HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 12, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

NUCLEAR ENERGY.

Mr. HALL: An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, headed "Caution Urged in Natural Gas Use", deals with nuclear energy and its application to electricity generation. Is the Premier aware of this report and, if he is, can he comment on it in relation to the project for gas distribution in South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Having seen the article, I have already ascertained from the Minister of Mines that at present this State has no known deposits of uranium. Also, the authorities in this State at present doubt whether the economics of an atomic power station would be as attractive as indicated in the press report. The Government has indicated that it will proceed with the pipeline for the supply of natural gas in South Australia, and we consider we have no need to alter our opinion on that matter.

CHAFFEY IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. CURREN: Several months ago approval was given for work to be carried out on the replacement of channels with pipes and the concrete lining of channels in the Ral Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area. Can the Minister of Irrigation say how this work has progressed, when it is likely to be completed, and whether funds will be available this financial year for the replacement of channel No. 14?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to indicate to me that he would be asking this question today, I have obtained information for him. The following work remains to be carried out to complete stages 1 and 2 already approved: concrete line 12.30 chains No. 12 channel, and replace four outlets with 12in. valves. This work will be undertaken by the Berri Lands Department maintenance gang at the earliest opportunity after the present irrigation season. No Loan funds will be available to pipe No. 14 channel this year, but estimates are being obtained to enable this to be considered in the 1967-68 programme.

POLICE OFFICER'S COMPENSATION.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked during the Estimates debate about the reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by a police officer who was injured while on duty?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The reimbursement of $1,125 for ex-Constable R. L. Minear is for medical expenses incurred by him during the financial year 1965-66. The extended illness of ex-Constable Minear followed injuries received by him in the course of his employment as a police officer in February, 1941. Members of the Police Force in receipt of a remuneration of up to $110 a week (this excludes certain senior commissioned officers) are insured under the Workmen's Compensation Act and are paid in full by the department for absences occasioned by injuries received in the course of their employment. Each case of a commissioned officer in receipt of a remuneration of more than $110 a week and injured on duty is considered on its merits. The Government carries its own insurance for injury on duty.

KANGAROO ISLAND WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on the provision of a water supply for Kangaroo Island, and has he any particular comment at present?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the honourable member that progress has been made. As he is aware, a camp has been established in the area and all necessary materials have been ordered, so that everything is ready to make progress and complete the scheme in the shortest possible time. However, I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

WAYVILLE INTERSECTION.

Mr. LANGLEY: On August 2 I received a reply from the Minister of Roads concerning a traffic light installation at the corner of Goodwood Road and Greenhill Road, Wayville, and was told that the lights were being designed and that the design would be completed early in September. As this is a busy intersection, will the Minister of Lands ascertain whether tenders have been called, when work will be started, and when it will be completed?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

ATHELSTONE SCHOOLS.

Mrs. STEELE: When the Minister of Education officially opened the new Athelstone Primary School last Friday he said that several extra sites had been purchased in the area to provide for schools. Can he say where these sites are situated and what types of school are planned for this area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a list for the honourable member soon.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. RODDA: A group of soldier settlers in zone 5 in the South-East are involved in a court case, the hearing of which commenced in the Mount Gambier Supreme Court but was transferred to Adelaide. As these people are very much concerned about the outcome of the case, can the Minister of Repatriation say when the hearing in Adelaide is likely to resume?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, a case concerning final rentals in zone 5 of the war service land settlement scheme is at present before the Supreme Court. As I am not aware of the stage reached in these proceedings, I shall be happy to ascertain that information for the honourable member and to notify him in due course.

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Queensland's Premier was quoted as saying in London yesterday that he had completed an agreement for the investment of $40,000,000 in a plant in Queensland for the production of nitrogenous fertilizers, using gas from the Roma field. As negotiations on this matter were carried out by the former Government of South Australia, can the Premier say whether the present Government has continued those negotiations or whether any other negotiations are at present being undertaken?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although negotiations for a gas pipeline took place during the term of the previous Government, I am not aware of any negotiations concerning the fertilizer plant to which the honourable member has referred. However, land has been purchased in Wallaroo in connection with this matter and the question arises whether sufficient gas can be economically provided for the fertilizer industry. Until gas can be brought to Adelaide, there is little likelihood of determining the various parts of the State that may receive a supply. The member for Wallaroo is greatly interested in this matter, and the member for Light, too, has asked a question about it. We are trying to ensure that the interests of everybody concerned with the project will be fully considered.

BRAEVIEW WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. SHANNON: As the Minister of Works previously indicated that a water supply for Braeview involved certain problems that he hoped the Engineering and Water Supply Department would solve, has he further information on the matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Since my last reply to the honourable member, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has completed further investigations into this request and, as a result, has recommended that the project be approved. Included in the scheme is the erection of a 30,000-gallon squatters tank (to be replaced at a later date by a 2,000,000-gallon tank), 8,600ft. of 12in. and 10in. approach mains, 23,950ft. of reticulation mains, and associated other works. The estimated cost of the scheme is $134,000, and I am pleased to say that Cabinet has this week given approval for the expenditure to enable the work to proceed. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief hopes to be able to make a start on the work early in 1967.

HOUSE CONTRACTS.

Mrs. BYRNE: My attention has been drawn to an estate developer in the outer suburban area of my district who has employed building workers from whom he has accepted deposits for the purchase of houses on the estate. These workers have now been dismissed and have no moneys to keep up their payments. Nor have all of them copies of the contracts made in respect of the house purchase transactions. Will the Attorney-General have the matter investigated by the Land Agents Board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will let me have the names of the people involved, I will have an immediate investigation made.

FREE BOOKS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 4, in asking the Minister of Education a question about contracts for the supply of school books, I quoted from a report by Mr. A. L. Slade (Chairman of Directors of Rigby Limited) to the effect that half or more than half of the contracts had gone to other States. In his reply the Minister said he did not think the

report I had read out indicated the true position and that he would bring down a report himself. As this matter is urgent and important I guess the Minister has investigated it by now. Can he give some information on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I promised the honourable member I would bring down a report, and I hope to do that either tomorrow or next Tuesday.

STEELWORKS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago I asked the Minister of Works whether he could obtain information for me about the developmental programme at the steelworks of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited at Whyalla. I understand that the Premier, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry, now has a reply.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I wrote a letter to Sir Ian McLellan on September 30, to which he replied in the following letter:

Thank you for your letter of September 30 with which you enclosed an extract from *Hansard* containing a question asked by Mr. Freebairn, M.P. I think that the best way in which I can cover the information that would be helpful to you is take separately each one of the projects mentioned in the question and set out its present status.

Wharf and Harbour Extensions: The work involved here is principally an extension of the product wharf in the Whyalla Harbour. This work is in hand and pile driving is taking place. It is quite a big job involving an additional 600ft. of wharf and a good deal of dredging and we anticipate completing it about May, 1967.

Coke Oven Batteries: We are engaged in installing two batteries of coke ovens at Whyalla, each battery consisting of 36 ovens. Design work is practically completed and foundation work is in hand. The first battery should be completed about October, 1968, and the second battery, February, 1969.

Basic Oxygen Steelmaking Plant Extensions: These extensions are quite extensive and involve a number of different items including the doubling of oxygen producing plant. The extensions will, we estimate, make possible the production of at least 920,000 tons of ingots per annum at Whyalla. Some of the extensions are now almost complete and others are just commencing.

Universal Beam Mill: This project is at an advanced stage and preliminary rolling commenced last week. We anticipate the mill should be fully operational before the end of the year.

The Iron Ore Pelletizing Plant: This is a very extensive project and design work is now at quite an advanced stage. Site work has commenced and foundations are being poured. We anticipate the plant should be completed about January, 1968.

Coffin Bay Lime Sand Developments: This large project near Port Lincoln is now almost completed and we expect to be making our first shipment of limestone about mid-October.

I trust that the above information is what you require, but naturally if you would like any more I will be only too happy to do my best to supply it.

TEACHERS COLLEGES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked during the Estimates debate relating to the recruiting and training of teachers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The additional $169,139 for Principals, lecturers and staff of the teachers colleges is required to provide for an additional 20 lecturers on the staff of three colleges, for increased salaries following the Teachers' Award, increase in the basic wage, the first instalment of equal pay, and normal salary increments. Of the $174,362 increase in the line for allowances to students in training, $96,000 is to provide for 245 extra student teachers and 100 teaching scholarships. The remainder is to provide allowances for extra students who were taken into colleges at the beginning of this year. At the beginning of 1967 it is expected that 3,525 student teachers will be in training and 600 teaching scholarships will have been allotted.

DOG RACING CONTROL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2056.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to make one or two comments on this Bill which the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) has introduced into this House to provide for what is popularly known as tin hare greyhound racing. I must say that until the last day or so I have had, I hope, a fairly open mind on tin hare racing, and I should say that I am somewhat inclined to support tin hare greyhound racing in this State.

I think most members know that a similar Bill was introduced by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) in 1951. Although that Bill passed this Chamber, it was rejected by the other place. We all know that last year the member for Port Pirie introduced a motion on this subject and that it was dealt with in rather summary fashion by the House at that

time. However, when he re-introduced the motion earlier this year it passed in this House.

In the last day or so I have been doing some reading on greyhound racing, and it is interesting to find what a grip it has on people in some oversea countries, particularly in Great Britain. In the Parliamentary Library I came across a book written by a Mr. Nichols, who comments on greyhound racing in England, and I think the following quotation from that book describes a greyhound race rather graphically:

For of all the organized fatuities which have yet been devised to satisfy the cravings of a leaderless democracy, dog-racing is the supreme example. Come with me to one of the most renowned tracks of London, and see this sport with unprejudiced eyes. The stadium holds, at a modest estimate, 30,000 people. It is lit by lamps whose beams radiate into the foggy night, so that from a distance they look like pale, ghostly ballerinas, with milk-white skirts, poised before a vast audience. It is bitterly cold. There is no gaiety. It is all strangely silent. Sudenly there is a roar. You stare out and you see a white streak flash round the course, followed by six other white streaks. And before you realize it, the race is over. How long does each race take? Thirty seconds? It doesn't seem as long as that, but even assuming that it takes a minute, it is indeed a brief reward for a quarter of an hour's wait, on a night like this.

If I went to a play and found that each of the three acts lasted four minutes and each of the intervals lasted one hour (which is exactly the same proportion), I should demand my money back. But such an attitude would be regarded as eccentric by the devotees of the dogs. Turn round, and scan the faces of England's youth, lit by the lamplight. They look doped. Hunched shoulders, caps over forehead, and half-burnt cigarette drooping from lips which occasionally part and reveal blackened teeth.

He then goes on to say that it is not an inspiring sight. Perhaps the writer of that book has romanced a little in his description of a greyhound meeting. Many of my friends who are very keen greyhound devotees tell me that the sport is lots of fun, and I know that there are two or three well organized greyhound racing clubs in my district.

I think we have to face the fact that greyhound racing is a sport that comes within the financial scope of many people in our community that are not able to economically enjoy the sport of horse racing: they cannot afford to own and race a horse themselves. I was interested to find that Sir Winston Churchill, who seems to have a quotation for every occasion, described greyhound racing tracks as "animated roulette wheels". In the last few days I think most members of the House have been subjected to much propaganda from both tin hare enthusiasts and tin hare detractors.

Mr. Hughes: I certainly haven't, and I thought I would have been the very person to be approached.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The honourable member for Port Pirie has been working on you, though.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A pamphlet from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals states:

In November, 1965, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals brought to the attention of the National Coursing Association of South Australia a report alleging that, on October 30, 1965, a rabbit was killed by two greyhounds at Waterloo Corner. The reporter alleged that a stone was tied to the rabbit, thus allowing it no chance of escape, and was then released in the open; a woman present then released the two dogs, which promptly attacked the rabbit and tore it to pieces. This report was referred to the Association in the hope that it might be able to assist in tracing these people for, unfortunately, the reporter was unable to get close enough in time to intercept the driver, or to take the number of the car, before the couple left the area—he was able only to describe the car as a fawn Chevrolet sedan, model about 1954.

That is the most important evidence the R.S.P.C.A. seems to have against tin hare racing. The motion moved by the member for Port Pirie, and eventually passed, was much wider than this Bill. The parts of the motion that do not appear in the Bill provide for licensing totalizators at greyhound race meetings and control of greyhound racing in this State. I quote what the member for Port Pirie said on that occasion, so that members will have an idea of the legislative measures still to be introduced, as they are not in this Bill. The honourable member said:

If this motion were carried, legislation would be introduced in three sections. First, the Coursing Restriction Act of 1927 would be repealed. At present, this Act restricts the use of a mechanically or electrically controlled hare to entice dogs to race, the method used everywhere else in the world. Secondly, the Lottery and Gaming Act would be amended to allow a totalizator to operate at greyhound meetings. It is considered most unfair to allow betting on one form of coursing and not on another. Greyhound racing is surely the best test of speed and must provide the best betting medium. Thirdly, legislation would be introduced to control greyhound racing in South Australia.

At that time the member for Port Pirie claimed that he did not have the power to

introduce the measure, which he has now introduced. Recording a speech of the member for Victoria, the *Hansard* report states:

Knowing the initiative, knowhow and pugnacity of the member for Port Pirie, I cannot see that he is incapable of drafting a Bill.

Mr. McKee: You know I can't do that.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member underrates himself.

Mr. Clark: It would be a financial measure.

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member would not have to look far for somebody with the ability and the authority to draft a Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It was not suggested that the member for Port Pirie did not have the ability to draft a Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister is trying to lead me off on a tangent. I appreciate the ability of the member for Port Pirie and I am sure it can be used to draft an adequate Bill; but he said he could not introduce a Bill, for it was a financial measure.

Mr. Hughes: That was true at the time.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have an open mind on this Bill, and the speeches of members who follow me in this debate will help determine how I vote.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I cannot take the line taken by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), because I do not have an open mind on the matter: I oppose this Bill. When this matter was last before the House, with a motion canvassing support for this legislation, I said that I was hesitating whether to support it or not. Eventually I voted against the motion because I thought we were going far enough with social matters in this session and it would not do any harm if we waited for a time. I am still of that opinion, but another aspect has been brought to my attention, which I had not thought of: the aspect of cruelty. It is on these two grounds substantially that I oppose this measure. I know today is the last chance for some time for the honourable member to have it passed in this House, but we have gone a long way with regard to loosening up social matters in this State. We have passed a Bill to introduce a totalizator agency board system of betting, and another to introduce a lottery in this State. I think that is far enough for the time being, and I want to see how these things go before I am pushed into anything further. The legalizing of tin hare racing opens a new field of sport, so called, and gambling, in this State.

