

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 25, 1965.

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act Amendment,  
Architects Act Amendment,  
Cattle Compensation Act Amendment,  
Companies Act Amendment,  
Constitution Act Amendment (Salaries),  
Crown Lands Act Amendment,  
Juries Act Amendment,  
Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries).

### QUESTIONS

#### PISTOL LICENCES.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked yesterday regarding pistol licences?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yesterday two honourable members—the Hon. Mr. Hart and the Hon. Sir Norman Jude—asked questions about this matter, and I obtained the following report from the Commissioner of Police:

In accordance with the usual practice, pistol licence renewal forms were prepared and distributed by the Police Department during November, together with a reminder that pistol licences should be renewed before December 31. This is a service not required by the Pistol Licence Act but is supplied each year for the convenience of licence holders.

However, as there was a Bill before Parliament which proposed an amendment to the fees prescribed in the Act, it was decided to decline the acceptance of licence fees until after the first week in December when it was expected that the Bill would have been passed or Parliament would have risen until after December 31. All police stations were then advised accordingly and instructed to request applicants for pistol licences to inquire again after the first week in December. No mention was made of any specific increase in fees, but the proposal to increase the fee to a particular amount has been reported in the press and it is conceivable that this amount was mentioned in discussion between the police and the applicant.

No pistol licences have yet been issued for 1966 but some fees at the existing rate may have been received before the abovementioned instruction was given. In such cases it will be necessary to hold the applications and advise the licence holder if and when there is any variation in the amount to be paid. It is unfortunate that the department's endeavour to assist licence holders by reminding them of the renewal date, and refusing to

accept fees which could be altered before the fee was actually payable, has been misconstrued.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I accept from the Chief Secretary the very courteous and sensible explanation of what happened but, if this situation was in fact realized only a few weeks ago, I point out to him that the matter was decided in August. An amendment was accepted with all due grace by the Government and surely if the legislation was passed in August an instruction could have been given prior to these thousands of notices being sent out in November? Therefore, I again ask the Chief Secretary, is it not reasonable that the fees offered by the people who, as I say, at considerable expense and inconvenience in many cases, accepted the bill as presented should be accepted for this season, at least?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer is 'No'. The Police Department, in its usual courteous and efficient manner, only tried to help the people concerned. It would be wrong for the Police Department to take, in November, fees that may be increased and will not be actually payable until January 1. In that way, some people would pay the lower fee and some would pay the increased fee. That particular aspect was not discussed at length with Cabinet this morning but my personal view is that, as the pistol licence fees cover the period from January 1 to December 31 of each year, and as the Bill may be assented to next week or soon after, the fee to be paid should be the fee of £1 that has been fixed by Parliament.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I listened carefully to the question asked earlier today by Sir Norman Jude. I appreciate the great inconvenience to which many people have been put in this regard. Will the Chief Secretary take up this matter with the Premier with a view to seeing that, in connection with any future legislation raising the licence fees and things of that nature, the matter will be dealt with more expeditiously in another place?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to do that.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On Tuesday I received from the Police Department a notice, with a form of renewal for my own pistol licence, and asking me to send 2s. 6d. for it. This seemed fairly simple to me. The notice was also accompanied by some sort of threat that, if I did not pay it, I would be an unlicensed person and also (even if that were not bad enough) if I did not renew the licence, I would have to apply for a new one, and it was suggested that I might not get it. I thought it was fairly simple, and I was going to send my 2s. 6d., because, although I was a party to this particular legislation, I thought, on the face of it, that the increased fee was not going to be applied until next year. Will the Chief Secretary please tell me what I ought to do?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Perhaps the honourable member was not in the Chamber earlier, but I do not want to repeat what I said. If he takes my advice and wants to save postage and the cost of a cheque, he will wait until mid-December and send in the fee for next year. While he may spend an additional 17s. 6d., he will at least save the cost of a postage stamp and the stamp duty on one cheque.

#### FRIENDLY SOCIETIES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The Chief Secretary may have noticed that a number of telegrams from irate chemists have been handed to honourable members, and I myself have received some. I shall not refer to the wording of the telegram, but will the Chief Secretary say whether the Pharmaceutical Guild was consulted before the introduction of the legislation now before Parliament?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I myself met the Pharmaceutical Guild two or three times and the guild also met the Premier. I do not want to misrepresent the position by saying that the guild was informed as to the actual number of friendly society shops that would be provided for, but there is no doubt in my mind that the guild has known that there would be provision for some increase in the number.

