

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 31, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT.

The Hon. Sir **THOMAS PLAYFORD**: Some time ago I asked, on notice, whether the Government intended to repeal section 63 of the Lottery and Gaming Act, to which I received a reply that it did. However, a similar question was asked last week in another place, and a totally different reply was received. Does the Government still intend to repeal that section? Has the Police Force been instructed not to use that provision in moving on an assembly of young people in a public place?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I previously indicated that the Government would take certain action on this matter. I know that certain other references have been made in relation to whether the relevant provision in the Lottery and Gaming Act could be included in other legislation. However, no finality has yet been reached. I should be surprised to hear any suggestion of encouraging what happened in Frome Street recently, and I point out that the police are carrying out their duties in the interest of public safety at all times. I should be surprised, too, if they received instructions that were contrary to this practice. I previously said that legislation would be introduced to abolish this provision, and I know that certain discussions have taken place, but I repeat that no finality has yet been reached as to whether this provision should be included in another Act. The Government will do everything in its power to assist the police in carrying out their duties as responsible officers of the Crown. In reply to the Leader's second question, therefore, the answer is "No".

HOUSING TRUST.

Mr. **CLARK**: My question relates to Housing Trust houses in my district. It will probably seem peculiar that I should be complaining as, according to the Loan Estimates, 1,291 houses were built in Elizabeth and Salisbury during the last financial year. However, I am concerned about the town of Gawler. I write many letters to the Housing Trust (in fact, possibly I am the trust's best customer in this House), a proportion of which are writ-

ten in an effort to obtain rental houses for people in the Gawler area. In recent months, the replies I have received from the General Manager of the Housing Trust (and they have been very courteous) have been similar to the latest letter I have received, a part of which reads:

It has, however, to rely upon vacancies occurring in its houses at Gawler to meet current applications for rental houses there.

It appears to me that more Housing Trust rental houses are urgently needed in the Gawler area. I see in the Loan Estimates that three houses were built in 1964-65 and that two are to be built this year. Will the Premier ask the trust whether more rental houses can be built at Gawler?

The Hon. **FRANK WALSH**: I will take up the matter with the Housing Trust to see whether the present position can be improved.

POTATOES.

Mr. **SHANNON**: The Minister of Agriculture was good enough to attend a meeting of potato-growers at Echunga recently. He addressed the meeting, gave the growers a good hearing, and I believe that they were satisfied with his remarks. The Minister made no promises, nor was he asked to make any. Since the meeting, over 300 growers who form the Potato-growers Co-operative have again been refused a merchant's licence by the present Potato Board. They are most dissatisfied about this. I am instructed by the organizers of the potato-growers to ask whether the Minister can supply information on two matters. First, can he say whether he has any plans for resubdividing the State for the election of members to the Potato Board; and secondly, has he yet been able to determine what action it is within his power to take to meet the request of potato-growers that the present four-year term for a potato-grower member of the board be reduced to two years? These two matters are perturbing potato-growers, and this information will help the industry greatly.

The Hon. **G. A. BYWATERS**: I thank the honourable member for his earlier remarks. At the meeting, which was well attended, the Chairman presented his report in a business-like manner, which impressed me. I did not altogether appreciate the remarks of one or two others who spoke later, and I believe they were a little off the rails. However, generally, the position was presented fairly. The refusal by the Potato Board to allow the growers

co-operative to receive supplies is a matter (as the honourable member knows) for the board to determine. Of the eight members on the board five are elected representatives of the growers co-operative. On the surface, this would seem the correct way for decisions to be determined in favour of the growers. It appeared from the meeting that there was general dissatisfaction amongst the growers, and a request was made that there be a revision of boundaries. This matter is proceeding well and has reached an advanced stage. Those who prepared the suggested boundaries examined the matter thoroughly. On the previous board were two representatives from Mount Gambier, which was at one time a large potato-producing area, but which now does not produce such large quantities. The growers of Mount Gambier have agreed to have only one member on the board in future. Another district will be divided and an additional representative will be elected from the hills area. This should at least help the situation regarding additional growers' representation from the hills area. I understand that the member for the area in which the meeting was held will be eligible for re-election when this takes place. The other request is that the term of office be reduced from four years to two years. This would involve an amendment of the Act and, although I have not yet gone as far as this, I assure the honourable member and the growers he represents that every consideration will be given to this matter and in due course we will be able to supply the answer.

MARINO TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier an answer to a recent question of mine relating to the train time table for the Marino to Adelaide service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The department has been aware for some time that the 7.35 a.m. "up" Marino passenger train is heavily patronized, and it is intended to provide relief for this train when the Tonsley railway is brought into operation at the end of this calendar year. It will then be necessary to provide a train to Tonsley from Adelaide for workers, and the return movement will be timed to follow from Woodlands Park to Adelaide immediately after the passage of the 7.35 a.m. train from Marino. This latter train would run express between Woodlands Park and Adelaide. A count of passengers reveals that this arrangement would relieve the pressure on the Marino train.

SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week I asked the Premier whether he could provide information regarding financial support by the Government towards the building of a swimming pool in the north park lands section of my district. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There are very heavy contributions involved in the current year's Loan and Revenue Budgets to assist metropolitan local government projects, including the drainage schemes, the Morphett Street bridge, the festival hall, and the acquisition of open areas. These will continue to be a heavy burden on the Budgets of the immediate future. Accordingly, I am not prepared to commit the Government to a larger share than one-third of the cost of the proposed swimming pool in the north park lands.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATIONS.

Mr. BURDON: During my maiden speech in this House on July 25, 1963, I referred to the subject of providing a motor vehicle registration office in Mount Gambier, and I have referred to the same subject since. I understand the Royal Automobile Association has strongly recommended to the Premier that a system of nominating an insurance company for third-party insurance be introduced in conjunction with South Australian vehicle registration. As I believe the system of nominating an insurance company is a practice in other Australian States and is a simpler method than the present system, can the Premier say whether the Government will seriously consider this method? Further, will the Government favourably consider my previous requests that an office of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles be established in Mount Gambier? A move in this direction was advocated yesterday at the annual meeting in Mount Gambier of the South-Eastern Local Government Association.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week I asked the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in how many Government schools vernacular education was provided for Aborigines and in what tongues this education was provided. Can the Minister say whether Yalata school is a Government or a mission school?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The school at Yalata is run by the Education Department.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I received a letter this morning from a person who is well

versed in Aboriginal affairs in this State. He complained that the statement attributed to the Minister in the *Advertiser* gave a wrong impression. Although he does not say so specifically, I think he is referring to the statement which the Minister made on a special occasion when he is reported as having said:

We are able to comply in education because in South Australia we are providing in established schools initial education in vernacular Aboriginal tongues.

I now ask certain questions so that the Minister may clear up any misunderstandings that may have occurred. I do not suggest that he intended to make misleading statements, nor does the writer of this letter suggest that. However, on reading the statement I believe that it is capable of being interpreted in a wider sense than is correct in fact. First, as far as I know, at Ernabella (which is a Presbyterian mission school) the vernacular has been used in the junior grades for many years. When, as Minister, I visited the school, I was an interested listener to a discussion between the teachers one evening about the wisdom of this procedure. Secondly, Musgrave Park is not at present an established school, and I agree that there is a strong case for the establishment of a school there. More important, perhaps, would be the establishment of a pre-school type of school, as, when I was there, for some strange reason most of the children appeared to be very young. I commend that suggestion to the Minister and his colleague when considering this matter. Thirdly, I understand that at Yalata the Aboriginal monitor is not at present teaching because, for some reason, that teaching has been discontinued. In order to clear up these matters I address the following questions to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs: First, is it not a fact that the mission teachers at Ernabella Mission school have taught in the vernacular for many years? Secondly, has the Education Department taken over the school at Ernabella as a full departmental responsibility? Thirdly, has the monitor at Yalata, to whom the Minister referred in his reply to the earlier question of the honourable member for Rocky River, undergone any teacher training, and if so, for how long, and is he working at Yalata now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not intend to make any statement that could be considered misleading on this score. Convention 107 of the International Labor Organization refers only to dealing with Aboriginal or indigenous people living under tribal conditions. Therefore, in referring to schools in

which people would be tutored in the indigenous tongue, at the outset I was referring only to those schools which would be relevant to convention 107.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The words "we" and "established" are those to which I refer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On that score, I regret that some people may have taken it that I was referring to Government schools. On the contrary: what I was putting was that in South Australia this teaching is given at the relevant schools. Of course, Ernabella Mission (as the former honourable Minister knows) receives a substantial subvention from Government funds, as do other mission stations.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I understand that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are running the school at Musgrave Park. It is a school that has been set up by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs pending the establishment of an Education Department school. Pre-school work is going on there regularly in Pitjanjatjara, and the teacher in the pre-school was trained at Ernabella as was the Aboriginal monitor who takes the rest of the teaching in the school. Both these people are still teaching at Musgrave Park. The Aboriginal monitor at Yalata was certainly there and teaching when I was there last. I have been given no information that he is not on the establishment: he is provided for in the Estimates. I will inquire whether he is, for any reason, missing from his employment, but he was there when last I was given any information about this matter. If he is not there, we would want to replace him as soon as possible.

MILK VENDORS.

Mrs. BYRNE: During the last five weeks in the Dernancourt and Tea Tree Gully areas, milkmen had about £70 stolen, the thefts occurring mainly on Friday and Saturday nights. These incidents are causing concern. As this is a rapidly growing area and is possibly not policed adequately, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether sufficient policemen patrol this area at night to protect the milkmen and the community generally?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I recall (as, no doubt, do other honourable members) that prior to the Second World War, milk vendors allotted some time during the week during which to collect milk money. Today, milk vendors operate under much better conditions than those under which they operated before the war and, in the interests of the public they

serve, they should make one or two afternoons a week available to collect the money, so that people do not have to put it in milkcans. However, I shall obtain a report about adequate police protection.

SMALL BOATS.