I do not know how far or how wide its ramifications would be and I am not prepared, in a hurried debate and without giving the matter much more thought and getting more information from the promoter of the measure, to vote for it. I imagine it would have wide repercussions. However, it was introduced towards the end of private members' business: the explanation of the Bill covered only two pages of *Hansard*, and then the honourable member expected us in two afternoons to agree to it. I am not prepared to do that: I am prepared to have an open mind, but I would like more information about the effects of this Bill. I have not yet got it nor do I expect to get it; therefore, for that reason alone, I would not support the honourable member. The question of cruelty had not occurred to me when the matter was last before the House, but since then I have received (as I guess all members have received) a circular from the R.S.P.C.A., and much other literature. I have also read an article written by Stewart Cockburn that appeared in the *Advertiser* several weeks ago.

Mr. Hughes: That was about 15 years old.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The article is not 15 weeks old, or perhaps not even 15 days old.

Mr. Hughes: It referred to the happenings of 15 years ago.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Wallaroo, in his recent conversion to this form of gambling, has not bothered to study the screed sent around by the R.S.P.C.A.

Mr. Hughes: Yes I have.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member has, how can he make such a silly interjection as the one he has just made? If he says that some things in the document are 15 years old, let us look at some of them! Page 1 of the circular refers to a prosecution in New South Wales in August last—not two months ago. Unless there is some explanation (and I do not believe there can be) for these prosecutions and for the points made by Mr. Cockburn in his article, I am against the measure on the ground that it would encourage cruelty to animals. If the member for Port Pirie can explain away the prosecutions and convictions recorded in various parts of Australia in regard to this matter, then perhaps he will start to convert me.

However, unless he can do that, I am not prepared to support this measure on that ground, namely, that it will encourage cruelty: I believe that no racing dog is a good dog until it has been blooded. The blooding process involves much cruelty to small animals. I

am opposed to the Bill on two grounds: I think we have gone far enough and fast enough; indeed, it is a pity that Government members and those who support the Government do not introduce legislation that will get the State going again.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Such as?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Although I do not wish to deal with other matters, because the member for Port Pirie's time is being taken up, there is the question of natural gas in this State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We've moved a little more quickly than you did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This Government has done nothing, and the State has run down since the Government came into office. The Government concentrates on matters of this kind but it is a pity it does not establish its priorities a little better than it has. We are going far enough and fast enough at present with this social legislation. Further, I do not know (and the member for Port Pirie has not explained) the ramifications of this matter. Secondly, if this Bill is passed it will encourage cruelty to animals.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I do not intend to cast a silent vote. When I was new to this place, not knowing the ramifications of a measure before the House, I found myself crossing the floor to support the member for Port Pirie when we had a dummy run on this matter some months ago. Having supported a motion to introduce this Bill, I now support the measure. I was interested to note the definition of a dog as including an animal of the same species as that to which the dog belongs. A former Leader of the Opposition was once rather uncouth and said (in 1927) that dogs were scraggy, useless, God-forsaken animals, no good to anyone. Being a man of the land, I owe much to dogs, and right now would welcome anybody's offer of a sheep dog.

Mr. Quirke: You may be landed with a dozen that are no good.

Mr. RODDA: I already have several of those. I do not care if a man lives at Port Adelaide, Glenelg or Naracoorte: he should have the right to do as he pleases in his leisure hours. We respect the laws that Parliament has enacted. The member for Mitcham, referring to correspondence members had received from the Anti-Tin Hare Racing League, said some nasty things about the people who raced dogs. Naturally, there are always two sides to every argument, but I like to look at the good things that are capable of putting people at ease. In this article the Secretary of the Royal Society of Queensland is quoted as saying that it is in the training and blooding of the greyhound that this barbaric cruelty takes place; they excite the dogs which some claim makes them faster out of the boxes; and the owners or the trainers throw small live animals to be torn to pieces. I would not have a bar of that. However, people who make such charges should be able to back them up; if they cannot, they should take what is coming to them. I do not believe that that sort of thing takes place in the Australian community to any extent.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you explain the prosecutions and convictions?

Mr. RODDA: Any person guilty of such practices should be prosecuted, but I do not think practices are as prevalent as is claimed. I am sure the people associated with coursing will be circumspect. I have no qualms about supporting this measure; I am prepared to go along with the good Australian spirit; but if somebody lets me down he will ultimately receive exactly what he deserves. Let us have a clean sport; if it is good enough to race dogs in Victoria, I cannot see a scrap of difference in the boundary between that State and South Australia.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill, because it is my political philosophy that we cannot be everyone's guardian. Parliament's role is to create conditions under which private enterprise may exist, with a minimum of restriction of and interference with the individual. The fact that the Government is not doing particularly well at present and is restricting people by various methods is quite apart from the principle. Various sections of the community say that other sections of the community should not do certain things. However, I find that it is those who are most talkative about what others should and should not do who generally have more faults than people who go about their own business in a quiet way.

I do not follow some of the arguments put forward. I agree with the member for Victoria on the matter of cruelty: if it were proved, the offender should be hit with everything in the book: for instance, he should be barred from coursing tracks for the rest of his life. If a coursing organization allows the baiting of animals on its track it should have its licence removed. Nevertheless, what would be the position if everything was banned because somebody did something wrong? People

would not be able to drive motor cars because of the potential murderers who drive around at high speeds. Under that argument practically everything would be eliminated.

I saw the President of the R.S.P.C.A. on television the other evening and he could not come up with one answer on this question; in fact, I felt almost sorry for him. An article on this subject appeared in the press. Of course, the press has a great responsibility in that, to a certain extent, it forges public opinion. I have great admiration for what it does, but in this case insufficient homework had been done and the article was emotional.

I have had much to do with dogs. Although I do not know whether greyhounds will chase certain things, in my experience dogs will chase everything they see. I do not work much on my farm these days but on Monday I worked with a young puppy that chased sheep and everything it could see. I think it is natural for a dog to chase everything; if one dog chases something the other dogs will join in and do the same. The suggestion is made that possums are being used to bait dogs but as far as I know it is always closed season for possums. I do not know where people would get possums in large supply to use to bait dogs. However, if they use possums they should be charged.

I am intrigued by the definition of "dog" included in the Bill, and I hope the member for Port Pirie will give me some help on it. According to my dictionary "dog" means "a quadruped of many breeds, wild and domestic". I suppose there are thousands more breeds than appear in the stud book. My dictionary also defines dogs as "the male of a wolf". I looked up "wolf" and the definition is "allied to a dog". I presume the definition in the Bill will encompass whippets and all dogs possible.

It amazes me that every time Government members introduce a Bill they do it in a different way which, I suppose, relieves the monotony of life. On this occasion, the motion passed by the House provided for a Bill to be presented for coursing and for a totalizator at coursing meetings. I know the member for Port Pirie cannot introduce a Bill to provide for totalizator betting, but nevertheless this makes it difficult to know what will be involved. If this Bill is passed, undoubtedly before long the various coursing clubs will ask for a totalizator or for bookmakers. I strongly oppose bookmakers and I think a totalizator should be used at dog racing meetings, as was provided in the motion. I hope that a similar position will not arise in this instance as applies to the totalizator agency board system. The Government receives 6½ per cent from the T.A.B. whereas a bookmaker pays just over 2 per cent on South Australian races and a little over 3 per cent on Victorian races. I hope we will not come up against anything as unjust as that on this occasion.

The Bill provides for the members of a particular section of the community to enjoy their sport. Generally they are people who do not have the resources to race horses and are therefore keen to race dogs. Over the week-end they can be seen on country roads with three or four greyhounds pulling them along or dragging them backwards. They are most enthusiastic people. As I said, if people are convicted of cruelty (or if a club is convicted of cruelty) the book should be thrown at them.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I rise to point out certain weaknesses in the Bill. When I spoke on the motion I said I wanted to see the Bill before I committed myself. The definition of "dog" reminds me of the story of the old shrewdy. When a coin was tossed, the shrewdy said, "What a dog's got." No matter how it came down, head or tail, the shrewdy won. I do not think there is any need for a definition of "dog".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Then it doesn't matter.

Mr. SHANNON: When I introduced a Bill on dog racing I intended to have the National Coursing Association of South Australia responsible for governing the sport. This is a most reputable body, and some organization should supervise the running of this sport. In these days no organized sport is conducted without some authority governing it. This association has its own rules, which are very strict. The problems that some of my colleagues see regarding cruelty would be covered by the rules of the association, and if a man was caught offending in this field he would be out for life and would not be able to race a dog again.

The association also has very strict rules regarding dogs when they are being prepared for a race. This prevents a dog from being "got at" or "given a shot" so that he will win or lose, whichever way people want him to run. In order that such things as that cannot apply, any dog entered for a race under the

association's rules has to be in the hands of the committee at a given time before the race and is under the committee's supervision and control until the race is run.

These things are important. I do not suggest that it is necessary to specify all these things in the Bill, but we should do everything possible to make sure the sport is run cleanly. The only way for that to be accomplished, in my view, is to have the sport under the supervision and control of a body that knows and recognizes all the tricks people can get up to. We must see that we do not license clubs where there is no real need for them. This Bill gives an open cheque, and it could enable any number of clubs to be established.

Mr. Freebairn: You don't think they are trying to squash our plumpton coursing, do you?

Mr. SHANNON: I think this thing can grow, like Topsy, anywhere it wants to. I thought the member for Port Pirie might have picked up some of these points, but apparently he has been a bit slow on the uptake. If any honourable member can show me anything in clause 5, which contains five subclauses, that prohibits anyone from getting a licence to establish a club, I should like to see it. As it stands, it wou'd be almost just a matter of applying and getting a licence. I admit the Minister has some say in these things.

Mr. McKee: He must have.

Mr. SHANNON: If we granted a licence to one country town, could we refuse to grant one to another town 25 miles away? When I introduced a Bill of this type in 1951 I went to the trouble of ascertaining how many prospective clubs there were in South Australia, and, speaking from memory, I found that there were some seven or eight clubs that could have been immediately licensed. The sponsors of the Bill who engaged me to look after their interests in this Chamber agreed with me that we should limit the number of country clubs to 10. I was assured that that number would more than meet the needs of the people who owned greyhounds and wanted to race them.

Mr. Clark: The Minister can do this.

Mr. SHANNON: I want to see it in the Bill, which as drafted gives an open cheque in this matter. I should not like to be the Minister who had to say that Peterborough could have a club and Terowie could not have one.

Mr. McKee: I am prepared to accept an amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not want the honourable member to accept an amendment: I want him to draft a Bill that is reasonably sensible. Perhaps members may think I am being tough in this matter, but I gave the member for Port Pirie a warning when I spoke on his motion that I would want to see his Bill.

Mr. Ryan: You have seen it.

Mr. McKee: I am prepared to go along with an amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: Well, the honourable member had better get busy. It will not be an unusual thing for a Government member to amend his own Bill.

Mr. Langley: We have been in office a long time!

Mr. SHANNON: I do not know whether any excuse can be made on that ground. The member for Light said that the resolution contained more than this Bill contains, and that is true. If there was one thing I was warned about more than any other regarding dog racing it was the unfortunate practices associated with betting. I was warned that, if this form of sport was to be permitted, gambling (both with bookmakers and with the totalizators) should at all costs be kept out of it.

Mr. Ryan: Who warned you?

Mr. SHANNON: The people concerned with the sport. I advise any member in doubt about this to consult the National Coursing Association of South Australia to ascertain its views. It is strange that we have no recognized body specified in the Bill to control this sport. I consulted the association before I introduced my Bill, because I thought it was my duty to do so. Both the late honourable member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins), who introduced a Bill in 1956, and I included in our Bills a prohibition on any organized gambling, both with bookmakers and the totalizator. In my opinion, this is a must, and I will not support any Bill that does not contain such a provision.

My reasons for this attitude are founded on the evidence I gathered first-hand from people who were concerned in this sport. I know that some of the dog owners wanted gambling and, in fact, that some of them were more interested in that than they were in the sport. Those particular owners were the gambling type, and they were the element the association warned me about giving too much licence, because they would cause most of the problems the ruling body would have to face.

These are the reasons why I find much fault with the Bill as presented. Any member who seeks to do something for any section of the community should look for all the evidence he can get. Perhaps the member for Port Pirie consulted many dog owners who are interested in this matter. Some of the dog owners were the strongest supporters I had for this control by the National Coursing Association; in fact, they were adamant about it: they told me that they thought this thing could get out of hand unless a very strong body was in charge of it. Everybody knows that the South Australian Jockey Club is the governing body for our racing clubs in this State. It has stipendiary stewards whose job it is to keep the sport of racing clean. Therefore, in a new venture such as this it would surely be wise to have a strong governing body.

Some time ago I had an opportunity of seeing dog racing on the Royal Showgrounds at Wayville. Some feature events were put on there, and I think the public thoroughly enjoyed them. Steeplechase races, which are spectacular, were held, and were popular at the show some years ago. The late Sir Walter Duncan was President of the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society and at his invitation I attended the show to see these races. Good reasons exist for permitting this sport, and if it is properly handled it is an attractive feature. However, a limit should be placed on the days on which racing is held. Good Friday and Christmas Day should be excluded, and the introduction of mid-week racing should be approached with caution because many dog owners have gainful employment.

Saturday night is good enough for anyone, although in the metropolitan area this sport would compete with trotting. I cannot support the present Bill and there is no point in amending it: it has grave weaknesses, and I am disappointed with the member for Port Pirie because he has had ample time to introduce a sound Bill. He wasted much time moving a motion: his correct approach was to introduce a Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the Bill, because the use of a mechanical lure has been lacking in greyhound racing in this State. By using pilot dogs the meetings have been spoilt, whereas the mechanical lure is favoured in other States and overseas. We should improve this type of racing and bring this State into line with other places. People in my district who are interested in this sport, do not participate in other sports, and greyhound racing will give them something to do in their leisure time. Occasionally, something goes wrong with horse racing and a battery is used, but people using them are punished by the racing bodies. Although the same thing may happen in other sports, I am sure that the cruelty aspect is well covered in greyhound racing. At White City in England the dog is taken from the owner, it is trained at the track, and there is little opportunity for people to interfere with the animal.

Mr. Ryan: It would be hard to put a battery on a dog.