#### ROADSIDE TREES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Some time ago the Hon. Mr. Kemp sought information on the erection of signs prohibiting the removal of trees from an area of native pine south of Tailem Bend. I travel this road fairly frequently and have noticed that no signs have been erected in this reserve. Can the Minister

of Local Government say whether any information is available regarding the erection of these particular signs?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: At this stage, no.

#### NATIVE FLORA.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads, representing the Minister of Lands, a reply to a question I asked last week regarding native flora on roadsides?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Lands, has informed me that the Commissioners of the National Park and Wild Life Reserves are well aware of the value of preserving roadside vegetation and do (and will continue to) assist in any way they can in its preservation. The Fauna and Flora Committee, which comes under the control of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, is also very concerned about this matter, and has set up a subcommittee to investigate and take whatever action is available to them. The assistance of the Director of the Botanic Garden will, as far as possible, be available for advice to constructing authorities and district councils on the value of particular roadside vegetation.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In view of the reply I received I ask leave to ask a further question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The tenor of the Minister's reply indicates that the problem is not appreciated exactly in that the damage being done to the roadside remains is caused mainly through ignorance. The council concerned has no idea of the value of those remains. It is more than a service of advice that is required. It is necessary for the council, which has no conception of what it is doing, to be told the value of these bits and pieces. The advisory service in this case is valuable only if the council has any real appreciation of it. I think the matter should be referred back to the Wild Life Commissioners and the Botanic Garden with the instruction that they tell these people that these remains are good and worthy of preservation. My question is, would such action be possible?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I consider that the answer I previously gave to the honourable member is sufficient for his purpose at this time, for it has been stated that the Department of Agriculture itself is concerned with the preservation of natural roadside flora and fauna and with its protection. A committee has been set up for that purpose. In addition,

they have sought and had made available to them the services of the Director of the Botanic Garden, who is an expert on these matters and, apparently, he will be used in an advisory capacity for the purpose of instructing district councils on what is valuable vegetation and why it should be preserved. If the honourable member thinks the reply is not sufficient, I will again refer the matter to the Minister of Lands, with the suggestions the honourable member has made, and obtain a further reply.

#### HAMBIDGE RESERVE.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: I direct my question to the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Lands in another place and it is in respect of an area known as the Hambidge Reserve situated north-east of Lock on Eyre Peninsula. It is an area of approximately 90,000 acres declared as a flora and fauna reserve. A few weeks ago a fire was caused there by lightning and I understand that it burnt between 30,000 and 40,000 acres of the area. That portion of the area will be ruined as a flora reserve for many years to come, and it is possible that on a hot day, or any time when there are thunderstorms, the remainder of this area will be burnt out. A large section of opinion in the area considers that the only reasonable thing to do in the circumstances would be to open the area for settlement because situated a few miles south of this reserve is another area of 160,000 acres, which is also a fauna and flora reserve. Hambidge is a menace to surrounding farmers whose properties completely surround the reserve. I ask the Minister what precautions are being taken by the Department of Lands, or what precautions is it prepared to take, to protect this area from fire and so remove the menace to surrounding landholders?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague and obtain a report from him, which I will make available to the honourable member.

#### UNIVERSITY DEGREES.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I was most interested and pleased, as I have no doubt

were other honourable members, at the announcement in this morning's *Advertiser* about variations in the requirements of the University of Adelaide in relation to an arts degree. As a layman in these matters, it has come to my notice, through my friendship with other gentlemen who are certainly much more academically qualified than I, that there have been certain anomalies over the years, and I shall mention some examples. I can think of one person who has 11 units or subjects towards a degree but who because of some technicality had to obtain 12 subjects before obtaining that degree. However, because of today's announcement he may now find himself a Bachelor of Arts, although I do not know for certain. I also know a successful professional man who was able to complete his degree in Sydney. He was fortunate to be able to do it in Sydney because he had a Roseworthy Diploma in Agriculture, which counts for matriculation in Sydney but not in Adelaide, so he may not have been permitted to do the course in Adelaide. A third example is of a gentleman who, to all intents and purposes, is a Bachelor of Music; he was in fact a lecturer at the Elder Conservatorium of Music at the University of Adelaide, but all he had after his name was a full stop because he had not been able to complete Leaving German, or a similar subject. I express my satisfaction at the variations announced in this morning's paper. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry inquire of his colleague, the Minister of Education, whether there can be more variations of this nature (not necessarily relaxation) so that some of these anomalies may be eliminated and so that there will be more readily acceptable and uniform requirements throughout Australia for attaining degrees and diplomas?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's statement, including the full stop, and the question, to my colleague, the Minister of Education, and get a reply as soon as possible.

