

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 6, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

THEVENARD SINKING.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question regarding the *Eleni K*, which sank near Thevenard recently?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Marine, states that the Ports and Traffic Manager of the Harbors Board has reported that, in its present position, the *Eleni K* does not restrict vessels from entering or leaving the Thevenard harbour.

WATERLOO CORNER CROSSING.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to what has become known as the Waterloo Corner crossing on the Angle Vale, Salisbury and Waterloo Corner roads. As all honourable members know, there have been some very bad tragedies there in recent weeks and part of the Angle Vale Main Road No. 410 has been closed temporarily. There is now a T-junction rather than an intersection. I understand that all members connected with that area, both here and in another place, have received information from the Salisbury council seeking a solution to the problem but also expressing the council's opposition to the permanent closing of that part of the Angle Vale road. I know that the Minister is as concerned about this matter as anyone else. Has he any further information regarding the solution of this problem?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. This can be taken as an interim report at this stage. For the honourable member's information, I received a lengthy communication from the Salisbury council regarding this matter and suggested that an officer of the department and others confer with members of the Salisbury council. That will be done in order to arrive at a final solution of the problem. Even prior to the occurrence of the last tragic accident, Highways Department engineers, who are highly qualified men, were examining the crossing. Then this last accident happened and it culminated in my ordering the department to

close a section of road pending a full examination. I have a full report from the department containing the recommendation of the engineers, but this will have to be verified by other people. The suggestion is that a section of the road now temporarily closed be permanently closed, so as to make the Waterloo Corner a T-junction. This would also necessitate an alteration to part of what is known as the East-West Road to bring it into alignment with Port Wakefield Road. I have a diagram which sets out these proposals. The latter suggestion would reduce the five-corner intersection higher up on the Port Wakefield Road to a four-corner intersection and would allow access to that road. This would mean a re-alignment of the East-West Road and the closing of part of it. The closing would have to be done legally by the Department of Lands. It is also desirable that the Town Planner should be consulted regarding the future use of land in the vicinity that could have a bearing upon the alterations to these roads. The Salisbury council would also have to be consulted.

If the proposition of the Highways Department is accepted, it will then be given legal effect. I shall make the diagram available to the honourable member for his information.

SUBURB NAMES.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Lands, an answer to a question I asked yesterday about the suburb of Centennial Park?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The Minister of Lands informs me as follows:

In 1945, as a result of the growth in the number of subdivisions and place names, considerable difficulty faced the P.M.G.'s Department in organizing its postal delivery districts. Hence, action was initiated to endeavour to rationalize the position and eliminate the names of smaller subdivisions and to incorporate them into larger areas to be known by a one place name. All metropolitan corporations and council areas were examined and revised subdivisions and place names were prepared.

The policy adopted in considering place names, which has been in operation since that time, was and is to consult with the local governing bodies concerned and with the P.M.G.'s Department. It is reasonable to assume that a local governing body would, in dealing with such matters and before making its decision on any proposal, bear in mind the viewpoint of its ratepayers. In the case referred to by the honourable member, the naming of the subdivision of Centennial Park, which included areas known as Goodwood Road Estate, Goodwood Estate Extension, Springbank Gardens, Pasadena, Bellvue Township, and portion of Castle Estate, was decided in 1947

after consultation with and with the consent of the then Corporation of the Town of Mitcham, and this situation has obtained up until the present time.

As a consequence of a petition recently received, which has been supported by the Corporation of the City of Mitcham, the matter is now being examined by the Nomenclature Committee.

PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Included in the programme for the widening of the main arterial roads is a proposal to widen or duplicate the Port Wakefield Road. Much land for the purpose of widening this road has already been purchased, but whether or not it will go through or will by-pass the township of Virginia is a matter causing some delay in this programme. The District Council of Munno Para is being somewhat inconvenienced by the fact that it cannot obtain from the department information about whether this road will go through or by-pass the township of Virginia. I have correspondence dating back over 13 months. In fact, the latest correspondence between the Clerk of the District Council of Munno Para and the Highways and Local Government Department is dated March 22, 1966—about seven months ago. For the benefit of the Minister, I will read this letter to the Council. It is as follows:

Dear Sir,

Receipt of your letter of 10th January concerning the Port Wakefield main road 6 through Virginia is acknowledged, and you are advised that this department has completed its investigations on several alternate proposals for road arrangements in Virginia. These proposals have now been referred to the Town Planner and as soon as his comments are to hand it is desired to seek council's views before a final scheme is adopted.

It is regretted that it is taking some time to reach finality in this matter, but you may be assured that this project has been given as high a priority as staff resources allow. Pending finality of the Virginia proposals, it is suggested that it may now be possible to resolve any specific land transactions that may be held up on the basis of information presently available. The Planning Engineer would be pleased to assist council or the proprietors of land involved in such matters.

The letter is signed by the Secretary of the department. However, there is more to it than that. The Munno Para District Council is being inconvenienced because it has a road sealing programme and also wishes to re-align the water tables in the Virginia township. It

would not be prudent for the council to proceed with those works until it knew exactly where the new road would go.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: The honourable member is about five years ahead of time!

The Hon. L. R. HART: As it is 7 months since the last correspondence was received from the department, will the Minister state whether he is in a position to advise the Munno Para District Council which of the alternative proposals has been recommended? In addition, will he ascertain why this delay has occurred and, if the recommendation is still not available, how long is it expected to be before such information can be made available to the council concerned?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall seek the information required and then inform the honourable member of the position.

AMPHIOMETERS.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand that in Victoria up until the month of July this year the road accident toll has been reduced by 1,000 and road deaths by 12. According to the report that I have read on this phenomenon, the police in Victoria attribute this to an electronic device called an amphotometer, which has been designed by a Victorian for checking speeds of motor vehicles as they pass a given spot. From the report, it appears that the machine is extremely accurate and far more efficient than radar. Will the Chief Secretary advise whether he is contemplating installing similar machines in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am usually up to date, but this is the first I have heard of the report or the machine. If the honourable member will give me the report I will check the matter with the Commissioner of Police. No doubt the Police Force is aware of the device, even though I am not, but I shall endeavour to obtain the information and give a reply in due course.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WATERLOO CORNER.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Roads): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The last fatality occurred soon after the previous one involving a school bus. On the Tuesday following the last fatality, the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, who right through has shown considerable interest not only in this intersection but also in others in his district, asked a question regarding Waterloo Corner. In answering his question I made other statements as well, although at the time only limited information had been given to me. On reading *Hansard* of September 20, 1966, at page 1653, I was amazed to see a statement of mine that could give an altogether wrong impression of what I intended when I made the statement, and I considered that it could have very far-reaching effects. I am not saying that I did not make the statement, as I am well aware that I did. The report in *Hansard* is factual and true. The words that concern me in that report are:

The driver, besides committing suicide, committed murder, because his wife, too, was killed.

I intended this to be generalizing. On reading that statement in *Hansard*, I realize that it has more far-reaching effects than perhaps one would imagine. The circumstances of the last accident have by no means been determined: inquiries and investigations into that accident are still proceeding, and there will be a coronial inquiry into the whole matter. My statement can be wrongly construed. I appreciate the ramifications of my statement if it is left as it is. My purpose in asking leave to make this personal explanation is to retract the statement, because I feel it should not have been made. It creates a position that I feel should not have been created, especially as other people have to be considered apart from the actual victims of the accident. On sane reflection, after reading in *Hansard* the words I used, I repeat that my personal explanation is for the purpose of retracting them.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2.)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page .)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): It is with some reluctance that I rise to speak to this Appropriation Bill. I do not wish to criticize the Government just for the sake of criticizing, and I should very much like to support the Bill gladly, but I cannot find any support or any enthusiasm for it as I read through the pages of the Chief Secretary's speech. As was mentioned, I think the day before yesterday, by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, there is a total deficit of nearly \$9,250,000 which has

come forward from the last financial year, plus a further deficit over July and August of nearly \$7,750,000, and this totals very nearly \$17,000,000 all told.

When a large overdraft has been accumulated it is normal business practice to make plans to pay it off in instalments of so much a year and to plan accordingly, and I would venture to suggest that no banker would permit otherwise. In this case, however, no real plan appears to have been made to correct the position. It is just as though John Citizen said to his wife, "My dear, we have additional liabilities to the extent of, say, \$50,000 on our property; we will do nothing about paying it off, but will continue to pay interest on it for the rest of our term." And, of course, all this interest amounts to a very large sum of money. It is like saying, "We will do nothing about it; we will pay interest on it for the balance of our lives and leave it to our sons to pay off." This, of course, would depend on whether John Citizen could get any bank to agree to such a set-up.

I wonder whether this is this Government's attitude, having set up a very big deficit by over-spending in double quick time? Does this Bill say, in effect, "We have got ourselves into debt; let our successors pay it off"? To my mind, it would appear to be so. However, even if this is so, it still comes back not to the Government or to the successors of the Government but to the people of South Australia, who will have to pay it off and who in the meantime will have to pay the interest charges. These interest charges could well amount to very large sums of money which otherwise might be used over the years for development.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin rightly says that over \$9,250,000 of extra charges have been placed upon the taxpayers, without any real attempt to correct the present financial position, and I believe that this is a very serious state of affairs indeed. Sir Lyell also correctly said that many items are missing from this Bill. He instanced the matter of mental health and the gas pipeline as two of the important ones. I have some friends who for many years have been rather interested in the Health Department and in the development of health services, particularly mental health services. I have had criticisms brought to my notice on many occasions about what more can be done to advance the situation, particularly as far as mental health is concerned. I think everybody would freely admit that there is much more that could be done

and should be done. The Premier, in his policy speech, said:

The plans that are now envisaged for Reynella and Hillcrest are so very long overdue that the Reynella project is still awaiting the consideration of the Government.