Mr. LANGLEY: It may be awkward, but I have heard about batteries on horses.

Mr. Quirke: If this legislation goes bad it can be repealed.

Mr. LANGLEY: People in this State are keen and there are many migrants who have been accustomed to this type of racing. It has been curtailed in this State because the method of conducting a meeting was inferior. This Bill contains nothing about betting, but it will improve racing and I therefore support it. A letter written by Mr. P. F. McCormack, President of the Australian Veterinary Association, S.A. Division, sent to Mr. R. E. Mitchell, Chairman of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club Incorporated, states:

The article on page 2 of the *Advertiser*, September 14, 1966, and your letter were discussed by this association recently. The remarks made by Stewart Cockburn and attributed to veterinary surgeons do not represent the views of this association. It is the general opinion of practitioners that surgical repair of wounds in greyhounds make up a small proportion of the total number of such cases in all dogs generally. Such wounds are not as common as the article would indicate. Though the tearing of a cat's claws is a very common self-inflicted injury in escaping on a hard surface, extremely few cases are found where the claws are apparently purposely removed.

Apparently there has not been as much talk about cruelty as we have been led to believe. Under the auspices of the people controlling greyhound racing and with better conditions, this sport will improve, and that is why I support this Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): When the motion of the member for Port Pirie was before the House earlier this session, I opposed it mainly because I could not support the method being used to test the reaction of members. I made that clear, but during my comments I said I was not opposed to coursing or to any kind of sport and also that my comments and the

comments of some other Opposition members might be interpreted by members of the public as being opposed to the sport of greyhound racing. I went on to say, "I will have to take a chance on their believing this because I am not opposed to greyhound racing." Now, after having had a closer look at it, I realize how little I really knew about the sport and, having received literature (which I know other members have received), I have changed my mind on this matter, which I am entitled to do if evidence is presented to make me feel that I had not adopted the right stand at that time. This is not the prerogative of a woman only, but something which members on both sides have done from time to time. Women are often accused of being emotional about cruelty to animals.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that especially true of women?

Mrs. STEELE: No. I am glad the honourable member has interjected, for I should like to refer to an impassioned speech made by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) in 1956. The House will realize just how strong his views on this matter are. After making a long speech, during which he touched on many facets of greyhound racing, the honourable member said:

This is not an innocuous measure; it is extremely important. I believe cruelty of the most diabolical nature is associated with it. Associated with this sport is the perversion of the natural instincts of an animal. It is something that will degrade anyone who supports it. It provides another avenue for a most pernicious form of gambling. It cannot be justified under any consideration and I am quite certain that the majority of members will support me in opposing the measure.

It is not the actual racing of dogs that is objected to, but what goes before. In introducing the Bill on August 3, the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said:

It is common knowledge that a dog will race after a moving object, which in the Eastern States is the mechanical lure. In South Australia the dogs are made keen enough to want to be first to get to a cage containing live rabbits. This type of racing indicates that a dog has to be made savage to win races in this State, but any dog can be taught to chase a moving object without its being made savage, so surely the use of a mechanical lure similar to that in other States is desirable.

That, I think, is the crux of the matter. Most speakers to this debate have said that it is necessary to blood an animal before it will chase a mechanical lure. The document that members have received instances the kind of blooding that takes place in this sport. Although the references do not apply to South Australia, similar cases mentioned were substantiated in New South Wales. The last page of the document, which does not make very enjoyable reading, states:

At 8.56 a.m. the same man in the control room took out another live rabbit and tied it on the lair by its rear legs. A man with a greyhound on a lead went on to the track and allowed his dog to attack the rabbit. He then drew his dog back, and whilst the rabbit was struggling and squealing, it was sent off at speed. The dog was released and chased the rabbit but owing to the dog running wide, the rabbit was stopped and the dog allowed to attack it. This action was repeated once more and after completing the circuit, the rabbit was stopped a few feet from the inspectors, shockingly mutilated and dead. Two charges of cruelly ill-treating rabbits were preferred against the lair operator and on August 23 at the Central Police Court he was fined $60 on the first charge with $36 costs. On the second charge he was sentenced to one month's imprisonment with hard labour which was however suspended on the accused entering into a $100 bond to be of good behaviour for 12 months. It was later learned that a fee of $2 was paid by each owner for the live rabbit training of each dog.

Mr. Millhouse: Reading that makes me feel sick.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, it certainly does. I am fond of animals, as I assume most members are. The document gives two instances of what happens in South Australia, evidence of which was given but a charge for which was not preferred, because the police could not catch up with the people concerned, as they managed to escape "in a Chevrolet sedan". As the document has suggested, nobody can say this sort of thing does not happen in South Australia. Although a charge was not preferred here, a similar incident was actually detected and a charge preferred in New South Wales. I am concerned at what takes place before a mechanical lure is used. Small animals, including cats, rabbits and dogs, have been used for this purpose; veterinary surgeons have said that cats have been brought to them, with claws removed and have obviously been mauled by dogs. We cannot ignore these things; we must take notice of the cases cited by the R.S.P.C.A. I sympathize with the inspector who appeared on television and could not substantiate with charges of actual cruelty laid, instances of cruelty which have taken place here. Sufficient evidence has been presented to the House of charges of cruelty that have been laid in other States to convince us that this sort of thing takes place here. After all, the R.S.P.C.A. is recognized by this Government, and has received a grant for a

number of years. I cannot believe that its members, all of whom are highly reputable citizens, are so devoid of feeling and so irresponsible to the well-being of small animals. While cruelty is taking place, I cannot imagine how people enjoy following a sport involving the maltreatment of animals to the point of maiming and eventual death. Having been to the library today, I should like to read from the *Australian Encyclopaedia* the following for the benefit of the member for Victoria:

The first organized open-field meeting on record was that held at Naracoorte, S.A., in 1867 when hunting greyhounds imported from Britain were used and the lures were wallabies. The Naracoorte club, which still exists, is also credited with conducting the first Waterloo Cup in 1873. . . . Coursing commenced in Victoria in 1873, when hares were used as lures for the first time in Australia.

I know that in many parts of Australia this sport is regarded as an industry, which is borne out by the following quotation from the same book:

At first it was conducted in open fields with the greyhounds pursuing either hares or wallabies; then, as more money was involved and greater control was needed, enclosure coursing became general; latterly track racing with either live or mechanical lures has become common and the sport has assumed a highly commercial character.

In many parts of the Commonwealth there has been a big move to abolish the use of live lures in this sport (if, indeed, it can be called a sport). I am sure that some members do not realize the full ramifications of dog racing. I believe it would be a good idea if, instead of passing the Bill, members deferred the vote so that they could acquaint themselves more fully with all aspects of the sport both here and in other States. Such things as the control of the training of the animals and the methods used in training should be investigated. I believe that before passing the Bill we would do well if we saw how this type of sport was conducted on a commercial basis. Also, we should acquaint ourselves with the extent of the facilities for betting in other States because it was implicit in the earlier motion that betting would take place at greyhound racing meetings.

Already this session we have dealt with so many measures similar to this that many people in many places have commented that this Parliament seems preoccupied with questions of social import, and in particular with the provision of facilities to enable people to gamble in South Australia. If people want to do these things that is their business, but any sport of this kind, as it is sponsored by the member for Port Pirie, should have a thorough investigation made to ensure that, if it is introduced, it is conducted on the best possible lines with no danger of cruelty to dumb animals. I believe we have gone far enough with legislation of this kind this session and I suggest that we get on to some more important things. For the reasons I have stated, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill. The member for Burnside referred to the speech made by the member for Enfield on this subject in 1956. Before he spoke on that occasion I intended to vote for the motion but, after listening to him, I voted against it. I love dogs. I have had a dog for as long as I can remember and I still have one, although he belongs to another member of my family.

Mr. Hudson: Is his name Susie?

Mr. LAWN: No. He is not the most intelligent member of the family, but he is intelligent. He will do many things if he is trained to do them.

Mr. Millhouse: He sounds a bit like you.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member does not like references to Susie, the most intelligent member of his family. I am concerned about cruelty to animals. I am surprised to hear members opposite say that they oppose cruelty to animals when they subscribe to the legislation at present existing in South Australia. The member for Burnside referred to certain things. They happen in South Australia and the honourable member knows it. The Government of which she was a member provided legislation that enabled these things to happen in South Australia, and I will deal with that aspect in a moment. A few weeks ago an article appeared in the *Advertiser* about cruelty to dogs in this State.

Mr. Ryan: Did the writer sign his name?

Mr. LAWN: Yes; he is well-known on the radio and as a writer for the press. I do not deny his capabilities and qualifications. He wrote an article alleging certain things happening in South Australia. I am an animal lover: I do not like cruelty to animals, children or adults. If members look at page 1562 of this year's *Hansard* they will see that I asked a question of the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, about this article. After my explanation of the question, I said:

Will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, ask his colleague to have the statements contained in that article investigated by the Police Department?

I could not have asked for a better organization than the Police Department to conduct an investigation.

Had the reply confirmed what was written in the article I intended to ask the Premier to ask his colleague whether certain action could not be taken against those responsible for cruelty to animals. As the member for Victoria said, people who allege cruelty should back up their charges. The Premier's reply to my question is reported at page 1877 of this year's *Hansard*. As it is lengthy, I do not intend to quote it fully. However, part of this report emanating from the Police Department stated that the writer of the article interviewed certain people and reported the interviews with considerable licence. Veterinary surgeon "A" stated that he had treated one case of a "declawed" cat about 2½ years ago. Another said he had only witnessed one case of deliberate "blooding" of a dog and that was about 15 years ago in Sydney.

Referring to dogs that had been treated on a Sunday, the surgeon surmised from the injuries that the dogs had been fighting over a live lure. No case of "blooding" of a greyhound could be substantiated by this veterinary surgeon. Members opposite have referred to hares. At present, apparently hares are tied to a tree or held in some way. Some things referred to by members opposite apparently made their hearts bleed, but under the present legislation live hares are used and members opposite have not protested in this House. Apparently the dogs chase live lures, and tear themselves to pieces to get at them. Because of the fighting that takes place over the live lure, the dogs have to be taken to veterinary surgeons and treated on Sunday afternoons. It appears that live lure racing should be banned and, if my interpretation of the Police Department's report is correct, I would support any move in the House to ban it.

I do not wish to delay the House and I will make my position clear: I would not support anything that I thought would lead to cruelty. The Bill provides for racing without betting facilities. Members would probably find more cruelty to animals if there were betting facilities, particularly if bookmakers were allowed to operate. If at any time betting facilities are introduced, I hope the House will limit this betting to the totalizator.

Although some members have denied that this is so, a person can train a dog to chase a stick or a ball and to do many other things; in fact, talking is about the only thing a dog cannot be trained to do. If these dogs were allowed to race at their own speed, and there was no betting on the result of the race, who would care? If there were no betting, the owner of a dog would not worry whether his dog ran first or last. This Bill does not provide for any betting facilities at all: it simply provides for dogs chasing a mechanical lure, not a lure they can catch and tear to pieces, which is where the cruelty comes in.

Members opposite have referred to literature they have received on this matter. I have already instanced just how much reliance we can place on everything we read in the newspapers. However, according to a letter in the newspaper recently, Mrs. Richardson (Secretary of the Animal Lovers' Association) investigated mechanical lure racing in Melbourne, and she had no complaints to make. Mrs. Richardson is actively associated with animals and is very much opposed to cruelty to animals. I am satisfied that this Bill will not result in any cruelty to animals, and if I thought for one moment that it would I would be the first to oppose it. After the police investigation to which I have referred, I say there is more cruelty now under the present method of dog racing than there will be if this Bill is passed by both Houses and becomes law. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I cannot support the Bill. The member for Adelaide said he could not support the Bill if gambling was permitted.

Mr. Lawn: I did not say that: I said I would not support it if there was any cruelty.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am sorry. Unfortunately, I think there will be some cruelty.

Mr. McKee: What makes you think that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think there will be any more cruelty in this than there is in many other sports, but unfortunately we have cruelty in any of these things, even though it may not always be intended. People flog a horse to get it to win a race; people say they have to do it to get it to win, but that is cruelty. However, that is not the main reason why I oppose the Bill. I oppose it, first, on the grounds that far too much time has been taken in this session of Parliament on social questions, particularly gambling questions, instead of getting down—

Mr. Lawn: To robbing the workers.

Mr. McKee: This is private members' day. Didn't your members have things on the Notice Paper on private members' day?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, but I still say that all this is taking up part of the time of the session.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What your members had on the Notice Paper was not taking up the time of the session, I suppose.

Mr. HEASLIP: Much of our business was devoted to improving the welfare of South Australia. I think we have spent far too much time on these social questions.

Mr. McKee: Well, sit down.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the process, we have been neglecting the real welfare of the people of South Australia. Somebody interjected about robbing the workers. Well, this Bill is a polite way of robbing the workers, because many people who own these dogs are workers, and no-one can say that there will not be gambling on this dog racing. We cannot stop gambling.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: These people get a lot of pleasure out of owning dogs and racing them, and you would deny them that pleasure.

Mr. HEASLIP: People can own and race dogs, provided gambling is not indulged in. However, I say that most of the people who will attend dog racing will be more interested in betting than in anything else.

Mr. Ryan: Doesn't that apply to racing, too?

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course it does. As I say, it is a polite way of robbing the worker. He will be robbed: no-one makes money out of gambling.

Mr. Ryan: He might enjoy it. Racing is a sport, isn't it?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, it is not a sport any longer: it is a business, and a wonderful revenue earner for the Government. Dog racing will not be a sport, either: it will be a business, and it will be raising revenue through gambling.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't investing on the Stock Exchange gambling?

Mr. HEASLIP: As long as people can afford to do it, it is all right.

Mr. Curren: It's all gambling, isn't it?

Mr. Clark: It's all right for the well-to-do but not for the poor people!

Mr. HEASLIP: If people can afford to lose their money on the Stock Exchange, that is their business, but when people who have only a certain amount to take home weekly to their families spend money on gambling, I say it is all wrong.

Mr. Hughes: This Bill doesn't deal with gambling, and you know it.

Mr. Ryan: What clause refers to gambling?

Mr. HEASLIP: I have here a publication issued by the National Coursing Association of South Australia, which runs this business. Gambling is referred to in the Bill.

Mr. Hughes: No it isn't.

Mr. HEASLIP: In his second reading explanation the member for Port Pirie said:

In the opinion of this House a Bill should be introduced to provide for the repeal of the Coursing Restriction Act 1927, and the amendment of the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1966, to allow the licensing of totalizators at greyhound race meetings.

