# LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, September 13, 1966.

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

## ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated the Governor's assent to the following Bills:

Superannuation Act Amendment,
Supply (No. 2).

## DEATH OF HON. C. C. D. OCTOMAN.

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

That this Council express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Charles Caleb Dudley Octoman, former member for Northern District in the Legislative Council, and place on record its appreciation of his public services, and that as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased honourable member the sitting of the Council be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I am sure everybody felt great regret on learning of the sudden demise of the Hon. Mr. Octoman, who had been a member of this Chamber only since March 6, 1965, when he was elected to represent the Northern District in this Legislative Council. During his short stay with us he endeared himself to everybody by the quiet, unassuming and efficient manner in which he dealt with the subject he was speaking about and his Parliamentary duties in general. He had been a member of the Printing Committee of the Council during 1965-66. He served not only his country and State in this Parliament but also for five and a half years in the Royal Australian Air Force.

Among the numerous duties that he performed as a private citizen in the interests of the community of this State, he served as State Director of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited from 1960 to 1965. He served three years with the State Technical Education Advisory Committee as well as with a number of other organizations. During his life on Eyre Peninsula, in spite of his many activities, he found time to take part in sport, and that is where the best qualities of an individual emerge. The late member was no exception, and I had the pleasure of enjoying his company as a member of the Parliamentary Bowling Club and journeying to other States with him. I soon learned to like the late gentleman because he was a person who simply went along quietly in a most unassuming manner, and he was undoubtedly sincere and genuine.



It was not my pleasure and privilege to know the late honourable member over a great number of years; other members in this Council knew him for a much longer period. However, I consider that I can speak for every member of the Council, including the officers, in expressing our deepest and heartfelt sympathy to his widow and son. It is with great regret that I find it necessary to move this motion.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): It is with regret (and I am sure that every member is of the same opinion) that we have to consider a motion such as this. It is only a comparatively short time since Dudley Octoman came to this Chamber, after the last election, as a colleague of ours in the Northern District. He has been taken at a comparatively early age and we had looked forward to many years of service from him because he had shown such promise as a legislator. That was typical of the Octoman family, who are well respected and recognized on Eyre Peninsula. Mrs. Octoman, the mother of the late honourable member, was a most prominent person in many fields of public activity and eventually was honoured with the award of Member of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire a few years ago.

The Hon. Dudley Octoman had a most distinguished career. Many details of that career were published in this morning's newspaper, and the Chief Secretary has spoken more particularly of his activities in the political sphere. In addition, he had a distinguished war record, attaining the rank of Squadron Leader and serving with the Royal Australian Air Force for five years. After having served his country in that capacity, he was later appointed a member of the Canteens Trust Fund, an organization with great responsibilities, for it administers large funds and assists dependants of ex-servicemen in various circumstances. Not only has the late member been honoured in the political world and elected a member of this Chamber, but he has rendered distinguished service in many other spheres. He will be mourned by many members of the public who have appreciated the splendid service he has given. As far as service in this Chamber was concerned, from the beginning he settled in like a veteran; I believe all members will agree on that.

We always listened to his comments with interest and respected his judgment. We heard some time ago that he was suffering indifferent health, but we did not think that his

untimely death would happen so soon. I join with the Chief Secretary by seconding the motion and I join him in expressing the sympathy that he has offered. I am sure not only members of my Party but also the Minister and his colleagues join in expressing the sympathy of this Council to the late Mr. Octoman's wife, his son and grandchildren for the loss that they have sustained.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): As a colleague in Northern District of the late Dudley Octoman, I should like to associate myself with the comments made by the Chief Secretary and the Leader of the Opposition in this Council. I knew the late Dudley Octoman for a number of years. I knew him prior to his election to this Chamber and was closely associated with him when he was a director of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd. I am well aware of the excellent service he gave in that capacity and of its value to the wheat industry as a whole and to the bulk handling of grain in particular.

I was very pleased to welcome him as a colleague when he was elected to this Council, and in his work as a member for the district and as a member of Parliament he has justified our confidence in him. Previous speakers have mentioned his extensive experience over a wide field, and the District of Northern and the State have been fortunate to have the advantage of that experience, even though he was a member for only a short time. He contributed much to the debates in the Council because of his experience and sound judgment. I am sure all honourable members appreciated his straightforward point of view and straight approach. He always made it known where he stood on any matter, and he held firmly to his opinion.

I do not wish to speak at length, as other members have covered his career in detail, but I, as a colleague, say that he will be very much missed in this Council and in the district because of the very fine contribution he made and the potential he showed as a Parliamentary representative. I join other members in expressing sympathy to his wife, his mother, his brothers and family in their sad loss.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to join other honourable members in an expression of extreme regret at the passing of the Hon. Dudley Octoman. We all know the fine record he had before he came to this place. We admired the dignity and tolerance that he showed at all times when speaking in this Chamber. We admired the knowledge that he always showed of the subject on which he spoke. I am sure all honourable members regret the loss of the Hon. Dudley Octoman.

I have, on behalf of honourable members and the staff, sent a telegram to his family expressing our regret and I am sure that we are all of one mind in regard to the sadness and the loss that his death has caused. I would ask honourable members if they would stand in silence and pass the motion.

Motion carried by honourable members standing in their places in silence.

[*Sitting suspended from* 2.30 *to* 3 *p.m.*]

## QUESTIONS

### RACING BOYCOTT.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I noticed in press reports in the last few days that it was the intention of an organization called the South Australian Racegoers Association to boycott a race meeting at Port Adelaide last Saturday. There has been further comment in the press about the conflicting reports of the actual number of punters who attended the meeting and the amount of business done on the course. Can the Chief Secretary comment on the situation and supply honourable members with the official figures showing the number who attended the meeting, compared with the number for the previous corresponding meeting, as well as the amount of revenue that flowed into the State's coffers as a result of the two meetings?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The question is in two parts: one concerns a matter over which the Government has no control, and the answer to the second part is, "Yes". As a racegoer over many years, I have never known of any official attendance figures being stated from the Government's point of view. It is a matter for the racing club concerned. The Government has never interfered with what the clubs say or do, and I do not think it would be our intention to do so. The turnover at meetings is under the control of the Betting Control Board. Over the years I have read the totalizator figures of a Saturday meeting not early in the week but in the latter part of the week. There should not be any secrecy over these things, and I am prepared to take up the matter with the Treasurer to ascertain whether the figures requested by the honourable member can be made available by the Betting Control Board on the next day of sitting.

## FREIGHT TRAIN LIGHTS.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Transport an answer to the question I asked on August 30 about reflectorized tape on the sides of freight trains?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. The matter of the placing of reflectorized material on the sides of railway vehicles has been the subject of much investigation over the years, not only in South Australia but at least throughout Australia. It has been discussed in conference by senior officers of the Railways Department and rejected, particularly for the reason that it would lead to confusion in train working. Trials using such material were undertaken in the Eastern States, but were discontinued when it was found that reflectorized material was causing confusion and hazards to shunting staff in railway yards.

## ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION PARKING.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I draw attention to the large area between the Government Printing Office and the Adelaide railway station and its approaches which has been provided for the purpose of giving parking for people using the railways or doing business with officers of the Railways Department. At present a large portion is used by the department for all-day parking areas for vehicles belonging to its staff, and the balance of it is used by the Commissioner of Railways as a public parking area at a fee for all-day parking. My questions are: (1) Will the Minister ascertain what space is made available, and for how many cars, for members of the Railways Department staff? (2) Is any charge made to the members of the railways staff for these privileged parking spaces in this public area? (3) What is the gross amount collected per annum in fees for the use of the space for all-day parking by the public? (4) Is the Minister aware that, as a result of the foregoing practices, members of the public collecting passengers from trains, especially at the busy time of the arrival of the Melbourne express each morning, are frequently forced to park their cars as far away as the City bridge, because of lack of parking facilities provided? (5) Is the Minister surprised that in view of this lack of consideration for the public the railways are not used to the greatest capacity?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will investigate the matter that the honourable member has raised and endeavour to give a reply to the numerous questions that were asked.