#### THEVENARD TO KEVIN LINE.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Some concern is being felt on upper Eyre Peninsula about the progress on the Thevenard to Kevin railway line. Can the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made in constructing this new line and when it is expected that it will be completed?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have been informed that good progress has been made on the line. I cannot tell the honourable

member the exact date when it will be completed, but if he desires further particulars I can obtain them. I understand that it will be completed early in January but, so that the honourable member will have definite particulars, I will obtain a report.

#### ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Transport, relates to amendments to the Road and Railway Transport Act. If a wheat carter (not necessarily a primary producer) carries wheat from a farm to the nearest silo and that silo is full, is it necessary for him to have a permit to cart the wheat, which is already in his truck, to the next silo should that silo be more than 50 miles away along the railway line?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Mr. President, I seek your ruling. As amendments to this Act are before the Lower House, are honourable members entitled to ask questions on it?

The PRESIDENT: I think it is desirable for honourable members not to ask such questions at this stage.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.  
Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: On Tuesday last I asked a question in relation to whether the extra £1,000,000 to be gained in revenue by the railways through the application of the proposed new taxes fixed under the Road and Railway Transport Bill would be gained at the expense of private transport operators. The Minister in his reply stated that this could well be the case. From this it must be assumed that it is anticipated certain operators will be forced out of business through the imposition of this tax. If that occurs, is it the intention of the Government to pay compensation to freight operators so forced out of business by the application of the proposed legislation, which will come before this Chamber shortly?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am prepared to answer this question as the honourable member has referred to a statement that was made. If road transport is as efficient as I am told it is, the effect of the proposed charges for competition with the railways will not affect such operators to any great extent. The amount mentioned will be gained by the extra freight anticipated, but it will not force transport to go bankrupt because, according to what I hear, transport companies flourish in other States.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not like the word "flourish".

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Well, they seem to flourish. I have not heard of too many going bankrupt in other States, and I consider the same circumstances will apply here. If, as I am told, road transport operators are so efficient, the slightly increased charges resulting from the Bill will not have any great effect on them. Incidentally, the figures that have been stated as the anticipated increase in the cost of living because of the proposed charges could not possibly apply unless the transport operators exploited those increased charges to the detriment of people in the country.

#### SAFETY RAILS.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: By far the most dangerous road going into the Adelaide Hills is, without question, Greenhill Road. Recently this was guarded by only a three-wire fence, but latterly some progress has been made in constructing safety rails. However, the work seems to have come to a stop. The worst corner has been guarded but there is a long length (about two miles) where, if any vehicle went over the edge, it would be a complete write-off and its passengers would probably be killed. There have been some extremely close shaves on this road in the last 12 months, but fortunately the vehicles concerned have left the road in the only places where it has been possible to avoid falling several hundred feet. Will the Minister of Roads say whether the programme of installing safety railing can be pushed forward more quickly? If it cannot, it is only a matter of time before there is an awful fatality.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This road has been surveyed and safety rails have been placed where it has been considered dangerous. Undoubtedly the other curves were considered to be not so dangerous to the ordinary motorist travelling in a proper manner. Unfortunately, sometimes vehicles get out of control because of mechanical breakdown, or something of that nature. That is another reason why the carrying of an excessive weight on the front axle of a vehicle should be controlled, as this contributes to mechanical breakdowns. I will refer the question to the Highways Department to ascertain whether it considers that other curves should be guarded by safety rails.

**TAILEM BEND SPEED LIMIT.**

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to a question I asked some time ago about speed limits on the Princes Highway through Tailem Bend?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am sorry, but I have not. I thought I had replied to the question some time ago. I will obtain a report as soon as possible.

**UNDERGROUND WATERS.**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 24 I asked the Minister of Mines whether the Government planned to legislate for the preservation, conservation and prevention of pollution of underground waters of this State in the present session, and the Minister said that the Government was considering appropriate amendments to the Act to strengthen it if amendments were deemed necessary. I understand there are many problems associated with underground water. Does the Minister still intend to introduce amendments to the legislation within the measurable future?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The question of the preservation of underground water has caused not only me but also the Mines Department considerable concern for some years, both before and since I have had the honour of being Minister of Mines. Difficulties are involved in bringing down overall legislation, because in one case the conditions may be entirely different from those in another. But something drastic will have to be done for the preservation of underground water if some people who use it are to continue on a commercial basis. That, again, has caused me great concern.