Mr. Ryan: Have you read the Bill?

Mr. HEASLIP: If that is not the implication of the Bill, I don't know what is.

Mr. Hughes: What page of *Hansard*?

Mr. HEASLIP: On page 830.

Mr. Hughes: That has nothing to do with this Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: It is headed, "Greyhound Racing".

Mr. Hughes: I can't help that: why don't you deal with the Bill on file?

Mr. HEASLIP: That was a motion introduced to bring in this Bill.

Mr. Hughes: Don't try to mislead the House. Deal with this Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am glad to hear the member for Wallaroo is so emphatic.

Mr. Hughes: I like fair play.

Mr. HEASLIP: Evidently the honourable member will support the Bill.

Mr. Hughes: I am going to.

Mr. HEASLIP: The circular from the National Coursing Association of South Australia states:

In 1962, 40 greyhound meetings were conducted in South Australia; in 1963, 45; in 1964, 19; and in 1965 about 30 to 35 meetings will be held in Adelaide. Because of the restrictions on betting in greyhound racing the interest at these meetings is limited and greyhound owners naturally seek to be able to wager on their dogs and must go to the open coursing meetings in the country to legally wager.

Mr. Millhouse: What has the honourable member to say about that?

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing in the Bill dealing with gambling.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have more information for the member for Wallaroo about the Bill he is going to support because, he says, there is no gambling in it. The circular continues:

Officials of each greyhound racing club take all steps and precautions to stop any illegal betting and wagering on greyhound racing at their meetings but as these meetings are attended by average Australians it is almost impossible to stop their wagering and betting on the dogs.

Yet the member for Wallaroo says there is not going to be gambling!

Mr. Hughes: It is not in the Bill.

Mr. Bockelberg: They wouldn't be silly enough to run dog racing without betting.

Mr. HEASLIP: These are facts: this is what happens.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: From what are you reading?

Mr. HEASLIP: A circular issued by the National Coursing Association, which is in charge of greyhound racing and which knows what it is talking about.

Mr. Ryan: How can you vote on a Bill that you know nothing about?

Mr. Millhouse: You're going to do it.

Mr. Ryan: Yes, but I am reading the Bill intelligently, not like you.

Mr. HEASLIP: Apparently, the member for Wallaroo does not realize that there has been, is at present, and always will be gambling.

Mr. Hughes: I realize it is not in the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: Apparently the honourable member is not convinced. The circular continues:

The National Coursing Association, which is the controlling body of greyhound racing in South Australia, wishes only to be able to operate a totalizator at each greyhound racing meeting. The totalizator would deduct 12¾ per cent from a turnover of $10,000 and over, which would be divided up 5¼ per cent to the State Government and 7½ per cent to be retained by the greyhound racing club.

Mr. Broomhill: That is not in the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: Of course not, but that is what will happen. It would be impossible to run it without betting and if the Bill is passed (and the member for Wallaroo will support it) there will be a totalizator. People who have travelled to Melbourne and seen greyhounds racing there realize that thousands of people go to those meetings and spend money on gambling. I have been there.

Mr. Curren: Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. HEASLIP: The Victorian Government is making much money from it, but the people who attend do not go to see dogs race but go to wager. That will happen in South Australia if this Bill is passed, and I oppose it.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I was not going to speak but because of a stupid remark made by a stupid member (the member for Mitcham)—

Mr. HEASLIP: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He wasn't referring to you.

Mr. HEASLIP: —the honourable member referred to a member on this side as "a stupid member", and I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Which member?

Mr. HEASLIP: A member on this side.

Mr. Clark: He never said a member on that side.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark referred to and I think I am entitled to know to whom the remark was addressed.

Mr. Millhouse: It was addressed to you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The member for Wallaroo was speaking.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Ridley knows that I know on whom I called to address the House, but I did not hear the remark and I ask the member for Rocky River if he wishes to press his point of order to give me information about which honourable member was called "a stupid member".

Mr. HEASLIP: The member for Wallaroo was looking at me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The honourable member for Wallaroo!

Mr. HUGHES: I had no intention of speaking in this debate until a stupid remark was made by an honourable member opposite—well, a stupid honourable member. I don't mind. It was a very, very stupid remark, and the honourable member who made it knows only too well it was a very stupid remark, when he referred to my conversion to this type of social legislation.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Who was that?

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member for Mitcham. I have no qualms about naming the honourable member. The other day the honourable member for Mitcham called the honourable member for Gawler the stupid member for Gawler. I rose on a point of order because I considered that the remark was outrageous. The Speaker, however, ruled that there was no point of order. The member's stupid remark about my conversion to this type of social legislation illustrates that he has a poor memory. I voted against a motion dealing with coursing, when it was moved by the member for Port Pirie, because it related to gambling, and I crossed the floor when a division was called for.

Mr. Clark: And everybody in the House knows about your opinion on such matters!

Mr. HUGHES: The member who made such a stupid remark this afternoon should also know that I spoke for one and a half hours to a motion dealing with a totalizator agency board that was introduced by the member for Frome last year, because I disagree with gambling. When I moved an amendment to that motion the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) asked, "Would you be prepared to abide by a referendum?" If honourable members look at *Hansard* they will see that I said, "I am prepared to abide by the decision of the people." If the member for Mitcham cares to refer to a vote on another Bill (to which I am not allowed to refer here), he will find that I still stand by what I said last year, namely, that I stand by the voice of the people. Moreover, I will stand by the voice of the people if further referenda are held.

Who was the member from the Government side who crossed the floor of the House when a division was called on the second reading of the Bill introduced this year for a totalizator agency board? The member who made the stupid remark this afternoon knows that it was the member for Wallaroo! When a division was called on the third reading of the same Bill, the stupid member who made the stupid remark this afternoon knows that the member for Wallaroo once again crossed the floor. I have already said that I intend to vote for this Bill, because nothing in it contains what members today have claimed that it contains. It does not deal with gambling. When the member for Rocky River was prompted by one of his colleagues to quote from *Hansard*, he was given a report of the wrong debate. That is the laugh of the century. I should like to know why the member for Mitcham has raised such objections to this small Bill, because not so long ago he said he attended horse-racing meetings and found it exciting to bet his 50c. I defy the member for Rocky River or any other member opposite to point to any clause in the Bill that legalizes gambling.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The member for Mitcham couldn't find it.

Mr. HUGHES: Of course he could not. Everybody in the House knows about my attitude towards gambling, and I assure the member for Port Pirie that if any attempt is made to introduce a Bill dealing with gambling I shall turn on him like the cat with claws to which members have referred this afternoon.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Even if there is a referendum?

Mr. HUGHES: A voice from the deep!

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Answer it!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, as the member for Ridley knows, and the member for Wallaroo is not obliged to answer them.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not mind answering the interjection. If the member for Port Pirie introduces a Bill containing a clause providing for a referendum, that would be totally different. I have already assured the House today that, if a referendum is held on any matter, I shall abide by the decision of the people, and the people I represent know that.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You believe in democracy!

Mr. HUGHES: Of course I do. What better democracy can we have than the voice of the people? The member for Burnside wishes that I should sit down because she is afraid that I shall refer to the wrong page that she handed to the member for Rocky River. The member for Mitcham wants me to sit down because he does not want me to refer to the stupid charge he made this afternoon. However, for the benefit of the member for Burra, I say that I have nothing against horse racing, trotting, or greyhound racing, but oppose it when gambling is attached. I love animals; I loved every one of the 80 horses that we had on the farm; and there is no better friend than a dog when one goes into the paddock for 300 or 400 sheep. In reply to the member for Mitcham, I point out that I read the correspondence sent to me.

Mr. Millhouse: You must have forgotten it.

Mr. HUGHES: I have not forgotten it, but I know how to come to a decision when I receive correspondence, whereas the honourable member apparently does not. I have been told in correspondence that people will tie live rabbits, as well as cats and possums, to a mechanical lure.

Mrs. Steele: Didn't you hear what I read out this afternoon?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not care about what was read out. That is what has been brought before me. In his second reading explanation, the member for Port Pirie said for the benefit of the House:

It has been asked whether mechanical lure racing encourages the term that has been used here in South Australia of blooding the animals to encourage them to race. The answer is quite definitely "No".

I assure the House that I would rather accept the word of my friend, the member for Port Pirie, than accept the stupid remarks made earlier in the debate this afternoon.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to say much, which will please the member for Port Pirie. I hope to make my remarks more coolly than the member for Wallaroo made his remarks. I do not understand some of the assertions he made, but probably that is my fault. However, when I look at this sport in other States I believe gambling is involved. It is wrong for the honourable member to assume that he is dealing with a matter entirely divorced from gambling; that is not so. The Bill will set up a system of racing in which gambling will be involved. If gambling is not legally present it will be illegally present. It is wrong to say these meetings will operate without totalizators or other gambling. On reflection I think the honourable member will realize that his remarks are wrong in this regard and that he is sanctioning an additional form of gambling in South Australia.

Other forms of gambling have been dealt with in the House this session, and the member for Wallaroo voted for the State Lotteries Bill. Whatever his reasons, he voted for it, and therefore he has sanctioned further gambling in the State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Other members voted for it.

Mr. HALL: I do not know why the Minister is protecting the honourable member. He directly associated himself with the introduction of additional gambling into South Australia. By voting for this Bill he is again sanctioning an additional form of gambling. I think it can be said that if we are to allow gambling in one sport there is no reason why we should not allow it in another. From what I hear, I understand that dog racing in other States is well conducted, although I have heard stories that it is not. A fairly prominent person in South Australian betting circles has assured me on several occasions that some of the support (and I do not say all of the support, because I am sure that many respectable people are associated with this move to establish greyhound racing in South Australia) has come from people who expect to establish illegal bookmaking on this form of racing. I do not know whether or not that is correct.

I cannot say so because I have not been able to examine dog racing in other States and I am unaware of the finer points. I am not willing to vote on this Bill until I know the true facts. Therefore, I suggest to the member for Port Pirie that he leave this matter on the Notice Paper until March, when this session will be resumed and when he can properly ask the House to give a considered view of the Bill. As one who has voted for most of the so-called reforms brought into the House this year, I sincerely ask the honourable member to leave the Bill on the Notice Paper. I would not have voted for T.A.B. in this House had I not personally examined the system in Victoria. I will definitely not vote on this Bill until I have examined the position in other States. If the honourable member wants my support he will wait until March before he asks for it. I move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member who seconds this motion must be a member who has not spoken.

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member must resume his seat.

Mr. FERGUSON: I second the motion.

Motion negatived.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I do not intend to delay the House: it has been delayed long enough by the rather foolish statements of some members opposite. The Bill is simple and straightforward, and I believe that in my second reading explanation I explained its purpose fairly fully. Members opposite have referred to acts of cruelty associated with the sport; reference has also been made to the R.S.P.C.A. I admit that that organization has campaigned vigorously against the Bill but, as the member for Victoria and other members have said, it has not been able to present substantial evidence to support its claims about cruelty. As the member for Victoria said, people who make such accusations should be able to back them up. I accept that as a reasonable approach to the matter.

The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) seemed only to be looking for an excuse to explain why he did not introduce the Bill himself. He has always opposed working-class people being able to participate in any sport from which they might get pleasure. Over the years his attitude towards the working-class people has been that if they have any spare time they should put it in working for the boss at no charge. The claims made by members opposite in opposing the Bill are not worthy of reply. If there were any substance in their claims I would have had nothing to

do with introducing the Bill. Only two or three cases of cruelty associated with the sport have occurred in the Commonwealth over the years. Although I do not want to refer to any other sport, I could mention cases of cruelty associated with other sports. To make this a good sport, the only solution is the mechanical lure.

The member for Onkaparinga said that he was disappointed in me because of the way the Bill had been drafted. I am disappointed in him because he was only looking for a way out, as was the member for Rocky River. He had to pull out some excuse and, as an old tactician, he pulled out a trick from his kitbag. As an old hatchet man, he believed that if he could pick something out he should do so. However, he did not make a good case, because the National Coursing Association, to which he referred, especially asked for the sport to be under the control of a Minister. I do not think we can get anything better than that, as the wishes of that body have been fulfilled in this matter.

Members will recall that I moved a motion early this session seeking an opinion of this House as to whether or not a Bill of this nature should be introduced. That motion was carried by a large majority, and I appreciate the support I received from members on that occasion. Although one or two members may have changed their minds, I think I will still get good support for this Bill, because it is a measure that will repeal the existing Coursing Restriction Act and permit dog racing in this State by means of a mechanical lure.

Mr. McAnaney: Why wouldn't the Government support you after the motion was carried?

Mr. McKEE: I cannot understand the honourable member's interjection.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're not the only one.

Mr. McAnaney: Why didn't the Government support you, following the vote of the House, and bring in a Bill?

Mr. McKEE: This is a social matter. I still cannot understand what the honourable member is driving at. I believe honourable members will agree that this Bill will facilitate a commonsense approach to the problem that exists today regarding this sport. Other sports have made a commonsense approach by introducing this type of measure. This legislation is desired by a large section of the people of this State, for it will benefit the sport and give the interested people the opportunity of enjoying the sport of their choice. I commend it to honourable members.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (21).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee (teller), Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

Noes (11).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse (teller), and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Freebairn. No—Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Licensing of dog-racing clubs."

Mr. SHANNON: I hope the member for Port Pirie will at least take some notice of my advice in this matter. No proper controlling authority is specified in the Bill, and I am sure the time will come when the honourable member will wish there was a controlling authority to which matters in dispute could be referred. A properly constituted association, such as the National Coursing Association, could deal with many important administrative matters.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Regulations."

Mr. QUIRKE: This is the regulation-making clause, under which many things could be done. It provides a penalty of $100 for any offence under the regulations. Are regulations to be promulgated for cases of cruelty or must action be taken under another Act? No power exists in this legislation to take action in cases of cruelty.

Mr. McKee: Clause 8 contains necessary powers to make regulations complementary to the provisions of this Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: But cruelty is not here, and cannot be penalized.

Mr. McKee: Regulations may do it.

Mr. QUIRKE: They may, but so much propaganda has been levelled against this sport that breaches of cruelty must be severely punished.

Mr. SHANNON: Control of the owner and of the identification of the dog is not provided for, and no controlling authority is named with which the dog is to be registered and given a proper description.

Mr. McKee: Look at clause 7.

Mr. SHANNON: The Greyhound Racing Association is already established, is competent

and knows the problems, and should be nominated to conduct this sport.