## *ALPHA-NUMERO* REGISTRATION.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I refer to mention in the press recently of the ease with which it is possible to obtain a registration number for a motor vehicle in this State and a set of plates following the allocation of the number. There is no doubt that this is the position in South Australia, which has been well known for some time. Indeed, it has been the subject of comment in the Criminal Court. I remember at least two occasions on which His Honour Justice Travers has said he has never been able to understand—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: When did he say that?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: On at least two occasions.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: How long ago?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Maybe 12 or 18 months ago.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It may have been three or four years ago.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: However, he said, on more than one occasion, that he had never been able to understand why some system could not be devised for a kind of certificate of registration to go with the motor vehicle in South Australia. Will the Chief Secretary obtain from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles a full and comprehensive report on the registration of motor vehicles system in South Australia and make it available to this Council for the information of honourable members?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Let me first say I am not surprised at the question. I have the answer in my pocket.

The Hon. C. R. Story: A Dorothy Dixer!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, but it is peculiar how this Government is expected to do many things in a very short time. I can appreciate the question because, when I was in Opposition, I asked a question and pleaded with the previous Government to do something—but to no avail. However, we have done something and are doing something to try to overcome the problem. If honourable members will bear

with me, I will tell them just what we are doing and what we hope to achieve. This question was not a Dorothy Dixer. I did not ask anybody to ask it, but I anticipated it. It deals with the *alpha-numero* system of motor vehicle registration. This, plus other things, will go a long way.

Recent publicity in the South Australian press criticizing our registration system and alleging loopholes to enable thieves from other States to register stolen vehicles with ease in South Australia results from an article by Geoff Clancy in the *Sunday Mail* on September 10, 1966. As in this press report, many people assume incorrectly that an inspection of the engine number is the one means of preventing registration of stolen vehicles. In any State thieves adopt various means of defeating the legal requirements of registration, and we have no material evidence to suggest that the registration in South Australia of stolen interstate vehicles is very prevalent. During the period July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966, 1,453 vehicles were reported stolen in this State, and 43 have not been recovered. I am always saying how good our police are, and this proves it. In New South Wales for the same period 12,720 vehicles were reported stolen and 795 have not been recovered. In Victoria, during the same period, 8,547 vehicles were reported stolen and 323 have not been recovered. Conversely, there are means by which a thief can steal a vehicle in South Australia and register it in another State.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: This is not much of an argument for altering the system.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Wait until I have finished! The honourable member will be sorry he spoke. It is very difficult for any authority to eliminate so-called loopholes without abnormal expense, inconvenience and delay to the general public. The Registrar expressed a willingness to assist and support any reasonable scheme which would not cause undue embarrassment or inconvenience to the law-abiding members of the motoring public. Three types of registration have to be considered, namely, new registrations—new vehicles; new registrations—interstate or oversea vehicles; and new registrations—second-hand vehicles.

However, in view of the importance of offering all protection possible in the interest particularly of the motoring public, Cabinet is considering a further report from the Registrar which indicates that the *alpha-numero* system should operate as from January 2, 1967. With the introduction of this system and a simultaneous proposal to retain the number on the vehicle, we are examining a proposal that will provide at a minimum cost an added safeguard against the registration of stolen vehicles. The report also provides that all renewals will be allotted an *alpha-numero* number as they become due. It will mean the small cost of a new plate. This system of *alpha-numero* numbers, combined with these other proposals, will assist to make the South Australian form of registration as protective as possible.

I do not know the real details of the other proposal, but a Bill will be introduced this session to give the police at Thebarton the right to inspect certain vehicles. It might meet with the old touchy problem of the right to go on to properties to inspect some of these things. Before we have finished, if the Hon. Mr. Potter will agree with it—and I hope he does—and will help us, we hope to have a different system that will make it as difficult as possible for stolen vehicles from anywhere to be registered within the State.

## WEEDS ON ROADS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my question of August 30 regarding the spraying of roadsides with weedicides?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. It is as follows:

The department frequently sprays, with weed killer, areas adjacent to guide posts, mile posts, bridge approaches, etc. so as to prevent their visibility being obscured. This has become accepted practice, particularly in hills areas, and will continue to be carried out. There is no intention, however, to generally spray roadsides, as the requirements of visibility can be most economically met, in most cases, by shoulder mowing or grading.

## NORTH TERRACE.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Recently we have read reports of the possible need to widen the southern footpath of North Terrace. However, in this afternoon's newspaper a report states that in North Terrace the southern footpath may be cut back 3ft. on the approaches to some of the main junctions between King William Street and Frome Road in order to step up the traffic flow. It is reported that this is the outcome of discussions between the Highways Department and the Traffic Committee at the Town Hall yesterday on North Terrace problems. To cut back the footpath in this area would require the removal of certain trees.

Has the Minister any comment to make regarding the report appearing in today's newspaper?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. I have not had the opportunity to read the report, but I can inform the honourable member that, as far as North Terrace or any other road within the boundaries of the City of Adelaide is concerned, the matter is under the sole jurisdiction of the Adelaide City Council. As far as I am concerned the Highways Department has no jurisdiction at all in this matter. What the City Council does is its business.

---

## QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Extensions.

## AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1966.

## MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Mines) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mines and Works Inspection Act, 1920-1964, as amended. Read a first time.

## LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (T.A.B.).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 1448.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): Similarly to nearly all Bills of a social character, this Bill has aroused considerable public interest, and pressure groups have even been formed in connection with the matter. To a point, this may be desirable and, as with many other pieces of legislation, I wish that even greater interest had been taken than is being taken at present. In the first instance, I wish to trace some of the history of this legislation.

Three basic requirements have been laid down by certain groups of people. First, there is the inherent right and wish of a large number of people to wager legally on racing when unable to be present at the racecourse. This, of course, applies particularly to country people, but I shall enlarge on that point at a later stage. Secondly, there is the removal of the winning bets tax on bookmakers' bets, and more particularly on that portion known as the tax on the stake. This tax on the stake has aroused, and continues to arouse, much indignation among people associated with the racing game.

Thirdly, there is the important necessity of keeping breeding, and therefore racing, on the highest possible plane in the State, which means that much assistance must be provided in order to prevent the obvious drift to Victoria where the stakes are always higher by reason of the greater population, even before the impact of T.A.B. Whichever way some people like to describe it, it cannot be denied that racing is an industry, concerning which those interested can be justly proud. The aim is to produce the finest horses, not only in this State but in Australia, as results are proving from week to week. The breeders in this State are to be highly complimented on these performances and on their faith in the industry, as compared with the position in the two larger States that have many advantages in this direction.

At the same time, they have to see their production dispersed to the Eastern States in order to secure this far greater stake money to which I have referred. In fact, as the years have gone by, it was realized that the racing industry (the breeders, the trainers, the jockeys and all the other adherents here) was about to languish almost entirely because of the introduction of T.A.B. in Victoria. Thus, the third factor that I have mentioned, the racing industry, became the paramount requirement as far as racing in South Australia was concerned.

Then, following careful consideration being given to the position of clubs, a Bill was introduced in 1964 to again increase bookmakers' turnover tax, which had been, shall I say, up and down during the previous generation. I shall say more about that anon. Later still, a draft Bill for T.A.B., known as the 14-pointer, was handed around amongst various interested people and, although the Bill was never introduced, I said at the time that it was so impracticable and unworkable as to be a joke but that, if the racing public and the clubs wanted to get some form of T.A.B. started, they might accept it. However, I personally had grave doubts about the propriety of supporting such a strange measure.