Mr. McKEE: I notice that the Minister of Marine is considering setting up a committee to investigate the registering of small craft. Can the Minister say who will be members of that committee?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, Cabinet agreed yesterday to setting up a committee to investigate the advisability of registering small powered craft, and to determine the terms of reference. This follows representations received from various organizations. The committee will comprise one person nominated by the Commissioner of Police, one person nominated by the Harbors Board, and one of two persons nominated by the South Australian Boat Owners Association. I have received telephone calls from other interested bodies, requesting that they be allowed representation on this committee. About five weeks ago I made certain statements on this matter (and the *Advertiser* published an article). It was not until the South Australian Boat Owners Association sponsored a meeting at the Adelaide Town Hall that I received any representation from other organizations. The only representation I then received was from the coast guards and from representatives of boat builders. I have made it clear to those people that it would be unwise to have a large committee, but I am confident that all interested people will be able to make written submissions to the committee when it is established. This is not intended to be a revenue-raising project, but if the committee is set up I shall endeavour to make it clear to all concerned that it will be only in the interests of safety.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I point out that, as a rule, organizations are only too happy to give evidence along agreed lines that will encourage their membership. However, the sea is entirely free and is used by any number of sensible, law-abiding boat owners who are not members of organizations and do not wish to become members. I wish to ensure that the committee will give every consideration to private boat owners when it takes evidence and makes its findings. Can the Minister say whether this report will be tabled in the House and whether every possible action will be taken by the committee to see that evidence is taken

from private people as well as from organizations?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will raise this matter with Cabinet; I think it would be a good idea if the report were tabled. I assure the House that we have no intention of hastening this inquiry. I said this morning that no legislation would be introduced that would affect boating this summer. As I want the fullest possible inquiry into this matter, I will recommend to the committee that it take evidence from all people interested in boating. As the honourable member said, associations are most interested as they do much towards policing their members. There are no complaints about many people who are not members of associations, but a few irresponsible people unfortunately act in such a way that this request for registration has been made. I wish only that they would behave in such a manner during the coming summer that registration would not be considered necessary. I do not want action to be taken that will prejudice the boat-building industry in South Australia. I assure the honourable member that all care will be taken to see that a fair and just report is made.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to a short paragraph in this morning's *Advertiser* which sets out the views of the Water Safety Council:

The Acting Chairman of the Water Safety Council of South Australia (Mr. Bruce Harris) said last night that the Minister would be doing boating a great injustice if he did not include the council on the proposed committee. I understand that the Water Safety Council, through its constituent clubs, represents about 8,000 boat owners. I further understand that a request was made to the Minister of Marine for an interview on this matter, but that this was refused. Can the Minister of Marine say how many members the South Australian Boat Owners Association has (that is, the body to be represented on the council); how active a body it is; and whether, in fact, there was any other reason for preferring the South Australian Boat Owners Association to the Water Safety Council than that mentioned in the reply to the honourable member for Port Pirie?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is incorrect to say that a request was made to see me, but that this was refused: no request has ever been refused by me. I considered the South Australian Boat Owners Association because that body had been continually and persistently asking for registration and submitting evidence as to why boats should be registered.

Mr. Millhouse: They have made up their minds already, then?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think that remark is uncalled for. This association will be in the minority on the committee, anyway. The Police Force, which will help to police the registration, and the Harbors Board, which will be largely affected, will be represented on the committee. I can only repeat what I said to the honourable member for Port Pirie. As I expected that every organization would want to be represented, I made a preliminary statement about five weeks ago that I was considering setting up a committee. The only people who had made representations to me (and this was after the South Australian Boat Owners Association had arranged a meeting in the Town Hall) were the coast guards and an association representing the boat builders.

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked him on August 26 concerning the terms of reference of a committee set up to inquire into bulk handling?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The terms of reference are as follows: To determine whether, so far as the State is concerned, a need exists to have any other ports declared terminal ports for the purposes of the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1955, other than those already so declared (*vide* section 3(2) of the said Act), taking into account the following matters: (a) The quantity of grain which is likely to be produced over the next 10 years in the various parts of the State and which may reasonably be expected to be available for export in bulk. (b) The haulage costs of such grain to the nearest existing terminal port. (c) The overall economics in respect of any new terminal port that may be proposed including its effect on the throughput and charges at existing terminal ports, road maintenance costs, and the possible need for improved or additional road or rail facilities, etc.

TREE CENSUS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 27 concerning a census of deciduous and citrus trees in the river districts?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The need for detailed census figures of horticultural plantings arises from rapid changes in one or more of the following: total plantings or production potential of a particular crop; varietal composition of plantings or production; processing demands. If these circumstances apply,

the annual statistical returns by growers are not sufficiently accurate or up to date to serve as a basis for processing and marketing.

In regard to the canning fruit industry, the rapidly changing situation in the early 1950's had become much more stable by the time of Mr. Mount's retirement in 1961, and it was considered at that time that the creation of a new position was unwarranted in view of other work requirements.

A check of the survey was made by field officers in 1963-64 and it was apparent that variations in orchard management, which are reflected in yield per tree, have just as important an influence on production as have tree numbers. The present procedure of annual crop estimates which are based on assessments of district trends in management and seasonal variations in cropping are therefore of more value than detailed statistical surveys of tree numbers. As far as citrus is concerned, it is true that rapid and large changes are occurring in plantings and the use of double plantings, hedge plantings and interplanting are all confusing the statistical picture. A survey of the citrus industry therefore, while being desirable, would be an enormous undertaking. Aerial surveys could help but could not replace ground surveys and such surveys are quite beyond the present resources of the Horticulture Branch. In the Murrumbidgee irrigation area, a permanent staff of four, a complete aerial survey annually and a seasonal employment for about 3 months of a team of 10-15 field survey officers are required to maintain the crop surveys in that area, which is more compact and less diversified than our irrigation areas.

ANGASTON WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the last Parliament I directed several questions to the then Minister of Works, drawing his attention to the poor water pressures prevalent in Angaston and Vine Vale during the summer months. The Minister at the time said temporary provision would be made to alleviate the position, by installing a temporary booster at the Nuriootpa pumping station and by providing a small booster pump at Vine Vale. He also said permanent improvements would be made as soon as possible. Indeed, I recall provision being made in the Loan Estimates a year or two ago for £2,500 in relation to preliminary work. I noticed a line in this year's Loan Estimates, under "Warren water district", for £40,000 to improve the Angaston water supply. Could the Minister of

Works say whether this money is to be used to effect permanent improvements to the water supply at Angaston, which will result in better pressures there during the summer months?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the representations of the honourable member and the actions of my predecessor, I have taken up this matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who reports that the line on the Loan Estimates for the improvements to the Angaston water supply refers to work being carried out as part of the approved scheme for improvements to the Angaston water supply. Work to be done this year will be: (1) Laying 8,400ft. of 14in. M.S.C.L. pumping main; (2) the construction of a 500,000-gallon R.C. tank alongside the existing tank. Work on both of the above jobs commenced last financial year.

GOODWOOD SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question concerning the purchase of land alongside Goodwood Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The land mentioned by the honourable member has on it an old dwelling and a disused shop, and negotiations for its purchase were commenced with the agents for the property last year. The matter was referred to the Land Board for valuation and the board reported that, unknown to the agents, the owner had disposed of it and that the new owner had spent a considerable sum on repairs. He was interviewed by the Property Officer of the Education Department, who was advised quite definitely that the owner did not wish to sell. In view of all the circumstances, including the fact that it would be necessary to compulsorily acquire the property, it was decided to take no further action.

KIDMAN PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Previously I have referred to the difficulties facing schoolchildren who live in the Kidman Park area and have long distances to travel to school. Can the Minister of Education tell me the expected completion date of the proposed new Kidman Park Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Accommodation will probably be available in the Kidman Park Primary School by February, 1967, provided no unforeseen circumstances occur.

LAKE ALBERT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the Lake Albert water levels?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

The position of the levels at the Murray River barrages is being closely watched with the object of keeping the lake level as high as possible without causing damage to surrounding areas. No gates have been opened since July 21 when 100 gates were open for two days, and the levels this morning are 2in. above pool at Goolwa and 7in. above pool at Pelican Point. As a further very small freshet is now coming down the Murray it will be necessary to open some gates this week, but every endeavour will be made to keep the level at or above pool until evaporation from the lakes exceeds the inflow from the river. Last year there were good flows in the river from June onwards, culminating in a large flow from September to December and hence the level of the lake did not fall below designed pool.

TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. QUIRKE: The economic practice (which is a good one) of transport operators in the country is to renew their vehicles on a mileage basis. Today, of course, many vehicles have reached that stage in their life and owner-operators are wondering what the position is regarding renewing their vehicles. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, indicate when transport control is to be introduced so that these people will not be at a disadvantage, as they are today, in relation to renewing their vehicles?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take the matter up again with my colleague to see whether there is anything we can do to relieve the situation the honourable member has mentioned. However, I assure the honourable member that the matter is receiving serious consideration so that legislation can be introduced soon.

MENTAL HOSPITAL STAFF.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that the clerical administrative staff at Parkside Mental Hospital, which has 1,500 beds, numbers 12. With the current trend of patients spending shorter periods in hospitals, more patients attending out-patient clinics, and staff members playing a greater part in communal activity, this small staff seems inadequate for the increased amount of work involved. Will the Premier refer this matter to his colleague, the Minister of Health, with a view to recruiting more staff to alleviate the extra burdens which are placed on members of the staff who are already working at minimal establishment?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take the matter up with my colleague and inform

the honourable member when a reply is to hand.

MILANG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: I have had a number of complaints from Milang residents that their water is more saline now that they are attached to the Strathalbyn water supply than it was when they obtained water from the lake and from bores. Will the Minister of Works ascertain how much water is in the Strathalbyn reservoir, and will he say whether Milang residents can still be supplied from the lake as they were previously?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret hearing this report from the honourable member. I will have investigations made regarding the salinity of the water he has referred to and see what can be done. We want to provide the best possible water, and every endeavour will be made accordingly.