The matter is still under discussion but I inform the honourable member that I intend to have the Act proclaimed, which will give the department the right to take action against the pollution of our underground water. The Act provides for this but has never been proclaimed, for reasons that I do not know. Its provisions are not effective until it is proclaimed. I am seriously considering this matter and intend to place it before Cabinet for the purpose of having the Act proclaimed.

**CRICKET.**

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Each day we see added to the list another board that has been brought under the control of a Minister of this State. Racing (usually known as the

Sport of Kings) has not evaded the net, because in today's paper it is stated that under the new Lottery and Gaming Act the Betting Control Board will be brought under the control of a Minister. Australia has another national pastime—the game of cricket, which is under the control of the Cricket Control Board. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends at any time to bring the Cricket Control Board under Ministerial control?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not in the habit of answering stupid questions.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Chief Secretary said he was not in the habit of answering stupid questions. I may point out to him that the question I asked was not perhaps as stupid as he thought, because in other States the control of sporting facilities does, in some instances, come under the control of the Government or a Minister. Is the Chief Secretary aware that the Sydney cricket ground is under Government and Ministerial control?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will not reply to that.

**GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In company with three of my colleagues in another place, I had the privilege this morning of inspecting the Government Printing Office. Those of us who had that privilege had brought home to us what we have all known or been told for some time—that it is high time that the office was shifted to another site. In this regard I am aware that considerable difficulty has been encountered over the years in finding a suitable alternative site, and I believe, according to the Government Printer, there is a site now being partially used by the Government Printing Office. The urgency of the matter was brought home to those of us who saw the conditions under which the work is at present being carried out. Can the Chief Secretary say whether any progress has been made in recent months in moving the Government Printing Office to the new site at Kent Town or to any other site?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As the honourable member has stated, there have been problems in this matter, and discussions have taken place with the object of eventually moving the Government Printing Office to a better site. This matter dates back to 1943, when this problem first arose. Through the years since then we have failed to find a satisfactory alternative

site, until it was finally agreed that a site in Kent Town would be sufficient for the needs of the Government Printing Office. It is true that some of its work has been done at Kent Town. Since I have taken office, the Public Buildings Department and the Public Service Commissioner's Department have questioned whether the site at Kent Town is large enough. I am no authority on this but I know that the world trend today is that Government printing works should be spread over a level area and not be built up into the air, because of the weight of the various machines.

The position as I know it to be is that a search has been made and there is a general feeling between the Education Department, the Public Service Commissioner's Department and the Public Buildings Department that the site at Kent Town for the proposed Government Printing Office is not large enough to cope with all the work. There was a further suggestion that the Engineering and Water Supply Department site at Thebarton be looked at, but it was doubted whether that was large enough. Whether those people have made up their minds on a site I am unable to say but I will get the latest information available and try to give the honourable member an exact answer about whether they have finally located a suitable site or whether they have made up their minds on what they intend to do.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I was interested in the reply given by the Chief Secretary regarding the construction of a new Government Printing Office. An endeavour has been made for a long period to obtain a suitable site near Parliament House. I could name many of the sites suggested, but I am not here to make a speech on the matter. However, the site that was obtained recently was reported on by responsible officers, and there was no suggestion that it would not be big enough for a printing office. I am not permitted to state here the reason or the details, but I think that it would be of interest for the Minister to consult the files and the report of the Government Printer as to the suitability of this site before going any further on the matter. I am astounded and concerned to think that there will be any further delay. The construction of a printing office has already been delayed for too long. The staff are crowded out and have to work under great difficulties. Will the Minister look at the file referred to,

because I will be surprised if it is found that the Government Printer has not recommended the site?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not have to read the files. I have already read them and it is quite true that the Government Printer did recommend the site. However, they have ideas on the storage of books, etc., which matter I think has arisen since the change of Government. There are no politics in this at all. It is considered that the frontage should go farther back on each side, and there is the matter of the additional storage room required. Because of this, a suggestion has been made by the Efficiency Officer (I think that is his title) in the Public Service Commissioner's Department.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: He was a Government officer, was he?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Not a person outside?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No. Cabinet has considered the matter on two or three occasions and I assure the Leader that nobody is more anxious than the members of Cabinet (and myself in particular) to do something to get the position remedied as soon as possible.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Perhaps by compulsory acquisition?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: We realize that, but when we are thinking in terms of a site for the Government Printing Office in close proximity to Parliament House, it is not an easy question. I offered a suggestion regarding part of the railway yards on the western end, facing North Terrace, as a site.

