my researches I found no trace of these diseases in Australia, and only one, vesicular stomatitis, is found in the United States of America. The main trouble with this and vesicular exanthema is that in the early stages they cannot be differentiated from foot and mouth disease. The purpose of this legislation is to include the two additional diseases within the scope of the eradication fund, and so that if an outbreak occurs it will be relatively simple to police it immediately.

The provision that includes these additional diseases stems from a recommendation of the Exotic Diseases Committee made in April of this year. Some references made to foot and mouth disease in 1958, when the parent legislation was passed, are worth considering. Under the arrangement for compensation to owners of

animals which would have to be destroyed under this legislation, the Commonwealth Government will pay 50 per cent of the total compensation costs and, of the balance, New South Wales has agreed to pay 29 per cent, Victoria 18.25 per cent, Queensland 20.5 per cent, South Australia 10 per cent, Western Australia 10 per cent, Tasmania 6.25 per cent, and the Northern Territory and Australian Capital Territory 6 per cent. I do not think it is generally realized how fortunate Australia is to be completely quarantined against foot and mouth disease. I find that the last outbreak in the northern Americas occurred in Canada in 1952 and it was believed the infection was introduced by a migrant worker. The worker was not identified precisely, but he was believed to be a migrant Dutchman. The disease showed up in February, 1952 and by August, 1952, when it was completely eradicated an amount equivalent to £120,000 in Australian money had been spent by the Canadian Government in compensation and control measures.

Another recent scare in the Americas occurred in 1946 when an outbreak took place in Mexico caused by an infected animal in two shiploads of cattle from a South American country. At the height of the outbreak some 200,000 animals a month were being slaughtered by the United States authorities, and by the time the outbreak had been completely controlled some 17,000,000 cattle had been vaccinated four times against the disease and a sum equilavent to £A36,000,000 had been spent in eradicating the disease. I find that in the United Kingdom eradication measures are quite severe. I understand that all stock within a radius of two miles of an outbreak are slaughtered and the carcasses burnt. The Minister may be able to verify my belief that all movement of stock within 30 miles of such an outbreak is prohibited. The effect of foot and mouth disease or either of the other two diseases that this Bill deals with can well be imagined if an outbreak occurred in this country. I commend the Minister for being fully alive to the situation.

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

## STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It repeals two Acts now considered obsolete, and makes miscellaneous amendments mainly of a drafting or consequential nature to several Acts. Clause 2 and the First Schedule provide for the repeal of the Sand Drift Act. Most of the local government areas of the State where sand drift is a serious problem are within soil conservation districts, and in such districts the Sand Drift Act does not apply. In areas outside soil conservation districts, district councils have the option of using the Sand Drift Act or the Soil Conservation Act. In practice the latter Act is used; the former Act is superseded, and it is considered that none of its provisions ought to be retained.

Clause 2 and the First Schedule also provide for the repeal of the Travelling Stock Waybills Act. This Act prohibits (with certain exceptions) the movement of stock unless the person moving the stock has in his possession a waybill complying with the Act. It is considered that the Act serves no useful purpose today and only causes embarrassment and inconvenience to reputable stockowners.

The original Act was passed in 1911 at a time when all stock was moved on the hoof and, if it were suspected that it had been stolen, could be inspected during its movement from place to place. As the owner was required to set out in the waybill the origin, destination and route of the stock concerned, it could be determined whether it had travelled more than the distance prescribed under other Acts. Modern stock movement, however, is by motor transport, and instructions for the movement of stock are given by owners or agents by telephone. The transport operator may make more than one trip to move a herd of stock and may use more than one vehicle to move it. As a result, the requirement to provide a waybill causes the owners and agents much inconvenience.