He went on to say that a Labor Government would immediately speed up re-housing of mental hospital patients in modern buildings adequate for their needs. While that could be so, to my mind a very great deal remains to be done at the present time and there is very little evidence of progress being made.

We have heard about the gas pipeline now for at least 2½ years, and this was a plan that was in hand when the previous Government was in office. One of the main problems, I think, at that stage was the necessity to prove the existence of sufficient quantities of gas to last for a sufficient period of years to justify a pipeline for such a long distance. I believe that the quantity has been proved, but I do know that the previous Government did have a plan depending on the proving of sufficient deposits of gas. Many plans that the previous Government had have been grabbed as plans of the present Government since it has been in office. When the present Government has not been happy about some things it has said it is the previous Government's fault; but whenever a plan has been a good one the present Government has been happy to get on the band wagon and say what it is doing. Very little has been done about this Gidgealpa pipeline, and I urge the Government to proceed to do something.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What more do you want done?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am asking the Government to expedite the implementation of this pipeline.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do you think we can get \$40,000,000 out of the air?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not know about that.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What you can do is let other people get on with it if you can't.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your Government could not have done any more or done it any more quickly.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: If you can't do it you have to let private enterprise get on with it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You can be a little reasonable.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask the Government to see that this is proceeded with. As Sir Arthur Rymill has said, if it is not possible as a Government enterprise then private enterprise should be allowed to proceed with the undertaking.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You can always tell when you hit them in the right place.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: They come in like the tide if you can hit them in the right place, especially if you mention the Tea Tree Gully hospital.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is further ahead than you will appreciate.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I thought the Chief Secretary was going to say it is further away. We will listen with great interest when the Chief Secretary makes an announcement about the Modbury hospital.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We are waiting for an announcement from the Commonwealth Government about the \$40,000,000.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable member always wants the Commonwealth Government to do everything. As Sir Lyell McEwin said yesterday, if all the district councils came running to the State Government for all the money they want, that would be exactly the same sort of thing. The State Government immediately thinks it should go to the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Don't you think the Commonwealth Government should assist on this?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think it will, and I hope it will.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: What about Giles Point?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is making about as much progress as many other things.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The deep sea port in the South-East got shifted to Giles Point.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The honourable member knows a little about the Public Works Committee these days. He should know that the committee disagreed about the South-East port.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What about the Keith pipeline: what happened to that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is another one. That made little more progress than Giles Point.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I ask honourable members to remain reasonably quiet.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Ask the speaker to remain reasonably close to the truth as well.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Other honourable members will have the right to reply. The Hon. Mr. Dawkins.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask the Chief Secretary to withdraw that little story about the truth.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said "reasonably near the truth", and I meant it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I will keep to the truth as I see it; the Chief Secretary might see it differently. I now intend to consider some of the provisions of this Bill. One of the items I noticed was the proposed recovery of \$1,000,000 from the Highways Fund. I noticed that my honourable friend, the Minister of Roads, who yesterday had made a spirited defence of his attitude to the highways situation, got a good spread in the press.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The press had a bit to hide, too.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The press pointed out the situation, that the whole of its report on Tuesday was taken from the Highways Department's report.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Out of context.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The press pointed out that its report was completely accurate. I know that the Minister had the opportunity, when his programme was announced a couple of months ago, to get headlines in the press, and this is always the case. However, I consider that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude was on the right track yesterday when he brought to the notice of honourable members the matter of this recovery of \$1,000,000. I believe that the highways work should continue at the same level as that at which it has been proceeding in the past and I also consider that it has to expand at the same rate as has obtained in the past.

If these loans are to be paid for in such large instalments, some slowing down will inevitably happen. The Minister made a statement yesterday and afterwards the Leader of the Opposition asked him whether there would be any delay. The honourable gentleman said in reply that there could be some delay in some highways projects. I consider that this is what the *Advertiser* was objecting to in its report. I sympathize with the Minister about the fact that this money is being taken back from the Highways Department into the revenue fund.

Regarding the Hospitals Department, I notice that the expenditure this year will be about \$20,000,000, which I think is about nine

per cent in excess of payments last year. I approve of the work being done in regard to hospital services in South Australia. I am aware that some things that have been promised have not been done. However, I am also aware that it takes time to carry out some of these promises. Generally speaking, I consider that a good job has been done over the years in the provision of hospital services in this State. The expansion of these hospital services is both necessary and desirable.

If I may turn to the parish pump, I should like to express my pleasure at the provision of \$125,000 for the commencement of reconstruction of the Hutchinson Hospital at Gawler. Many of our hospitals have served the community well over the years. When they were erected they were adequate and modern by the standards of that time. However, just as many old and out-dated schools have served their purpose well, the Hutchinson Hospital is slightly more than 50 years old and when a school, hospital or any other public utility becomes that old, it gets to the stage where some renewal is needed.

This hospital will be completely reconstructed and modernized and the accommodation will be increased by about 50 per cent. I am fully in accord with this work and with the assistance provided by the Government to any other hospitals whether in the city or in the country. I commend the work being done by the Hospitals Department.

Regarding the Education Department, nearly \$45,000,000 is allocated, and this amount is considerably more than actual payments last year. This allocation includes an amount for the free school books scheme that has been promised by the Government, and a considerable amount is for increased salaries. I do not think we can complain about any money being spent on education in South Australia provided it is being spent wisely, because the continuation and broadening of education in this State is vital to our progress.

I consider that the extension into the country of good high schools and advanced classes in high schools, and the broadening of the services available in adult education centres in the country as well as in the city, are of vital importance to the community. I commend the work being done by the department. Before I pass on, however, I express concern that we are not able to match what I consider to be the generous grants of the Commonwealth to our universities.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We cannot afford another by-election. We don't want the honourable member to pass on.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I appreciate that sentiment. Personally, I should like to stay a little longer but, whether I am allowed to stay longer or not, I consider that we must continue to expand the primary and secondary education to which I have referred and some semi-tertiary education provided by adult education centres in country spheres, particularly in accountancy, which is provided in the country for people who would never have the opportunity to attend a university. Not only must we expand these services to the country but we must also ensure that our universities, institutes of technology and agricultural colleges continue to expand and serve the community as they are doing now. With the increasing population and the increasing need for more education for students in the tertiary field, this is a vital matter and I am concerned that we are not able to match the grants.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Some of the highways money could be used for it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Apparently, we can use highways money for everything else. I have noticed that there is to be a small improvement in the amount of money coming in from motor registrations and that, because of the statutory provision regarding that amount of money, that would have no effect on the Budget.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did you see the editorial today about what the Commonwealth Government is doing regarding taxation?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I did consider that, if that statutory provision had not been there, some of that money might have been transferred somewhere else. There is one other matter which, if the Government were in a good financial position, might be considered a relatively small amount of money but, as we are in the red to a considerable extent, as I mentioned earlier, the allocation of \$84,000 for the enrolment of Legislative Council electors is unnecessary. No explanation regarding this amount has been given either in this Council or in another place; the only information that has been given has been by means of television.

I draw the attention of the Minister of Roads to the fact that he at one time said that Great Britain was a most democratic country. If this is so, we must remember that in Great Britain there is a House of Lords, which is an hereditary House plus some life peers created by appointment. Great Britain has voluntary voting for the House of Commons. I also remember the Minister's saying that local government was most democratic

and was nearest to the people. In local government, if my memory is correct, there is a ratepayer's franchise, which is not unlike the present Legislative Council householder's franchise; the only difference being that the franchise for the Legislative Council is rather more liberal than that of local government. If a joint property is valued at more than \$200 for Legislative Council enrolment purposes, both joint owners qualify. In local government the first person who comes on to the roll alphabetically is the one who is regarded as owning the property, and only when the value of the property is in excess of \$300 is it possible for both joint owners to be on the roll. The present Legislative Council roll in that respect is more democratic than the local government roll, and certainly more democratic than the House of Lords in Great Britain.

I consider that the Legislative Council franchise is as it should be; it is a voluntary franchise, a voluntary enrolment and a voluntary vote. Honourable members are well aware that the British people believe in voluntary voting. The British migrants really take quite a delight in not exercising their right to vote at Legislative Council elections, because they believe in voluntary voting. My experience, and I think it has been the experience of other honourable members, even of the Hon. Mr. Banfield, if he remains with us long enough—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He will be here for years.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In enrolling Legislative Council voters, the success of any scheme, generally speaking, would not average more than 25 per cent. I know some honourable members would tell me that that percentage was generous and that 25 per cent would not be the average response from sending out cards to people who, after an examination of the roll, appear to be qualified to be on the Legislative Council roll. Is the \$84,000 to be wasted on a 25 per cent response, or worse, or is there to be pressure to enrol? I should like the Minister, when replying, to comment upon this because, if the \$84,000 is to be spent on an enrolment scheme, fairly done by sending out cards at the one time to all people in the State who appear to be qualified to enrol, I venture to say that the response will be considerably less than 25 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. Story: There will be several public relations officers going around and booking them.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If that is to be the case, it is not voluntary. The whole Legislative Council scheme at present is voluntary. From oversea experience, I think it can be said that the voluntary voter is the person whose vote is worth something, but for Australian Lower Houses we have compulsory voting, where even what is known as the donkey vote can have some influence on the result of an election. I am not sure that this compulsory voting is a good provision. I consider it is not a good provision for both Houses of Parliament in any country. Can the Minister say whether there is to be a number of public relations officers going around persuading people to vote.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: If that is so, and if the cards are to be posted out from the electoral office at the same time, are all electors to be treated on the same basis? Are the cards to be sent out simultaneously? If that is the case, and if there are to be no public relations officers going around saying, "Have you filled in your card?", I consider the \$84,000 will have been very largely wasted.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you think we ought to oppose it?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am very doubtful about it. You may have something there.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You are not worried about it?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You have been on this for a quarter of an hour, and that is a long time for one who is not worried.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am pointing out what the result will be. I have done this work.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Pressurizing!