AGENT-GENERAL.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One of the most important duties now undertaken by the Agent-General's office in London concerns the marketing of the South Australian apple crop. Each time there has been a new appointment it has been necessary to make some arrangements for the experience gained in this matter to be passed on to the new appointee. Can the Premier say whether this matter has been considered in connection with the present appointment, and whether the experience gained by predecessors in the office in marketing South Australian apple crops can be passed on to the new Agent-General through a special provision such as that used previously?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have arranged to have an interview with Mr. Milne very soon, I think next week. I have already intimated to him that he would be well advised to have as full a discussion as possible with all persons who have had anything to do with this office, regarding the apple industry particularly and primary production generally, so that he can acquire a reasonable knowledge of these matters. He has also arranged to have certain discussions with Mr. Deane, who was Secretary to the Agent-General some years ago. I think all relevant matters will be covered prior to Mr. Milne's departure, for he will receive full briefing. In addition, if any honourable members in this place wish to pass on information concerning primary production they can do so.

ADVERTISING.

Mr. HUDSON: On page 40 of the August 28 edition of the *Sunday Mail* there appeared an advertisement headed "Swiss Watch Liquidation". This advertisement was inserted by Cologne Trading Company, situated on the fourth floor of Paringa Building, Hindley Street, Adelaide. Various watches were advertised, all at greatly reduced prices. Five-year guarantees were offered, and with each watch a radio or travelling clock was to be included. A constituent of mine attended the sale yesterday, along with many other members of the public, and she purchased, for £7 10s., a lady's wristlet watch that had been advertised as being usually priced at £21. As the radio offered with the watch was nothing more than a child's crystal set, she took the travelling clock offered as an alternative. She was told that no guarantees were ready and that the guarantee on the wristlet watch would have to be posted to her. This aroused her suspicions, and she took the watch to a respectable jeweller to get a valuation. The jeweller said that the watch was not a Swiss watch, but that it had been imported from some Middle Eastern country, and he valued it at £4 10s. He said that paying money for it would be throwing good money down the drain, because if anything went wrong it could not be fixed. He valued the travelling clock at 30s. From this experience, it seems that not only this constituent but many other people must have been taken in by this advertisement, which could be described as completely and deliberately misleading. Will the Attorney-General investigate this matter to see whether something can be done to prevent unscrupulous companies fleecing the public in this way?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen this advertisement. We have had some grossly misleading advertisements drawn to our attention this year, and I am currently examining proposals for legislating in respect of misleading advertisements. On the face of the matters explained by the honourable member, it would seem that offences may have been committed under existing legislation. If the honourable member will let me have the advertisement, I will have it investigated immediately.

KADINA ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. HUGHES: On August 21, 1964, the Principal of the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre at Kadina was informed by Mr. Bone (Superintendent of Technical Schools) that action had been taken to recommend that

a residence for the Principal be included in the 1964-65 list of houses to be built for the department. The Superintendent asked the Principal to supply information about two or three building blocks at Kadina. On October 27, 1964, Mr. Munt for the Secretary of the department, confirmed in writing a telephone conversation with a Mr. Turner of the Housing Trust to reserve allotments 285 or 286 in Southward Terrace, Kadina, as a site for a new departmental residence, as it was expected that the group order next year would include a residence for the Principal of the Kadina Adult Education Centre and that the land in question was being sought for this residence. At a council meeting of the Adult Education Centre, held on July 6 last, concern was expressed that to date no start had been made on the erection of the proposed residence, and a letter was forwarded to the department on July 7 last, expressing the members' concern. A reply to that letter was received, dated July 20 and addressed to the Principal, as follows:

I acknowledge your letter of July 7 in which you express your council's concern that no start has been made on the erection of a residence for the Principal at Kadina. I think you know that the South Australian Housing Trust has reserved allotment 286, Southward Terrace, Kadina, for the erection of a residence. However, I have been informed that, as an order for the construction of the house has not yet been placed with the Housing Trust, it is not possible to inform you when the building will commence.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) C. Rooney,

Senior Assistant Superintendent
of Technical Schools.

Will the Minister of Education have the matter of a residence for the Principal of the Yorke Peninsula Adult Education Centre at Kadina examined, and ascertain whether an order for the construction of the house has been placed with the Housing Trust? If it has been placed, will he also ascertain when that building is expected to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

DRIVING INSTRUCTION.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked earlier this session concerning students' driving instruction?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Education Department fully recognizes the importance of youth driver-training and would like to extend the facilities for this purpose among the older students. At the same time, there are many difficulties. Under the law, no

student can be instructed until reaching the age of 16 years and obtaining a learner's licence. It is clear that the large majority of these students would be in the Leaving or Leaving Honours year, and would naturally wish to concentrate on their school work in preparation for tertiary education or for entry to their chosen occupation in the future. It would therefore be desirable that normal school work and normal school time should not be unduly interfered with, and as far as practicable, all youth driver-training should occur during the vacations.

The Director of Education has kept closely in touch with the Commissioner of Police and his officers on this matter. As honourable members know, we have had in this State since 1959 a first-rate working arrangement with the Commissioner under which groups of 25 students at a time are taken for an extensive driver-training course at the Police Advanced Training Wing near the city. Instruction is both practical and theoretical and is given by expert police instructors. There is no doubt that the students who take the course derive great profit from it and are most appreciative of what is done. Ten to 12 courses are held annually and cater for 250 to 300 students. We are greatly indebted to the Commissioner of Police and his officers for this work, as in so many other ways, but it is not possible at present to extend the arrangements because more trained instructors cannot be provided.

Consideration was given several years ago to the possibility of setting up a full driving instruction centre in conjunction with, or at least adjacent to, several large metropolitan high schools and perhaps in country centres. However, apart from the question of interference with normal school work, funds are not available in the Education Department either for the construction of a centre or for the annual outlay which would be involved.

PESTICIDES.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question concerning the use of pesticides in South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have rather a lengthy reply for the honourable member, which I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading.

Leave granted.

PESTICIDES.

Reference is made to the attached cutting from the *Australian* and the question asked by

Mr. Hudson. As the three "highly toxic pesticides" are not named, it is difficult to be sure just which of the pesticides are referred to in the criticism. There are three main groups of pesticides: (1) The chlorinated hydrocarbons which include dieldrin, aldrin, telodrin, B.H.C. and D.D.T. (2) The organic phosphorus compounds which include diazinon, malathion, and a number of others widely used in horticulture. (3) The carbamates of which the major one is sevin. The chlorinated hydrocarbons vary somewhat in toxicity, and generally result in long lasting residues. The most toxic and long lasting are the cyclodiene group, including dieldrin, aldrin and telodrin. These have all been refused registration by the Stock Medicines Boards of all States for use on animals except dieldrin for use on dogs to control fleas. Dieldrin is used in agriculture only for Argentine ant and cricket control. The former do not occur in South Australia, and crickets are limited to a very small area of South Australia and Victoria. Random sampling of meat and dairy products over three years has shown only a very low level of dieldrin (0.1 p.p.m.) on very rare occasions.

The other chlorinated hydrocarbons D.D.T. and B.H.C. have also been refused registration for use on animals, except for D.D.T. treatment of flystruck sheep (not prevention) and control of buffalo fly in Queensland and Northern Territory. Both D.D.T. and B.H.C. have permitted residues of 7 p.p.m. in meat by all countries. No residues are permitted in dairy products by most countries. As there are as yet no alternatives for these pesticides (D.D.T. and B.H.C.) for the control of pasture pests, their use is permitted in all countries, but levels are set either by regulation as in New Zealand or by recommendation as in most other countries. Random sampling of meat in South Australia has shown no levels of D.D.T. or B.H.C. above that permitted (7 p.p.m.). Residues have been found in dairy products from all areas. The levels are generally very low (less than 5.0 p.p.m.) but residues up to 12 p.p.m. have been found in cheese. It is generally accepted that the levels of pesticides now present are of no danger to human health, but are of importance only because they interfere with the export of dairy produce. Complete absence of residues could be achieved only by the absolute prohibition of the use of these pesticides, and as there are no suitable alternatives, the result would be marked reduction of available pasture and hence loss of production.

The organic phosphorus compounds are more highly toxic to the persons using them, unless the proper precautions are taken, but they are very quickly excreted from the body and very quickly disintegrated on pasture. Animals grazed on pastures or treated with these pesticides are shown to be free of residues in meat and milk within 72 hours compared to up to 9 months for dieldrin. Except for inhalation and skin absorption by the user, the O.P.C.'s are generally regarded as very safe. Investigations by the department in co-operation with the Department of Chemistry have shown the presence in pasture of naturally occurring substances closely akin to the O.P.C.'s. The carbamates are not widely used, and are accepted as being safer than the O.P.C.'s.

Both the O.P.C.'s and the carbamates are very much less valuable as pesticides on both pastures and animals than the chlorinated hydrocarbons. The initial action taken to control the toxic pesticides in use in Australia dates from 1962. New Zealand had taken steps a year or so before Australia, due to rejection of meat in the United States of America because of high levels of pesticide residues. No opposition to controls has been experienced from the pesticide manufacturers. They recognize the dangers of residues, and accept the controls without question. They have, as have also most persons responsible for parasite control, deplored the emotional unqualified condemnation of pesticides by alarmists.

PORT BROUGHTON TO PORT PIRIE ROAD.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the Port Broughton to Port Pirie Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the 5-year advanced construction programme envisages completion of the 30 miles of road between Port Broughton and Port Pirie *via* Cocky's crossing by 1968-69. Work is already in hand on the bridge over the River Broughton at Cocky's crossing. The District Council of Port Broughton has already completed four miles of the road to sub-base standard over the past two years. It is anticipated that further similar construction will be continued during the current year.

UNLEY LIGHTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a

reply to the question I recently asked concerning the installation of traffic lights to safeguard people crossing Unley Road at the site of the new shopping centre adjacent to the Unley council buildings?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the installation of pedestrian-operated traffic signals is the direct responsibility of the Unley council. The board has not, as yet, been approached by the council with any proposal for control facilities for either pedestrian or vehicular traffic in connection with the new shopping centre. It is understood, however, from the council that although a scheme has been approved in principle for a shopping centre and certain demolition works have commenced, the final details envisaged by the developers for the shopping centre have not as yet been submitted to the council for building approval. It is anticipated that when these plans come to hand the matter will be discussed with both the Highways Department and the board in connection with the widening of the Unley Road and any control measures which may be necessary to serve the shopping centre.