In modern times, the only justification for the continued operation of this Act is that it could operate as a deterrent to stock stealing. The Government considers, however, that the Act has no such effect and that it should now be repealed. The Commissioner of Police, in recommending the repeal, proposes, as a more satisfactory measure for detecting any stealing of stock, the introduction of stock movement forms to be completed by police officers whenever stock is observed on the move. Inquiries can then be made at the places of departure and destination of the stock.

Clause 3 and the Second Schedule provide for the amendment of several Acts. This Schedule contains two amendments to section 48 of the Dentists Act consequential on the amending Act of 1960. The need for these

amendments has been raised from time to time by the Minister of Education, and the opportunity is taken to include the appropriate amendments in this Bill. Section 13 (*a*) of the amending Act of 1960 amended section 40 (1) (*c*) of the principal Act by striking out the words "and practises dentistry under the immediate supervision of a registered dentist", thereby allowing operative dental assistants to practise without supervision. The amendments to section 48 of the principal Act contained in the Bill are the same as the amendment to section 40 of that Act made by section 13 (*a*) of the 1960 Act. In other words, they are consequential amendments overlooked in 1960.

The other amendments in the Second Schedule are, in general, drafting amendments to Acts passed in recent years, as follows:

(1) A purely clerical correction to section 134 (3) of the Licensing Act.

(2) Two drafting corrections to the Local Government Act, sections 384 and 443 respectively. Last year section 384 of the Act was amended by the insertion of a new subsection after subsection (1) and before subsection (2), but the new subsection was in error also designated subsection (2). The amendment contained in this Bill merely renumbers the second subsection (the one inserted by the amending Act of last year) as subsection (1a), so as to give it a distinctive designation. The other amendment to the Local Government Act contained in the Bill deletes the references to "coupon" in section 443 (1). This is consequential on sections 28 to 31 of the Local Government Act Amendment Act (No. 2) of 1963 which deleted the references to "coupons" in sections 437, 438, 439 and 443 of the principal Act.

(3) A drafting amendment to section 29 of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act in which the words struck out are duplicated.

(4) A clerical correction to the long title and section 1 of the Mines and Works Inspection Act Amendment Act, 1964, in which the short title of the principal Act should have read "1920-1962" instead of "1929-1962". (Under clause 4 this amendment will have effect retrospectively as from the commencement of last year's Act.)

(5) A drafting amendment to section 33nb of the Nurses Registration Act, so as to make it clear that the section deals with dental nurses and not general nurses.

(6) An amendment to section 38 of the Phylloxera Act consequential upon the deletion of the words "phylloxera-resistant" in subsection (7) of that section effected by section 13 of the amending Act of 1963.

(7) Amendments to sections 7 and 10 of the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act consequential on the amendments made by sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the amending Act of last year. The effect of those amendments was to provide that the agent as well as the master and owner of a ship would commit an offence in certain circumstances where water was polluted by oil. The amendments now proposed will enable the Harbors Board to recover from the agent (as well as from the owner or master) the cost of removing any such pollution and will require the agent to report any discharge of oil to the board. As the agent, as well as the owner and master, may commit an offence in connection with the discharge of oil, this Bill proposes, as a consequential measure, to include the agent in the sections of the Act providing for recovery of the cost of removal of the pollution and for reporting a discharge of oil to the Harbors Board. Last year's amendments were designed to place full responsibility upon agents as well as owners and masters and the present amendments are designed to carry this purpose into effect.

(8) A clerical correction to section 17 of the Public Service Act in which the word "pounds" has been duplicated.