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No, sending out cards. I do not think the result will be anything like 25 per cent. In the financial position the Government finds itself at present, this \$84,000 will be largely thrown down the drain and wasted if we accept the Chief Secretary's assurance.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Cards have been posted out for years.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am aware of that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Everybody will get a go this time, which was not the case when you were in Government.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The whole matter is administered by the electoral office.

The cards are not sent out by any particular person. I have expressed my concern about the financial position in which we find ourselves. I said at the beginning that I have no wish to criticize for criticism's sake, and the criticisms I have made, which have drawn some response from honourable members, have been made because they are necessary in view of our present financial position. I am glad to note that my honourable friends on the Government side have at least taken some notice of and made some interjections to the things I have said because, when they occupied the Opposition benches, they spent plenty of time criticizing the then Government. I think it is fair to say that we always conceded them that right. They made a lot of criticism—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A lot of constructive criticism.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: That is a matter of opinion but I should like the Ministers who have in the past been so good at making this so-called constructive criticism to accept it when it is given to them now.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: They have not given much constructive criticism since they have been in power.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: It is more destructive than constructive, because of this huge deficit.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It was the case with your Government, too.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: No. I am reluctant to support this Bill and regret the situation in which the State finds itself today.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I start on a similar note to that of the Hon. Mr. Dawkins in his very constructive address. He concentrated his opening remarks upon the unfortunate aspect that there has been no real endeavour to rectify the position of the deficit as estimated for the current year compared with the history-making deficit of the Government at June 30, 1966, covering the past year. It is great pity that this Government has not come forward with a more definite plan at this stage to right the position into which the State has drifted.

The need to produce a plan gets back again to ordinary, orthodox financial planning, that when one is in overdraft, or when some operation is in overdraft, it is not prudent simply to run along with it: it is wise, if not necessary, to make plans to improve the position and restore it to what it was. I cannot see any real endeavour in the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation or

in the Treasurer's Financial Statement to improve the position of deficit into which the State has drifted during the last complete financial year. The Treasurer states in the Financial Statement:

The covering of the deficits already incurred must in the circumstances await later action, unless of course we are fortunate enough to experience a significantly better revenue year than now looks likely, or further substantial Commonwealth assistance is forthcoming.

The Chief Secretary in his opening remarks made a similar point. He said:

The overall 1966-67 programme is to hold the line financially without any further deterioration of the Treasury balances. The Government considers that to go further than this in one year would put unreasonable strains upon the State . . .

So I do not think it is being unfair if this fact of no real plan being brought forward to rectify and restore the position is stressed, because no real plan has come forward. I consider that this is an admission by the present Government of its being unable to do just that and to take this course.

I now touch upon the history of last year and the balances brought forward in the Financial Statement to which I have just referred. The aggregate deficit at the end of the financial year (June, 1966) was \$8,077,000, and the estimated deficit for the current year is \$8,072,000, so the figure is much the same, there being only \$5,000 difference. We find that at the beginning of the year 1965-66, on July 1, 1965, the Consolidated Revenue Account had a surplus of \$1,222,000, and the Loan Account had a deficit of \$59,000, which gave a net credit of \$1,163,000—or, as this is sometimes termed, \$1,200,000 credit that the Labor Government had in its combined balances when it began its first complete financial year in office. After the first 12 months, at June 30, 1966, the Consolidated Revenue Account had gone into a deficit of \$5,612,000, and the Loan Account had gone into a deficit of \$2,465,000, which gave an aggregate deficit of \$8,077,000—or, in round figures, an aggregate deficit of \$8,000,000.

The estimates for the end of this current year, June 30, 1967, are that the Consolidated Revenue Account will show a deficit of \$7,928,000 and the Loan Account will show a deficit of \$144,000, those two amounts making an aggregate deficit of \$8,072,000. The plan of running along (as I call it) with high deficits like this is, of course, completely new to this State in financial arrangements at Government level.

Based upon our history, it is entirely different from our successful approach and, further to highlight this aspect, I refer to Appendix 6 of the Financial Statement, in which the Consolidated Revenue Account balances, surpluses and deficiencies over the past 20 years are listed. Here we see this glaring fact and this most unfortunate trend emerging, that this running deficit is growing bigger and bigger all the time: in fact, increasingly so compared with years ago.

Turning to the columns dealing with surpluses and deficits from 1946, remarks alongside the column show how the balances were treated, and some remarkable situations arose that were rectified by the orthodox and successful financial approach of the previous Government. In some earlier years smaller deficits were encountered, while from 1951 to 1954 surpluses were shown. There was a fairly large deficit at the time, but enough was held in the account to meet it except for a small amount of \$160,000. It is to be noted that the deficiency was brought about to avoid the possibility of the Loan allocation not being granted in full by the Commonwealth Government.

It is interesting to note the position during the time when this State encountered the bad years of 1961 and 1962. They were bad years for this State and Australia because a recession was looming in November, 1960, and by March, 1961, South Australia's economic plight was serious. In 1960-61 the Playford Government had a surplus of over \$2,000,000 and in the following year there was surplus slightly exceeding \$1,000,000, and from the Consolidated Revenue Account in those difficult times the Government was able to pay \$1,000,000 to the Electricity Trust for country developmental work as well as carry forward a small credit of \$13,000. Surely those figures are evidence of the buoyant financial position in which a former State Government kept this State's finances. The conditions are in marked contrast to those shown by the present Government when in 1965-66 the deficit was just over \$6,800,000, with a deficit carried forward of \$5,611,610. That deficit is expected to increase at June 30, 1967, to \$7,928,000. It can be seen that the figure grows bigger and bigger as the years go by.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That proves we are doing the job!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It proves that the Government is doing something and it certainly proves that it is getting the State into a mess.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It has got it into a mess.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I return to the method of finance compared with that of the previous Government. The old method was remarkably successful. Its success can be judged from results. When we were in Government financial affairs were kept in proper order. As far as economic growth was concerned, we were the envy of Australia. What are we today? Certainly not the envy of Australia!

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Of course we are!

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We have reached parity as far as taxation is concerned.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes, we have jumped on the band waggon as far as uniformity is concerned.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: But only as far as taxation is concerned.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is so. The present Government says, "The old approach to finance was wrong; we believe in this new approach. Because the other States have deficits, why can't we?" It is left at that.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Didn't the previous Government have deficits before 1965? How many times has there been a deficit in the last 19 years?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the honourable member did not hear me earlier, he should refer to Appendix 6 in Parliamentary Paper No. 18. It is history now; we know, and know it with regret, that this Government has deficits. The money has to be found and it has been taken from the State's reserves—in effect, in the form of trust funds. When debating the Loan Estimates a short time ago, mention was made that nearly \$9,000,000 of \$27,000,000 had been drawn upon up to the end of June, and alarming reports recently appeared in the press regarding further deficits in the first two months of this year. Therefore, it is a serious position into which the State has drifted. Because of this, the people want some resolute and definite plan put forward by the Government, not only to put financial affairs in order but also to improve our economic position. The people want, expect and look to the Government for leadership and good management.

If there is any doubt concerning the present state of economic development in South Australia, I refer briefly to the unemployment position. We know that in the last published figures for the preceding three months South Australia had the worst percentage of employment in Australia. That position had con-

tinued month after month at the figure of 1.7 per cent. When this Government took over, our employment position was second only to Victoria. If the Government needs any further reminder concerning unemployment, I hope it saw or heard the television programme the other evening—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Did you read Stewart Cockburn's article on page 2 in this morning's edition of that good paper, the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am speaking of television. Working people in this State told a television interviewer that they did not even have enough money in their pockets for their tea that night; that is the position under this Government. It should hang its head in shame. I am waiting to hear what the Government is going to do about it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Rubbish! You don't know what you are talking about.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am waiting to hear what the Government is going to do.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Has the honourable member read this morning's article in the *Advertiser*?

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Yesterday the Chief Secretary said that the *Advertiser* was no good.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is good and bad.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: They came good!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Four or five members cannot speak at once.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Let the honourable member put more than the one side. Has he read the article I mentioned?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not read the article.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Well, I advise the honourable member to read it; I am only trying to be helpful.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If it will make the Chief Secretary any happier, I will read the article.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And the honourable member can tell me privately what he thinks of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: We shall have a complete discussion on it. Unemployment is not the only problem from which we are suffering in South Australia. There is a lack of establishment of new industries. I do not know whether the honourable gentleman is prepared to argue that point.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We will argue anything.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Talk is cheap. We want industry and the State is crying out for it.