Mr. McKEE: I don't know whether the member for Onkaparinga does not understand or will not understand. Clause 4 prohibits participation in the conduct of dog racing unless such dog racing is conducted by or on behalf of a licensed dog racing club, namely, the National Coursing Association. Clause 5 deals with the granting and revocation by the Minister of licences to dog racing clubs. I think the provisions of this clause are self-explanatory. Clause 6 enables the Minister to delegate his powers and functions under the legislation. Clause 7 empowers authorized persons (including members of the Police Force) to enter premises where dog racing is conducted and to take action to prevent the commission of any offence, and provides the necessary sanctions against preventing or hindering such persons from exercising such powers. Clause 8 contains the necessary powers to make regulations complementary to the provisions in the Bill. Clause 9 contains the usual provision concerning the summary disposal of proceedings in respect of any offence.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No provision is made for power to take action in respect of cruelty, except a provision regarding inspection (contained in clause 7) in connection with cruelty on the course. I cannot imagine, however, that cruelty will occur on the course.

Mr. McKEE: The power of authorized persons to enter premises is clearly explained in the Bill as follows:

> Any person authorized in that behalf by the Minister or the President of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals . . . and any member of the Police Force may at any time enter any premises where dog racing is being conducted or any building, enclosure or place appurtenant thereto and may take such action as he deems necessary to prevent the commission of any offence under, or any infringement of, any provision of this Act or any other Act.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: There is no provision concerning cruelty.

Mr. Hudson: There is provision under other Acts.

Mr. RODDA: Although I supported the Bill, I wish to be assured that a provision is included dealing with this situation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: What the member for Port Pirie has read out merely refers to action that may be taken under another Act.

Mr. McKee: The Police Offences Act!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: We were assured that a provision would be included in the Bill dealing with cruelty. What the honourable member said is not in accordance with fact.

Mr. McKee: That is not so.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Bill merely relates to the inspection of premises where dog racing is being conducted, so that no power exists in respect of a person who may train a dog in, say, a paddock.

Mr. McKee: The police and the R.S.P.C.A. have power under the Police Offences Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not covered in this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the debate is getting back to clause 7, which has been passed. The Committee is dealing with clause 8 relating to regulations.

Mr. HEASLIP: Certain things are not included in the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: If they are not, the honourable member must restrict his remarks to clause 8.

Mr. HEASLIP: No provision is made concerning betting or cruelty. Provision should be made to prevent that. The mover would be well advised to include the necessary provision in the Bill.

Mr. McKee: You will find it is adequately covered.

Mr. HUDSON: The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1936-64, specifically covers cases of cruelty, section 4 of that Act defining an animal, and section 5 relating specifically to cruelty. The provisions of that Act can be taken together with the right of entry provided under clause 7 of the Bill, which refers specifically to an infringement of this or any other legislation. The specific items referred to in clause 8 do not limit the generality of the power to control and regulate dog racing. If, in relation to the conduct of dog racing, it is necessary to prescribe regulations to prevent certain practices being undertaken, then clause 8 would provide that power. If a particular practice in relation to a dog race was regarded as unjustified by the Minister or his delegate, the Governor could, under clause 8, make a regulation to proscribe that practice. If the practice were continued it would be subject to a penalty of $100 under this Bill and to the cruelty provisions of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act.

All this Bill deals with is dog racing using the mechanical lure. The aspect of cruelty arises here only in so far as cruelty may arise

in the process of undertaking dog racing. In so far as cruelty arises in any other way it is covered by the provisions of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. If the member for Gumeracha does not regard that Act as adequate, then he stands condemned because it was his Act. I do not think the arguments raised on this clause are anything more than red herrings designed to prolong the discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: I think cruelty can be covered under clause 8. If a person were convicted of cruelty some regulation should provide that he be excluded from dog racing for all time. For their own protection, I believe the people involved in this sport should make sure that cruelty is not associated with it. I should like the member for Port Pirie to say that he will do everything in his power to see that regulations are provided that will effectively control cruelty in this sport.

Mr. SHANNON: The Bill is cleverly drafted and leaves more doors open than it closes. Of course, the power referred to at the beginning of clause 8 resides in the Minister. No appropriate penalty is laid down to deal with a person who comes from another State with a dog under an assumed name. All the rules relating to dog racing are contained in the rules of the National Coursing Association which, mysteriously, is not referred to in the Bill. This association has its own rules regarding cruelty, too. The whole of the provisions in the clause virtually apply only to licensing or de-licensing a club. No real control is provided in the Bill other than through a Minister, and if a Minister is expected to look after this sport then a tenth Minister will be required, because the Bill does not limit the number of clubs in any way. It is undesirable that the Minister should accept this responsibility. Although he can delegate it, he has to delegate it to somebody. Will he delegate it, for instance, to the National Coursing Association? I think that is unlikely, for otherwise that association would have been mentioned in the Bill. As so drafted, the Bill virtually gives a blank cheque.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: When I spoke in the second reading debate I said there were two reasons why I opposed the Bill and that either one of them standing on its own would be sufficient reason for me to oppose it. The second of the reasons given was that the Bill would encourage cruelty. As I understood the drift of the remarks by supporters of the measure, it was that there was no trouble about cruelty, that the Bill covered the situation, and that we need not worry. I cannot see anything in the Bill which forbids cruelty, which regulates it, or which takes any step to prevent it.

Mr. Shannon: They delegate that to the R.S.P.C.A.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but in a very restricted way, because the right of entry (which would be, I would have thought, essential if anything were to be done) is restricted to premises where racing is being carried on or to any building, enclosure or place appurtenant thereto, which is next door. All a person has to do is go away from the track and there is no right of entry to the R.S.P.C.A., the police, the person the Minister may delegate, or anybody else. This is a serious matter. The learned member for Glenelg (I use that term in the non-technical sense, of course) said that it was covered under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act. However, section 16 of that Act gives a right of entry to a constable or an inspector but only into a sale yard or a place where animals are being kept for the purposes of sale: there is no general right of entry in that Act, unless I am mistaken. I know that the learned Attorney-General (he is learned in a technical sense only, as distinct from his colleague, the honourable member for Glenelg) is studying the matter and may correct me on this, but it seems to me there is no general right of entry under that Act to investigate and prevent cruelty.

This Bill itself does not give a general right of entry to the inspector or the person nominated by the President of the R.S.P.C.A., and to that extent it is defective. Clause 8 does not go to this point at all, and this is the regulation-making power where one would expect the matter to be put right. I see the honourable member for Wallaroo, who is such a vigorous supporter of this little measure, studying the brief. I do not know whether he is going to jump to his feet and make a vigorous defence of his colleague's Bill. I should be glad to hear him on this, although I think his own electors in Wallaroo—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —probably would prefer him to pursue the question of the natural gas pipeline.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! When I call the honourable member to order I expect him to obey. The honourable member will sit down, as provided for by the Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the honourable member behave himself?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, I only want to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, shut up!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I protest at that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, I withdraw that remark. I ask the honourable member to control himself and refrain from speaking while I am addressing him. The honourable member will take his seat. I ask him to confine his remarks to clause 8, which does not concern the matter he referred to a short time ago. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, after that metaphorical standing up or dressing down, whatever one likes to call it, perhaps I can proceed. The point I am making is that there is no provision in this Bill at all to deal with what I am afraid will happen—cruelty—and there is no general provision in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act which would cover the position. If the honourable member for Port Pirie is prepared to get up and explain just how he proposes to deal with these matters, I shall be very pleased, but I do not believe that he can do this, and despite the help he has been given by the honourable members for Glenelg and Wallaroo I think he is still in the same difficulty, namely, that there is no provision to deal with this point. I know the Attorney-General is studying the position, and I shall be very grateful to him if he proposes to get up and say something on the matter; if he does not do so, it will be mere confirmation of what I have been saying. Is the member for Port Pirie not going to give the Committee some assurances on this matter?

Mr. McKee: I think you have had an adequate explanation. I do not know how you are going to get any further explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member, I take it, is not going to give any explanation, therefore he admits that there is nothing in this which covers the point raised. Is this the position? It apparently is. In that case, I think one should oppose this clause.

Mr. RODDA: I should like to have an assurance from the member for Port Pirie that regulations will be made that will cover the fear that has been expressed by members on this side.

Mr. McKee: The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, together with clause 8, adequately covers the point.

Mr. RODDA: I should like to have the honourable member's assurance on that.

Mr. McANANEY: I must still protest about this. I supported the member for Port Pirie on this Bill, and I think I can expect something more from him in this respect than I have had. The penalties under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act are not sufficient. Undoubtedly, once this dog racing gets under way it will be very big business, and a penalty of $100 or so will be only a flea bite.

Mr. Hudson: The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act prescribes a penalty of six months' imprisonment.

Mr. McANANEY: The maximum penalty is rarely imposed, and the minimum penalty, which is a small fine, would not be a sufficient deterrent. I believe that if this industry is to be kept free of any criticism some severe penalty must be prescribed, such as banning a person from racing a dog.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Don't you think gaol is quite severe?

Mr. McANANEY: We often see in the courts a fine of $20, in default six months' imprisonment, and I can never reconcile those degrees of punishment. A person has the opportunity to pay an insignificant fine, and it is only if he does not pay the fine that a term of imprisonment is imposed. Penalties are not severe enough, and unless they are increased I shall not support the clause.

Mr. McKEE: The provisions of clause 7 are adequate to cover any breaches that may occur, and cruelty is covered by the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, which provides substantial penalties of up to six months' imprisonment—and that Act was introduced by the Opposition when in Government. I cannot give Opposition members any more assurances that the Bill will do what I say.

Mr. McANANEY: It is in the training of the dog that cruelty occurs. I am not satisfied, and the clause should be tidied up.

Mr. McKee: Powers exist under present law.

Mr. SHANNON: Ring-ins are not unknown in horse racing and if the person is caught he is suspended for life, without the right of appeal. Fraudulent practices should be included in this clause, so that a person responsible for them could be severely punished. The National Coursing Association provides for these aspects, including cruelty. Regulations may not cover this point, but if the sport were controlled by a proper authority they would not be required.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the explanation given by the member for Port Pirie from his screed does not satisfy me. It begs my question because it is restricted to the place where dog racing is being conducted. Clause 8 does not remedy the defect in clause 7 that restricts the right of entry to where racing is being conducted, and it does not cover places where training is being carried on. There is no provision for this in the Bill or in the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, because section 16 of that Act is restricted to places where animals are kept for sale or are sold. I ask the member for Port Pirie whether or not the cruelty aspect is covered in this Bill or anywhere else. Is the member going to sit and not answer the question?

Mr. Hudson: He has given an answer.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, he has not. His answer referred to where dog racing is being conducted, and that was not my question.

Mr. Hudson: Read sections 4 and 5 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have considered those sections, but they do not cover the right of entry to which I referred. Is the member for Port Pirie prepared to answer my question? I civilly ask him to reply on this point.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: After clause 8 is dealt with, clause 7 could be reconsidered to add words giving the right of entry to places that would be incidental to dog training. If the member for Port Pirie assured me that clause 7 could be reconsidered so that the power of inspection could be widened, it would at least meet some of the objections that have been raised by members on this side.

Mr. McKEE: This clause is covered by the Police Offences Act, and I cannot see how an amendment will satisfy the Opposition; the situation is already adequately covered.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a new answer; you didn't give that one before.

Mr. McKEE: The member for Mitcham, being a legal man, should be aware of the machinery available to cover the objection raised.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, that explanation is not sufficient.

Mr. McKee: The machinery is all there.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Where? Why is section 16 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act worded in the way it is? It would not be necessary to include a section giving specific power in any Act to search, if such power were covered under a general warrant. I am not prepared to accept the honourable member's explanation.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You don't want to accept any explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There is no power to enter so that cruelty can be detected.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That clause 7 be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN: Reconsidered!

Mr. Millhouse: Whichever word suits your pleasure.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is just trying to be clever.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I'm not.

The CHAIRMAN: Standing Orders provide that, if a Bill has been amended, it shall be recommitted. The clause to which the honourable member refers has not been amended and, therefore, Standing Orders (and not the Chairman) provide that it shall be reconsidered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I certainly meant no disrespect to you, Sir, I hope you will accept my explanation. I move:

That clause 7 be reconsidered.

Motion carried.

Clause 7—"Power of authorized persons to enter premises, etc."—reconsidered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In subclause (1) after "where" first occurring to insert "any dog is being trained for the purposes of dog racing or where".

I think that meets the difficulty that has arisen, and I hope the member for Port Pirie will accept the amendment in the spirit in which it is offered to him.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should immediately negotiate with the Commonwealth Government to have provisions of the Railways Standardization Agreement implemented, to provide a standard gauge railway connecting Port Pirie to Adelaide with the object of—

(*a*) obtaining the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland; and

(*b*) providing relief from unemployment in this State.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2071.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion. South Australia has some difficult

problems at present, one being a lack of profitability by the railways and another being the unemployment situation. If we could take some action to solve either of these problems we would be doing something in the interests of the State. Undoubtedly South Australia is favourably situated geographically in that it is in the centre of Australia but, at the same time, it must have an efficient and cheap form of transport to take its goods to other States and to bring to it goods from other States. This is essential if we are to have the state of momentum we had two years ago. To try to handicap road transport with charges to make up for the losses on the railways is a negative approach. In other countries it is found that long haulages on the railways make that form of transport competitive if it is efficient and well organized.

We must make our railways more efficient. I do not remember the exact figure, but I think the Railways Commissioner claimed that a locomotive could get four times as many ton-miles from diesel fuel as road transport could get. If that is correct (and I assume it is) there must be something wrong with the system if it cannot compete—and it cannot compete in Australia at present. The advantage road transport has over rail transport is that with the latter a person must get the goods he wants delivered from where he purchases them to the railway station and from another station to his property. The Railways Department should use some initiative and consider a simple form of containerization from the railways truck on to road transport. Perhaps then something could be accomplished.

The break of gauge presents a further difficulty regarding competition by the railways. It is absolutely necessary in the interests of the progress of South Australia that rail standardization be effected as soon as possible. At first glance it would appear that South Australia has more difficulties to face than the other States because it has in it three gauges that will be expensive to change, and disorganization will be involved as they are changed. However, the Commonwealth Government (which is much abused by the Government but which provides so much money for the State) will incur most of the expenditure. As this money will be spent in South Australia, States that already have standard gauge will have to contribute to the sums to be spent here. Work on standardization would mean much money would come into South Australia without much commitment by the people of the State.