In addition, the Second Schedule contains minor amendments to section 45 of the Police Offences Act and section 13 of the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund Act, by the substitution of references to the new Bush Fires and Road Traffic Acts respectively.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

## PISTOL LICENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its chief purpose is to increase the fee for the grant or renewal of a pistol licence from 2s. 6d. to £1, and the fee for registration as a pistol dealer from £1 to £5. The Bill also makes special provision for two or more pistol licences held by a member of a pistol club approved by the Commissioner of Police in which case a reduced fee of 5s. will be payable for the grant or renewal of each licence after the first. Clause 3 makes an appropriate amendment to section 5 (4) of the Pistol Licence Act relating to grants and renewals of pistol licences, and inserts a proviso therein

to cover the case of licences held by members of approved pistol clubs. Clause 4 amends section 10 (2) of the principal Act relating to the registration of pistol dealers. The existing fees were fixed in 1929 when the principal Act was passed. Since then the principal Act has not been amended. The increases are occasioned by the fall in value of money since 1929 and will ensure to the Police Department a more adequate return for the cost of the administration of the principal Act.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

## EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The Employees Registry Office Act, 1915-1953, provides for the licensing and control of employment agencies. It was passed in 1915 and has been amended three times since then. The last occasion was in 1953 when there were three licensed registry office-keepers. In recent years there have been some applications for licences under this Act. Four were granted in 1963 and six in 1964 and so far three applications have been approved this year. The total number of licensed registry offices in South Australia is now 21.

The Act, as at present framed, is inappropriate to present day conditions. A prerequisite to obtaining a licence is to have a character certificate signed by six ratepayers in the municipality in which the registry office is to be located. As most of these offices are situated in the city of Adelaide, it has become increasingly difficult to find six ratepayers in the city to vouch for them. Also the Act makes no provision for the registration of a partnership or a company, which is necessary under present conditions.

The principal provisions of the present Bill are as follows:

(1) By clause 4, section 2 of the principal Act, which deals with definitions, is amended. The definition of "licensee" has been extended to cover a licence issued to two or more persons jointly to carry on an employees registry office. The definition of "metropolitan area" under the Act is no longer appropriate, since it refers to certain House of Assembly electoral districts as they existed in 1915. The new definition incorporates the definition of "metropolitan area" as it appears in the Industrial Code, 1920-1963. It is a common practice for employer organizations and trade unions to obtain employment for their members without fee or reward. It was never intended that the Act should apply in such cases and the definition of an "employees registry office" has been changed so as to make it clear that these bodies do not have to be registered under the Act so long as they obtain employment for their members without fee or reward.

(2) The authority to issue licences and the general administration of the Act has been transferred by clause 3 of the Bill, which amends section 2 of the principal Act, from the Chief Inspector of Factories to the Secretary for Labour and Industry. This is consequential upon the formation of the Department of Labour and Industry, of which Department the Secretary for Labour and Industry is the permanent head and the Chief Inspector is one of his officers.

(3) At present a licence to keep and conduct an employees registry office may only be issued to a single person. This is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive and it does not take into account modern developments in the recruitment of employees. Clauses 7 and 10 provide for a licence to be issued to a company through its manager or to two or more persons of a partnership by inserting the new sections 4a, 4b, 6a and 6b respectively.

(4) The Minister is given power in clause 5, which inserts a new section 2b, to exempt any person licensed under this Act from any of such provisions as the Minister considers necessary, where he is satisfied that the conducting of an employees registry office is subsidiary to any other business of the company. This clause would enable the Minister to exempt, for example, management consultant companies, who, as a subsidiary part of their business conduct a registry office for the recruitment of management and stenographic staff from exhibiting their scale of fees in their public office.

(5) As mentioned earlier, a pre-requisite to the granting of a licence under the Act is that the applicant should get a character reference from six ratepayers in a municipality within the district in which the employees registry office is conducted. Clause 6, by amending section 4 of the principal Act, provides that the area should be extended to cover the whole metropolitan area or any other district to which the Act applies. The fee payable on an application for a licence is at present 10s. and has not been changed

since the Act was passed in 1915. It is considered that a more realistic annual fee nowadays would be £5 and clause 6 also provides for this.

(6) Clause 11 effects a drafting amendment to section 7 of the principal Act.