COUNTRY ROADS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the use of local labour within district council areas, rather than employing outside contractors, to maintain the Main North Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Roads reports that the rumour that outside contractors were engaged to shoulder the Main North Road near Gulnare is entirely erroneous. This work was carried out by a departmental bitumen spray gang that was put on the work during the winter months when bitumen work is not practicable.

Mr. HEASLIP: My information from a member of the district council was that there were no departmental trucks there (they were all private people with trucks); and the council plant was idle because, although they had the equipment to do this work, they did not have the chance to put in a price for it. Will the Minister take this further and obtain an answer?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the present session I have asked the Premier questions about the possibility of concessions on the railways for former South Australian Railways employees. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Retired employees of the South Australian Railways receive the following travel concessions: one free pass for use during the currency of their retirement leave, which enables a journey to another State to be made; 12 privilege tickets for travel at reduced rates, and two destination passes for free intrastate travel, obtainable each financial year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier's reply is not an answer but merely a statement of what is given now. The question I originally asked the Premier on June 16 (or rather the implication behind it, because it was linked in the same sentence with free travel for members of Parliament) was whether he could arrange for retired members of the South Australian Railways to have free travel, which is now restricted, I understand, to men who have been heads of departments in the railways for a period of seven years. The statement the Premier gave a few moments ago simply set out the present position, which is not an answer, I respectfully suggest, to the question at all. I therefore ask the Premier whether he will take up this matter and make representations, perhaps through the Minister of Transport, to the Railways Commissioner to see whether it is not possible to allow all former South Australian Railways employees to have free travel on the railways after their retirement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the honourable member to put the question on notice so that I can get a formal reply for him.

LEGISLATION.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Attorney-General recall that, when giving the second reading explanation of the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill to the House, he said that that legislation was one of three parts to be introduced to the House? (This was to be considered with the Capital and Corporal Punishment Abolition Bill now before the House.) Does the Attorney-General also recall saying that a Bill dealing with the Juvenile Courts Act would be introduced before the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill was passed, to enable members to understand the whole matter fully? When is the Bill likely to be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Bill is ready and I expect that it will be introduced very shortly.

RENMARK ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. CURREN: Often, during the past two sessions, I asked the previous Minister of Education about land needed for the construction of an adult education centre at Renmark. I was unable to get any definite assurance from the then Minister that the land had been purchased or that the centre would be constructed. Has the Minister of Education any information regarding the proposals for the adult education centre at Renmark?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The position concerning the site is that action is being taken by the Crown Solicitor on behalf of this department, under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, to acquire land from two separate owners. The Crown Solicitor has advised that in each case proceedings have commenced and are now pending submission to the Supreme Court for determination of the amount of compensation payable to the claimants. The amount claimed in each case is considerably in excess of the valuation placed on the land by the Land Board. Based on the present state of the list of cases awaiting trial in the Supreme Court, it is unlikely that these cases will be heard before the latter part of next year.

NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Agriculture been able to obtain from the Commonwealth Government an indication of the effect of the New Zealand Trade Agreement on the timber industry in the South-East of South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: As yet, I have no reply on this matter. However, I noticed in the *Australian* only a few days ago (I think it was a report of an answer given to a question in the Commonwealth Parliament) that the agreement was to be signed today. It was stated that there was no necessity for this to be ratified by the Australian and New Zealand Parliaments. However, the situation is as it was last week, and as soon as I can get some information I will inform the honourable Leader.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week regarding the neglect of animals on their arrival at the Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports:

It would appear that this complaint has reference to a kelpie dog which arrived from Melbourne on the Overland on the morning

of Saturday, August 21. As no inquiry had been made for the dog on the following Monday we wired Melbourne regarding ownership and ascertained that the owner was travelling by road and would collect the dog on arrival. As the animal had not been delivered to the owner on Wednesday, August 25, arrangements were made to transfer the animal to the Dogs Home. The dog was fed, watered and exercised and the crate cleaned each day. Dogs are occasionally held overnight, as in the present instance, in a room under the northern end of the roadway approach to the station, but it is very unusual to have a dog on hand for such a long period. It may be that we would hold dogs in this position twenty times a year. It would be difficult to find alternative accommodation for the provision of this service which would be as suitable as the present location, but the matter will be investigated.

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. SHANNON: On August 3 the honourable member for Adelaide raised the matter of the dismissal of a certain doctor from the Northfield Hospital and from the Public Service. The Premier replied that this man held his appointment at the pleasure of the Crown. The Leader of the Opposition then asked the Premier to explain the position and I understand that the Premier was to bring down a report explaining what had happened. I have received a letter from the gentleman concerned.

Mr. Jennings: The honourable member is not an orphan in that.

Mr. SHANNON: I have no axe to grind. I do not know the man, nor do I think I have ever met him. I am interested to know whether this man was unfairly or improperly treated. Can the Premier say why this man was dismissed, and whether his dismissal was in accordance with the practice relating to dismissals from the Public Service?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Having said that I would make a full statement as soon as I could, I assure the honourable member that this has been the subject of exhaustive inquiries. I expect to be able to give a reply tomorrow.

MARINO ROCKS CROSSING.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to my recent question regarding the safety of the Jervis Street railway crossing at Marino Rocks?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The provision of automatic warning devices at the Jervis Street level crossing near Marino Rocks is included in the schedule of such work to be

undertaken during this financial year. The installation will be carried out as soon as practicable, having regard to current commitments.

STURT RIVER.

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the discussion on the Loan Estimates I raised the urgent matter of the widening of Sturt River. Has the Minister of Works a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the Public Works Committee is currently engaged on taking evidence in regard to disposal of floodwaters at the lower end of Sturt River. The work of widening Sturt River further upstream cannot be proceeded with until finality is reached at the seaward end.

EVAPORATION LOSSES.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 24 regarding the possibility of establishing the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization headquarters for water evaporation in South Australia?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In framing his question, the honourable member asked whether the Government would follow up something he had started, as Minister, in an effort to see whether the headquarters of the C.S.I.R.O. for the evaporation of water could be established in South Australia. I understood, from what the honourable member said, that he raised this matter with the Water Research Council at a meeting in Hobart. I read the minutes of that meeting very carefully but unfortunately I could not see anything there that indicated that this matter was discussed. I want to be fair to the honourable member: docket in the office show that the honourable member, as Minister, followed this matter up with a good deal of enthusiasm, and, following that, early this year Mr. Dridan had a further conversation on the matter with Mr. Christian, the representative. It appears that Mr. Christian also stated that when this programme was developed to a stage where practical field experiments were necessary, he wished to have the co-operation of the water supply authorities and would approach them, that is, the South Australian people. Discussions with the officers rather indicate that they are keeping their finger on the matter; they consider that the right and proper time to make an approach is not at the moment but that as soon as the experimental work and the field

work is done they will approach the organization concerned.

BANK AMALGAMATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation this session to carry out the policy of the Australian Labor Party, presented at the last general election, of amalgamating the State Bank of South Australia and the Savings Bank of South Australia?

2. If not, is it intended to introduce such legislation during the life of the present Parliament?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matter raised by the honourable member is known to him as one of policy. The Government will deal with it and other policy matters at the appropriate time and undoubtedly with the assistance and courtesy of the Parliament.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 26. Page 1318.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill. I do so without any inhibitions at all, and I assure the House that I am going to be very brief about this matter because, unlike the ex-Premier who addressed himself to this matter and many irrelevant things last week, I am going to speak only to the subject matter of the Bill. As I say, I am not concerned at this moment about debating the merits or demerits, the advantages or disadvantages, or the morality or immorality of a lottery: I am concerned only in debating what is in the Bill before us. All this Bill does is authorize the holding of a referendum to allow the people of the State to decide whether or not the Government should introduce legislation for a State lottery. In one respect I agree with what the honourable member for Mitcham said only a few days ago about rather a similar matter, that somehow in many instances Parliament is shirking its responsibilities if it calls for a referendum. There is a classic quotation about this, if I could only remember it, and I think it is to the effect that a referendum is a request from people who should know and can find out asking those people who do not know and cannot possibly find out what they should do. Even

though I might not have the text of the quotation accurate, I think it is nevertheless roughly a pretty good definition of a referendum.

However, this matter is completely different altogether, because whilst from, I think, the point of view of both major political Parties in the State any social question is left to the conscience of an individual member, yet the issue of a State lottery has become so much a part of political discussion in South Australia over a very long number of years that we should, I believe, ask an expression of opinion from the people about it. The ex-Premier, during his long and tortuous speech, said that he had never been asked a question about this at an election meeting. Well, if he has not, I can only attribute that to one of two things, the first (there may be some germ of substance in this, and I have frequently noticed it) being that he carries his hand-picked audience around with him and they would know that a question of this nature might be embarrassing to him and so would not ask it. The only other way in which I think he could possibly be justified in this assertion is that his memory is failing badly. I am sure that he is the only politician in this State who has not been asked this question at innumerable public meetings at election time. Many things have been raised about lotteries, but I do not consider that I should trespass on Standing Orders by debating the merits or demerits of a lottery, as the ex-Premier did last week.

Mr. Millhouse: Tell us what a lottery is?

Mr. Shannon: In a lottery you lose your money.

Mr. JENNINGS: As a general principle that would be fairly true, and I do not disagree for a moment. I was not astonished at the opposition of the Leader. He has felt it incumbent on him to oppose practically everything that has been raised from this side of the House, and I do not deny him his right to do that. No doubt he felt justified in opposing something that he rejected when he was Premier for such a long time. What affronted me was his contemptuous reference to the electors of this State, when he said that granting them the right to a referendum on this issue would be putting poison in the hands of children. Would the responsible electors of this State regard themselves as children and not capable of deciding an issue of this nature?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is how they have been regarded in the past.