#### TAXATION INCREASES.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I have been trying to keep a record of the number of increases in taxation that we have had this year, but neither my brain nor my ready reckoner can keep pace with the total. I can remember increases in water rates, Harbors Board fees, succession duties, land tax, and taxes under the Stamp Duties, Pistol Licence and Companies Acts. Will the Chief Secretary prepare for the Council a statement showing all increases in taxation that have been brought in by this Government this year and indicate in that statement the amount of revenue that the Government expects to get from such increases during the remainder of this year and for the whole of next year, so that honourable members will know what the exact position is with regard to these increases?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If, when I was a member of the Opposition, I dared to ask that

question, I would have been told promptly that I could do my own homework.

The PRESIDENT: You would probably have been told to put it on notice.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I do not want to ask that that be done. I tell the honourable member that, if he wants to get that information, he can do a little research work. If he is unable to do that, he can look at the Auditor-General's report and the Budget next year and make up his own mind.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am sorry that every time I ask a question of the Chief Secretary I am brushed off, to use a colloquialism. I am quite happy to do my homework, but in many instances, no matter how much homework I do, I cannot obtain the information. For instance, in connection with the Succession Duties Act, amendments were made in another place, which affected the report given in the second reading explanation. So, there is no possibility of my obtaining the information otherwise than from the Government. In view of that, I again ask the Chief Secretary whether he will make available to me the information I cannot obtain, no matter how much homework I do?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am trying to keep peace and a happy family. Therefore, I shall refer the honourable member's question to Cabinet for an answer.

#### POLICE AIDES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Hon. Mr. Potter made reference (I think it was during the Budget debate) to the fact that many police officers were doing work that could quite easily be carried out by clerks or other people not trained as police officers. By way of interjection, I suggested that this work could be carried out by women police aides. The Chief Secretary, in replying to this debate, stated that he was not aware that this was occurring and said that he would look into the matter. I know of one police station which has applied for increased staff, either by way of further police officers being allotted to it, or some other form of staffing assistance given. The records of this particular station are available to the Police Department and I shall give the Chief Secretary the name of the station later. Is he prepared to examine the position at this particular station, in view of the fact that he has said he would look into these matters?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I appreciate that the honourable member does not want to make public the name of the station. However, if he gives me the name, I shall forward a copy of his question to the Police Commissioner and ask for a report thereon.

#### COMMERCIAL VEHICLES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (on notice):

1. How many commercial vehicles were registered in South Australia, excluding utilities, in each of the following years—1962, 1963 and 1964?

2. What were the total registration fees paid in each of the aforementioned years?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The replies are:

Year.	Numbers.
1. 1962 .. .. .	42,344
1963 .. .. .	43,006
1964 .. .. .	45,011.
	£
2. 1962 .. .. .	4,405,696
1963 .. .. .	4,712,078
1964 .. .. .	5,384,723.

#### LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells in order to permit the managers appointed by the Council to attend a conference arranged with another place.

Motion carried.

At 3.10 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference.

They returned at 5.46 p.m. The recommendation was:

That the Legislative Council do further insist on its suggested amendment and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): While the Legislative Council got its point of view upheld, I want to say that the conference was conducted amicably. No harsh words were used. While no doubt the managers from the other place were disappointed at the result of the conference, we left it as good friends as we were before. I move:

That the recommendation of the conference be agreed to.

Motion carried.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DECIMAL CURRENCY).

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

*That this Bill be read a second time.*

Its purpose is to make certain adjustments in relation to the totalizator investments, the

stamp duty on betting tickets, and the tax on winning bets consequentially upon the introduction of decimal currency and accordingly clause 3 of the Bill provides that it shall come into force on February 14, 1966, the date upon which decimal currency will be adopted. I deal with the three matters which I have mentioned in order. The present provisions of the Lottery and Gaming Act prescribe as a condition for issue of a licence for the operation of a totalizator that there must be provision for bets in units as small as 2s. or 2s. 6d. and as a result of this 2s. 6d. has become the most widely used effective unit for totalizator investments. It is proposed that the new unit be 50c—the equivalent of 5s., and clause 4 accordingly amends section 20. In relation to money values, this new unit will be no greater than the value of 2s. 6d. when those provisions were first enacted.