Now, let me address myself more directly to the basic approach of this Bill. Section 28 of the present Act takes 12¾ per cent at base, on which stamp duty at 5¼ per cent is paid, leaving 7½ per cent to the club, of which it is estimated that about 4½ per cent goes in

overhead expenses. The Bill increases the on-course deduction when T.A.B. comes in to 14 per cent. This also applies to off-course deduction. The clubs will then retain an additional 1¼ per cent, making 8¾ per cent, for the next three years, and I ask honourable members to bear in mind that, after three years, the clubs shall pay this 1¼ per cent to the Fund. I shall say more about the Fund later. Again, that will leave only 7½ per cent to the clubs. Therefore, it appears that the 1¼ per cent is expected to cover all totalizator improvements over the three years. Then the club will lose this part of the revenue which it has been earning for the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What would these totalizator improvements entail?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: They would obviously entail considerable adjustments to adding machines and so on in connection with incoming off-course bets and presumably more expertise in general in administration on race-course totalizators. At present we have only a half hour or so between races and in Victoria it takes about 40 minutes to correlate the various incomings from all over the State and from places as remotely removed as 2,000 miles away in the north of Queensland. Allowing for increased charges in all directions, the 1¼ per cent seems most unreasonable and certainly out of line with the much-praised and advertised Victorian system.

Referring again to these charges, they appear to be barely adequate and I point out that a clause in the Bill virtually demands that the Treasurer shall approve of various improvements, etc., but more of that anon. T.A.B. commenced in Victoria in 1961 and 1962 was its first full year of operation. In four years it has paid a net revenue to the Government of about $9,890,000, and it is estimated that in four years to 1965 (and this is an important point for honourable members to consider) the Government received a further $2,200,000 from fractions, and that is not an inconsiderable amount. It is interesting to note this, particularly when it represents between one-quarter and one-fifth of the total revenue derived.

It may be correct to say that on the totalizator the stake is taxed to a greater degree, and this is the probable reason for the very small proportion of wagering done through this machine as compared with that done with course bookmakers and the illegal bookmakers. Further, the non-racing public and Governments simply do not seem to appreciate that every person with any business acumen avoids tax wherever possible and, when both bookmaker and punter connive to avoid what they regard as an unfair tax, the Government must lose a great amount of revenue that, if legalized betting had been promoted some years ago in a practical and acceptable manner to the general public, would have been channelled to general revenue.

I suggest to honourable members that the basic fact is that racing clubs do not divide any profits, except for charity. The bookmakers take the profits. I point out that, under the Bill, this Government gives it all to one Fund in particular. At least, the previous Government did not talk glibly of advocating gambling taxes in order to raise money for hospitals. This is a gimmick of which every self-respecting legislator should be ashamed.

Any Government should be competent enough to divide its Budget appropriately among its various departments and, for example, if the incubus of any betting taxes, amusement taxes, excises on liquor, poker machines, lotteries or any other grab that is made after people have paid their income tax, provides a total far in excess of hospital requirements, will the money go to bigger and better hospitals, whether needed or not or, say, to education or town planning? That point needs to be considered in connection with this so-called fund. This gilding the lily whilst gelding the man in the street meets with my extreme disapprobation. In 1964, when the Bill to increase turnover tax was introduced, the then Leader of the Opposition in another place opposed it, but according to *Hansard* he stated, *inter alia*:

> I have no doubt that the extra amount obtained as a result of this measure will be passed on to the punters.

I think we can all agree that it is a most extraordinary statement. I have rarely read what would appear to be a more incorrect statement in *Hansard*, and I wonder that the *Hansard* staff did not inquire whether Mr. Walsh meant that. Mr. Steele Hall approved of that Bill, which he said would mean more money for stakes, but he said that he hoped that under T.A.B. it would rise to 2 per cent. At least, in recent reports on this Bill, he has shown his consistency. In 1964, the present Minister for Works (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), supported the Bill on the ground that the bookmaker could afford to pay, while Messrs. McKee and Casey bitterly opposed it. To return to Mr. Walsh, at page 1558 of *Hansard* in 1964 he vigorously defended the bookmakers, stating that the tax was one on a minority. I suggest that it was one possibly on a monopoly group. Yet, under T.A.B., only some 20,000

punters must pay an increase, not even for general taxation but for a specific purpose when betting on the course—again to this fabulous fund.

Mr. Walsh went on to say at page 1559 of *Hansard*, "Over the years the Playford Government has deliberately bled the racing industry white." The interesting fact is that in 1954-55 (I am going back some 10 or 11 years now) the Government's total revenue from racing was £727,000, and 10 years later, in 1963-64, it had risen to only £770,000—a mere increase of £43,000 over 10 years. When we consider monetary values, we could virtually say that it has not risen at all. I think that is quite a fair comment.

This was all that Sir Thomas Playford collected over the 10 years, but the total result, including the clubs' proportions, amounted to approximately £13,500,000, of which more than £7,500,000 was retained by the Government. Having regard to the proportions of tax collected by the Government and those retained by the clubs, I think that honourable members should be informed of the opinion of the present Premier, Mr. Walsh, expressed on page 1561 of *Hansard*, which I quote:

Why is not the return to the clubs in about the same proportion as the distribution of the turnover tax at present, namely, three-quarters return to the clubs and one-quarter paid to revenue, or, better still, if the original intention of turnover tax was to provide attractive stake money for the various events, why does not the Government return the whole of this tax to the respective clubs?

Honourable members should cogitate on what the Premier said 18 or 20 months ago—"Why does not the Government return the whole of this tax to the respective clubs?" Then Mr. Walsh said:

This would give far greater encouragement to the progress of this industry than will the imposition of an onerous burden on bookmakers.

It is very interesting. Now, in this Bill, the Government proposes to leave bookmakers untouched and to inflict the punter with increased taxes all round, and then in a few years take away some more from the clubs. The Government proposes to take away this money from the clubs, but it is still investors' money, not to mention retaining the tax on the winnings. I return to the previous Government turnover that I have spoken about. When honourable members look at the income envisaged under T.A.B., with no additional tax on the profit-making or bookmaking side of the gambling aspect, I suggest that this Bill might be more appropriately labelled or titled the "Bookmakers' Protection Bill" and under previous propaganda regarding T.A.B. and winning bets tax by this Government, I would expect to see the billboards screaming "Walsh welshes". These crocodile tears! The Government should be ashamed of itself!

I have a number of friends who are bookmakers who can take their winnings with a grin and their losses with a smile, but they do not come running for Government assistance or to anyone else if they have had a bad day. They are there because South Australian people want them there but, like the punters, they do not like the winning bets tax. If they lose they tighten their odds and that is their business. They can still compete with the totalizator and they will while the public supports them. I was glad to read in the same period that my friend, the Chief Secretary, who is somewhat knowledgeable on these matters, said that he was opposed to more betting days or more race meetings if T.A.B. was introduced.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am opposed to what?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: To more race meetings if T.A.B. is introduced.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In other words, I was saying that we would not want them to be racing every day of the week. I think you and I agree on that.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I think I could agree with that. On the other hand, Mr. Bevan said, "I have no love for racing clubs, which I think are out for all they can get." I do not think that was a very powerful contribution. I think it can be well left to the board to use its judgment from the economy angle and the requirements of the betting public as to how many events should be wagered on. I am in favour of giving very wide powers to the board and not having it hamstrung more than is necessary in the interests of the Bill (or the Act, as I trust it will become).