The Premier argued that this work would not create much employment. Of course, modern means are available to lay the railway lines. The member for Frome referred to the use of tournapulls and other equipment which he said would drastically reduce the number of men required previously to work with picks and shovels. However, many people are required to produce the machinery used on the railway lines. I know of a farm on which, 30 years ago, four men worked. Now one man does the work previously done by the four, and the other three men probably work in factories supplying the machinery enabling one man to do the work. The same applies with the building of railway lines. Bulldozers and other equipment are used in roadmaking. Although a person chipping stones on the side of the road would probably be able to do the work as cheaply, I would not advocate that we should go back to that system. Therefore, the Premier was wandering in the wilderness when he said that if this work were started it would not mean much employment. The fact that the standardization work was going ahead would mean much employment in factories.

At present, an inquiry is being held on State transport services. The first aspect of that inquiry should have been a thorough examination of the railway systems of the State to see just what lines were necessary and should be maintained. South Australia has the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited which is one of the most efficient organizations in the world. Despite the inflated costs in Australia, until recently we were producing the cheapest steel in the world. The B.H.P. Company Limited has retained a United States firm to advise it on better management and general control of its organization. The same firm of consultants advised the Ford Motor Company in the U.S.A. and this company has now regained its leadership in car production.

It is essential for an expert to examine what is wrong with our transport system. Obviously, main lines in South Australia are essential, but they must be efficient and thus become profitable. That was found in Great Britain where an expert investigated a system that was losing money and suggested that about one-third of the railway lines be closed and the others modernized. Since then the British railway system has become successful. No-one can deny that a slowing down of activity in South Australia has taken place. We must receive a boost and this is one way it can be given.

The gauge standardization work carried out in this State has been reasonably efficient and apparently good results have been produced quietly without much publicity. This compares favourably with what happened in Western Australia. There has not been a sufficient effort by the Government to go ahead with plans and designs to extend gauge standardization in this State by obtaining money from the Commonwealth Government. In the last 12 or 18 months a substantial sum has been in credit to the Railway Standardization Account in the trust and deposit accounts, and it should be spent rather than accumulated. The Government should become active in the extension of gauge standardization. The Premier said it might be difficult to retain some spur lines, but expert advice should be obtained on which railway lines should be retained and how the railway system could fit in with road transport rather than having road transport trimmed to fit in with an excessive number of railway services.

Some spur lines must be operating uneconomically, and it is distressing to note that in the last three months (as shown by the September Treasury figures) Railways Department receipts were down to a much lower proportion than they should be for the first three months, whilst the working loss was $800,000 for this period. Obviously, our main lines must become more efficient and standardized in order to become competitive. The railway system in Canada has been examined and is to be subsidized by a reducing amount over eight years, but the system must become efficient or it will be replaced by other methods of transport. A commonsense business view must be taken of what happens in this State if we are to solve our problems. I support this necessary motion.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the House for its consideration of this motion, which is an important one and which was moved without political bias. I am sorry that the Premier has not treated it as such, as he has introduced many political aspects. In his speech I found what I believed to be peculiar statements, and the subject matter should not have been swamped with this political flavour. He said:

"Obtaining the full economic advantage of additional and facilitated trade with other States, particularly Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland"—I can only conjecture what this might be.

Later he said, "It is a longer-term project." He then said:

It is not intended to build an independent 4ft. 8½in. gauge line from Adelaide to Port Pirie, as inferred by the Leader.

I am sure the Premier did not read or hear the debate on this motion, and that he read a report prepared by someone else. How else could such a ridiculous and futile statement be made? When moving this motion I did not say or imply that I was advocating the building of a new 4ft. 8½in. gauge line to Port Pirie. I specifically spoke about many items that referred to shifting the line over on the permanent way. For the Premier to say that this statement implied a new line indicates that he has no knowledge of the motion. Finally, the Premier said:

Although there is no harm in the Leader's motion, it cannot achieve any purpose as it only supplements what the Government is already doing. I oppose the motion.

This is a ridiculous comment because the best answer to this proposition was for the Government to do something about it. We were willing to join the Government to provide a united front, but were told that all the Opposition did was to criticize. We offered to assist the Government in an important work, but we have been rebuffed in the usual way. This indicates the thinking of Government members, which is entirely politically orientated and which cares little for the development of this State. At least this debate has illustrated that the Opposition is concerned about South Australia's development, and I confidently expect that those concerned about it will support the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall (teller), Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Casey and Jennings.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

COMPENSATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should, this session, introduce a Bill to provide for the payment of compensation to victims of crimes of violence.

(Continued from October 5. Page 2073.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I thank the members for Victoria and Angas who have supported me in this motion. The only other speaker in the debate has been the Attorney-General and I must say, with due charity to him, that I have never heard him to worse effect than on this measure. As he has always championed this matter in the past, I thought he was quite ill at ease on this occasion in having to oppose it. The Attorney-General gave only one reason for opposing the motion (and that a most specious one), to the effect that the States could not afford, apparently, to relieve the Commonwealth of its financial obligations to pay pensions. That was the only thing the honourable gentleman said. He concluded a very short speech by suggesting (I think rather facetiously, though) that I should, in the time before he continued his remarks, ask the Commonwealth Government to do something about this.

I took the honourable gentleman seriously and, in haste (because we expected, at that time, the debate to go on the next week but, unfortunately, the Attorney-General was sick, and it did not go on), I contacted the Hon. Ian Sinclair (Minister of Social Services), and received an answer from him within the week by telegram, which was subsequently followed up by letter. I invite members to see what the Attorney-General said in the debate at page 1466 of *Hansard*:

However, a difficulty has arisen because, although we have repeatedly raised the matter, we have been unable to get any undertaking from the Commonwealth Government as to what it will do about social service payments to victims of crimes whom we seek to compensate from State funds.

The letter I have received from the Hon. Ian Sinclair, which really does not tally with what the Attorney-General said, states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, This letter is to confirm my telegram of today in answer to your letter of September 1. As I said in the telegram, my department has not been directly approached concerning the effect on social service entitlements of any compensation to victims of crimes of violence. The present position is that any capital sum received by way of compensation would be property for the purposes of the Social Services Act and periodical payments would constitute income. My department is prepared to consider the effect of any proposed compensation scheme which may be submitted to it.

That was the answer given by the Commonwealth Minister—

Mr. Hudson: What did the Commonwealth Attorney-General say?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —compared with the specious reason given by the Attorney-General in opposing this motion. I hope that, in view of the letter that the Attorney-General himself invited me to get, he will now do something about this, because it entirely negates his reason for opposing the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Nankivell and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Casey and Jennings.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6.3 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 11. Page 2173.)

Clause 8—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act"—which the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford had moved to amend in new paragraph (*b*) by striking out "for every $100, or fractional part of $100, of such amount or value . . . . $1.50."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The words proposed to be struck out in this amendment are the words that I would move be struck out. I therefore agree to the amendment. If this amendment is carried, the Committee will have to consider whether it is prepared to accept the amendment of the member for Gumeracha. In the circumstances, I think his amendment should have preference.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

In new paragraph (*b*) after "$12,000" to insert "$150 plus $1.50 for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of the excess over $12,000 of such amount or value".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I said last evening, I do not accept the amendment, which will have the effect of reducing the expected duty from all conveyances in excess of $12,000 by $30. As it is estimated that between 4,500 and 5,000 conveyances exceeding $12,000 may be expected in the ensuing 12 months, the loss of revenue by virtue of the amendment would be about $140,000. The

lower rate of 1¼ per cent for conveyances up to a value of $12,000 was to give a concession in respect of the low-cost and moderate-cost houses, but not in respect of big conveyances. The effect of the amendment would be to extend the concession to all conveyances, irrespective of size. Before the Bill was introduced, what constituted a reasonable amount was considered. It was considered that, because of the trend in real estate, modest houses could cost about $12,000, but the amendment will get away from that figure entirely. The amendment would apply the same concession to more expensive transactions as was intended to apply to transactions involving modest houses. In the circumstances, I ask the Committee to reject the amendment. As already intimated, I intend to submit a further amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I hope the Committee will not follow the advice given by the Treasurer, who has stressed that the result of my amendment would be the loss of $140,000 revenue to the Government. I do not dispute that figure, but the basis of all taxation is that it should be fair to the taxpayer. This Bill would be grossly unfair to the taxpayer and the fact that the Treasurer is now trying to patch it up is an indication of that. It is a well-recognized principle that any exemption in taxation rates should be carried forward. When the Treasurer introduced the land tax legislation, provision was made for the exemption on the lower rate to apply throughout the scale, even to estates of a large amount. There is no reason in equity why this principle should suddenly be dropped.

The CHAIRMAN: I am not sure whether the honourable member realizes what the Committee has done. What the honourable member seems to be speaking about has been deleted from the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand exactly what has been done and what the Treasurer intends to do. He intends to move the injustice from estates valued at more than $12,000 to those valued above $15,000: he is not removing the injustice. Undoubtedly he thinks this will have some electoral appeal, but I can tell him it will have no appeal in the districts of Glenelg, Unley and Chaffey.

Mr. Curren: What about Gumeracha?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not think it will have much appeal in Gumeracha, but I will not be concerned with that district. I will be going into Chaffey. There is no justice in the Treasurer's proposed amendment because if a person has a house worth more than $15,000 there is no exemption whatever, but if it is worth less than $12,000 he gets the exemption. The Treasurer has tried to remove the anomaly brought to light by the member for Mitcham but it has completely escaped his notice that the whole thing is rotten to the core. In talking about the revenue he is losing, the Treasurer is talking about revenue not yet approved by Parliament. I hope the Committee will not accept the Treasurer's proposed amendment.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The member for Gumeracha is playing Party politics. He has already indicated he is going into Chaffey. However, he has been there plenty of times and he has not got far. He referred to fairness in taxation. In fixing the rates, we considered the transactions likely to take place. The member for Gumeracha agrees with the exemptions on estates valued up to $12,000. As the Bill was originally worded the tax on a property valued at $12,100 would have been $181.50. My proposed amendment provides that the tax will be $152.50. Under the honourable member's amendment the tax will be $151.50. Under the honourable member's amendment, when the target of $16,000 is reached he wants to drag the chain by $30 right through irrespective of the value of the property. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment and enable me to move my amendment.

Mr. McANANEY: The Treasurer's amendment is contrary to all Labor policy I have previously heard: that all forms of taxation should increase on a gradual scale. However, in this case the scale is irregular and has sudden rises. Admittedly, the Treasurer's proposed amendment is an improvement on the original provision. However, the amendment leaves the Bill in an unsatisfactory position because the middle group of estates valued at between $12,000 and $15,000 will be taxed at a higher rate than will estates valued at more than $15,000.

Mr. HEASLIP: I support the amendment. The Bill as drafted would have penalized the people prepared to spend money, as a property valued at $12,001 would be taxed at the rate of $1.50 for every $100, whereas a property valued at under $12,000 would have been taxed at the rate of $1.25 for each $100. The amendment progressively irons out the increase. What kind of living can be made on a country property worth $15,000? It costs twice that

amount to start in business. People should be encouraged to develop the State and the confidence that is lacking today should be restored. The share market and the unemployment position show the seriousness of our difficulties, and confidence will not be restored if people who come to this State are taxed to the hilt.

Mr. HUDSON: The statement was made by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) that the rate of duty on a property valued at $15,000 would be higher than that on a property valued at more than $15,000, but that is not correct. If the honourable member examines the Treasurer's foreshadowed amendment, he will find that, in respect of values between $12,000 and $15,000, the rate of duty will gradually rise from 1¼ per cent to 1½ per cent and that it will remain at 1½ per cent in respect of valuations over $15,000. It provides for gradual increments in the duty payable, not for sharp increases. The member for Stirling incorrectly informed the Committee. We were all interested in the signs of leadership displayed by the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford). They are the only signs of leadership we get from the Opposition, but I think many of us think that retirement, like justice, must not only be done but must be seen to be done.

Mr. RODDA: I support the amendment because it so spreads the tax that the people in our "one horse" towns will be able to afford it.

Mr. Hughes: You wait until you go home for the weekend! You will not be welcomed.

Mr. RODDA: Did the honourable member go home at the weekend?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! A welcome home at the weekend is not mentioned in the clause.

Mr. RODDA: The Treasurer is making a lame attempt to get over the difficulty regarding the valuation of $12,000 and still to retain all the tax-gathering powers of the original Bill. The people of South Australia will not accept these tactics.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I was confused by what the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) said when he disputed the statement by the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney). Last night we were discussing the abrupt increase in taxation on valuations in excess of $12,000 and the Committee's view was that this sudden injustice should be broken down. The Treasurer's foreshadowed amendment brings about the same position when a valuation of $15,000 is reached, because there will be a tax of $1.50 for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of value in excess of $15,000. The argument advanced by the member for Glenelg is quite invalid.

Mr. Hudson: You have not understood it. You have not done your arithmetic. All I said was that the average rate of duty between $12,000 and $15,000 would be less than 1½ per cent. It becomes 1½ per cent at $15,000. There is no jump.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: When a figure of $15,000 is reached, there is a sudden jump, because the tax on every $100 or fration of $100 above $15,000 is $1.50.

Mr. Hudson: In terms of the Treasurer's proposal, the duty reaches $225 at a valuation of $15,000 through gradual increments, and $225 is exactly 1½ per cent of $15,000.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: With the difficulties associated with the jump from $12,000 to $15,000, we should soften the blow. I am prepared to support the amendment of the member for Gumeracha because a gradual increase in tax should apply and should be carried on to a higher figure than $15,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take strong exception to the unseemly remarks of the member for Glenelg. If he has no better argument to support the Treasurer's proposed amendment, he should not speak at all. When the Premier has to alter one day what he proposed to include in the Bill the day before, one has little confidence in his arithmetical powers. The schedule should have been checked to remove anomalies, and one can have little confidence in the Government when it back-pedals suddenly, as it is doing here. I contrast the outlook of this Government with that of the Commonwealth Government, which is using $14,000 as an upper limit (but it is considering increasing it) for the purpose of giving money to people who wish to buy a house, whereas the State Government picks a lower limit for the purpose of taking money away from people. I am glad the Treasurer has come a little way towards a more realistic appraisal of what is a modest house, but I prefer the proposals of the member for Gumeracha to those of the Treasurer. It should be a graduated scale, but the Treasurer's foreshadowed amendment provides for a special area of higher taxation between $12,000 and $15,000. This is where the greatest number of transactions will take place; thus providing a greater return. The amendment of the member for Gumeracha provides a smoothly graduated scale, and has the merit of simplicity.