It is not appearing on the horizon at the present time. May I refer for a moment to the chaotic position of the building trade in South Australia. I have not brought along (perhaps I should have done so) all the articles that have been appearing in the *News* by trade union leaders condemning this Government on this question of the building trade.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: I have the answer to this one, too.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should like to hear it. The Minister had better give the answer to the trade union people who are highly critical of the Government because of the chaotic position that exists in the building trade. Overall, it simply boils down to a complete lack of confidence by people in the State Government, and this applies in all sections of the community. The retail trade has decreased.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: That is not what John Martins said this week.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is no resolute plan (and there is a need for one) in this year's Budget, and I believe that the Government consequently has lost the confidence of the people.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: According to the *News* it looks as though the car manufacturers are going to come back to the Labor Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I hope the car manufacturers can increase their production, because the people in Elizabeth who are supposed to be the honourable member's friends are badly in need of increased employment in that motor car industry there.

I move from that matter to a general survey of the estimated expenditures that are before us. I think it is necessary for a very close scrutiny to be made of these expenditures, for there is some evidence of extravagance. There is some evidence of over-spending, when every cent this State can save at present, in the circumstances, should be saved.

The first point upon which I should like some explanation is under the heading "Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances". I am speaking on behalf of those people who have sent me into this Chamber, and it is only proper that I must query any item in these Estimates which I think should be queried or upon which I consider some explanation should be given.

The line to which I am referring under that heading is "Ministers' Salaries and Allowances". This line shows that in 1965-66 the actual payments amounted to \$38,387, whereas

the proposed amount for the current year is \$119,000 in all. This comprises \$114,000 under "Ministers' Salaries and Allowances" and \$5,000 under "Ministers' Travelling Expenses", so I have grouped the two together. I ask for some explanation in due course of this very large increase indicated here.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You accepted your whack of it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We only got a 7 per cent increase.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Minister likes to call it a "whack", I will accept that word. I did not want the debate to drift into a standard of this type.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The honourable member should make his own investigations into a matter such as this before he comments.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Mr. President, I am seeking some clarification here, and I am going to stay on this item until I finish my complete submission. In due course I hope to obtain some explanation that will satisfy me and also satisfy people out in the street. The Chief Secretary can say that he will help us—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Have you ever been refused any information that you have sought?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No, I have never failed to receive the information sought.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And you never will.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am very pleased to hear that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Then don't insinuate anything.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am not insinuating that the Minister will not give me a reply: I am only saying that I am seeking some clarification of the matter. Under this heading, the sum payable to Ministers this year is to be increased by 197 per cent, according to these figures.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No wonder the Chief Secretary said he was happy with the new Government.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: For purposes of comparison (and I use this comparison quite seriously, because it is one which I examined and calculated), on the next line, under the heading "Members' Salaries and Allowances", the amount paid last year was \$392,155, and the amount proposed for this current year is \$420,650. On my reckoning, that is an increase of about 7 per cent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will give you a written guarantee that you will get a full explanation of that question.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thank the Chief Secretary for that assurance; I knew I would get a full answer to it. However, what worries me is that there must be an error somewhere here, because I do not believe that the tribunal which fixed increases in the remuneration of Parliamentarians would have intended that the Ministers in this Government or any Government were to receive an increase of 197 per cent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will give you another written guarantee—I never received it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But you will.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: This is for the future.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have here the figure of what the Minister and his colleagues in Cabinet received for the year ended June 30, 1966. For this year the total figure is \$119,000. The increase listed here on the previous year is \$75,613, and in addition there is an increase of \$5,000 in Ministers' travelling allowances. I know a ninth Minister has been appointed, and I gave some thought to this as a possible reason for the extra amount.

However, my memory is that the ninth Minister was appointed about half-way through the last financial year, so I do not think that new appointment would cause any particularly great increase. The increase of 197 per cent in Ministers' remuneration is worthy of a very close scrutiny and inquiry, and I am very pleased to know that I shall hear more about that in the future.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You will be sure to hear more about it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: We would need to.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I want my share of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At least the Chief Secretary is honest about it. I turn now to page 10 in Parliamentary Paper No. 9, and I come to the same item that was referred to by Mr. Banfield. This item concerns enrolling on the Legislative Council roll of further qualified electors.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You said the Hon. Mr. Banfield. It was the Hon. Mr. Dawkins.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am sorry. I was referring to the Hon. Mr. Dawkins. In my opinion, some further explanation of this matter is required. It was not given in the second reading explanation. I understand that a computer at the university will be used by the Government and that a system will be

found by which people eligible to be enrolled on the Legislative Council roll will be communicated with and told that they may enrol.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There are two items there, one under salaries and wages and one under contingencies.

The C. M. HILL: Yes. An amount of \$84,000 is provided, \$14,000 under salaries and wages and \$70,000 for "enrolling qualified electors for Legislative Council."

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It seems that there will be extra staff.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes. I understand that at present the Lands Titles Office issues change of ownership notices, as it has been doing for a long time, to various authorities. These notices are issued to municipal councils so that rate books can be altered, to the Land Tax Department so that records of ownership of property can be altered, and to the Electoral Department. I endeavoured to find out when this practice had begun, because it has been said by many that this method was introduced and encouraged by the previous Government. I understand that the practice started in 1925 and have some reason to believe that it started under the Gunn Labor Government.

It goes back about 40 years and, apparently, at that time there was a definite endeavour to increase the number enrolled on the Legislative Council roll. People had not availed themselves of the opportunity to enrol. I understand that the police visited houses with application forms in an endeavour to increase the number on the roll. I do not think that that was very successful and that the position drifted on over the years. Since then, the electoral office has been sending out these notices telling people that it appears that they are entitled to enrol under qualification No. 1, the property franchise, or qualification No. 3, which I understand to be the Crown lease qualification.

If the present Government took exception to that practice, surely it could have informed the electoral office that it did not desire the practice to continue. Despite the Government's financial problems, it has found it possible to lay its hands on \$84,000 for this purpose. I have spoken about whether the State can afford this outgoing at present. However, the Government can determine its policy and whether it wants to spend \$84,000 so that more people can be enrolled.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We want elections to be as democratic as possible.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am pleased to hear that. I am going to use a term that has been used by the Chief Secretary and others and ask what is the real honest intent.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: To have as many people as possible on the roll and to have elections as democratic as possible.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When that is accomplished, what will be the next intent? The honest intent of the present Government is to gain more representation in this place.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Is there something wrong with that?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is there anything wrong with it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: There is nothing wrong with it at all. I wondered whether it would be denied.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. We wish we had a majority here.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That is my next point, that the Government's intent is to gain a majority in this place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Our final aim is to abolish the place.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill): Order! There are too many interjections.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall not dwell on the matter, because the Chief Secretary has just said that his final intent is to abolish the place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right. Everyone knows that.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Therefore, is not this money being used for political purposes by the Labor Party? The people in the street are asking that. These are State funds that will be used and this money belongs to the people. If the Labor Party wishes to abolish this Chamber by having it vote itself out of office, let the Labor Party put canvassers in the field with the Party's own money.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That was introduced by a Labor Government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And it was carried on by your Government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: Order! There are too many interjections, which is against the Standing Orders. I do not propose to interfere with interjections. However, if interjectors will kindly interject singly, that will enable the speaker to have a fair run in his speech.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is my view and, I am sure, the opinion of many people outside the Chamber with whom I have discussed the matter that this money is being used to satisfy this plank in the Labor Party's platform. The

Labor Party wants to abolish this place and considers that the only way it can do so is by having the Council vote itself out of office. The Government is providing State funds of \$84,000 to enable it to do that, and I think that is a shocking state of affairs on principle and that it is shocking that the Government is taking this money when the financial affairs of the State are as they are at present. I ask the Chief Secretary for a further explanation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have all the information that you will get on that matter.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should like to know who will be the first to receive these notices that will apparently pop out of the computer. Will any particular districts be given priority? If the Government is successful in this manoeuvre, does it intend to send the notices for the whole State out at the one time?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: They certainly will not go to property owners only.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should like an assurance that it will be done by post, not by personal canvassing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I understand that it will be done by post, not by personal canvassing.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I thought so. However, the provision of \$14,000 under salaries and wages gave me cause for some doubt. I move on from that item to page 38 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9. This is only a relatively small point and deals with the Royal Commission on the Licensing Act. I notice that over \$15,000 was spent on that Commission last year and that a further \$34,000 approximately is to be spent this year, making a total of \$50,000.

It is my view that the Government might give some consideration to terminating this Royal Commission which, in view of the financial position of the State, is a very expensive one. It might well be that any interim report that the Royal Commission could issue in the relatively near future might suffice for the Government's purposes.

On that same page there is an item dealing with the festival hall. I notice that \$141,000 has been spent last year under this heading, but that no allocation has been made for it in the current year. I am not criticizing the Government for not allocating any money under this heading this year, but I make a plea that in following years the Government of the day might seriously consider setting up a fund and allocating to the fund some amounts of money on an annual basis, so that a large

sum could be built up for providing the State with a festival hall. It would be a State theatre in the true sense as people from all over the State will come here and be entertained in the hall.

On page 108 of the same Parliamentary Paper, under the Public Parks Act, this Government is putting aside money, quite wisely, year by year for the purchase of land for public parks. That same principle could be applied in regard to a fund for the purposes of the establishment and erection of a festival hall in Adelaide.