The existing provisions as to payment of totalizator dividends are that if the investment is 5s. or less any fraction of less than 3d. is not paid to the bettor; if the unit of investment exceeds 5s. but does not exceed 10s. any fraction smaller than 6d. is disregarded, while if the unit of investment is over 10s. any fraction of 1s. is not paid. Fractions not paid to the bettor are paid to charity. As a matter of practice it is very seldom that a unit of investment is greater than 5s. and the 2s. 6d. unit is by far the most widely used. These matters relating to fractions are provided for by section 28 (1) (b) and (2). It will be seen that one result of the present provisions is that copper coins are not required in any cases for either investments or dividends for totalizators. The lowest silver coin in decimal currency will be the 5c coin and accordingly clause 5 (a) of the Bill provides in effect that fractions of 5c in relation to the minimum unit of investment, that is 50c, shall be disregarded. These amendments are introduced following lengthy discussions with representatives of the South Australian Jockey Club and persons conversant with totalizator procedure. The South Australian Jockey Club has, in turn, discussed the matter with the South Australian Trotting Club, metropolitan race secretaries and the Country Racing Clubs Association, and they have agreed that the proposed amendments would seem the most practicable.

The clubs did suggest that dividends should be paid to the nearest 5c, thus eliminating fractions for the benefit of charities, but the Government has not agreed to this. Subsequently the clubs suggested that provision

be made for a guarantee of the return of stake money in the extraordinary case where the dividend might be less than the stake, the necessary funds to do this to be provided out of fractions arising from other totalizator dividends at the same meeting. This has been agreed as reasonable particularly as the clubs have agreed to make up the difference from their own entitlements if the fractions available from the meeting prove in an extraordinary case inadequate. Clause 5 (b) of the Bill makes the necessary provision and sub-clause (c) makes a consequential amendment to section 28 (2) providing that any amounts remaining shall continue to be paid to charities. The subtraction of fractions for these particular purposes will be very small indeed, and the expected net result of the new provisions on fractions is that charities may benefit to the extent of perhaps £25,000 a year, instead of £20,000 or thereabouts at present.

Section 44 of the principal Act provides for a stamp duty of  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. on every betting ticket. The existing equivalent of  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the new currency will be five-twelfths of a cent but it is proposed that the tax should be altered to two-fifths of a cent, which is very slightly less than  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. In effect, adoption of the new rate will mean that stamped tickets will be issued at the rate of \$4 a thousand. Retention of the old rate would have meant £2 1s. 8d. a thousand, an amount not directly convertible to decimal currency. The loss of revenue would be about 4 per cent and amount to a loss of about £1,000 a year. Clause 6 of the Bill makes the necessary amendment.

I deal now with the winnings bets tax. This matter has been discussed with the Bookmakers' League and the Betting Control Board which, between them, must implement the tax and do the administrative work. The present rate of tax is 3d. for each 10s. or fractional part of 10s., no tax being payable on a bet of less than 5s. It is proposed to vary this to provide that there shall be no tax on a bet of \$1 (10s.) or less and thereafter 5c on a bet of under \$3, 10c on a bet of \$3 and under \$5, and so on. The necessary provision is made in clause 7 (a) of the Bill. This new scale will involve about a 3 per cent loss of revenue because it is rather less severe than the present tax. It is estimated that Crown revenue may be reduced by about £17,000 a year and that of the clubs by £6,000, as a result of this new scale.

To obviate the necessity of dealing in copper coins and to simplify calculations, it is considered that the most practicable course is



for the bookmaker to calculate the amount chargeable with tax having regard to the amount to be paid out to the bettor in whole multiples of 5c. In other words the tax will be calculated on the amount payable to the bettor to the nearest 5c. The tax will then be deducted and the balance calculated to the nearest 5c will be paid to the bettor. Clause 7 (c) so provides and clause 7 (b) makes a consequential amendment. Clause 8 directly amends the remainder of the principal Act by substituting in all cases references to amounts in money in the new currency for amounts referred to in terms of the old currency. This is purely a machinery provision which has been omitted from the Decimal Currency Act because of the specific amendments required to the sections of the Act to which I have referred.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING CONTROL BOARD).

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary):  
I move:

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

The object is to bring the Betting Control Board under Ministerial control. Clause 3 amends section 34 of the principal Act so as to provide that in the performance of its duties and exercise of its powers it shall be subject to the directions of the Treasurer. Clause 4 inserts a new section 34a in the principal Act providing that in the exercise of its powers, functions, authorities and duties under the Act the board shall be subject to the direction and control of the Treasurer.

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

#### PHARMACY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 24. Page 3098.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I shall probably confine my remarks to clause 5, which states, *inter alia*:

(1a) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (1) of this section the body known as the Friendly Societies Medical Association Incorporated may, after the commencement of the Pharmacy Act Amendment Act, 1965, carry on the business of selling goods by retail in not more than thirty-six shops.