Mr. SHANNON: According to my calculations, the Treasurer's foreshadowed amendment increases the taxation on values between $12,000 and $15,000 to $2.50 for each $100 over $12,000, and over $15,000 it is $1.50 for each $100. Why should the group between $12,000 and $15,000 be penalized? I know the Government wants revenue, but we should treat this group fairly. The amendment of the member for Gumeracha does greater justice with a graduated scale, and I do not complain of a higher rate of taxation for wealthier people. I would not have complained had there been a sliding scale similar to that operating in the land tax legislation. If my arithmetic is wrong, perhaps somebody will put it right.

Mr. HUDSON: I point out that the rate of duty operating between $12,000 and $15,000 is not greater than 1½ per cent. There is a rate of $225 on $15,000.

Mr. Shannon: What is that?

Mr. HUDSON: That is at $1.50 per $100.

Mr. Shannon: Your arithmetic is crook.

Mr. HUDSON: Even the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who is the acknowledged financial expert on the opposite side of the Committee, would agree with me on this, that $225 on $15,000 is $1.50 per $100, or $15 per $1,000. If the member for Onkaparinga cares to check it further, on $13,000 the $1.50 would give a duty of $195. The Treasurer's proposal is for a duty of $175, which is less than 1½ per cent.

Mr. Shannon: If you divide 225 by 150, what do you get? That is a simple sum.

Mr. HUDSON: I get 1½. I do not mind how it is worked out. Further, between $12,000 and $15,000 the rate of duty is less than 1½ per cent. What happens under the Treasurer's proposal is that the rate of duty gradually builds up from 1¼ per cent to 1½ per cent, between $12,000 and $15,000, and it stays at 1½ per cent from then on.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am surprised that no Government member spoke in support of the Treasurer's proposed amendment on the ground of equity. The only ground upon which the matter is brought forward is that it is convenient to impose taxes in that way; it is politically the best way to do it. By the Government's proposal we depart from the principles of taxation and introduce a new principle to charge an additional amount of $140,000 that cannot be justified on the grounds of fairness. I invite honourable members to look at the Land Tax Act passed this year and see how a graduated scale of taxation comes into operation.

Honourable members will see that if the value of land was $200,000 a certain amount of it was subject to taxation at the low rate, a certain amount at the intermediate rate, and a certain amount at the high rate, and the rest of it at the extreme rate. That has been an accepted principle of taxation but it is not convenient now to adopt that principle, so we must look around and see a cut-off point that we believe will not be practically bad politically, and after that we can go our hardest. We do not mind how we get it as long as we get it.

The Committee will not be impressed by the fact that no honourable member opposite, not even the member for Glenelg, has been able to produce any argument why the exemption should apply up to $12,000, and should cease to apply at $15,000. I hope the Committee will support my amendment, which is fundamentally fair. No honourable member can produce an argument that will make me change my ground.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Freebairn and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Casey and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In new paragraph (*b*) to insert "but does not exceed—

$15,000 . . . $150 plus $2.50 for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of the excess over $12,000 of such amount or value.

Exceeds $15,000, for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of such amount or value . . . 1.50;".

The amendment is designed to obviate an anomaly and to restrict loss of revenue; it will ease the sudden change over the range of $12,000 to $15,000. The duty would then be 1¼ per cent at $12,000, rise steadily to 1½ per cent at $15,000, and then remain at 1½ per cent above that figure. The cost of the concession is estimated at about $25,000. I hope the amendment meets objections raised by the

Opposition last evening and I ask the Committee to accept it.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

In paragraph (*c*) to leave out all the words, figures and symbols after "$12,000" second occurring and insert "but does not exceed—

$15,000 . . . $150, plus $2.50 for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of the excess over $12,000 of such value.

Exceeds $15,000, for every $100 or fractional part of $100 of such value . . . 1.50;".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ROWLAND FLAT WAR MEMORIAL HALL INCORPORATED BILL.

The Legislative Council requested that the House of Assembly give permission to the Hon. B. H. Teusner, a member of the House of Assembly, to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated Bill.

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

That the Hon. B. H. Teusner have leave to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the Legislative Council on the Rowland Flat War Memorial Hall Incorporated Bill, if he thinks fit.

Motion carried.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 2120.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is one Bill introduced by the Government that I have pleasure in supporting and I think I can do this briefly. As I understand it, its purpose is to simplify the machinery provisions inserted in the Bill last year for the election of members of the Flinders University Council between now and the constitution of the Convocation of that university in the early 1970's. This is a good example of the difficulties members of Parliament, draftsmen and others have in foreseeing problems likely to arise in practice; the difficulties that have arisen here concern the members of the Senate of the University of Adelaide. The extreme difficulty was in tracking down all the members in order that they might vote for members of the Council of the Flinders University. That is something that, looking back, we should have attended to but none of us noticed it at the time. As I have said, it is one more example of the difficult job members of Parliament have in trying to foresee and foretell the effect of legislation that is passed.

The effect of this Bill is that those members of the Council of the Flinders University who were elected by the Senate of the University of Adelaide at the beginning of July this year will have a much longer term than was expected when they were elected. I am happy with the people who were elected at that time and I say, "Good luck to them." It is something that no doubt members of Parliament would often like to do in their own case but seldom do they get as far as doing it. However, in this case I have no qualms in supporting the Bill, the effect of which will be to give those people elected on July 1 by the Senate of the University of Adelaide the right to continue as members of the Council of the Flinders University until 1972. Therefore, without worrying the Minister any further, I support the Bill.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I thank the honourable member for supporting the Bill. It is not controversial, and therefore there is no need for me to elaborate any further on the matter. I commend the Bill for the favourable consideration of honourable members.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 11. Page 2191.)

Clause 33—"Governor may proceed with development plan or refer it back to authority."

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

In subclause (5) after "office of" to insert "the authority and"; and after "council" second occurring to insert "if any".

These are merely drafting amendments.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In this and the previous clause reference is made to the Governor examining the development plans and so on. The purpose of introducing the term "Governor" is to make it quite clear that the Minister cannot do something on his own but must do it through Cabinet. Section 24 of the Acts Interpretation Act provides that

wherever the Governor is doing anything it is to be done with the advice and consent of Executive Council. It is the Minister's purpose to make sure that he will not have the final authority and that each of these plans will have to go before Cabinet?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There are some disabilities attached to this procedure. Cabinet members have only a certain amount of time and this is taken up with the administration of their own departments. However, under this provision all members of Cabinet will have to consider representations made in this connection. This could be extremely cumbersome and could result in Cabinet approving of something without going into detail, as has happened frequently before.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There are two reasons for providing the draft of the Bill as it stands. The first is that the Opposition has on more than one occasion in the last 18 months objected to administrative authority being exercised merely by a Minister, particularly when it happens to be this Minister. I am not being unfair in this; in fact, a good deal of criticism has been directed to the fact that it happened to be this Minister concerned, and it happened in the second reading debate on this Bill. The Government wanted to make it perfectly clear that this was a decision to be made by Cabinet and not merely executive authority being vested in one Minister alone, because these development matters will have far-reaching effects, and it is proper that they should be examined at the highest level.

Although we have provided that the public authorities most concerned will be members on the authority, nevertheless there are other Government departments and instrumentalities vitally affected by the decisions of the plan. It would be quite unfair to the Ministers, the departments and authorities concerned if they were not consulted at the stage where the final decision had to be taken as to the form of the plan, because the departments and authorities under Ministerial direction will be affected in some measure, and they should be in a position to be able to examine these things and to raise objections if necessary. Although I agree that it will load Cabinet with some extra work, I think it is work that is essential and should be done at the highest level. It will mean that all Ministers will have an opportunity to see how far these plans are affecting their departments and the authorities for which they are Ministerially responsible.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I want to refer to the matter raised by the member for Gumeracha. The Minister said something about the Opposition having a shot at him personally. As far as I know, that is quite incorrect. I certainly raised a complaint last year about the too frequent use of the word "Minister" but I do not think it has much relevance to this Bill. I suggest that the Minister forget about the motives of the Opposition in this respect, because I do not think they are as sinister as he suggests. Is any difference made to the legal right of a private citizen by the use of the word "Governor" instead of the word "Minister" in this clause? I understood the Attorney-General to say last night, in answer to a similar question, that the rights of private citizens would not be affected. However, I should like the Attorney-General's advice on the following statement by a lawyer outside this Chamber in connection with clauses 32 and 33:

The clauses seem to have been deliberately drafted with a view to preventing the use by the Supreme Court, at the instance of a private citizen or company, of the remedies of mandamus and prohibition in connection with the authorization of development plans. It is clear that these orders do not issue to the Government, that is, the Government in its executive capacity. All reference to the Governor should be omitted from these two clauses and the responsibility of authorizing the development plan should be fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Minister, who is answerable not only to Parliament but also to the courts for the legality of his actions.

It seems that the rights of private citizen are being deleteriously affected by the use of "Government" instead of "Minister".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought I had answered that question last evening. I do not see, if these clauses were altered and this were merely a Ministerial or Executive decision, on what grounds prohibition or mandamus would lie. These are rarely-exercised prerogative writs. They issue only in the most stringent circumstances. Given what the Minister would be required to do under these provisions, I cannot see where there would be any likelihood of a plaintiff's being able to successfully issue mandamus or prohibition to the Minister. With respect to the learned counsel, I think that, frankly, he is plainly wrong.

Amendment carried.

Mrs. STEELE: I move:

In subclause (5) to strike out "one month" and insert "three months".

Frequently people complain that they do not have the opportunity of knowing that by-laws

and such things are being altered by councils because there has been insufficient publication of the proposal. My amendment so increases the period that people will have a better opportunity to study these proposed changes. It is linked with my other amendments providing for the publication of plans in a newspaper circulated within the particular district so the people interested will have a chance to study the proposal. They would then have no excuse for saying that they did not know what was going on.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Clause 27 has been amended to provide for a period of two months instead of one month, and the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) proposes to move an amendment providing for a period of two months in this case. I think we should provide for two months here in order to be consistent. The member for Burnside may care to withdraw her amendment.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: My amendment has been on the file for a considerable time.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Ladies first.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the member for Ridley and of the Minister of Agriculture to Standing Order No. 419, which provides:

When there comes a question between the greater and lesser sum, or the longer or shorter time, the least sum and the longest time shall be first put to the question.

The member for Burnside has the longer time.

Mrs. STEELE: I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I move:

In subclause (5) to strike out "one month" and insert "two months".

My amendment brings the clause into conformity with clause 27, as amended, which provides for a period of two months in respect of an original plan or a plan that is recommitted. One month is insufficient time to enable the members of district councils, who are busy men, to examine the effect of proposals.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (6) after "councils" to insert "if any".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Supplementary development plans."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to add the following subclauses:

(2a) A council may examine the area of the council or any part thereof which is within the planning area affected by an authorized development plan and may, from to time, prepare a supplementary development plan of the area of the council or any part thereof which is within that planning area.

(2b) Such a supplementary development plan shall be of the same nature as a suppplementary development plan that could be prepared by the authority under subsection (1) of this section and the council shall, in relation thereto and in relation to matters incidental thereto, do all such things which the authority would have been required to do under sections 29, 30 and 31 of this Act, if the plan were prepared by the authority as are appropriate and practicable.

(2c) Where a supplementary development plan prepared by a council under this section is submitted to the Minister by the council together with a summary of the representations (if any) received by the council and a statement in writing describing the action taken or recommended by the council regarding each representation, the Minister shall, if he is satisfied that the council has in relation to the plan and to matters incidental thereto, done all such things which the authority would have been required to do under sections 29, 30 and 31 of this Act, if the plan were prepared by the Authority, as are appropriate and practicable, refer the plan, summary and statement to the authority for a report as to whether the supplementary development plan is consistent with, or is a suitable variation of, the authorized development plan.

(2d) If the authority reports to the Minister that in its opinion the supplementary development plan is not consistent with, or is not a suitable variation of, the authorized development plan, the authority shall furnish the Minister with its reasons for such opinion, and the Minister shall inform the council accordingly and return the plan to the council, but if the authority reports to the Minister that the supplementary development plan is consistent with, or is a suitable variation of, the authorized development plan, the supplementary development plan shall be deemed to be a supplementary development plan prepared by the authority and duly submitted to the Minister in accordance with section 31 of this Act and the provisions of sections 32 to 34 (both inclusive) of this Act shall apply and have effect in relation thereto accordingly.

This is designed to give power to a council to prepare supplementary plans of its development. When a supplementary development plan is prepared by a council and the authority has requested that the plan is consistent with or a suitable variation of the authorized development plan, the supplementary plan is to be deemed to have been prepared by and have the same effect as the supplementary plan prepared by the authority. This amendment has been asked for by councils and is a useful addition.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 36—"Planning regulations."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (1) after "plan" first occurring to insert "and on receiving from the Minister a certificate that in his opinion such of the provisions of section 38 of this Act as are applicable have been complied with,"; and after "thereof" to insert "and any matters incidental thereto".

This is to ensure that provisions of section 38 have been complied with before the Governor makes a planning regulation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why does it provide for the recommendation to be made by the authority or a council, rather than a recommendation both of the authority and a council? The authority is a Government authority whereas a council is, in theory, answerable to those who elect it. The recommendation should come both from the authority and the council.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It simply provides that one or the other may initiate the regulations. Inevitably, one or the other must be consulted, and regulations cannot be applied to an area unless the council is consulted, and the authority will be consulted about any regulations initiated by a council. Both must be consulted.

The CHAIRMAN: For the information of honourable members the whole of a clause can be discussed before it is put, but once an amendment is before the Chair the question is the amendment, and discussion should be confined to that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does this mean that by the Attorney-General moving the amendment on page 25 the Committee is prevented from discussing, at any stage, something further back?

The CHAIRMAN: The clause can be discussed any time before it is put, but once an amendment is moved to any part of the clause discussion is confined to the amendment until it is dealt with.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can we discuss anything further back than that amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What if I had not been satisfied with what the Attorney-General said in explanation, could I have moved an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: No. Amendments cannot be moved to a line back from the one the Committee was discussing.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

In subclause (1) after "as" to strike out "he considers" and insert "are".