I turn to page 56 of Parliamentary Paper No. 9, which relates to the Premier's Department. Within that department's estimate of expenditure, there is an item proposed for this current year—publicity and information, documentary films, etc., for industrial promotion, \$100,000 for this year. A little higher up on that page appears "Industries promotion, research, administration and clerical staff," for which approximately \$29,000 is provided, which is \$10,000 in excess of that spent last year. On page 61 there is an item "Industries Development Committee—Fees and expenses—\$3,000."

I should like some information from the Minister, when replying, regarding this expenditure and the method by which it is to be spent. I am not criticizing the amount and I am not saying that promotion and publicity are not needed to promote industry in this State, but I make the point that some form of publicity should be directed at local manufacturers to increase their existing output, as well as publicity for the benefit of people overseas who might be interested in establishing here.

This need to encourage local people to produce more might have been overlooked in the initial consideration of this item. Regarding the need for publicity overseas, I should like to know what we are going to see from this publicity as far as our present record in the industrial field is concerned. I consider there is an obvious need for both political Parties to join in this kind of promotion and publicity. Great achievements were accomplished during the Playford era as far as industrial growth was concerned.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: But it never gave us any credit at all.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If this State's achievements at a political level are going to be publicized, there may be a danger that the State will not derive as much benefit from this expenditure as it would with a joint effort by both political Parties. It would take a great

deal of courage on the part of the present Government to include the achievements of the former Government.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We never got an ounce of credit for our share of it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I hope the Labor Party will consider this point and that when publicity is used overseas a great deal of this promotion expenditure will feature all the achievements in this State over a great period of time.

Regarding page 58 of the Parliamentary Paper, I should like some further explanation concerning the expenses of the Agent-General in England. The total proposed cost in the current year to keep an Agent-General (who is also termed the Trade Commissioner) in England is \$163,655, plus his salary, which, in sterling, is the equivalent of \$15,000, making a total of \$178,655 for this item. This is a large amount of money.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not if you know the circumstances.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I believe there is a need in the view of the present Government to brighten up the show in London and to present a much more attractive picture to people who are making inquiries there about establishing in South Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: And some additional staff.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: And some further staff, too. However, in my experience many English businessmen are rather more attracted to the conservative image when inquiring as to a State's record and image as reflected in London. If we were to present an image of exercising care and prudence in the spending of money, we might gain considerable respect.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We were getting disrespect for the appointments there. This proposed expenditure is not luxury expenditure. We cannot do what we want to do there with peanuts.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The record of the previous Government in getting industries here was splendid.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Yes, and it did not seem to stop the flow of migrants and capital to this State.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I do not mind how much we spend in London, provided we can afford it and it is not spent extravagantly and it gets results. Perhaps my idea of showing a conservative image in London is wrong. I notice that the Agent-General's house is rented for him at a rental of \$90 a week.

I am not criticizing the man personally; I am only criticizing this expenditure which we are being asked to agree to and which has been put before us by the Government. Perhaps this is regarded as the best way to attract more inquiries and industries, but I do not think it is. I know that the gentleman's salary is \$15,000 (£6,000 sterling) per annum, and that office expenses, exhibiting shows, advertising the State, rent, rates, insurance, reimbursement of travelling expenses, fares, receptions, subscriptions, publications, minor equipment and sundries cost \$66,499 a year. I notice that motor vehicle repairs and expenses will cost \$2,131 in this year. The rent that I mentioned would not include commission, alterations and maintenance charges. They have been paid for out of the amount of \$5,651 spent last year. Then "structural improvements to office premises" is probably the work to which the Chief Secretary referred a moment ago by interjection. The expected cost for this year is \$21,314. All this is happening a long way away. I know that the Government is keen to gain the maximum benefit from this office and this officer in London. It made a splendid choice in my opinion—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The work was done after a personal inspection by the Premier and the Minister of Mines when they were there. The Premier personally inspected the place and authorized this expenditure.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If the Premier personally inspected the place and authorized the expenditure and if he was assisted by the Minister of Mines, I am heartened to hear it. The Government has had a personal look at the matter.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It has made a double check on this expenditure. It seems to me to be a lot of money but if the Minister tells me now that the Government examined the matter closely and that the Premier was personally satisfied that there was no extravagance on this item, then I am satisfied.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Whatever anybody says about the Premier, nobody can say that he is extravagant.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree with that. I was about to say a moment ago that the Government made a splendid choice when it appointed Mr. Milne to that office. That choice was widely acclaimed throughout the State. With the appointment of Mr. Milne and by the expenditure of all this money under this heading, I hope the State will benefit

greatly. I turn now to page 61 of the Estimates of Expenditure, where I see an item "Contribution to Electricity Trust of South Australia—for subsidies in country areas". For that \$50,000 is provided. I remember a few years ago when the Playford Government had a most attractive surplus in its Consolidated Revenue Account of over \$1,000,000. It lent \$1,000,000—

The Hon. C. R. Story: It was a gift.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Anyway, it transferred to the Electricity Trust \$1,000,000 for the development of country power lines. That has been a great boon to the country people and to the State. When we are in credit and have available money of that kind, there is much merit in such actions, but with the present financial state of affairs I wonder whether this Government can afford to give \$50,000 for this purpose. It can be argued that it is an internal matter within the Electricity Trust, and that if it needed \$50,000 to be spent in this way the consumers in the city areas ought to bear the cost of some of this developmental work. I wonder whether there was a particular reason for that item.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There was. I will get the answer to that afterwards for the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Chief Secretary has indicated that he will give me a further answer.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I will give you the real reason.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move on to page 80 to the University of Adelaide and allocations of money in that respect. I do not want to go into these figures extensively. Other honourable members more closely connected with this sphere may like to expound upon it when they have their opportunity to speak, but I notice that under the item "University of Adelaide—additional general purpose grant" there is a decrease of over \$3,000,000 in the allocation for this year, comparing what is proposed for this year with what was actually spent last year, and that there is a decrease of \$390,000 in the general purpose grant for the South Australian Institute of Technology.

I turn now to page 93 and note that the Waite Agricultural Institute is to suffer a small reduction, too. There may be some explanations for this, but there is considerable disquiet in the public mind at present, especially since the Government announced that it would not be able to match the Commonwealth grants for education at university level this year. The universities in South Australia may have to

reduce their student intake in the year 1967. Despite all these figures for the universities shown here, I am concerned with that bare fact, and nothing else, at the moment. The public is currently discussing this matter fully. If there is no truth in this, if it is simply a rumour, the sooner the lie is given to it, and the sooner it is denied, the better. I ask that the Government as soon as possible make some definite announcement on this point and answer the question that the public is asking at the moment: "Is there to be a reduction in the intake of new students into the universities in South Australia at the beginning of next year?"

Lastly, I turn to page 96 and touch upon a matter that the Hon. Mr. Dawkins discussed—the proposed gas pipeline. The account for that comes under the Mines Department, under "Contingencies". Considerable expense has been incurred already, and money will be spent this year on studies such as "Expenses of natural gas pipeline feasibility study" and "Expenses of natural gas pipeline engineering consultants".

I note the amount of money spent last year on the oversea visit of the Premier, Minister of Mines and party. I thought that possibly some of the expense of that trip would have been costed against the Premier's own department, but it has been included here under the Mines Department, which rather indicates that the Premier's sole purpose was to investigate gas and a gas pipeline, although I understand he was to make inquiries about other forms of industry. However, that is only a small point. Also, there has been a further visit of officers overseas, and a very small amount is appropriated this year for that purpose. I express the hope, as did the Hon. Mr. Dawkins, that we will have action in the near future with regard to the pipeline and I look forward with interest to hearing something about it.

I agree with the interjection by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill earlier this afternoon that, if there seems to be an unending delay in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government concerning the provision of finance, the Government should turn to private enterprise as a second string and give it the opportunity to fully investigate the possibility of building the pipeline.

I have two or three points to make in conclusion. First, in an endeavour to improve the employment position in this State I wonder whether the Government has made full investigation whether any factories in the State

could change over to some form of defence production. I notice that the Commonwealth Government is allocating the sum of \$1,000,000,000 a year for defence, and I also note that much of that money will go towards the cost of labour and large equipment, such as aeroplanes and ships, which will be bought overseas. The factories in this State are not in full production at present, but they are efficient and capable in the production of vehicles. Surely many manufactured goods of this kind must be needed by the Australian defence forces, and I hope that every inquiry is being made by this Government of the Commonwealth Government to see whether further defence work can be allocated to South Australia.

Finally, I express my deep regret at the way the Government is approaching its current financial programme. I think there is some evidence of over-spending in some of the items to which I have referred. I hope, as the Premier hopes, that the weather and Commonwealth Government will assist this State in the near future.

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

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1938.)

Clause 8 as amended passed.

Clause 9—"Tax on winning bets."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move, as a suggested amendment:

To strike out clause 9.

I seek the support of all members. Clauses 9, 10 and 11 are in no way related to the establishment of off-course betting facilities in South Australia. Indeed, to me they are an excrescence on an otherwise excellently drafted Bill. I am sure that, if all who have been associated with what I term a "package deal" (that is, people associated with matters contained in the Bill, including the Government, racing clubs and committees) spoke openly on the question, they would agree that the three clauses should not appear in the Bill. Their removal would in no way prevent this or any succeeding Government from removing the tax on the stake, or even doing something better, but it should be done at the appropriate time.