Speaking of possible amendments, I have been informed quite publicly by a Minister of the Crown that if any amendments are put up by honourable members the Bill will be discarded. This is interesting, when the Government in both Houses has stated that its members are free to vote as they please. Frankly, I love a challenge, and whatever it might mean to the racing clubs, the public, or the Government, I say today that if honourable members were to accept this sort of threat—however pleasantly made—we should not be here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We have had a couple of them lately.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: If we can improve this Bill by a free and democratic approach on an obviously non-Party basis, then, if the Government refuses to accept or even consider reasonable suggestions, which, as yet, they do not even know, and if the people of South Australia do not get T.A.B. it will rest squarely on the Government's shoulders alone.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Time will prove whether that is right.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I have no doubt about that. More specifically, regarding clause 6 of the Bill, which inserts new section 28 in the Act and deals with money paid into a totalizator used by a club, I draw honourable members' attention to subsections (9) and (10), which deal with the discontinuance of the 1¼ per cent additional deduction by the clubs after the establishment period. I say to honourable members and to the Minister, "Why should this become a permanent tax?" An amendment would appear to be worthy of consideration, particularly as this would appear to commit the incoming Government (probably of a different political colour) to an entirely new set-up in the taxation clauses of this legislation dealing with a turnover of probably some $20,000,000.

No wonder my colleague, Mr. Hall, wants the tax off now, instead of having to hold this hot potato in the face of some paralysing deficit he seems sure to inherit. A further portion of these subsections deals with the use of money by the clubs—the use of their own money. As I briefly mentioned earlier, it would appear somewhat dictatorial, to use a mild expression. In other words who runs the ruddy show—the race clubs or the Minister?

I refer now to a statement made by the Chief Secretary in his second reading explanation in connection with new section 31h. It is as follows:

It will also enable the Government to exercise adequate control over the establishment of any agency at Port Pirie and in exercising such control the Government—

the Government, mark you!—

They will have regard to the wishes of the people of that town as well as social and economic factors.

It appears to me that here we have a Bill to establish a board to do something and, half way through it, we find the Government saying, "As far as one exempted city is concerned we take charge of that and deal with it. The board does not matter." This is an extraordinary state of affairs to ask honourable members of the whole Parliament to accept.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: This may not apply only to Port Pirie.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No. I am afraid the people of Mount Gambier may have something to say about it. Perhaps they will like another form of betting. This places Ministerial control directly over the board with regard to Port Pirie. This anomaly in the betting world that has existed for far too long must cease—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What did you do to eliminate the anomaly?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: —and, whilst I would not like to see the local arrangements upset overnight, it must be plain to honourable members that the Totalizator Agency Board must in due course, and at general convenience, establish an agency there while gradually liquidating the present position. I should prefer to see this left in the hands of the board which, I trust, will be composed of men of the highest possible calibre.

I contend it is not, as the Minister suggests (and certainly not under this Bill), for any one city to decide what betting facilities it shall have, and it is my firm intention to move some suitable amendment to try to iron out the anomaly.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do you think the Government will accept an amendment?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I do not know; we shall find out. Regarding this what may be termed "exemption clause", the "most favoured city" clause, it is interesting to note what my friend Mr. Fred Walsh, said in 1964:

Any system of T.A.B. should eliminate S.P. betting and should have facilities for people who wish to bet off the course.

Later he said:

Nobody opposed the introduction of bookmakers more vigorously than I did when a resolution supporting their licensing was introduced in 1933.

Now I come nearer home. On the 1964 Bill my friend opposite, the Chief Secretary, said—and I am not misquoting him but am summing it up only briefly:

This taxation was levied on sectional interests.

He went on to say:

If this is not a taxation on sectional interests, I do not know what is.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That was quite sound.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Doesn't the Minister think that the racegoers on the racecourse are a section compared with the whole of the State after they have paid their rates and taxes to the Government? Was the honourable member right or wrong?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Of course he was right. We don't run away from that one.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: We should note that the previous Government with great fairness reviewed the turnover tax from time to time, but now this Government intends to tax only the punter, the one section, and increase the tax still further in the future, because after all—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not correct. We do not intend to increase it in the future for the punter. You should read what the Bill says.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: If the honourable member could—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No; you have been going all right so far.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I will repeat what I have said for the Minister's benefit. This Government intends to tax only the punter, the one section, and increase the tax still further in the future, because, if the Chief Secretary will give me time—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: After all, if the race clubs do not get it, the Government does, so the punter obviously pays the further 1¼ per cent. Does the Chief Secretary deny it?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is still a sectional tax.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: We are referring to the 1¼ per cent coming back from the totalizator, and the Chief Secretary admits it is a sectional tax.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Any tax is a sectional tax.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: That is exactly what I want: it is a sectional tax. Do you call income tax a sectional tax?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said that apart from income tax it was a sectional tax.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I did not hear the Minister say that. I can tell him of plenty of others. I refer now to the winning bets tax, now 2½ per cent, which after removal of the tax on the stake will, therefore, produce only about 70 per cent of the present figure. It is proposed to leave this tax on the winnings (on the winnings, not on the stake) indefinitely. Further, while the Government at present rebates 50 per cent of the total, it will then for one year only, under this Bill, after the removal of the tax on the stake pay the clubs 50 per cent of their previous year's revenue from this source.

Then this Government, continuing to mulct the punter and estimating that the clubs will by this time be more than recompensed by the income from T.A.B., proposes to retain the whole of the tax on winnings. This is what is called "doing away with it". Should its estimate be correct, it may be (and I say "may be") all right for the clubs if T.A.B. gains, but what about the poor punter? What about the original objectives to which I referred at the beginning of my address—illegal betting, the elimination of the tax, etc.? Even if this was acceptable to me (and it is not) it seems quite illogical that the clubs lose their share—which is another thing that the punter, being fair-minded, will object to. After all, if he is forced to continue paying this tax, he will prefer the clubs to get a fair share of it, even if only to improve his own racing amenities. If the punter is to continue to pay the tax and the club is no longer to receive any share, then again the Government has only the justification of additional revenue for retaining this tax. I remind the Government and the Premier that this is very sectional.

I now turn to clause 8 (new section 31m (3)), which deals with limiting the board with regard to pay-outs, and states that the board shall not pay out on the same day. I am in general agreement with that but would certainly suggest that the board be fully empowered to pay out after the last race in country areas where, particularly on Saturday racing, shearers or other country employees have to travel 30 or 40 miles to pick up a few dollars on some future day, or they may even have left the district. I need hardly enlarge on how impracticable that is and how reasonable it is that they should be able to collect on the same day after the last race. I was informed only last Thursday by the Chairman of the Queensland Totalizator Agency Board that they had found it necessary to look at this and the matter was under immediate consideration.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But they have not amended their Bill as yet.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: That is so, but it was told to me only last week by the Chairman. He went on to say, "It is a good thing to get in while you have the opportunity." After all, they have made a success of it over there.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think you have made a "kill" with the Chief Secretary; he is going to accept this one!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: In other words, I was leaving it to the board to use its discretion, but this may need a small amendment to the Bill. The board will be somewhat top-heavy, but I appreciate that racing, trotting and country clubs have all demanded recognition on the board and that the Government has acceded to the requests. Because of that, I find it hard to complain, even though I think the board will be unwieldy. I impress on the Government the absolute importance of properly considering the matter of the appointment of both the Chairman and the General Manager. With all these racing people represented on the board, I am not sure that it is essential for either the Chairman or the General Manager to be an expert on racing. I do not think there will be any harm if they have some knowledge of it, but I sincerely hope (not only from the point of view of the taxpayer, although it is mainly for the benefit of the Government) that first-class businessmen will be appointed to fill both positions, and that the attitude will not be, "We must give old Bill a job".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can rest assured on that one; it will not be for the sake of giving somebody a job.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I congratulate the Parliamentary Draftsman on his work in connection with this Bill. It is not usual to do this, but because I had something to do with a similar problem a few years ago I am aware of the difficulties that must have been encountered in drafting the measure. In saying that, I am conscious of the fact that it took nine months or a year to produce the Victorian Bill on T.A.B. However, apart from differences of opinion on one or two clauses, I have found nothing to criticize in the drafting. I do not know whether my friend, the Hon. Mr. Potter, has found anything to criticize in the Bill, but I do congratulate the Parliamentary Draftsman on his work.