The amendment is designed to ensure that the Governor makes such planning regulations as are necessary or expedient, and not such as he considers necessary or expedient for the purpose of implementing the authorized development plan.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (3) after "relates" to add "and it may provide that the regulation shall be administered or enforced or administered and enforced by the council".

This amendment will enable a provision to be inserted in the planning regulations, made on the recommendation of a council, that it shall be administered or enforced by the council. This has been specifically asked for by the city of Adelaide, which wanted to make certain that when it initiated a plan or regulation provision could be made that it was in the hands of the council rather than the authority. It is a useful means of obtaining co-operation of councils to carry out the provisions of this Bill, and I recommend it.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause 4 (*b*) (iii) after "the" first occurring to strike out "mode of construction"; and after "thereof" to insert "and the general character of the external appearance of buildings and structures".

This is designed to remove a possible inconsistency with the Building Act.

Mrs. STEELE: It has been suggested that it would be impracticable to make regulations on this subject, and that if regulations were made it would be impracticable to enforce them. There would be endless confusion, disagreement, and numerous appeals, and much delay would be caused. This follows from the amendment that the Attorney-General has just moved.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Regulations of this kind are made by planning authorities elsewhere, and they do not seem to result in the confusion that the honourable member has mentioned.

Mrs. Steele: They could result in much delay and confusion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In certain new or redevelopment plans, a provision for the general appearance of the buildings involved could be essential to proper planning. Indeed, in some of the older planned developments in

England beautiful areas have arisen from providing a consistency in building and siting. One of the things that may be essential in our planning of, for instance, city squares is the provision of some sort of reasonable relationship between the new buildings to be erected there. Once we reach the stage where everybody is putting up buildings haphazardly regardless of the height or construction of the the adjoining buildings, we get not planning but confusion. This sort of thing is already arising in Victoria Square. With a committee set up for certain areas (as could be done under the provisions of this Bill already passed by the Committee), we might be able to reach some reasonable agreement amongst the people concerned and produce a regulation to control development and make city squares or similar areas places of beauty and consistency of architectural relationship as they should be. I do not think such regulations will create confusion.

Mrs. Steele: What about the delay?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There may be some delay. In fact, sometimes there will be delay to allow us to achieve what we want; but the delay will be worthwhile if we eventually get something satisfactory.

Mr. SHANNON: I refer to what we have done at the northern end of Victoria Square, where we see the glasshouses of the M.L.C. building and the Reserve Bank building. Then, near the old Supreme Court building there is Charles Moore's emporium, and both are fine, old buildings. We may be going too far in this. After all, tastes in architectural features vary considerably. I saw an article in a week-end newspaper featuring some buildings of unusual architecture recently erected. One was the well-known Arkaba restaurant on Glen Osmond Road; another was the new St. Saviour's Church at Glen Osmond. Their architecture is entirely new. I am not too sure that we should grant this authority to decide on the designs of buildings in different places. The Attorney-General has drawn our attention to Victoria Square. If that is an example of conformity, I am surprised.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: No. I am saying that what is happening there is what we do not want to happen elsewhere.

Mr. SHANNON: I agree that the new Government office block, the M.L.C. building and the Reserve Bank building are all out of keeping.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Surely we want to get some sort of architectural relationship between the buildings?

Mr. SHANNON: I think this is perhaps going too far. It is reaching the stage where the actual costs of a structure play a part. For instance, I have no doubt that the Government office block now being erected in Victoria Square could have been made much more attractive architecturally, but at considerably increased cost. Economics play a part in this, but uniformity is monotonous.

Mrs. STEELE: I agree with the honourable member who has just spoken that people will tend to lose their individual ideas if they are compelled to conform to certain plans. We should guard against the danger of conformity. Many new office buildings resemble matchboxes. To write into the Bill a provision requiring that, for all time, buildings should conform to a particular plan in a particular locality would be a great mistake.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

To strike out subparagraph (iii) of subclause (4) (*d*).

This regulation-making power is to be deleted, as it is intended to replace it with specific enactments contained in new provisions of this clause.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (4) (*d*) (iv) after "authority" to insert "or a council".

This amendment and the subsequent one are designed to extend to councils the powers to be conferred on the authority.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In subclause (4) (*f*) after "authority" to insert "or a council".

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Paragraph (*m*) has been seriously questioned, because of the way in which it is framed. We are dealing with a regulation-making power to authorize the Governor, on the recommendation of the authorities and by proclamation, to exempt certain land. Once the regulation is made, the Governor may proclaim any exemptions he wishes. It has been suggested that the exemptions themselves should be made by regulations. Will the Attorney-General comment on this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN; This is no different from the power of exemption given to councils in their zoning by-laws. It has been consistently the case that zoning by-laws have empowered councils to make specific exemptions, for instance, in respect of non-conforming uses or the like, and a discretionary power of this kind ought to be allowed to an

administrative authority; otherwise, considerable injustice could occur, and it would be considerably cumbersome to give effect to this power by regulations.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (4) (*h*) (ii) after "building" to insert ", structure, stockpile, earthworks".

This amendment is designed to extend regulation-making power to structures, stockpiles, and earthworks, which could cause some difficulty if not within the regulation-making power.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (4) (*h*) (iii) after "erection" to insert "or making"; after "structure" to insert ", stockpile, earthworks or excavation"; after "traffic" to strike out "along the road"; and after "congestion" to strike out "on the road" and insert "or traffic hazard".

The first two amendments are merely drafting amendments, the following amendments being designed to ensure that increased and excessive vehicular traffic, traffic congestion and traffic hazards are avoided not only on the road in question but also on nearby roads. It is not merely the immediate congestion area with which we are concerned but the congestion arising from a particular use at some other point, which may be of considerable moment to effective planning regulation. Therefore, we wish to ensure that by placing something at a particular point, although the traffic may be coped with immediately around it, we are not creating a traffic difficulty or congestion somewhere else.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

In subclause (4) (*l*) after "advertising" to insert "devices,"; and after "signs" to insert ", panels".

These are merely drafting improvements.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Paragraphs (*m*) and (*n*) of subclause (4) are two of the few provisions that actually require action to be taken to prohibit or modify a structure. Will this mean that people may be compelled to demolish unsightly buildings?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think it would be possible to provide for that in the regulations but whatever the regulations provided they would still be subject to the scrutiny of Parliament before being effective. That is, they would be subject to disallowance by Parliament. If draining is to be effective, some areas may have sections that require complete removal or alteration. Such action could be taken by regulation under which the authority concerned (be it the authority or the council) could require that work to be done. However, it would have to be subject to the scrutiny of Parliament. I would not think it was so broad that the honourable member need worry about it. This provision exists in the Local Government Act, but these regulations may be made as part of a comprehensive plan rather than the activity of a local government authority unrelated to any planning measure.

Mr. SHANNON: Parts of my district have an infestation of African daisy and it is believed that in some areas it has been carried from Government property. In many cases nobody is to blame, because it occurs on what may be termed neglected land under these regulations. Other noxious weeds cause problems in the hills area, but we have been able to deal with many of them, such as the blackberry. African daisy, however, is one of the most difficult to eradicate. I am concerned that if this Committee becomes too enthusiastic about cleaning up the areas affected many people not to blame for the infestation will suffer. Many people have built a house on the knob of a block while the lower land stretches into inaccessible places and can be infested by seed from other areas. Eradication would be most difficult and expensive under these circumstances. I am not certain whether it is intended that the regulations should cover such instances. Perhaps we are giving this standing committee authority to deal with something that could be handled by local government. I believe that the latter should be left to handle such problems, as they have definite powers at present.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Under the ruling, which is new to me, that we must proceed line by line, we are prohibited from making any further amendments.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The only thing that can be done then is to strike out the whole clause.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is so, and because of that I should like to discuss subclause (*m*) a little further, as it is something that concerns me. The regulation-making powers in this Act are extremely wide, and we are requiring action to be taken on something that happened long ago. Normally planning is for the future, but this can be used to force the cleaning up of things that other people have, through untidiness or carelessness, done in the past. In many cases people do not

agree on what is unsightly and the regulations in subclause (*m*) could have the most far-reaching effect and alter the entire *status quo*. I believe there is a strong case for preserving the *status quo* in legislation of this nature. By all means concentrate on the future, but be careful about legislation that will alter something that has already happened.

I can think of properties in the metropolitan area on which there are derelict vehicles; possibly those places would need cleaning up, according to most people. However, if people were ordered to pull down buildings, it would be at the expense of the owner. The regulations could almost make the Weeds Act superfluous in some respects, and members are aware of the economic effect of cleaning up weeds. It would cost too much for that to be done overnight, in many cases, on Government as well as on private land. Only the other day this House discussed the enormous problem of removing weeds from Government reserves. I do not hold with the view that it is always the Government that starts these infestations, because both private and Government lands are infested with weeds and often with vermin. This could cause tremendous economic loss if not carefully and wisely drawn up.

I am not sure that it is a good enough safeguard to say that this regulation must run the gauntlet of Parliament, because it is based on a different principle from the majority of regulation-making powers in the Act. Nearly all the others relate to proposed plans or Acts. If regulations were particularly far-reaching, they could alter land uses in old established districts.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Paragraph (*m*) causes me much concern. About 70 per cent of the land in my district would come under the definition of neglected or waste land. It is rocky land not capable of economic development, whereas the richer land in the gullies has been developed and is used. A large area of the land that is not developed has not been fenced. Paragraph (*t*) provides for a daily penalty for failure to comply with a notice or for a breach of a planning regulation. I should like some explanation from the Attorney-General on what these paragraphs propose. There have sometimes been difficulties in getting approval for subdivisions on the ground that they destroy natural beauty, but these provisions provide for the opposite circumstances. The Government has brought large areas of this type of land to keep it in its natural state, and it is by far the most neglected land of the lot. Government land is often the subject of criticism because of the fire hazard it causes. I do not suggest that the Government should not have bought the land or that it should dispose of it, because I believe there is value in having land in its natural state adjacent to the city. Will the Attorney explain what is proposed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not intended by these provisions to cover areas of natural scrub or areas likely to be held as wildlife reserves, public parks or naturally covered open space. What is intended to be covered is land which has obviously fallen into a grossly neglected condition and which is both unsightly and at times hazardous. Areas of this kind can be found dotted around in numbers of surburban districts. If the honourable member likes to come to Kensington, in my district, I can show him a few examples. In these areas there are unsightly and hazardous conditions prevailing because, in some cases, land has not been properly drained, and it may be necessary for the purpose of a plan of development to make some regulation in relation to it. Certainly the provisions are not intended to cover and, in my view, do not cover naturally covered areas of land in the hills.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: What is the effect of regulations made under this clause in regard to Government instrumentalities? Some are not particularly tidy in their habits, although most are. The Railways Commissioner has much difficulty in keeping some of the land under his control tidy. Also, there are dilapidated buildings under his control. Are these regulations to apply to the Railways Commissioner?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This could be done. On the other hand, the plans and regulations to carry this out must go to Cabinet before being approved. One of the reasons for this is to keep every Minister informed of what is proposed.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Would the regulation have general application throughout the State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not necessarily; it will apply only in relation to a planning area. What is required in one planning area may not necessarily be what is required in another.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

To strike out paragraph (*m*).

After listening to the discussion and considering the implications, I still believe that people may be required to take action on something that already exists, and they could be put to

considerable expense and involved in pulling down buildings that were not satisfactory to the authority. I am not satisfied that this provision is necessary.

Mr. SHANNON: I know places where certain derelict buildings are to the detriment of land values because they do not serve any useful purpose but, by virtue of neglect, are allowed to remain. The power to remove them should not be denied the authority. In one or two cases in my district certain landowners would be glad to get rid of nearby buildings that were an eyesore.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: One or two building eyesores along the Torrens might very well be removed.

Mr. SHANNON: I propose to move to strike out the words "or the condition of any derelict, waste or neglected land". I draw attention to the difficulty of determining the meaning of "waste land". If land is waste land and an owner is required to spend money on it, the money will be wasted. We expect councils to look after their own districts, and an active body known as the Mount Lofty Ranges Association takes an active part in preserving the beauty of our hills. I do not think these people would ask an owner to spend money on a piece of waste land in a deep gully, where nothing could be done with it.

Other areas of waste land in the State are samphire swamps. Would an owner whose land was subject to occasional inundation by high tide be required to put up a dyke so that there would be no more damage by the sea? That may be taking the matter to an extreme, and I do not think any sensible authority would require such a thing. However, why should Parliament grant this power when councils, whose members have local knowledge, already have adequate power? When council officers instruct landowners to remove noxious weeds, for example, these officers know whether such removal is practicable or whether the cost of removal would be more than the value of the land. I move:

In paragraph (*m*) to strike out "or the condition of any derelict, waste or neglected land".

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member cannot at this stage move the amendment indicated. The honourable member for Alexandra has already moved that the whole of paragraph (*m*) be struck out. To safeguard the rights of the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) I shall put the question that all words from "require" to "locality" be struck out.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not entirely in favour of deleting this paragraph, but there will be difficulty about implementing it. A clause dealing with unsightly goods and chattels has been inserted in the Local Government Act, but it has been ineffectual in cases in my district because there has been difficulty about who decides whether the goods and chattels are unsightly. The same difficulty could arise here, although the paragraph should remain, in principle.

I do not know whether waste lands is derelict land. I invite honourable members to see the many old lorries on Mr. Jolly's premises on the right-hand side of Main North Road, Prospect. These lorries have been there for about 20 years and were a problem for Sir Malcolm McIntosh when he was Minister of Works. No doubt they have been a problem to the present Minister of Works. All the council has been able to do is pull down an old building that would have fallen down anyway.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for Alexandra has moved that the whole of paragraph (*m*) be struck out. The question is: "That the words from 'require' to 'locality' stand part of the clause." If this question is defeated, the whole paragraph will be deemed to have been struck out, but if it is carried the member for Onkaparinga will have the right to move his amendment.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman's amendment negatived.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

In paragraph (*m*) to strike out "or the condition of any derelict, waste or neglected land."

We should not override councils in respect of their power to take some steps where it is obvious that a neglect can be cured. I ask the Attorney-General to accept my amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot agree to this amendment. It may well be necessary, under planning proposals for Bowden and Brompton, to have power in relation to disused pugholes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the amendment. We criticize instances of untidiness without thinking of the implications involved in doing something about them. To clean these things up may mean a heavy expense to the owners.

The Committee divided on Mr. Shannon's amendment:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon (teller), Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Freebairn and Teusner. Noes—Messrs. Casey and Jennings.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 13, at 2 p.m.