Mr. JENNINGS: That is what I was going to say. The ex-Premier has long adopted a "big brother" attitude. I once heard the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), when he was much more liberal (with a small "l") than he is now, complaining about "big brother". The ex-Premier is adopting not only a "big brother" attitude on this but also the paternalistic attitude that has characterized him for so long, in that he knows better what is good for one than one knows oneself. For many years he has said, irrespective of the way the people of South Australia thought, that he would arrange the boundaries in such a way that no matter what they thought he would have more than a 70 per cent chance of winning, and that he knew what was good for them, and that was he.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely you are getting off the point now.

Mr. Coumbe: That is the subject of the member for Adelaide.

Mr. JENNINGS: The ex-Premier said that this was not in the long-term interest of the State, but that is not valid. I am not arguing the point at the moment, but when we were a claimant State at least two moves were made from the Opposition side for a State lottery and those moves were opposed on the ground that as we were a claimant State it would affect any financial benefit we gained from the Commonwealth grant. Now that we are no longer a claimant State we have an entirely different argument advanced. If a referendum on this issue is authorized by this Bill it will go to the people, and if that referendum is defeated the Government will proceed no further. If it is carried, the Government will introduce legislation to provide for a State lottery. Here the ex-Premier was astray the other day, although he pretends to know so much about Labor policy, when he said that it would be binding on Labor members.

At another stage in the same speech he said that he had always believed it was Labor Party policy to regard such matters as social questions. Even following the carrying of a referendum in support of a State lottery and the Government's introducing a Bill for such, it will still be a social question, and any Government member who in conscience cannot support a State lottery would be within his rights to oppose it. I hope I have made that matter absolutely clear. I believe this is a matter that should be decided as quickly as possible. I commend the Bill to the House, and cannot see that we are putting poison into

the hands of children. We are allowing electors of this State to exercise their democratic franchise on a matter which for many has been of great public importance.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I oppose the legislation for reasons that I shall give to the House. However, first I comment on one or two statements made by the honourable member for Enfield. He devoted most of his time to criticizing the Leader of the Opposition for things that he had said. I do not object to that, as it is the normal function of any member to criticize another member's statements. He said that if the Leader had not, at election meetings, been questioned on this matter, it was probably due to one of two reasons—that he took his audience around with him or that his memory was failing. Anyone who is foolish enough to suggest that the Leader, speaking as he did and as he has done for as long as I have known him at places throughout the State, could possibly take his audience with him is beyond comprehension. It is so far from common sense that a mere reference to it is sufficient.

The second point, that the Leader's memory may be failing, is equally wide of the mark. If anyone in this Chamber has a monumental memory it is the Leader, and I have never known it to fail him yet. The reason the Leader has not been questioned on the matter is probably the same as the reason why I have not been questioned on it. On the subject of a State lottery I have not, at least in the last two election campaigns, been questioned by anyone in the audience, nor do I recall being questioned in a private conversation, although I do not say that categorically. That also goes for the other subject we are debating, namely, off-course betting facilities. During the last election I was not asked a question on this matter at any meeting, and I can recall being questioned about it only twice as far back as I can remember. Both those questions came from members of the committee of the Port Lincoln and North Shields Racing Club. The Leader of the Opposition and I have well-known views on such questions as this, and people realize that we have convictions—

Mr. Jennings: That might be why they didn't ask.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be so, but if a person has convictions on these matters, he must have the honesty and perhaps the fortitude to allow his views to be known. For the benefit of the honourable member who has just left the Chamber, my figures at the last election went up, and not down. That may, or may not, have been because of my

attitude on social questions, about which I have made no secret in my district; nor do I propose to do so. The electors in this State are decent enough to give a mandate to a person prepared to let his own views be known. Whether or not they agree with that person's view, it is, nevertheless, a respect shown by electors to members of the House who express their views. I think that the honourable member was correct when he said this Bill dealt not with the principles of the matter but with whether a referendum should be granted.

Having expressed myself at some length on a previous matter, namely, on the morals and social implications of gambling, and on its effect on the community generally, I do not intend to repeat those arguments now, except to say that I do not attempt to adopt a paternalistic attitude towards other people. I do not seek to impress my views on these matters on other people. I do not say to them, "I know what's good for you." But as a responsible member of this House, I am charged with the duties of promoting, so far as I am able, the well-being of the State and of its citizens generally, in every respect.

Holding the views that I do hold in regard to social questions, I cannot, without subverting my own conscience, vote any other way than the way I do, because I believe social questions are not merely matters to be decided by expediency or on the score of a moment's consideration. I believe the standard of electors generally largely stems from the lead that responsible citizens give to the general public on these and other associated questions. As I said the other day, we take great pains and care to ensure that we do not expose our citizens—either young or old—to the risk of accident, body injury, or infection by diseases, that can be prevented. We go to great lengths to prevent these things, and yet it seems to me that, without much thought (other than possibly electoral expediency), we are prepared apparently to expose our citizens, including young people, to the risks of moral contamination.

The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) may hold a different view, and I shall respect him for that, but this is my view. As I have said, I shall take the political consequences, if there are any consequences, but as a legislator I think this is my duty, and I do not give myself a pat on the back for it. I think every honourable member in this House does his duty according to the way he sees it. I am generally opposed to the principle of referenda, as it is apparently expressed in the policy of the Labor Party.

Here again, I raise no objection to the Labor Party's reverting to referenda as a plank in its platform. That is for that Party to determine, but we are all responsible for what we do during our tenure of a seat in Parliament, and I believe it is not reasonable or proper for us to take refuge in a referendum on a question which we ought properly, in my opinion, to decide.

I have said that people in my district know my views on these matters, and therefore they have them well in mind when they go to the polls on election day. If they cannot agree with me on certain things, and if they believe that I cannot agree with them on matters, they can put the figure "1" in somebody else's square. But if they take the attitude, "Well, Bill Jones is not a bad sort of bloke; although we don't see eye to eye on everything, I still think he is the best man," they will vote accordingly. I cannot believe that every elector who votes for a candidate agrees with that candidate's views in every respect. Similarly, I should imagine that the candidate for whom he does not vote may hold views that would satisfy him on certain matters. I believe that I am elected by the people of the district of Flinders not because they agree with me on every point, but because they agree generally with the principles I enunciate and endeavour to uphold.

If they do that, they will require me to exercise my vote on every question that comes before the House on their behalf. This is not a question that was not considered at the last election or, indeed, at previous elections, because the policy on referenda has been enunciated by the Labor Party for some time. Finally, I disagree with the most important ingredient of this Bill: the wording of the question which is to be submitted to the people and on which they must exercise their vote compulsorily. The question to be put to the people is:

Are you in favour of the promotion and conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?

On the face of it, it might seem that this is a reasonable question to ask the electors, but is it? On every referendum difficulty seems to arise out of the varying interpretations of the question being asked. I do not know of any referendum that has been put to the people in recent years that has not had trouble on this aspect. A Commonwealth referendum was submitted not long ago, and it was finally decided that huge advertisements be inserted in the press explaining to the people each side

of the question. The electors were invited to study these explanations and to form their own conclusions. Although that may have helped considerably, I believe that in some cases it only made confusion worse confounded. I believe the only way this question can be clarified is by the Government's introducing a Bill for the establishment of a lottery. Such a Bill should be debated fully, with every member having the opportunity to raise points of doubt and have them clarified either by amendment or explanation, so that if the Bill were passed by both Houses (with all points having been carefully considered) the question could be put to the people in its final form. Then they would have a specific question to answer. I believe that this is the only way to consult the people and the only fair way to put the question to them.

The question in the Bill is far from specific. First, it states "Are you in favour". I believe everybody could understand those words. The next part of the question reads "of the promotion and conduct of lotteries". What does "promotion" mean? Does it mean that, if I vote in favour of this question, I am authorizing the Government not only to establish a lottery but to go out and make it of bigger and wider appeal? As I understand the word "promote", it means to develop, encourage, enlarge or widen, and I have always applied those meanings to the word. If that is the popular concept of the word (and I suggest that it is) then many people, who might be prepared to have a Government lottery in modest terms instead of having South Australians sending their money to some other lottery in another State, might be deterred. They might be prepared to go along with a lottery if they were satisfied that the Government did not intend to widen, broaden or enlarge the whole appeal of lotteries. Even from the negative point of view I think the word "promotion" is dangerous because it might make people who would otherwise vote for it decide against the question. It is unfortunate that the word "promotion" in relation to the State conduct of a lottery has been inserted in the question. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall have something to say about that word.

Then there is the word "lotteries"—in the plural. Does this mean that the State is to be involved in and authorized to conduct lotteries of all types and kinds, large, wide and handsome? Again, I think the popular concept of a lottery, as it concerns South Australia, is that it should be legal to invest in a lottery

similar to Tattersalls, the Golden Casket or the New South Wales lotteries. When arguments are advanced about this we constantly hear it said that many people take out tickets in a lottery anyhow and, as it is illegal in South Australia to hold a lottery, this money goes out of the State. These people ask why we should not have a lottery in South Australia. They obviously mean a lottery similar to Tattersalls or to the Queensland Golden Casket. However, the word in the Bill is 'lotteries', and I should not be willing to say that I wanted the Government to be given an authority, and indeed, an instruction to go into the setting up of lotteries (plural) in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Each time a number is drawn out there is a lottery, and therefore a series of lotteries is involved.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be, but I say again that most people who desire a lottery in South Australia do not desire lotteries—they desire a lottery. I think the Attorney-General will accept this. He is inclined to think that there is not much merit in my point. However, this question is being referred to the electors as a specific proposal. Therefore, why not be specific?

Mr. Ryan: Doesn't the honourable member think this question is specific?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I don't. If the honourable member had been listening I think he would have absorbed that, even though it would take a little time. What should be done is to bring a Bill before the House for the establishment of a lottery and allow members here and in another place to chew it over and, after a conclusion has been reached, to submit it to the people.

Mr. Ryan: Why didn't the honourable member say that about another matter before the House?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I did.