(7) Section 12 of the principal Act requires a licensee to display in a conspicuous place on his premises his christian names and surname together with the words "Licensed Registry-Office Keeper". Clause 16 alters this requirement to provide that the person who holds a licence under this Act shall display a copy of the current licence issued pursuant to this Act in the same way as the Registration of Business Names Act requires the certificate of registration to be exhibited. This is considered to be more appropriate.

(8) By clause 14, section 11 of the principal Act is repealed and wider powers are conferred upon inspectors including power to question persons on premises of a licensee through an interpreter. Clause 15 inserts a new section 11a and provides that obstruction, etc., of an inspector in the execution of his powers constitutes an offence under the Act.

(9) It is not considered necessary that the power to transfer a licence should be retained and all references to transfer of a licence in sections 2, 4, 5, 6, 8 and the Second Schedule have been deleted from the principal Act. If the proposed amendment is accepted every person to whom a licence is being transferred will be treated as a new applicant for a licence and thus be clearly bound to supply the character certificate mentioned in section 4(1) of the principal Act.

(10) By clause 17, section 16 of the principal Act is repealed. This section provides that a licensee under the principal Act may not have an interest in a lodging house. This provision is no longer applicable to present conditions.

(11) Clause 18 increases the maximum penalty which may be prescribed under section 17 of the principal Act for breach of any regulation from £20 to £50.

(12) Clause 19 increases the penalty under section 22 of the principal Act for breach of any of the provisions thereof from £20 to £50. The reason for the increases in this clause and clause 18 is to make the penalty more realistic having regard to present-day values.

(13) Clause 20 amends the Second Schedule and makes consequential amendments following upon the deletion of the power to transfer licences from the principal Act and the insertion of the new concept in sections 4a, 4b, 6a and 6b that a company through its manager may hold a licence under the Act.

(14) Clause 21 is also a consequential amendment to the Third Schedule resulting from the amendment to section 4 of the principal Act.

(15) Clause 22 is a normal provision for consolidation purposes.

The remaining amendments in the Bill are of a minor drafting nature.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

This Bill to amend the Architects Act, 1939, has a threefold purpose: (*a*) to provide for uniformity of registration of architects; (*b*) to delete the requirement that applicants for registration must reside in the State; and (*c*) to enable the board to make by-laws in relation to examinations and examination fees.

By clause 3, section 28 of the principal Act is amended and provides that a person who is not registered shall not use, either alone or in conjunction with any name, title, words, letters or additions or description, the title or description of "architect" or any other title or description containing the word "architectural" or any name, title, etc. implying that he is registered under the Act unless he is a person whose sole occupation is that of architectural draftsman. This amendment to section 28 is designed to prevent the improper use of the word "architectural" by unregistered persons. Under the principal Act only registered persons are permitted to call themselves "architects" or "architectural practitioners". It has been found that some unregistered persons have been using other titles, such as "architectural designer", which are not prohibited by the Act but which are calculated to lead the public to believe that such persons are registered architects.

By clause 4, section 32 of the principal Act is amended and the requirement that applicants for registration must reside in the State is deleted. South Australia is the only State that has this requirement in its Act. This leads to difficulties when architects based in other States carry out professional work in South Australia and are unable to become registered here. This occurrence of work being carried out by an architect in more than one State has increased considerably in recent

years. In addition, this clause provides that applicants for registration, unless registered as an architect under any Act of the United Kingdom or a member of the Royal Institute of British Architects or of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects must, *inter alia,* have had at least two years' practical experience, of which period at least one year was after the applicant graduated. The Act at present states that applicants for registration must have had "at least three years' practical experience in the work of an architect". It is suggested that this requirement be brought into line with the policy being adopted by the other States, and with the requirements for membership of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects, namely, two years' practical experience, of which at least one year must be after graduation. The board considers that it is important that applicants should have at least one year's practical experience after they have completed their academic training.