In this Bill the Government can be charged by the racing clubs, the punters and the general taxpayers with making a further grab for revenue purposes, but in excess of that suggested in either the Queensland or Victorian T.A.B. It is also expressly contrary to so many published comments and statements about the Bill that was to be introduced, and regarding which a motion was passed in another place. The statements to which I refer were made by members of the Government and concerned the Bill as a whole. Even the Grants Commission, which is highly respected by Parliamentarians and financial people in every State, warned the Tasmanian Government it could well be penalized for not introducing T.A.B. I hope for and anticipate a strong and well-considered debate on this somewhat controversial Bill. From all aspects, we have the nucleus of a well-drafted Bill and I suggest that T.A.B. in South Australia must come to stay. I support the second reading.

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

## ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 1457.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): When this debate was adjourned on the last day of sitting I was given leave to conclude my remarks because time was not available then for me to finish. I was about to draw attention to the proposed granting of mineral rights to the trust. Clause 16 is the relevant clause, and I think I mentioned that I wanted to consider it further so that I could elaborate on the nature of the proposed grant. I intend to refer only to the relevant portions of the clause. Subclause (1) states:

> The Governor may by proclamation transfer any Crown lands or any other lands for the time being reserved for Aborigines to the trust:

Subclause (2) states:

> . . . upon the making of any such proclamation such lands shall, together with all metals, minerals and precious stones, coal, salt, gypsum, shale, oil and natural gas therein or thereon be vested free of all encumbrances in the trust. . . .

If I remember rightly, since the 1880's mineral rights have not been granted to the ordinary citizen who holds the fee simple in land, and this places the trust on a different plane from that on which rests the ordinary citizen. The trust gets a superior right. Up to about 1880 mineral rights were granted with the fee simple, but not since then.

The second reading explanation said, as I remember it, that it is proposed to grant the right to the trust in order to make up for the fact that 130-odd years ago we took away the land of the Aboriginal without compensation. The explanation dealt with many historical references as to what the Colonial Commissioners said was to be done about Aborigines and their rights. I do not need to go into detail on this matter, because my recollection is (and the Minister will correct me if I am

wrong) that the explanation said that this grant is to be made 130 years later in compensation for rights taken away many years ago.

One can say that this a very altruistic approach, but it cannot be said to be anything but very much out of date. Generations have passed since then. These people had their hunting grounds taken away in such a manner that they gradually retired further and further afield. They have been dead for many years, and so have their children and grandchildren. In that relationship we are getting rather remote, which is one reason why I will support the move, assuming it is made, for the appointment of a Select Committee. We need to understand these things much better than we do at present. I should like to take an example that occurs to me. After the Battle of Trafalgar a grateful British Parliament granted a handsome annuity in perpetuity to the person bearing the title of Earl Nelson. That was done in 1806, and in 1947 the British Labour Government, headed by Lord Attlee, decided that the annuity should cease. In other words, after 140 years the Government reckoned that that was long enough for the gratuity, and an Act of Parliament was passed providing that only the present holder of the annuity and the immediate successor to the title would be entitled to it and that thereafter it would cease. It appears from the questioning in the House of Commons that the person holding the title at that time was 89 years of age and that the heir-apparent was 86. I think that is correct, so the annuity ceased fairly quickly after the Act was passed. This seems a completely opposite attitude to that taken by the South Australian Labor Government, because after 130 years we are told that we must take this action, whereas after 140 years the Labour Government in England said that the expanse of time was enough. That Government said, "You can forget the annuity." On the face of it, there might not seem to be a relationship between the Aborigines of South Australia and Lord Nelson, but I think I have explained the matter well enough to show the sort of doubts that I have about whether this move is not too belated in relation to the way in which it is being done.

I want more information about whether this Bill gives the Aborigines what they want and, indeed, about whether what the Bill does is the proper thing 130 years afterwards. I do not see that the Bill, as drawn, need necessarily be as far-reaching as it has been represented to be, because it will be noticed that what appears to be given with one hand can be taken away with the other. I refer in particular to clause 16 (2), which provides that mineral rights shall be vested in the trust, and that they shall be reserved from the operation of the Mining Act and the Mining (Petroleum) Act. It then goes on to say:

> . . . provided that the Governor may by proclamation declare that any portion of any such lands shall be brought under and be subject to either of the said Acts with or without modifications specified in the proclamation. No such proclamation shall be made except upon the recommendation of the trust or the recommendation of both Houses of Parliament by resolution passed during the same or different sessions of the same Parliament.

Ours is a sovereign Parliament, so this could be said to go without saying, but the fact that the powers that be have seen fit to put that into the clause raises doubts in my mind. For instance, what would happen if a major oilfield were found on the North-West Reserve, with enormous royalties coming out of the reserve for the Government or the trust? What would the Government do if it found itself in some sort of financial difficulties and saw millions of dollars going to the Aboriginal Lands Trust from the North-West Reserve? Is this not why the proviso has been included? I know that a sovereign Parliament can take away those rights just as it can give them, but has that proviso not been included so that a future Government can say, "We especially provided for this when we passed the Act. We deliberately provided that the Government may, by proclamation, bring these lands back under the Mining Act or the Mining (Petroleum) Act"?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There must be some specific reason for its being written into the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is what I think, because there is no reason technically for its being there. While the land remains outside the Mining (Petroleum) Act the trust will have power to settle the royalty, but if this proclamation is made it will go back into the hands of the Government and the department. As my honourable colleague says, there must be some reason for the inclusion of this proviso in the clause, but there is no technical need for it. This Parliament, within its powers, can undo what it has done or reverse it at any time. My interpretation is that the proviso is a saving provision so that if something such as I have mentioned should happen the Government will be able to say, "We have already thought about this and included it. Therefore, we are justified in invoking the

proviso. When we granted the rights, we included the proviso so that if something of this nature happened we would be able to take the rights away. That was the basis on which we gave these rights." No doubt, as the point has been raised, we shall get an explanation, and it needs some explanation.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Did the Hon. Mr. Banfield cover it in his speech?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Weren't you listening?

The Hon. C. R. Story: The honourable member said so much that it was hard to absorb it if one were not a sponge.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not think the honourable member covered it in his speech, but he made a lengthy speech and, although we all listened intently, possibly we would not be human if we were able to remember everything that was said.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You can read it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: At times I enjoy listening to the honourable member's speeches, and at times I enjoy reading them more than I enjoy listening to them. If the honourable member thinks I may be enlightened by perusing his speech in *Hansard*, I shall be glad to do it. Many words in the second reading explanation dwelt on what the early settlers were supposed to have done and not done in relation to Aborigines. If they had done what the Government says they were instructed to do and ought to have done 130 years ago, what would be the position regarding the grant of these 80-acre sections that the Government now says should have been granted to the Aborigines? If we had had Governments over that period of 130 years with the same views on succession duties as the present Government, there would not be much left for the heirs and successors of the then grantees of the Aboriginal world.

I should also like to mention Part III of the Bill, which relates to the Secretary and staff of the trust. Other honourable members have mentioned this matter but I think it is a very important part of the Bill and something about which a Select Committee might be able to gain more enlightenment. Clause 6 (1) states that the trust shall consist of Aborigines or persons of Aboriginal blood. It says:

Each member of the trust shall be an Aboriginal or person of Aboriginal blood within the meaning of the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962.