The present Act provides for only 26 shops. Apart from this provision I do not think the Bill is controversial. The Hon. Mr. Potter

was a little perturbed about clause 5 and its amendment of section 26 (d) of the Act, which will provide for this increase in the number of shops of the Friendly Societies Medical Association Incorporated. However, when we examine the position in the light of the increased population of the State and the increased number of members of the society, the proposed increase is small indeed. In 1947, the population of the metropolitan area (excluding Elizabeth and Salisbury) was 382,454, and the total population of the State was 646,073. In 1964 the population of the metropolitan area had increased to 607,800, an increase of 58 per cent, and the population for the whole of this State was 1,031,619, a 59 per cent increase of population in 17 years.

Membership of friendly societies has increased from 45,393 contributors covering 114,844 persons in 1949, to a total of 90,000 contributors covering 223,560 persons in 1964. In spite of the increase in population and the number of members of the society, no increase in the number of friendly society pharmacies has taken place. In 1948 there were 228 private pharmacies and 26 friendly society pharmacies, or 11 per cent of the private pharmacies. In 1964 the private pharmacies had increased to 453 whereas friendly society pharmacies had remained at 26, and this was 5.7 per cent of the number of pharmacies in the State. The intended increase of 10 shops would increase the percentage to about 9 per cent of the total of private pharmacies which is 2 per cent below that which obtained in 1947.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you think there should be restrictions at all on friendly societies?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: If the honourable member thinks the Bill should be widened we have no objection, but we do suggest that to meet people's convenience the number should be increased to 36, and not to be unrestricted as suggested by the honourable member.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I did not suggest that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We are prepared to accept restrictions on the number, but the Government would accept an amendment to increase the number beyond 36.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Are these shops to be established in the city of Adelaide or in the country?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Bill does not state where they will be established. The society has the right to establish them

where members require the service, and no doubt they will be established where the services are not being obtained at present. It is reasonable to expect that members outside the metropolitan area are entitled to the service for which they are paying and the friendly societies should be allowed to increase the number of shops.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Can they trade with people other than members?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In the 26 shops there is no question of that. Where there are no shops belonging to the friendly societies, the members paying for the benefits not only pay the society to which they belong but pay the full price when purchasing at other shops, or spend extra money in travelling to secure the benefits for which they pay the society. Shops can be situated in any place decided by the society, but it would be uneconomical and unprofitable to site them where they can sell goods to their members only, whereas hairdressers, barbers, and supermarkets can sell chemists' lines to anyone. They can have as many shops as they like provided they sell to their members. They are business people, however, and have to look after their members, and it would not be prudent for them to set up shops that would be unprofitable.

As a result of the Housing Trust and private housing extending their building activities to areas near the metropolitan area and a large number of friendly society members moving out into those areas, it is logical that they should expect the services to go out with them into those areas.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Haven't they got them now?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, simply because the friendly societies are restricted to having 26 shops in which to sell on a retail basis, whereas these people have been paying into a society for years and, when they want the service, they find it is not there. The passing of this legislation will at least allow the friendly societies to expand the services to their members. It does not mean that anybody else will go out of business: it means only that the friendly societies will expand their services to their members.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: How many people should be in one of these new areas before it is economical for a friendly society to go there?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that a private pharmacist will not go into an area unless there are at least 400 established houses there. The honourable member

can work it out from that. That is the minimum requirement of a private pharmacist.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: That is a fairly small area.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I know, but it has to be at least that to be economic. I gave that figure in answer to the question put by the Hon. Mr. Geddes.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Do you think that the friendly societies will go into areas of less than 400 houses?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I do not know what they will do but, unless the present legislation is altered, they will not go anywhere. I am suggesting that their members are entitled to the extra privileges for which they are paying.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Do you think the friendly societies could run a shop in Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is for them to decide. If honourable members see fit to pass this Bill, the friendly societies will no doubt examine the areas and see where their members are and they will extend their services to those areas in which their members reside. The Hon. Mr. Potter stated that the friendly societies controlled 30 per cent of the dispensing in areas in which they operated. Surely there is nothing wrong with that if they have a membership of 30 per cent of the population in those areas?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: What does the honourable member understand by the word "member"?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A person who pays into a friendly society for the purpose of having his medicine dispensed at a lower rate. It is a type of insurance against the time when they cannot afford to pay the full costs of medicine. They are paying on a weekly basis by contributing to a friendly society and, when the need arises, in these areas the members have still to pay the full amount for medicine because the friendly society services are not there. Surely the members are entitled to expect services for which they pay? Even the Hon. Mr. Rowe is complaining because he does not get service for which he does not pay. He is expecting something for nothing.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: What does it cost a family to belong to a friendly society?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I believe (though I stand to be corrected on this) the fee is 3d. a week for medicine.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: For each member of a family?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: For the family, not each individual member of the family. I stand to be corrected on that figure, but that is what I believe is my weekly contribution for medicine. It is 6s. 6d. a quarter, which works out at 6d. a week, not 3d.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Are you a member of a friendly society?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, and I have been for a number of years. Fortunately we have not had to call on them much, but I would have been very annoyed if I had wanted their services and I had not been able to get them. I believe other members who are at present not getting the services are also justified in asking that the friendly societies go out and give the services that are required.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Is the honourable member a past chief ruler?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, not yet. I have noted the comments of the Hon. Mr. Potter that, because the F.S.M.A. has not opened pharmacies for members, that casts suspicion on its claim of wanting to give better service to members. Surely the honourable member was not sincere when he made that assertion, as he would know that the set-up under those conditions would be neither practicable nor economical. All kinds of stores—hairdressers, fruiterers and so on—can sell these items to anybody without restriction.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Did you get a telegram from the guild?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that the guild chemists ran out of cash before they got around to sending Government members telegrams, and consequently they concentrated on the Opposition. That is my understanding of the matter.