Mr. Ryan: You did not: you opposed everything.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: And I oppose everything in this Bill. If the honourable member will listen intelligently he will understand what I am saying. If this question is to be submitted to the people then let it be specific and not as it is worded; that is all I ask. I have stated my main objections to the Bill as it now stands. I feel obligated to oppose it, and that I do. If it passes the second reading, I shall have something to say in Committee about the question the people are to be asked.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I intend to be mercifully brief; in fact, it is my ambition to make perhaps the shortest speech I have made in this place. I have listened with much interest to the remarks made by the honourable member for Flinders. I find that, as usual, I am always prepared to have certain admiration for a man's convictions. On this and kindred matters I appreciate the feelings of a man who has particular convictions and is not afraid to stick to them. However, I point out to the House and to the honourable member for Flinders that, after all, this is not a Bill to provide a lottery or lotteries but a Bill to discover what the people of South Australia think about it.

Mr. Ryan: According to the Opposition we are discussing a lotteries Bill.

Mr. CLARK: It is simply to get an expression of opinion from the people of South Australia regarding lotteries. Incidentally, I could not see the point the member for Flinders was making regarding the plural of 'lotteries'. Surely the idea of it, if a lottery were instituted in South Australia, would be to run not just one lottery but a series of lotteries, and they might happen fairly frequently, according to the length of time it took the lottery to be fully subscribed. I believe that on this question of a Bill to decide what the people of South Australia think about lotteries we will find, when the vote is taken, that there will be a number of members in this place who, although they detest lotteries, will find themselves in all good conscience able to support this Bill. Indeed, I think the vote will prove that. As I say, it is simply a Bill for a referendum. In itself it does not create a lottery at all: it simply seeks to give the people of South Australia the opportunity of telling us their opinion about it.

Personally, I have no particularly strong feelings one way or the other regarding lotteries. In fact, to be quite frank I do not think it is a very important matter at all. However, there again I must try to be fair, as the honourable member for Flinders tried, and I must try to realize that there are many people in South Australia who think it is important. In my opinion there are only two things that the people of South Australia need to know in order to understand this Bill. First, they need to know what a referendum is, and I do not think there is anybody who does not know that. Secondly, they need to know what a lottery is, and, Mr. Acting

Speaker, I do not think there would be anybody in South Australia who did not know what a lottery was.

Mr. Hudson: Except members of the Opposition.

Mr. CLARK: If people do not know just what is envisaged as a lottery in this case, or if they have any doubt about the form this lottery will take, then I suggest they should definitely vote against this referendum and be done with it. I listened with a good deal of interest to begin with to the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition the other day on this matter, and in my opinion he made (to put it mildly) a very indifferent speech. I think he would have been wiser if he had risen and said (as the member for Flinders virtually did), "I do not like lotteries, I have never liked lotteries, I have always opposed lotteries, and on this occasion for that reason I am going to oppose this Bill to have a referendum for a lottery." I think if he had done that his remarks would have been appreciated by everybody, not only in here but outside as well. I want to (although I am not certain I should because I am afraid I could be giving over-emphasis to something that possibly is not worth emphasizing) quote two sentences from the Leader's remarks. First, he said:

"We should hold a referendum only in this House and authorize a general referendum only if we are satisfied that the question to be put before the people is one from which they can gain advantage.

I will come to the latter part in a few moments, because I would not like to disappoint my colleague, the Attorney-General, regarding the question of "advantage". The Leader's idea of "advantage" may differ from my idea of "advantage", and both our ideas of "advantage" may differ from the ideas of the majority of people in this State. If things were as the Leader says, I believe we would be wasting our time holding a referendum, but we are not sure what the people think and we want to find out; and that is what we are seeking to do in putting this legislation through the House.

Mr. Quirke: I still think you are wasting your time.

Mr. CLARK: I want to quote just one other remark, and I think this is probably what the Attorney-General wanted me to mention. The former Premier said:

One does not put poison in the hands of children.

There again, that could very well be regarded as a matter of opinion. What is poison, after all? In this regard again it is a matter of opinion, and we want to find the opinion of the people of the State. Are the electors of South Australia children? We believe quite sincerely that the people should judge, and we consider (and I cannot say this too strongly) that the majority of the electors of South Australia are not children but intelligent adults and capable of giving a direct answer on this question. I think they are capable of distinguishing between what is poison and what is not poison. It is a very simple matter indeed, and that is why I do not think it is necessary for any of us to speak at length on it. If most of the people in South Australia want a lottery we will introduce legislation for it, and there again we will follow the normal democratic principles of Parliament. If the Bill is introduced I am quite certain, knowing my colleagues on both sides of the House, that Parliament will, by the usual discussion, question, debate, and amendment, make the legislation the best we can, as I believe we always do in here. Possibly sometimes we may not be quite as successful as at other times, but we endeavour to make the legislation as good as possible. I cannot see that there are any other factors to be mentioned at all. As I said before, if there is any doubt in people's minds regarding a lottery, the form it will take or how it will be run, my advice to them is to vote against a lottery altogether. The reverse also applies: if the majority of the people in South Australia decide that they do not want a lottery, then a Bill will not be necessary, and I am quite certain that a Bill will not be introduced. The matter is in the hands of the electors of South Australia, just as is the result of an election.

Mr. Jennings: You can't gerrymander a State-wide electorate.

Mr. CLARK: No, all votes will have the same value, and I believe that is as it should be in a democracy. However, I do not want to be sidetracked into bringing politics into the matter, for I do not think this is a political issue at all. I was most interested in a leader in the *News* of Friday last, and I would like to quote the last couple of paragraphs from it because I believe this sums up my feelings and the feelings of most members in this House on the matter. The words refer in the main to a speech made in the House last week, and they are:

Sir Thomas has suggested that the full terms of a proposed lottery should be set out

in detail and then the people should be asked to vote. But surely the first thing is to find out how the people feel on the basic principle of a State lottery. If they vote against it, that is the end of it: if they vote for it, then their elected representatives will be in a better position to frame the details. What can possibly be lost by putting the question to the people?

On this occasion I completely agree with the press, and I support this legislation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader today opposed this Bill substantially (as I understand it) on two grounds. Their first reason is that they disapprove of all gambling; they will oppose anything that will increase gambling in this State, and this Bill is a step, albeit a shaky one, in that direction. Secondly, they oppose the Bill on the ground that the question to be asked at the referendum is so inexact as to be worthless. I cannot agree with them on the first point. During the debate on the motion of the honourable member for Frome about T.A.B., I gave my view on gambling and I give it again briefly. I think gambling in itself is a thing indifferent: it is neither good nor bad. It can, like anything else, be abused and then the results which flow from its abuse are evil indeed. But, as with alcohol, there is nothing wrong with gambling in itself, so far as I can see. Certainly, because some people have abused the opportunities they had to gamble, that is not a sufficient reason for trying to forbid it altogether, even if that could be done, which, in my view, it cannot. I say definitely but respectfully that I cannot agree with my Leader and his Deputy in their views on this matter. They were naturally giving their personal views, but mine happen to differ from them. The honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) said something about a certain sentence used by the Leader, that one does not put poison into the hands of children. That was, and I say this with respect, a rather unfortunate analogy to use, but I do not believe the Leader meant it in the way that Government members have claimed he did.

Mr. Ryan: How do you think he meant it? What did he mean?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that he meant that he was opposed to gambling, and it would be better for us as a community if we did not have a lottery. I do not think he meant to say or suggest that all people in South Australia were like children or should be treated as children.

Mr. Jennings: We were not debating a lottery. We were debating a referendum.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is absurd and childish to try to suggest that a person can separate the two. This is a referendum on the question of a lottery. It is silly to say one can concentrate only on the referendum and ignore the question to which the referendum refers, that is, a lottery.

Mr. Hudson: The Leader meant it was highly dangerous to ask the people a question. Don't you agree with that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I said that it was an ill-considered analogy, and that he did not mean it in the way that Government members have taken him.

Mr. Hudson: But that is the only straightforward interpretation you can give it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have given my interpretation, which I think is the true one. It is not a phrase I would use myself, but I do not intend to take the matter further.

Mr. Jennings: It was said early in his speech, and before he got rattled.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think he got rattled. It would take more than the member for Enfield or any of his friends to get the Leader rattled. I have seen the member for Enfield trying to do it but he has never done it in my experience, and he did not succeed last Thursday.

Mr. Jennings: I have seen him getting red in the face.

Mr. Casey: You would not say the Leader was being jesuitical?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I did not offend the member for Frome (or should I say Rome?) when I used that expression the other day. I do not want to get sidetracked into a theological argument. I was going to say—

Mr. Jennings: Say something!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —that the Leader in his speech relied rather heavily on the Royal Commission's report which was presented in 1936, and which was, as I understand, unanimously opposed to a lottery in this State.

Mr. Ryan: You would not remember much about that Royal Commission?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and I am grateful for the interjection from the member for Port Adelaide. I do not remember much about lotteries in 1936. My main recollection of that year is seeing Father Christmas come over in his aeroplane before John Martin's pageant.

Mr. Ryan: The Leader wants you to accept those times.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not prepared to do that: I believe the outlook in the community has

changed greatly in the last 30 years. The Leader rather proved that by stressing the change in outlook that had occurred in England on lotteries over the centuries. He said that views accepted generations ago were not necessarily the views of the community today. The fact that the Royal Commission presented its report in 1936, that is 29 years ago, does, in my view, greatly diminish the force of the conclusions reached at that time. I reserve my right to make up my mind on the question of a State lottery, or lotteries, or whatever is proposed in this Bill, when I know precisely the proposal to be put before the people of South Australia. On this second ground, which was taken both by the Leader and his deputy, I am 100 per cent with them. No-one should be forced (and I use that word advisedly) to answer a vague question. All people, whether they be members of this House or members of the general public, have the right to know exactly what is proposed before they are required to express their opinion. This Bill does not enable them to know.

Mr. Shannon: You remember the example of the question about whether you have stopped beating your wife yet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and that is an apt interjection. It is elementary that any question to be put to people by way of referendum should be specific and precise, so that people may give a proper answer. That, if one looks at the writings on the theory of referenda amongst the political scientists, is taken for granted. So much so, that it is difficult to get authority on it, but I was able to get some authority on that proposition, an authority which I think will not be challenged by any member. The authority is Herman Finer's *The Theory and Practice of Modern Government*, a work on political science on which the Attorney-General and I, and probably many other members, were almost brought up at the university. This is what Finer says at page 560 on direct legislation—

Mr. Clark: Finer is very good on gerrymanders, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can see that I am getting somewhere when the honourable member for Gawler tries to sidetrack me.