Clause 14 states:

The Director of Aboriginal Affairs shall be the Secretary to the trust.

Clause 15 (1) states:

The trust may, with the approval of the Minister, appoint such officers and employees as are required to carry out the functions and duties of the trust.

Clause 14 is mandatory, as the Director of Aboriginal Affairs is to be the principal executive officer of the trust. Clause 15 (2) suggests that if he wants any help it is to be provided for him by the officers of his own department. That is not mandatory; it says, "The Minister may". What does it mean? Does it mean that by having the administration of the trust the Department of Aboriginal Affairs will virtually be doing exactly the same as it is now doing? This is my interpretation of it. Again, this is a point on which a Select Committee might be able to gain some knowledge and information. I think I have covered the various matters that I indicated I would cover. I propose to support the second reading of the Bill. I think I indicated that previously, and I certainly indicated previously that if a move is made, as has been foreshadowed, for the appointment of a Select Committee I intend to support that move as well, because I think it would be extremely helpful to the members of this Council to have further information available from the committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I look upon the Bill as another step in the general policy to endeavour to help the Aboriginal people of South Australia. In this legislation we are dealing with people whose way of life has been different from ours and, in many cases, still is different from ours. There has been and there still is a general need to help them. It is an obligation, and it has been recognized since white settlers first came to South Australia.

Administrators and people interested in this subject have had very good intentions in this matter, but it is understandable that problems have occurred in the practical application of this well-intentioned help and these well-intended plans. Problems will undoubtedly occur in the practical sense with this legislation if it is passed, and any future legislation, too. Problems will occur because we are dealing with human beings. The responsibility and the need are apparent, when making such plans as these, to exercise extreme care and to have thorough investigation. That is undeniable.

On the other hand, I hope we shall not be too conservative in this matter. When I say "conservative" I use the word in the old

sense of being opposed to change. Putting it another way, we should not stress that we intend to carry on a protectionist attitude in this matter. On this general aspect the Bill has some undoubted merit. Our goal, and it has been mentioned by other honourable members, is ultimately to reach complete integration. I refer, as another honourable member has referred in this debate, to the quotation by Professor Abbie, as it appeared in the press last month, "The only possible future for the Aborigine lies with the world of the white man."

Complete integration is a worthy goal. When I say I hope we shall not be too conservative, I recognize that there is a trend in this modern world to jump ahead somewhat in the giving of opportunity to people with different ways of living from our own and for them to accept the great challenges that they are eager and willing to accept, including the leadership of their own people. In providing that opportunity we still know and somewhat fear the dangers that lie ahead. We know that the path for these people will not be easy. Extreme care and caution are needed, as well as full information on all the details of the planning, including all the human facets of the practical side of the implementation of such planning.

The need to acquire all such detail and to completely consider all such information lead me to favour the suggestion that a Select Committee would be desirable. I favour it as a means of help and assistance in fully considering and appreciating this matter, and not by any means as a method by which this legislation can ultimately be defeated, as has been implied by recent press statements.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Would you put a time limit on the legislation?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not think there is any reason for us to assume that it will be delayed unduly.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is in the hands of the House.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Previously it took three years.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not think it will take that long. It is difficult for me at this stage to see how the provisions in the Bill, which will tend to set up ultimately a society within a society, can lead to complete integration. There seems to be some contrast or conflict in the two approaches. If we develop the trust as the Bill indicates it should be established, I think we shall be developing a society within a society. If that is so, I have grave doubts that we shall be doing all we can towards the goal of ultimate and complete integration.

The need for care and caution is recognized by the Government, as many controls, checks and restrictions are included in the Bill, and I shall deal briefly with them. First, I deprecate the general emotionalism that was stirred up here a week or two ago on this issue. The word "bitter" was used in the Minister's speech. I am not accusing the Minister in any way of endeavouring to stir up this emotionalism, but nevertheless the word "bitter" was used. The interview that I had here with Aboriginal people at that time led me to believe that there was no bitterness in their hearts at all. Indeed, the young gentleman who acted mainly as spokesman for the delegation mentioned, and even stressed, to me the passive character of the Aborigines, and I do not think there is bitterness in the minds or hearts of the majority of Aborigines in this State. However, they have been given the impression that the setting up of this Select Committee is a means to defeat the Bill, and I deprecate that they have been given this impression.

I do not think the Aborigines deserve to be incited by emotionalism. A week or so ago they simply exercised a democratic right when they came into this Chamber to sit in the gallery and then be heard (as they were) by the people they asked to see, and they presented their case in a calm and highly commendable fashion. Emotionalism has no place in this issue, where we are legislating to affect their future and their whole way of living. Theirs is a human problem, and calm and sober thought and deep consideration must be given to their needs.

I will now touch upon the Government's recognition of the need for the checks and controls placed in this Bill. Control seems to permeate the whole Bill and, because this is so and because the majority of members of this Council would, if they favoured the measure in a general sense, favour these points of control, this is even more evidence that great caution is needed in approaching this problem.

Regarding the control that exists in the Bill, I think it is pertinent to express my view that many of the Aboriginal people who came here recently did not know or appreciate the full import of the measure and many of the very relevant points concerning them. On this aspect, I mention first clause 6, which deals with membership of the trust. It provides that the trust shall consist of a chairman

and at least two other members appointed by the Governor. I stress, however, that there is the following proviso:

Provided that the Governor may whenever he thinks fit so to do appoint additional members not exceeding nine.

If we assume that the Government will advise the Governor (which will be the case), it is obvious that the nine extra members (one from each of the reserve councils) need not be appointed: they would be appointed only when the Government thought fit so to do.

I think here is a check within the legislation. I am not being critical, but this shows the caution introduced by the author of this measure. On the other hand, I think that some of the Aborigines to whom I spoke thought they would definitely have these representatives from the reserves on the trust.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The caution in the Bill is not matched by the optimism of the second reading speech.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so. I turn now to clause 10, which deals with meetings of the trust. As other members have referred to this point, I do not wish to stress it. However, no meeting is to be held unless the Secretary is present, and I do not think all the Aborigines who came here realized this. I do not think they realized that, if the trust were composed of Aborigines appointed from their reserve and these people attended a meeting, that meeting could not start until the Secretary (the Director of Aboriginal Affairs or a nominee if he were not available) arrived.

The young gentleman who led the delegation and to whom I spoke mentioned the dignity of the Aboriginal race. I do not think it would be very dignified for a committee of Aborigines to wait for the arrival of one man before proceeding with their business.

Clause 15 deals with officers and employees of the trust, and here again there is some control, as the trust will not be able to employ any person without the approval of the Minister. Not only is the matter of the possible reversion of mineral rights to the Crown written into the Bill but it is also provided by clause 16 (2) that they can revert to the Crown on the recommendation of both Houses of Parliament, so here again is this control. The matter must come back to Parliament, or the Government through the Governor must do this or that.

Clause 16 (6) deals with the disposal, leasing or mortgaging of land, and the words "with the consent of the Minister" are used. Although it is a qualified consent, control is nevertheless there. A sale cannot be completed unless both Houses of Parliament approve.

Through all this legislation there is control. I am not opposed to control, but this indicates the concern the Government had in compiling this Bill, and that concern is echoed by me and by other speakers. I think it gives further weight to the request for an investigation by a Select Committee.

Clause 16 (7) deals with the North-West Reserve, and provides that the trust cannot dispose of it without control and cannot even encumber it. If the trust had this reserve transferred into its name and needed funds to develop it, it could not borrow money for development purposes unless the matter came before both Houses of Parliament. While the concept of the trust and the Aboriginal people controlling their own destiny is here, the controls are also here.