The Chief Secretary at some stage during the debate said that the removal of these clauses would prevent the honest intention of the Government to remove the tax on the punter's stake. I point out that if my proposal is accepted it will in no way interrupt or

prevent the honest intention of the Government to do that. Many people consider that the removal of the three clauses would prevent the racegoer from receiving some benefit from the Bill. I believe the Chief Secretary, by interjection, implied that if the three clauses were deleted the Council would have to bear the blame for voting out a benefit that is to be conferred on the punter.

As I have shown, there is nothing to prevent the Government from implementing its promise whenever it is so inclined. I am sure that if the three clauses are left in the Bill we shall be doing a disservice to racegoers. I am convinced that the Government is committed to making some amelioration, but a greater benefit could be forthcoming to the racegoer in the future if the clauses were now deleted. We have heard that this benefit is of some magnitude and that it means that the punter will receive a benefit. I think the Chief Secretary said "up to 32 per cent".

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No; not less than 28 per cent and up to 32 per cent.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My research on the matter shows that those percentages are inaccurate and, indeed, I challenge the Government to show that this amelioration or benefit is 28 to 32 per cent of the total tax. My research shows that the figure is nearer 20 per cent than about 30 per cent.

I think there has been a net of security around this Bill in its passage through both Houses of Parliament. It is difficult to ascertain the attitude of many people and organizations vitally interested in the passage of the Bill. Further, I refer to the position in relation to country racing clubs. I believe that if the Bill is left as it is, with these three clauses included, country racing clubs could be in some difficulty. The revenue from T.A.B. is an unknown quantity, so we do not know how much time would elapse before it could take the place of the winning bets tax and so enable the whole of the tax to be removed. In the meantime, there is going to be a hiatus and a period of difficulty, and if these clauses are left in I think that the country racing clubs could be adversely affected. I point out that the removal of these clauses would in no way affect the revenue of the Government. I consider that the case I have put is a worthy one, and I ask for the support of the Committee.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I move, as an amendment:

After "out" to insert "paragraph (a) of".

Notice of this amendment has been placed, in a different form, on members' files, but I am taking the opportunity now, seeing that Mr. DeGaris has moved his amendment, of moving an amendment to his suggested amendment. Therefore, honourable members will now have before them the two alternatives. Mr. DeGaris's suggested amendment will have the effect of removing the clauses from the Bill, so that the winning bets tax on both the stake and the winnings will remain, and it will be the prerogative of the Government at another time and in another Bill to do what it may feel it ought to do in respect of either or both of those taxes. My amendment will present the other aspect, and will mean the complete elimination of the winning bets tax from the stake and from the winnings within a period of 13 months after the introduction of T.A.B. I emphasize that this tax would come off on the relevant day, as defined in this Bill. I make it perfectly clear that my amendment is not going to remove the winning bets tax on the passing of this Bill. The tax will come off—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The lot?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, the lot will come off in the 13 months. I move this amendment because I feel that this is the appropriate time when it should come off, and its removal will then be enshrined in this Bill once and for all. I take this step on behalf of the people who are the racegoers, because I think they are the people who ought to be considered now. Unfortunately, the winning bets tax is a red herring that has been dragged into this Bill. During the debate on the second reading I quoted statements by Labor Party members on other occasions about this iniquitous betting tax, which they said had to be removed and which would come off, in the expectation of most members, when T.A.B. was introduced.

When I referred to those speeches the Chief Secretary said, in effect, "Well, of course, this was a social issue and members were free to exercise their own vote, so that does not necessarily represent the view of the Government." So far as I can see, that is just a lot of humbug, because there is no suggestion that this taxation aspect of the Bill is a social measure on which everybody has a free vote. This is a matter on which there has been a surprising unanimity of agreement on the part of the Government members. I say that now is the time when once and for all

we should provide in this Bill that the winning bets tax will be removed. I believe that the tax must come off eventually, because if it does not come off attendances at race meetings will fall away; they will fall away to nothing if we do not do something to help the racegoers. I am not trying to pretend for one minute that this is not going to deprive the Government of revenue.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is your real motive.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Ultimately it will do that, and I am not pretending that the Government is not going to be forced to look elsewhere to make up for this loss of revenue. During the second reading debate I made some suggestions about this.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Your friends over there would give us the stick because we did that to suit you.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I suggested that some increase in bookmakers' turnover tax was one method.

The Hon. C. R. Story: The Minister is not suggesting that politics comes into this?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Not as far as we are concerned.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You will take it off one and put it on another.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am suggesting there are ways and means in which some of the revenue lost from this tax could be made up. I do not suggest it is the only way. I am conscious of the fact that this is, after all, a suggested amendment to the House of Assembly, and that it is not really the function of this Council to tell the Government of the day how it is to raise taxation; that the onus will be on the Government if my amendment is carried.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You want to take these clauses out.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I want to take the tax off completely after the 13 months. I agree that the other clauses will have to be deleted consequently. In effect, it will mean that eventually the winning bets tax on both stake and winnings will be removed. The Government is not going to lose the revenue immediately. It would only mean that within that 13 months the Government has a target and that it has to so order its finances that the objective of removing the winning bets tax without revenue loss will be achieved. It will be compulsory for the tax to be removed by that particular day. I have stated the reasons for the amendment, and I believe it is right and proper that this opportunity should be taken now.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I have not opposed this Bill, because I consider that the majority of the people of South Australia wish legislation of this nature to be introduced. I am fortified in that opinion (but that is not my total method of gauging public opinion) by the almost overwhelming vote at the lottery referendum. That indicates to me that the people of South Australia want to be free to exercise their own judgment about whether they indulge in this sort of thing. I have said many times in the last 18 months that we, as members of this Council, have to try to gauge public opinion in order to analyse matters to the best of our ability. I am sure that no-one wants betting shops in the manner in which some of us knew them before.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Hear, hear!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Honourable members on both sides have expressed that view. That is not the intention of the Bill. If it were, I should vote against the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I should link arms with you.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This is partly a money Bill and, again, many times during the past 18 months I have said that I shall not interfere with money Bills without having good reason but that, if I have good reason for voting against money Bills (or any Bills, for that matter), I shall express my views. This is a Government Bill. I think it started as a private member's motion in another place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: An opinion of the House.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It received substantial support as the opinion of the House. Then the Government took the matter up and the Bill before us is a Government Bill. I think there is much merit in both amendments. I have much sympathy with the ideas that have been expressed but I cannot find sufficient cause or reason in the opinions that have been expressed by my colleagues for voting against the Government in the matter.

The Government has said categorically that it will drop the Bill if money clauses are altered. This would not intimidate me, in common with my colleagues, in the least if I considered it proper at this stage that we should interfere with a Government Bill on these particular matters. However, as I have said, I consider that the points raised are not of sufficient importance in relation to the totality of the Bill for us to cause the Government (because I believe what the Government has said) by this means to drop the Bill. I

think that at the next election the Liberal and Country League will regain power and, in my opinion, that will be the time for us to consider these amendments.

The Government wants the Bill in this form. It is a Government Bill. I have said that, in the totality of the Bill, these amendments, although of importance, are not all that important. Thus, I propose to support these clauses as presented to us by the Government but I certainly think that there will be plenty of time before the next election for us to consider what election promises we shall make on the matter. I consider that there is plenty of room for amendment and that at the next election the Party to which I belong will no doubt submit its policy on the matter. It will then be for the people to gauge what they want. Of course, this will not be the whole of the issues at the election. There will be plenty of others.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You won't win it on this one.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This will be a part of a very good policy.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: A very small part.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That may be so, but it is of great importance to some people.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: To quite a lot of people.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is true. In view of the Government's attitude, I think that will be the time for the Party to which I belong to submit its policy. That is why I propose to support the Bill at this stage, but that does not necessarily mean that I agree with the Bill *in toto*.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I consider that the Government, when it introduced the Bill, badly misjudged the attitude of members of both Houses of Parliament. I think it has been demonstrated clearly that members on both sides in both Houses have been prepared to accept the introduction of the totalizator agency board system of betting in South Australia. I know that the Chief Secretary has jumped up and said, "Yes, you are prepared to accept it on your terms." That has not been the case. If this Bill had contained only the essential elements needed for T.A.B., the measure would have been dealt with long ago.

However, the introduction of red herrings has caused the delay in both Chambers. I consider that the Government is endeavouring to embarrass the Legislative Council by including some of these amendments to the Act. The Government should have known that the Council

would see that those clauses were not necessary and were not related to the T.A.B. system. They were put there as red herrings. The Government realized that the Legislative Council would, in its wisdom, endeavour to have these clauses deleted. It is the function of this Council to look after all sections of the community, including the racehorse owners, the clubs, the punters, and all associated with T.A.B.

The Chief Secretary has said many times, "You interfere with this Bill, and out it will go. If you interfere with the money clauses in the Bill, we shall have nothing to do with it." The other day, when a division was taken in this Council, when he walked back from the Clerk's table, he said, "That's the end of. That's the end of your Bill." He did not say "our Bill" or "the Government's Bill": he said "your Bill".