Mr. Clark: I was hoping you might care to read that section.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will certainly not read it before I read what he has to say on referenda.

Mr. Jennings: Why not?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the members of the Government listen; they will find this interesting. This is what Finer says on referenda:

In the referendum, the Legislature refers its work to the people for approval or disapproval. In other words, by the referendum, it is intended that the people shall have the opportunity of passing judgment upon a Bill which has already been dealt with by the people they have elected . . .

That sums it up, and sets it out about as well as it can be set out. The referendum is designed for people to give an answer on a Bill that has already been dealt with by their members of Parliament. I point out that Finer is an unimpeachable authority on political science. The Leader in his speech referred to the provision in the Commonwealth Constitution and, in fact, the Premier, in his second reading explanation, drew some analogy, or made some reference, anyway, to the Commonwealth Constitution and to the provision in it for a referendum. There, of course, one must have a Bill passed by both Houses before one can have a referendum. It is rather significant—

Mr. Jennings: What about the two referenda on conscription?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Enfield likes to go back as far as that, he may. I have enough examples here for my purpose.

Mr. Jennings: Very different ones, though!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The next example is topical. Several speakers in this debate have already referred to the debate on off-course betting (the motion that is on the Notice Paper). Perhaps I may remind honourable members (especially members opposite) of the amendment moved by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). The significance of it is that it provides for a Bill to come in first before there is a referendum. He has put it that way, and it was seconded by another honourable member. Why are members of the Government somersaulting now that we come to lotteries? This is the amendment by the member for Wallaroo:

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

Why does the member for Wallaroo say one thing on one matter (another matter of gambling, incidentally) and another thing on lotteries? How many of the members opposite who will support the member for Wallaroo will somersault on this matter? There, we have an amendment to a motion moved by a private member of the Government Party, which calls

for a Bill before the referendum is held, and yet apparently he is content, on a sister measure, to have the referendum before we have the Bill. Now that we are talking about the Labor Party, perhaps we should also look at the specific plank in its platform, out of which this Bill has no doubt grown. This is it, and you will know it off by heart, Mr. Acting Speaker. It is under the heading "Social" and states:

16. The submission of the question of a State Lottery to a referendum in which the Australian Labor Party will take no part.

Mr. Ryan: My word, that is a good policy!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That does not preclude the introduction of a Bill into this House before the referendum is held. It merely says that the question of a State Lottery shall be submitted to a referendum.

Mr. McKee: You are ridiculing the people of this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member should not be so idiotic; he should control himself more. That is the Labor Party's platform. Why does the question have to be specific before a referendum is put to the people to say "Yea" or "Nay"? Otherwise, it would be so vague as to be worthless. Let us think for a moment of the aim of having a referendum at all. Why does the Government want to have a referendum on this matter (apart from the fact that it is bound to have it because of the plank in its platform)?

Mr. Hudson: We also got a mandate for it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One thing the army has tried to teach me is to think straight, and first of all to ask what the aim of an exercise is. Surely the only possible aim of a referendum is to obtain an expression of opinion from the people to guide the Government, and to guide members of this House, in deciding on legislation which will be introduced and which will come before us. An expression of opinion on this question will not help us at all; it will be no guide to us, because the question has no precise meaning whatsoever.

Mr. Hudson: Come now!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We hear a low rumble from the member for Glenelg, but let us look at the question to be asked; it is set out in black and white in clause 4 of the Bill, and states:

Are you in favour of the promotion and conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?

Mr. Casey: Yes!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If honourable members look in Murray's dictionary in the Parliamentary Library they will find five meanings of the word "lottery".

Mr. Hudson: You know as well as anyone else what it means.

Mr. Jennings: You are getting as ridiculous as the ex-Premier, when he said that "fair" could mean "blonde".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the first meaning, which is the relevant one here, there are also alternatives, but what other help do we have on the meaning of lotteries?

Mr. Hudson: Common sense!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity that the member for Glenelg does not use some.

Mr. Hudson: It is a pity you don't use some, because it is perfectly obvious that what is meant is to have one similar to those in other States.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only other definition I know is certainly far from precise. If we look at the definition of a lottery in the Lottery and Gaming Act, I should like to be told which of the alternatives is mentioned in this particular question. In section 4 of the Act, lottery means:

Any scheme or device for the sale or gift or disposal or distribution of any property, real or personal, or money, or thing, or any right thereto, or of any share therein depending upon or to be determined by lot or drawing, whether out of a box or other receptacle, or by cards, token, coin, or dice, or by any machine, tickets, envelope, or device, or chance whatsoever:

That is the definition of "lottery". Which of those particular references is in the question to be put to the people of South Australia? The question is so vague and contains so many alternatives that it is meaningless, and nobody can say what it means.

Mr. Ryan: Does the honourable member understand it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No.

Mr. Hurst: Then why oppose it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Does the honourable member mean that, because I do not understand it, I should let it pass? How stupid! It is unlike the member for Semaphore to make an interjection like that. I think I have said enough about the definition now to convince even the doubting Thomases on the other side. I was surprised to see an editorial in yesterday's *Advertiser* under the heading "Lottery Referendum Plan".

Mr. Shannon: They had two bob each way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think they put all their money on one side. Frankly, I thought

the editorial was as weak as water, and right off the beam.

Mr. Casey: The honourable member was very disappointed when he read that one.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, because the standard at the *Advertiser* is usually fairly high and the reporting impartial, but that was not the case this time. The editorial stated:

It is virtually certain that during the proposed referendum campaign the possible consequences of an affirmative vote will be fully discussed.

The use of the word "virtually" means that it is not certain, otherwise it does not have any meaning. The editorial continued:

In other words, the public will have a reasonably clear picture—

another inexact phrase that means nothing—before the vote is taken of the likely consequences of telling the Government to go ahead. That meets to a large extent—

another inexact phrase—

the objection that people will be voting in the dark.

That is absolute nonsense and I am surprised the *Advertiser* published anything like it, let alone in an editorial. Doesn't the *Advertiser* realize that the Government is not going to put a specific proposal to the people during this referendum campaign? It is forbidden to do that under the plank of its platform, which states that the Australian Labor Party will take no part. For all we know there may be half a dozen proposals for a lottery put to the people of the State during the referendum campaign. How are the people to choose just one proposal or know which will eventually come into this House? How are we to know which one the people will favour? There is nothing at all in the Bill, as it stands, about this. The *Advertiser* did even worse than that. It had already been said in this editorial:

No-one is in a position to indicate even approximately the proportion of South Australians favouring and opposing lotteries. Possibly the weight of opinion in their favour has grown over the years as more of them have been established in other States. But only by taking the poll can the Government determine whether the majority is for or against their introduction here.

Again, that is entirely erroneous. From time to time the *Advertiser* publishes the results of Gallup polls held throughout Australia. I do not know whether the editor of the *Advertiser* had overlooked, or whether members in this House had overlooked, that in July 1964 the result of a Gallup poll on this very question was published, and I have no doubt

that it appeared in the *Advertiser*. Under the heading "Lotteries are Popular" the poll report states:

In every State big majorities favour Government lotteries, but in Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania people are inclined to think they should be run for the Government like Tattersalls, not by the Government.

Of course, that is something which would come out in a Gallup poll campaign but which is not specified in the question itself. The report continues:

People interviewed throughout Australia by the Gallup poll in July were first asked whether they were for or against Government lotteries. 83 per cent said favour, 10 per cent said opposed, and 7 per cent were undecided. The majority for Government lotteries was at least 80 per cent in all States except Tasmania where it was 63 per cent.

The question to be asked by virtue of this Bill is no better than the question that would be asked by a Gallup poll, and there is no reason to believe that the result of a referendum, with that as the question, would be significantly different from the result of the Gallup poll held twelve months ago.

We know before we start that a majority in South Australia will be in favour, and I venture to say that, if the poll is held and the question is asked in this form, the majority in favour will be about the same as is set out in that Gallup poll. The Government would do far better, if it wished to check public opinion on a question like this, simply to get the Gallup poll people to hold another public opinion sample rather than go to the expense of asking a question like this (which is so vague as to be meaningless) by way of referendum. We already know the answer fairly well, by virtue of the poll conducted last year. In other words, after the referendum is held (if it is held and this question is asked) we will not be one whit further advanced than we are now. Indeed, we will be further away from an answer.

What would happen if a poll were held and the answer was a majority in favour? There would be endless argument as to what was in fact meant and what was the significance of the answer. There would be endless argument whether a lottery should be run for the Government or by the Government, and about whether there should be offices in the city of Adelaide, a telephone system or something else. The number of unanswered questions would be legion: we would have argument after argument about it; and no conclusion at all would be possible from the result of the referendum. This would be

because people's minds would just not have been properly directed to the various points of detail which must, of necessity, come up. Yet the proponents of any particular scheme that is put before this House would always say that the people had favoured a lottery, as had been shown by the referendum result. They would say we had to vote for a lottery because the people wanted one in this State. That would mean that members of Parliament, when considering this Bill, would be in a most unfortunate position. There would be this vague pressure in favour of whatever happened to be the matter before Parliament. What would happen if a Bill were introduced and defeated in this House? What would be said of members in this Chamber and in another place who voted against it? They would be told that they were flaunting and thwarting the will of the people, and yet that would be entirely unfair because they would not have had any guidance at all on the specific matters to be embodied in a Bill. That is why this question is absolutely and entirely unsatisfactory.

Of course, we know why this position has arisen: it is because the Labor Party is well split on this question. There is a non-conformist wing and another wing. I can name four members of the Labor Party who are obviously bitterly opposed to a lottery. They are the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Works, you, Mr. Speaker, and the member for Wallaroo. I respect these members for their opinions, but they are obviously and bitterly opposed to anything like this.

Mr. CASEY: Did they tell you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They do not have to tell me; I have been here with some of them for 10 years now, and with others for a shorter period. I know perfectly well how they feel, and I respect them for it. There is a deep cleavage of opinion on the other side about this. Those members do not want (nor do any of the members, I suppose) to have to fight and argue with each other about a lottery. A convenient way of avoiding the responsibility is to have a referendum and let other people make the decision for them.