I should like it to be written into the Bill that the members of the trust shall be South Australian people. After all, the financial resources that would be given to the trust would be South Australian funds. The people being helped and supervised by the trust and its officers would be South Australians. I quote from the Minister's speech at page 1010 of *Hansard*:

I know that there are Aborigines in South Australia with the necessary qualifications and abilities properly to discharge the functions of the trust board.

So the Minister admits that there are people in this State who can hold office. It would be much better to have South Australians filling these offices than leave the possibility open of people from other States being brought in to control (I suppose one can say) the whole Aboriginal population of South Australia.

I believe that nothing but good can result from a Select Committee, after thorough investigation into how the lives of all Aborigines will be affected in South Australia, not only those who came into this Chamber but also those who wish to remain in their tribal state on the reserves and the many others who are endeavouring to establish themselves elsewhere. It is difficult for me, as a metropolitan representative, to assess the real worth of this measure, because I have not had much contact with Aborigines, but I could have a greater knowledge of the whole subject if a Select Committee was appointed.

We should be armed with more information to decide whether or not there is a serious danger in the conflict between ultimate and

complete integration on the one hand and the setting up of a society within a society on the other. If danger is apparent, we might know just what features could be introduced to plan more effectively for the future at this stage. So, whilst not wishing to obstruct or restrict assistance to the Aboriginal people in any way, I feel they may be helped considerably if a Select Committee investigates this whole matter.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

## DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1335.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill was introduced by the Minister to amend the Dentists Act to remove the present restrictions whereby only fully qualified dentists are allowed to practise, and to provide for a system of dental nurses similar to the scheme operating in New Zealand. The Minister said:

In New Zealand there is a special provision enabling the performance in the School Dental Service of dental work for schoolchildren in accordance with conditions approved by the Minister.

That was all that the Minister had to say. On two occasions I have spoken of the New Zealand dental scheme—in the debate on the Address in Reply last year and again this year. My remarks are recorded in *Hansard*, where I expressed approval of the New Zealand scheme. When the Minister made some statement about it, he supported the principles of the scheme; but he has not said how far he proposes to go with it. When I witnessed the New Zealand scheme in 1950, I was impressed by the principle inasmuch as it can be applied to relieve the problem, which it does: that is, to use other than fully qualified dentists for school dental work. I saw the dental nurses in operation. I do not want to repeat what has been said previously, but they do a wonderful job with schoolchildren. They train them how to look after and appreciate the importance of their teeth, and in prophylactics generally; also, how to look after their baby teeth with the idea of preserving the dental arches; they teach them all those desirable things in the treatment of teeth.

They have a very advanced scheme in New Zealand. That is why I should like to have heard more from the Minister, because this scheme can grow into a big organization. New Zealand has a population about double that of South Australia—or it did then, about 2,000,000 people compared with our 1,000,000—so that possibly in a similar scheme we could take the New Zealand figures as representing double our own requirements.

Generally, I think I should give the Council some information about the scheme so that honourable members can appreciate what I am saying. I should like the Minister to indicate how far he intends to go—whether or not it is merely to retain the position in the profession itself, and try to train dentists (there being seven or eight operating throughout the State) or the more quickly to accomplish their work by the initiation of the scheme of training nurses under this principle of two years' training. The Minister has not said how and where these people will be trained. The New Zealand scheme was reported on in 1950 by a British dental mission, which said:

We are of the unanimous opinion that the training of the New Zealand school dental nurse has resulted in a high standard of technical efficiency in the treatment of children within the limits laid down and we further consider that, subject to the staffing limitations, the dental nurse system in New Zealand meets an urgent need.

What has happened in England as a result of that and how much of it has been absorbed into the free dental service I do not know. As regards the scheme of training that New Zealand has, there is published the bi-monthly *School Dental Service Gazette*. I looked through a copy with interest. I realize that this copy is now 16 years old, that the scheme was in its commencement at that time and that it had not long been in operation. However, it has now grown to fairly substantial dimensions.

The New Zealand National Dental Service was organized in two divisions—(*a*) the School Dental Service and (*b*) the Adolescent Dental Service. The School Dental Service was the only one that was properly organized when I was there; the service for adolescents had not then been developed. It was stated that it was being gradually developed. The National Dental Service was an integral part of the Division of Dental Hygiene of the Department of Health, and was under the control of the Director of that Division (himself a dental surgeon), who in turn was responsible to the Minister of Health through the Director-General of Health. The Director was assisted by a Deputy Director, an Assistant Director (Training), a Principal Dental Officer (Health Education), and a Principal Dental Officer (Orthodontics). A Senior Executive Officer was responsible for the secretarial services.

Also attached to the Director's office was a Dental Field Research Officer, who was seconded from the New Zealand Medical Research Council.

That is a fairly large organization. The service was organized in seven units, each of which was controlled by a senior dental officer, who was directly responsible to the director. These officers were the Principal of the Dominion Training School for Dental Nurses and the Princpal Dental Officers of the six dental districts into which the Dominion is divided. I think the number was increased later.

At that time 100 student dental nurses per annum were being appointed and they entered in groups of 50 at six-monthly intervals. The rapidly increasing school population created a new problem, and it became necessary to train still more school dental nurses in order to build up the field staff to the strength necessary to cope with the greatly increased number of children. It was estimated that it would be necessary to increase the field staff by more than 50 per cent during a few years.

The Dominion Training School for Dental Nurses in Wellington, a modern, well-equipped institution, which was completed in 1940, was proving inadequate, after having been in existence for 10 years, to meet demands following the Second World War, and additional training facilities were being planned. During training, student dental nurses were accommodated in the department's hostels, which were conducted in association with the Dominion Training School. I am referring to only certain parts of the information I have in order to give a review of the organization that was bound around this scheme of training nurses.

The Government was granting between 20 and 30 bursaries each year to selected students to assist them to qualify as dentists and the bursaries were of a value of £70 per annum. I again remind the Council that I am speaking of money values in 1950. The bursaries were tenable for five years, subject to satisfactory reports from the university authorities. An additional amount of £40 per annum was payable to students who had to live away from home in order to pursue their studies. Students who were granted bursaries were required to enter into an agreement to pursue their studies diligently and, on graduating, to enter the service of the Crown or of a hospital board appointed by the Crown for a specified period not exceeding three years. That is not dissimilar to the arrangements in regard to our teacher training institutions.

Regarding the cost (in sterling currency) of supporting that scheme, at that time the net cost of school dental services was £322,000, which today would be equal to about £1,000,000. The number of patients under systematic treatment was 235,746 and the cost for each patient was £1 7s. 3d. Today's equivalent of that cost would be about £5. If we convert that currency to dollars we get the substantial cost of about $1,000,000 and, assuming the number of children concerned here to be half the number concerned in New Zealand, the cost would be half that amount. Whether the Minister contemplates using more staff to do the work of dental nurses or whether he contemplates this sort of organization, I point out that considerable financial provision will be involved to inaugurate what is doubtless a good scheme.

Whether we are in a position to go as far as the scheme in New Zealand has gone is a matter for planning, because it seems to me that they have a fairly top-heavy organization. The gazette, which it is almost compulsory for all concerned to have and read, is issued every two months and has a further organization that I suppose one would call a public relations section. The gazette lists material that is available, including posters (N.Z. and oversea), poster frames into which to fit the posters, pamphlets, booklets, coloured folders, dental models, films and film strips, and an extensive range of publicity and newspaper pulls.

I also find that on March 31, 1950, which was 10 years after the inauguration of the scheme, the staff consisted of dental officers 47, matron and home sisters two, dental nurse inspectors and dental tutor sisters 23, school dental nurses 514, students nurses 203, and dental attendants 28. The staff runs into big figures and if we were to use the scheme for our requirements, it would take some time to obtain the staff necessary. The qualifications for the nurses from both the health and the educational points of view are fairly high.