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is not correct.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I was sitting in my place, quite close to the Chief Secretary. He will not find that in *Hansard*, because he addressed it to all and sundry and the *Hansard* staff would not have heard it. Attendance at the racecourses will drop, and the effect of that will be less money invested with bookmakers, less payment in tax, less money invested on the totalizator, less income for the clubs through less admission payments, and less money passing through the booth and other means by which clubs gain revenue. I consider that this will be detrimental to racing in South Australia. In fact, it may be news to some honourable members, but I understand that in the last nine months seven grandstand bookmakers have ceased to operate in the grandstand because the business was not there and because people were not going to the races to the extent they did previously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: There are no vacant stands there.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I know that not many bookmakers become bankrupt, but some of those who have ceased business probably saw the writing on the wall. I consider that these clauses have been introduced into the Bill as a red herring, and that it is our duty as a Legislative Council to see that they are removed. This will not in any way affect the finances of the Government. The Government should shoulder its responsibilities when it is found that revenue from T.A.B. is sufficient so that the winning bets tax is no longer necessary. If the Government in its wisdom decides that it still wishes to retain the winning

bets tax it will incur the wrath of the electors. It is trying to avoid that. I support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: When I spoke on the second reading of the Bill I suggested that the amendments were worthy of consideration and I gave my reasons, but since then we have been told that the Government will not consider any such amendments because they are financial clauses and because this is a revenue Bill so far as the Government is concerned and because this Council should not interfere with it. I commend the movers of both these amendments because a large number of people is involved in the winning bets tax. As far as racing is concerned I have always been under the impression, as I said on the second reading, that T.A.B. solved all problems and would be the millennium so far as racing was concerned. Since this Bill has been introduced there has been a different set of circumstances from what there had been previously.

When speaking in the second reading debate I mentioned the failure of previous attempts at legislation in which I had taken an active part in sponsoring. I did support the provision of facilities for people who wished to have a legal bet. I adhere to that, and have done so for many years. In view of the circumstances that have been created by the Government's refusal to accept these amendments, I am not going to give the Government the opportunity to get out of its responsibility and provide T.A.B. In those circumstances I find myself supporting the Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I consider that, if all the side issues that have come into the question are stressed, we might be inclined to lose sight of the main issue. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill mentioned this afternoon that he believed a large percentage of people in the State wants T.A.B., but I believe the main reason why people want it is that they feel they should have the freedom and right to bet legally, particularly in those areas where race meetings are not close at hand and the facilities for betting are not available.

Many of the people who wish to bet under T.A.B. are not racegoers, in the sense that they are distant from racecourses and can only attend at rare intervals. I think that the main purpose of the Bill and one of the main reasons why members in both Houses have supported this Bill is to enable people to bet legally throughout the whole of the State and not only in one portion of it. I believe that members of both Houses who have supported

this Bill have not done so on the understanding that this Bill will promote betting, and I consider that that is not the intention of those members. I also consider that most members do not wish to see this become **primarily** a revenue-raising Bill. Most of the support is coming from members who wish to see a system of T.A.B. used in its widest sense as a service to the people and not as a revenue-raising Bill or one to promote gambling. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I do not wish to delay the Bill. Honourable members know the Government's point of view on this particular measure. In effect, the suggestion is that if the Hon. Mr. DeGaris's amendment is carried, it will remove from the Bill the whole of the provisions dealing with the winning bets tax. If the Hon. Mr. Potter's amendment is successful, it will mean that the whole of the winning bets tax will be removed within 13 months of the date of operation. Every racing club and all the officers of the Treasury recognize that the amount of money received by way of taxation from the punter's stake is from 28 to 33 per cent of the totalizator, and I accept that figure. The Government cannot accept the amendment, but I want to say sincerely and in a straight-forward way—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Do you mean your own personal view is not necessarily the same as the Government's?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have said in the debate that I did not necessarily agree with all the arrangements on these matters. I am representing the Government here and I have a job to do, and I do it to the best of my ability. I know the feeling of the majority of the Government and because of the financial position of the State the Government cannot give an undertaking as to the date when the whole of the winning bets tax can be removed. We have told certain people, and the committee has agreed, that the Government will give a guarantee that within 13 months of the date of operation of T.A.B., whether it is showing a profit or not, the tax will be taken off the stake.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Who are these people?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Off-Course Racing Committee and others. I am not a racing club administrator, but every country racing club and trotting club wants T.A.B. and if they do not get it many of them will go under. I shall not go into the details of it all. It

has all been worked out and will function very well. They are the fundamental principles of it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: But you are debating the clause, and this is a detail.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will not go into that.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Will those clubs still stay alive with T.A.B.?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: They have in every other State and there is no reason why they will not here. If T.A.B. functions and it is profitable to anywhere near the extent to which it is estimated it will be, we will earnestly review all the taxation clauses in connection therewith. I was told today by somebody who should know that, if T.A.B. functions and it is as profitable as it is estimated it will be, the winning bets tax on the stake could be removed three months after T.A.B. commences. That is what I am told.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Did they say when it could possibly come off the other?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, but I can say that is what I heard from casual conversation. This is my personal view, and it is the wish of the majority, if not all, of the members of Cabinet, that the winning bets tax should be completely removed when we are able to do that.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: If the present financial state of the Government continues, you will never be able to.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: But you do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You are trying to.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is only the honourable member's opinion, and it is not very valuable, but he is entitled to his opinion. I do not want to get into a debate on this. Everybody knows the Government's views on this. We have stated them plainly and clearly. The decision rests with the members of this Council.

The Hon. C. B. STORY: I waited to hear the Chief Secretary's reply to this debate, because I thought he might be able to offer something new. I have heard him on this subject all the time this Bill has been in this Chamber. It seems to me he is to be heartily congratulated upon the way in which he has handled this matter of T.A.B. right through from the very first negotiations that took place, and upon the wonderful effect that he has had upon the general public in getting them to quieten down. In my opinion, he has

been quite magnificent in doing this and he must take much credit for it.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Have you ever heard of an Indian firewalker?

The Hon. C. B. STORY: Yes. I know the Chief Secretary is the adviser to the Government on racing matters, and that he is very keen on racing. I have it on good authority that it was he who got the whole thing to simmer down—in fact, so much so that we have received letters from bodies which only 18 months ago were extremely difficult and were quite happy to become politically involved. Now they do not want to become involved in politics and at this point of time we are surprised when we see some of the Opposition speeches, and particularly amendments put forward in this Chamber, reaching the public through the press.

I congratulate the Chief Secretary on the magnificent way in which he has been able to do this. This must have been most important to the people involved in this industry. We have heard nothing but praise from the owners and trainers. Even a prominent member of another place, who is usually vocal and is never muzzled by anything, has come down heavily on the side of the Chief Secretary in this matter. As I understand it, all the clubs are unanimous, because I received a letter only a few days ago pointing out to me that, whilst a few members of the committee might have slightly different views, they were still unanimous that this Bill should be passed *in toto* in this Chamber.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You make me blush. I will take this speech home and frame it!

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Wait until he has finished it!

The Hon. C. B. STORY: I feel that we have only one group of people who have been able to put their case, and they represent a number of punters in this State. It is a tragedy that we cannot at present debate this Bill as a T.A.B. measure, because I have always advocated legalized anything—I don't care what it is. If we are to have something, let us legalize it. I go a long way along that line. The public wants T.A.B., one of the reasons being to give people who cannot easily attend race meetings the opportunity to bet legally. The Government leaves little scope for members of this Chamber. This is part of the tactics. It is a little sinister, because this Council is up for abolition and anything that this Government can do to get us into a corner or difficulty it will do. This is one very good example.

There is no reason at all why clauses 9, 10 and 11 cannot be removed from the Bill. It would not affect the Government at all except that, if these three clauses were removed, the Bill would then lose its impetus as an attractive weapon of the Government. It would then revert to being merely a simple social question, as it was when it entered this Chamber. Now, by leaving clauses 9, 10 and 11 in the Bill, it becomes a hot and highly political potato. I do not like the attitude of the Chief Secretary in saying that this is a package deal and that it is a Bill in which this Council can "take the lot or take nothing". The Chief Secretary should not be singled out for special treatment, but I mention him rather than the Government merely because he has so ably managed the Bill in its passage through the Council and that is why I am referring to him all the time. I think that the members of this Council, as well as racing clubs and the other people connected with this Bill, have been led into a position which they will regret for a long time. However, if the three clauses are removed perhaps the Government will be hoist with its own petard.

The CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Mr. Potter has moved as an amendment that the words "paragraph (a) of" be inserted after the word "out".

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On a point of order, is it intended to put the amendment to the amendment first?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, I will put the amendment to the amendment, and in the following form:

That the words in paragraph (a) as proposed to be inserted after the word "out," be so inserted.

Amendment negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has moved:

That it be a suggestion to the House of Assembly to strike out clause 9.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have listened to arguments put forward by the Chief Secretary why my amendment should not be accepted, but in the context of this debate the two amendments were somehow locked together. Once again I ask the Chief Secretary for the reason why my amendment cannot be accepted, because it does not in any way affect the revenue of the Government. The three clauses have been fully explained by the Hon. Mr. Story but, in my opinion, they are an excrescence on an otherwise good Bill. It has produced the posi-

tion where this Council has been in some difficulty in giving proper consideration to a purely social matter. I again ask the Chief Secretary to give the reason why the Government will not accept the exclusion of the three clauses.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have given the reasons about three times, but I do not mind repeating them. It was agreed between the people interested that this is what should be done. It was said that on one matter something should be done and on another matter something else should be done, such as the 1½ per cent and the winnings bets tax.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Will the racing clubs be any happier if these clauses are included?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have told the honourable member before that the persons concerned have agreed on what should be done: that is the way they want it, that is the way our advisers want it, and that is the way the Government has accepted it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris's suggested amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 10—"Application of winning bets tax."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In view of the previous vote it would be foolish for me to proceed with my suggested amendments regarding clauses 10 and 11. I seek leave to withdraw those suggested amendments.