It was suggested that the friendly societies employed only the minimum number of registered pharmacists required under the Act. The position is that the guild members do not accept their full responsibility in the training of apprentices but they are quite content, once those apprentices have been trained, to entice them away from the friendly societies after they have qualified. Friendly societies have trained about 20 per cent of all pharmacists trained in the last 10 years.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: That goes on in all sections of trade, surely.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it does, but we now find that the guild is not prepared to accept its responsibility to train pharmacists but it is prepared to get the pharmacists who have been trained by the

friendly societies, and it still wants further protection! Let the pharmacists be fair and accept their responsibility to the community. They have not trained enough pharmacists but have taken the trained pharmacists from the friendly societies and then complain that the friendly societies are employing only the minimum of pharmacists! I am not suggesting that the guild enticed all the trained pharmacists away because it is logical to assume that a number of them went into business on their own because it is such a paying proposition.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You think all chemists are paid extremely well?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I don't know about that, but I have not seen any pharmacists in the bankruptcy court, nor have I seen any who push a bicycle to work. I can only assume that they are doing a little better than the basic wage, otherwise they would not remain in the job. If they were not doing well on their own they would go back to the F.S.M.A. and obtain employment there. That is why I suggest they are doing better than they would do on wages.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What is the position in other States regarding friendly societies?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It varies. I believe that in Victoria they have a fairly open go. I understand that in Western Australia there is a limited number.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It has been further restricted in Western Australia, hasn't it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, I think it has been broadened a little. When the Friendly Societies Act came into being and they were restricted to having only 26 shops, it did not give them much scope at all to pioneer in any area.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They were not allowed to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course they were not.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They were not permitted by certain Government instrumentalities to do so.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand it was not a Labor Government.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Was it State or Commonwealth?

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What about income tax?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: On the question of pioneering, the fact is that they have been restricted under the Act and they have been unable to do any pioneering. They

have also been unable to keep up with the requests of the members. I point out that it is not only necessary to look after the interests of 450 chemists. We must also realize that many more people are involved than just those in the chemist shops. The 90,000 members of the F.S.M.A. that are involved also need some protection, more so in fact than do the 450 private chemists. Without doubt, there is a shortage of pharmacists in this State, mainly because the private members have not been doing the right thing in training apprentices. In an effort to correct this position, the friendly societies have played their part in training personnel; they have advertised in other States and overseas, and they have sponsored qualified pharmacists from overseas. They are bringing out four or five qualified pharmacists a year.

The question of taxation was raised yesterday by the Hon. Mr. Potter and again today by the Hon. Mr. Hart by way of interjection. They wanted to know what was the taxation position in regard to friendly societies. It is

true that at the time of the introduction of this section of the Act which limited the number of shops that could be conducted by the friendly societies on an unrestricted basis, income tax was not then payable by the societies. However, shortly after that the Commonwealth set up a committee to inquire into the question of taxation, and as a result the Commonwealth Government decided to charge taxation at company rates on 10 per cent of all sales, including those from the dispensary. This was done by the Commonwealth to give reasonable parity between the society and private pharmacists, and it certainly eliminated any financial advantage previously held by the society. Mr. President, there is terrific pressure on me to get leave to continue. Therefore, I seek leave of the Council to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 6.22 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 30, at 2.15 p.m.