The nurses have to graduate with qualifications and the scheme is based on a fairly high intelligence quotient. The work that these dental nurses are capable of doing and the way the nurses are able to handle tiny children of pre-school age commend the scheme as being a good service indeed. I wish it success,

as all would do, but I think care must be taken to ensure that it does not get beyond the ability of the authorities to handle it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health): I want to take the opportunity of replying and of thanking Sir Lyell for his comments. I know that the scheme could cost much money but when the matter was submitted to Cabinet the estimated cost for the first three years was, I think, about $178,000. We desire to work with New Zealand. The Director General of Public Health (Dr. Woodruff) has been looking after this matter and, I am sorry to say, he has been ill. Because of that, the matter has not gone on as we would have hoped. He had much of this information at his fingertips, and somebody cannot pick up just where another person has left off.

For the benefit of honourable members, I have the regulations under the Nurses Registration Act 1920-64. I think our intake for the first year is about 16 dental nurses. The next regulation describes the course of training.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: What qualifications must they have?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot say. Then follows children's dentistry, oral surgery, periodontics, orthodontics, and dental radiology. There is a preliminary examination in English, dictation, arithmetic, etc.—200 marks. It appears to be of a high standard. I hope it works. I have seen it. I made a special trip to Tasmania this year to see its school opened, and the scheme started very well. Tasmania has been rather fortunate in that it not only obtained a trained sister from New Zealand for the first 12 months but had one of the top executive officers made available for 12 months to ensure that the scheme, which is similar to New Zealand's, got off to a good start. If the scheme goes on, the man from New Zealand can be made available to South Australia. I hope Cabinet will proceed with the scheme. Buildings will be necessary but, as members know, money is short this year. If our scheme is proceeded with we hope to have the man from New Zealand for the first 12 months to ensure that our plans are properly founded. It will cost a couple of thousand dollars, but that is nothing if we can ensure that we have the right foundation.

Almost everywhere I have gone in my travels through the State I have been asked, "What can we do to help dentists in the country areas?" That is what we are aiming at, although this scheme could be two years away. From what I have seen in Tasmania, and from what I have read and been told of the scheme in New Zealand, I think it will be something in the very best interests of the younger people of the State, provided the scheme functions well and is properly controlled. No-one wants to send half-baked dentists out into the country. If the scheme develops, in a few years' time there should be a very good result. I do not think the question of finance will be a serious one.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Will it be a free service?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, free to the community. It will be a cost to the State, and Cabinet is unanimous that it should go on. I hope it does and that it will function efficiently. I look forward to the day when it will be in operation, and I hope it will turn out as well as the one in Tasmania. Tasmania has a hostel for the girls, who are mainly from the country. I do not think we shall need a hostel, but we do need the correct training and a director. We have someone in view. I thank Sir Lyell McEwin and other honourable members for permitting the Bill to go through, which I hope it does without delay.

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

## MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1343.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I support this measure, but comment upon two of its clauses. The first is clause 7, which deals with the registering of a motor vehicle in a business name. I notice that the Minister in his second reading explanation said that this was simply putting into the Act a practice that had been carried on for some time by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. I do not think that that is a very good precedent, nor is it a very good idea to have the ownership of any kind registered in other than a person's name or a limited company's name.

Where there is a limited company there is a legal entity, and where there is a legal action that entity is proceeded against, but where there is a business name, which is

simply a name registered with the particular State department, I do not think it is a good thing to encourage the practice of vehicles, or any other assets, being registered simply in a business name.

The clause refers to those who have registered with a business name as being liable for any action of any kind but, nevertheless, I think that the motor vehicle should be registered in the name of a person or limited company.

Clause 10 concerns me most. It deals with the exemption of some driving instructors from the need to be licensed by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. At one time, all driving instructors had to be licensed as such, but later that was altered so that police instructors were exempted. I have no query about that, but the point has been further expanded and other people are being exempted from the need to be registered as driving instructors. This licence is different from the ordinary driver's licence. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Many public authorities, such as the Electricity Trust and the Municipal Tramways Trust, have their own instructors and it is considered unnecessary that such instructors should be required to undergo a test by the Registrar and to be licensed by him.

Although I notice that they still have to be approved by the Registrar, there seems to me to be a trend here to relax the control by the Registrar of driving instructors.

As I see it, driving instructors fall into two categories—those who are in private practice as instructors and give tuition to people for them to obtain licences, and those who are employed by authorities such as were mentioned by the Minister. Of course, "public authorities" is a wide description. Only two were mentioned, and I do not know if it is intended that they only be covered. I suppose Government departments may come under this heading, because some departments, such as the Highways Department, have many vehicles on the road and may have their own driving instructors.

I think it is fair to say that the driving instructors who will be covered by this measure will instruct, supervise and influence many drivers on the roads in this State. The M.T.T. drivers are on the roads for long periods, and at any given time a considerable number of drivers are on the road who have been instructed and influenced by these driving instructors who, before this Bill was introduced, had to obtain a special licence. The licence was for three years, and its cost was $20.

The prerequisites that the Registrar had to go into before granting these licences were adequate, and they gave him all the authority he needed if he had to discipline an instructor. The prerequisites were that the man had to be over 21, to have had a licence for over three years, to be of good character and to be proficient in motor driving instruction. The Registrar had the right to test either orally or by practical examination, and the test or examination could include such matters as traffic laws, driving practices, vehicle manipulation and teaching technique.

Now these men, although they must obtain the approval of the Registrar (which I think their employers would do by a formal covering letter), do not have to measure up to these requirements. I am concerned about road safety and, as the Minister has mentioned this recently when dealing with children crossing a certain road, I know that he, too, is concerned about it.

To appreciate the seriousness of the matter, it is important to refer to some statistics. Every three hours an Australian kills himself or one of his fellows in an accident, and every seven minutes one of our fellows is maimed. In 1965, which is the last year when statistics were compiled, Australia had 8.5 deaths for each 10,000 registered vehicles, which was more than in the U.S.A., Canada and New Zealand. So, there is no doubt about the seriousness of the road toll and accidents generally. Any legislation that may reduce this toll should be welcomed, and anything that relaxes the position and gives the slightest possibility of opening the door so that the accident rate remains bad or gets worse should be looked at very carefully indeed.

I think the obligations on driving instructors are being lessened by this Bill; they will not have to answer to the Registrar as they might have had to do before if he had called them up for examination. I think it is our responsibility in the public interest to see that this measure will not lead to any greater road toll. If one goes back to the prerequisites and thinks of the changes in world traffic signals, road markings, the law concerning traffic, teaching methods and the

mechanical construction of vehicles, one realizes there is a need for strict supervision of driving instructors. The cost has been small—only $20 for three years.

Not only safety but convenience is involved. As the M.T.T. has been mentioned, I point out that to my knowledge many of the trust's drivers, when coming to a stop to set down or pick up passengers, do not bring their vehicles right to the kerb, as they should. I know that buses are not easy to manoeuvre, but inconvenience is caused to the public and there is danger to cars behind when the traffic lane out of which buses should be when parked at the kerb is somewhat obstructed by the rear of a bus. If complaints of this kind kept coming in they could ultimately filter through to the Registrar and, when driving instructors applied for renewal of their licences after three years, he could indicate to them that they must instruct bus drivers to watch this point and exercise great care when stopping buses.

I realize that the Minister is very concerned about road safety. If in the future there is any indication of the need for driving instructors employed by public authorities to be watched more carefully in relation to their being granted licences, the matter should be brought forward again.

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

## ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.15 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, September 15, at 2.15 p.m.