Leave granted; suggested amendments withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 and 12) and title passed.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 8—"Enactment of Part IIIa of principal Act"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I move:

After subclause 31h (3) to add the words "without the approval of the Minister".

When Mr. DeGaris's amendment was placed in the Bill I said it was highly desirable that payments by way of commission should not be made. I supported the amendment by Mr. DeGaris. I later checked with the Queensland authorities and discovered their attitude was that on no account should commission be paid except in remote areas where it was economically desirable. Queensland has a set system where a retainer of \$23 a week is paid, and a commission of 3 per cent. However, when the percentage commission reached a reasonable figure (I understand about \$50 a week) the person concerned was requested to become a fully-paid agent or the opportunity would be

given to somebody else. It is said that the system works effectively. I was afraid that the acceptance of the amendment might deprive some remote area from obtaining an agent where it might be desirable to have a part-time person operating on a commission. At present the clause reads:

The board shall not pay to any of its officers, employees or agents any commission based on any amount of money received or handled by such officer, employee or agent on behalf of the board.

I point out that "not" is the guiding word. I believe the opinion of this Committee is that the board shall not pay commission. If we put in the words "without the approval of the Minister" it gives a loophole for the Minister to approve of paying agents under certain conditions.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Just to prove that I am not the hard-hearted man some members think I am, I say that the amendment is acceptable to the Government.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I rise to comment on the Chief Secretary's remark. I point out that quite naturally the Government would be prepared to accept this amendment. I will vote for it because I voted against the previous amendment. I do not think it is a question of the Minister proving that he is such an open-handed, generous type, because the amendment is somewhat in accord with his wishes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: When I first moved my suggested amendment I was adamant in the attitude I took in this matter. However, in my discussions on it with my colleague, Sir Norman Jude, we found that in some extreme circumstances the amendment could perhaps present some difficulties to the board. However, I cannot see these circumstances, and I believe that the board would be able to operate quite effectively under my amendment. I think that Queensland has the best system of off-course totalizator betting in Australia. The resolution in another place was that T.A.B. here should operate along Victorian lines, but I should like some assurance from the Chief Secretary that it will operate similarly to the way T.A.B. operates in Queensland in this respect, and that only in extreme circumstances will the board pay commission to an operator.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am not opposing the amendment. However, I think there is some real point in the matter raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. The honourable member used the words "extreme circumstances", but I think "special circumstances" would be a happier phrase, and that only in special cir-

cumstances should the Minister be permitted to approve of a method of remuneration other than that based on a salary or a retainer.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Isn't that what the amendment implies?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am not sure. I was thinking that it might be much better if the amendment were worded so that the relevant passage would read, "The board shall not, except in special circumstances with the approval of the Minister", or, if it was considered better to have it in the negative form, as it is now, "The board shall not, without the approval of the Minister in special circumstances". It does reinforce the point made in the rest of the subparagraph, namely, that this is the law and that this is the principle, and it can be departed from only in special circumstances. It seems to me that it may very well be the position that the approval of the Minister could open up this matter in a way that was not intended, and I think that at least we should have an assurance from the Minister along the lines sought by Mr. DeGaris.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I cannot give an undertaking of the nature sought by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. Sometimes I am astounded and shocked that members have such a poor opinion of Ministers. I do not know who is going to be the Minister in charge of the Act. I am in charge of the Places of Public Entertainment Act; I have to give decisions every day on the recommendation not of a board but of an inspector, and if I did something silly with that Act I would not be here five minutes. Members of any Party do not reach Ministerial rank without gaining some experience and knowledge of Parliamentary procedure, and if a Minister does something foolish he will not remain a Minister very long. It comes back to Parliament.

I understand that Victoria has made many bad deals with commissions. The appropriate Minister and the board will learn by experience. I think in the main the board will pay commission only to people it is not able to employ full-time, and that if a Minister departed from that principle he would be looking for trouble. I shall not be a Minister for ever; I certainly do not want to be. I have no ambition to die in this place, as some members have; I like to go away with my wife sometimes; I do not see her very much. I do not want to be here all my life. Let us trust to the Minister's common sense and intelligence in this matter.

Amendment carried.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later, the House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment.

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to give effect to the "Yes" vote recorded at the referendum on lotteries held in 1965 by providing for the promotion and control of lotteries by the Government. Clause 1 contains the citation of the measure and provides that it is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 2 amends the Lottery and Gaming Act as indicated in the schedule. This amendment inserts in that Act a new section 4a, which provides that that Act is to be read and construed subject to the provisions of this Bill. Clause 3 is the definition clause.

Clause 4 provides for the establishment of a Lotteries Commission as a body corporate consisting of a Chairman and two other members to be appointed by the Governor. Apart from being given the usual characteristics of a body corporate, the commission will hold its property for and on behalf of the Crown and will be subject to the control and directions of the Government acting through the Minister. Clause 5 provides that the normal term of office of a member will be five years, except that in the case of the first three members (a) the Chairman will be appointed for five years; (b) one member will be appointed for three years; and (c) the third member will be appointed for one year, but a member appointed to fill a casual vacancy shall be appointed for the balance of the term of office of the member in whose place he was appointed and a member will be eligible for re-appointment on the expiration of his term.

Clause 6 provides for the appointment by the Governor of a person to act for a member during that member's illness, suspension or absence. Clause 7 provides for the suspension or removal from office of a member. Clause 8 sets out the circumstances when a casual vacancy would occur in the office of member. Clause 9 deals with the affixing of the common seal of the commission and with meetings of the commission. Clause 10 prescribes the statutory duties of the Chairman. Clause 11 provides that no act of the commission shall be invalid on the ground only of a vacancy in

the office of a member or of any defect in a member's appointment. Clause 12 provides for the remuneration of members of the commission. Clause 13 sets out the powers and functions of the commission in relation to the promotion and conduct of lotteries, including the power, subject to appropriate Ministerial approval, to make use of the services of any officer of the Public Service.

Clause 14 renders lawful the doing of anything under the Bill which would be unlawful under the Lottery and Gaming Act or any other law. Clause 15 deals with the accounts of the commission. It requires the Auditor-General to audit the books and accounts of the commission whenever he deems it necessary and to make a monthly report to the Minister on the state of the affairs of the commission. The Minister is required to table each monthly report in each House of Parliament.

Clause 16 provides for the establishment of a Lotteries Fund in the Treasury in which all moneys received by the commission are to be kept. After payment of its administration expenses the commission shall, as and when required by the Treasurer, transfer the balance remaining in the Lotteries Fund from time to time, to the extent that it represents any surplus of income over expenditure and any prizes that have not been claimed for over six months, to an account in the Treasury to be known as the "Hospitals Fund" and the moneys in the Hospitals Fund shall be used for the provision, maintenance, development and improvement of Government and subsidized hospitals and such institutions as the Home for Incurables, Minda Home, etc., and equipment for such hospitals and institutions in such amounts as the Treasurer shall, upon the recommendation of the Chief Secretary, approve, but subject to Parliamentary appropriations. Provision is also made in this clause for the Treasurer to meet any late claims for prize moneys and to advance to the commission sufficient funds to set it on its feet.

Clause 17 provides that the commission shall offer as prizes in any lottery conducted by it not less than 60 per cent of the value of the tickets offered for sale in that lottery. Clause 18 provides that the payment by the commission of the prize to the person who, in the commission's opinion, is the beneficial owner of a prize winning ticket shall be a valid discharge to the commission.

Clause 19 defines the offences for which a person may be punished under the Bill. The more serious offences are defined in subclauses

(1) (forgery), (2) (fraudulent conversion) and (3) (fraudulent alteration or falsification of a book, document or voucher relating to a lottery). These offences can be tried either summarily or upon information. The punishment, if tried summarily, is \$200 or imprisonment for one year, or both; and, if tried on information, is \$1,000 or imprisonment for five years, or both. The lesser offences are defined in subclauses (5), (6), (7) and (9).

Subclause (5) prohibits the promotion of a syndicate for fee or gain without the written authority of the commission. However, it will not be unlawful for two or more persons to form a syndicate to purchase a ticket and share the prize, if any, won by that ticket. Subclause (6) prohibits advertising that any person will accept money for a share in a lottery ticket. Subclause (7) is designed to prevent the publication or display of advertisements by or on behalf of persons authorized to sell tickets in a lottery which are intended to induce persons to purchase lottery tickets from them. However, the display of a notice bearing the words "Lottery Tickets Sold Here" without the addition of any other words, symbols or characters will be permitted.

Subclause (9) prohibits a person who has carried out any duties or functions in connection with the promotion or conduct of a lottery from failing or refusing to answer truthfully any questions asked of him by the

Auditor-General or a person acting under his authority. The penalty for each of these lesser offences, which are triable summarily, is \$200. Subclause (10) provides that proceedings for any offence against the Bill may be brought within three years after the commission of the offence or, with the consent of the Minister, at any later time.

Clause 20 contains a regulation-making power. The regulations may fix a penalty not exceeding \$200 for the breach of any regulation. The schedule contains the amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act referred to in my explanation of clause 2. The Bill has been prepared after a study of the operation of the lotteries conducted by Tattersalls in Victoria and by the Lotteries Commission in Western Australia.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.50 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 11, at 2.15 p.m.