By clause 5, section 43 of the principal Act is amended to provide that the powers of the board to make by-laws under the Act are extended in two ways. The first extension is to empower the board to make by-laws adopting, for architectural examinations, an examination syllabus set by an authority other than the board. The present position is that the board has power to make by-laws prescribing examinations for the purposes of the Act, but all the details of the subjects must be set out in the by-laws themselves. The board is not entitled to make a by-law adopting, in general terms, a syllabus fixed by another authority. It is proposed that the board be given such a power. In particular, the board desires to adopt the syllabus prescribed by the Royal Australian Institute of Architects.

The second extension is to give the board express power to make by-laws prescribing examination fees to be charged for architects' examinations. Some decisions of the courts cast doubts on the board's power to prescribe fees to be charged for architects' examinations. It is desirable that such a power should exist. The board has to pay the cost of the examination and it is fair that the candidates should contribute to it.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It amends the Hawkers Act, 1934-1960, and it has a two-fold object, namely, (*a*) to increase the fees chargeable to hawkers by doubling the existing rates in the Second Schedule of the principal Act; and (*b*) to amend section 20 of the principal Act which deals with the licensing of visiting traders by councils. With regard to the increase of hawkers' fees, it is thought that such an increase is justified since the fees in the Second Schedule have not been changed since the passing of the Act in 1934. The existing fees no longer reflect the present day costs that have to be borne by local traders in such matters as payment of wages to employees, rent for their premises, and local government rates. Clause 4 accordingly amends the Second Schedule of the principal Act by doubling the existing fees.

With regard to the amendment to section 20 of the principal Act, this amendment, by inserting a new subsection to section 20 in clause 3, is designed to ensure that local authorities shall charge such fees to visiting traders as are specifically related to the days specified by him in his application for a licence as being the days on which he is authorized by his licence to trade. Certain councils have interpreted the words "not exceeding two pounds per day or portion of a day" as conferring upon them a power to charge a flat rate of fees which in some by-laws are not related to any particular days of trading or, indeed, to any period of trading at all, while in other by-laws a flat rate fee of so many pounds is charged per quarter of a year. It has been contended that this interpretation is contrary to the spirit and intention of this section and that certain councils have been abusing their powers under this section with the object of discriminating against visiting traders and making it economically unprofitable for visiting traders to trade in their council areas. Clause 3 is not in accord with Government policy, and it is proposed to move certain amendments thereto.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

## LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MORPHETTVILLE).

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The object of this short Bill, in effect, is to enable what is in effect a transfer from this year to 1966 of one of the available 17 days for which totalizator licences may be granted

for the Morphettville Racecourse. Section 19 of the principal Act provides, in paragraph (*a*), that the total number of days for which a totalizator licence may be granted for the Morphettville Racecourse in any one year is not to exceed 17 (subject to a special provision regarding charitable meetings). The reason for the amendment lies in the unusual fall of dates—Saturdays and public holidays—in 1965. The total number of available days for racing throughout the metropolitan area permitted by the Act is 61. In order to make use of the full number, the South Australian Jockey Club would have to hold a meeting on Thursday, December 30, a day which is not a public holiday and a day on which no Melbourne race meeting will be conducted. In contrast to 1965, with the declaration of Monday, January 3, 1966, as a public holiday, there will be 62 available days. The club has, therefore, asked that it be permitted to hold an extra race day in 1966 and one less in 1965. The total number of days over the two year period will, in fact, be the same.

The club applied for a transfer from December 30, 1965, to Monday, January 3, 1966, but there is no power in the Act to accede to the request, which the Government supports. Accordingly, this Bill will provide the necessary amendment to section 19. In commending the Bill to honourable members, I mention that this is one occasion where there seems to be an extra day. Thursday, December 30, is not a public holiday. The race day usually held on New Year's Day will be held on the Monday, and by this arrangement over the two-year period the number of race days normally allocated will automatically work itself out. The Legislative Council, in its wisdom, passed the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

## ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 14, at 2 p.m.