I do not agree, as a rule, with referenda. I think the responsibility on all questions is a responsibility that is given to us, but on this matter, if this were a properly phrased question arising out of a specific Bill which had been brought before the House, I would not oppose it. I must acknowledge, little as I like doing it, that this was a matter

which was brought forward by the Labor Party before the last election. The Labor Party won the election. Therefore one could say that they had a mandate for it and it should not be opposed outright. But, for Heaven's sake, if we are going to have a referendum let us have one which means something and which will be of some help to people, and that is only a referendum which follows the passing of a Bill in this House.

There are only one or two other small matters I want to mention, and they concern the details of the Bill before the House. For some reason, voting at this referendum is made compulsory; I do not know why that is done, but I suppose it is simply because we have compulsory voting at elections. However, it is most unusual for voting at a referendum in other countries to be compulsory. There is no reason that I can see why it should be, and it is specially unfortunate that in the way the ballot paper is to be drawn there will be no provision for people to have no opinion: people have to vote "Yes" or "No".

Mr. Ryan: Is it compulsory or voluntary in a Commonwealth referendum?

Mr. Shannon: I suppose they could leave a blank.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They could do that, but that would then be an informal vote.

Mr. Shannon: At least they wouldn't be fined then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They would not be fined, but they should not put in an informal vote. Although the policy of the Labor Party is voting by a cross, strangely enough people are to vote on this matter by "No. 1". However, these are only small matters. What is more important is that people are being forced to express an opinion on a matter on which they may have no opinion, and there seems to be no reason why that should be so. I sum up by saying that I oppose this Bill, not because I oppose all gambling (I do not, and I could not maintain that position) but because I think the proposal in this Bill for a referendum is no more than a waste of time.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I am not going to allow myself to be waylaid on this matter because I do not think it deserves any great consideration from members. I agree in the main with the remarks of my colleague, the member for Mitcham, regarding the way this matter is to be put to the public. I do not like shelving responsibilities, and since I have been in public life I have never shelved any responsibility. I have always taken what

blame or what praise comes to me for doing things, and I have done what I thought to be right. I have never made promises in my district, and at this stage of my life I do not intend to do so. I do not advise any young member coming into Parliament to make promises because often he will find they will be embarrassing in the light of the full information he will gain when he comes into this Chamber. They are a snare and a delusion. A person may win a friend temporarily but lose him permanently because he has to change his mind when he finds out the full facts. Hence I am in favour of accepting my own responsibilities. I do not like any form of referendum on any subject.

I remind the House that the first known case of a reference to the people occurred in Biblical history. Pontius Pilate had brought before him our Saviour Jesus Christ, whom he had to examine and pass sentence on. Having examined Him, he said, "I find no fault in this man", but when he turned to the window where the mob was congregated he heard the screams from the mob, "Crucify Him." Members know the answer: Jesus Christ was crucified. I refer this very appropriate quotation from the Scriptures to my good friend the member for Wallaroo, who has had the temerity to suggest a referendum on another question now before the Chamber. We are running a grave risk in asking people who have not the full facts and who, of necessity, cannot know the full facts of any case to express a view to guide us in the things which we should know. If we are responsible people we should not need to ask people outside what they think or what they consider we should do. We are put here to carry out the functions of Government: that is why we are elected. Therefore, members will gather at once that I am not a very ardent supporter of the Bill now before us.

I should like to refer to one or two things to refresh the memory of those of my generation, and it would not hurt some of the younger members to listen. One of the first lotteries established in an Australian State was established in Tasmania by a man called George Adams. He called his lottery "Tattersalls". He promoted it for private profit, and it was later taken over by the Tasmanian Government. Let me be fair about this so that members will know where I stand regarding lotteries. I am not one of the straight-laced, narrow-minded people, and at present I have a small interest in a little syndicate that has a ticket in Tatts.

Mr. Ryan: You only send in the hope of winning.

Mr. SHANNON: The member for Port Adelaide can make his speech later. I went in for this ticket with a group of friends; I do not have enough interest in it to be, shall we say, the promoter of a syndicate to take a ticket, but I put in a couple of shillings to take a ticket with friends, which is a common occurrence amongst some of my friends. I offer no objection to that. I have no inhibitions about this, and I see no sin in it. As most people know, Tattersalls became famous throughout Australia, and so great was its public goodwill that when Jonathon Cain became Premier of Victoria he decided that a lottery should be established there. He very astutely got Mr. Cosgrove, the Labor Premier of Tasmania, into conference, and by some strategem transferred the Tattersalls office from Hobart to Melbourne. It was a very astute deal, and it assured the Victorian State lottery of success from the word "go", because he was able to hawk the name "Tattersalls", a name so well known that I do not think even the Golden Casket (which is a more recent lottery), the lottery conducted in New South Wales for its opera house, or any of the others are in the same street. I think that if we took a census of public opinion about 90 per cent of the people in this State would think only in terms of "Tatts". There is no happy name that we can give to a State lottery that will automatically advertise itself to people who want to invest.

Mr. Ryan: That is not to say they are not just as popular.

Mr. SHANNON: There will have to be some ratio to encourage the investor that he has some chance to win: not the 200,000 to 1 first prize, because that will not entice him. Tattersalls has a range of chances to each ticket—one chance in 48 of winning a prize in one lottery; 67 chances to 1 in another, and in the popular lottery, 97 chances to one. The poor person can afford only the lower-priced ticket. The wealthy chap puts in £2 and has one chance in 48: the little fellow has one chance in 97. We have not been told what will happen with this State's lottery, and have no idea of the ratio of chances that will be given to an investor. All honourable members realize that competition has to be met, and the investor will have to be encouraged to put his money into the lottery.

Mr. Casey: This is a pretty competitive world.

Mr. SHANNON: Highly competitive. Mr. Drysdale, a knowledgeable man, undertook to run a lottery for the Tasmanian Government with Hadley's Hotel as first prize. He did not have much success, and eventually the Government lost its goodwill to Victoria. Agents will have to be appointed here to sell tickets, as people cannot be expected to invest in a lottery by reading a small advertisement in the *Advertiser*.

Mr. McKee: Agents are simple enough to set up.

Mr. SHANNON: I have not suggested they are not, but they have some impact on the public reaction to this type of legislation. Agents work on commission and it is customary to appoint any reputable small shopkeeper as an agent. In Western Australia one has only to walk one block to pass no less than six agents, all alleging that he is the lucky one. That will become rampant in South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: They are not frowned upon.

Mr. SHANNON: The betting shops that we had in the late thirties were not frowned upon before they were established, but I am absolutely certain that after the public had a taste of them, they were not only frowned upon but the Butler Government was booted out of office largely because of betting shops.

Mr. Quirke: Don't tell them that.

Mr. SHANNON: They should know. I am quoting from history and want Government members to know the way in which they are heading and what will happen as a result. The question that is proposed to be asked is not so inexact as is suggested by the member for Mitcham. It is too exact for me. Two words in the question give the Government an open cheque: "by or" leave the Government free to allow private enterprise or anyone else to operate a lottery. The sky is the limit.

Mr. Ryan: You were praising Tattersalls for its integrity.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not remember praising anyone that owns a lottery, because when I have an interest in a ticket I know I have little chance of collecting. One prize is a free ticket in the next lottery, and perhaps a person may win a major prize with that free ticket. Under the question to be put to the public, the honourable member for Port Pirie could become a promoter. The wording of this question could not deny anyone, if they had the goodwill of the Government, the right to set up a lottery. That is how wide it is, and that is why I am not particularly enamoured of the referendum or of promoting it. "Promotion" is a good word. How many

members remember the promotion of one of the most grandiose schemes since the South Sea Island bubble? This scheme was in South Australia, and Mr. O'Grady was the promoter. Many people had itchy fingers over the matter, and I am afraid their fingers will continue to itch about it. "Promotion" has a connotation that to my mind is not particularly favourable. If this measure provided for a referendum to ask the straight-out question whether people favoured the State Government's establishing a lottery under certain fixed conditions, it would be difficult to oppose it. I do not want to ask anyone this question, however, as I shall vote on the matter here.

Much strong language is sometimes used about the evils of gambling and drink, but these things are bad only when they are excessive. I believe that things making for the enjoyment of life are of sufficient importance to the individual that if they are within his financial limit he should have them, so I have no objection to modest amusement within the reach of the individual. However, we will be the last State in this field, which is a tremendous handicap. A lottery will not be any good to the Government or to charity if it is not profitable, and to be profitable there must be sufficient turnover. The lottery gambler likes to know his fate as early as possible; he does not like to wait for a fortnight or a month for a lottery to be drawn. This State is small numerically compared with New South Wales and even Queensland, so there will be delays in drawing.

Mr. McKee: Western Australia is a numerically small State, but its lottery is successful.

Mr. SHANNON: But Western Australia is isolated.

Mr. McKee: So is South Australia.

Mr. SHANNON: It is squeezed alongside the Eastern States, and it will take at least five times as long to fill a lottery here as it does in Victoria.

Mr. McKee: Do you know how much money goes out of this State annually for lotteries?

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think it is germane, and in any case a large percentage of it will still go out of this State because the post office cannot be stopped from accepting letters for interstate lotteries. People will still send away because they will learn the result quicker, and with the increased competition the prizes will probably be raised and no profit will be left for this State.

Mr. Hudson: That may be why the words "by or" are included.

Mr. SHANNON: Let me point out to the honourable member what door he is opening. After thoroughly investigating the prospects, this Government may decide to employ some other agent. That can be done under this measure.

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. SHANNON: Will the proportion that will go to charity and into prizes be set out? It is not stated.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): Although I support the second reading, I wish to state at the outset that I am strongly opposed to a lottery—let there be no misunderstanding about it. However, I believe I can support this Bill. There has been some cross-fire about whether we are supporting a lottery or whether we are supporting a Bill to introduce a referendum. We are discussing only the latter, but I wish nevertheless to make clear my position in relation to lotteries. To those who are trying to convince me that my attitude may make a difference to me politically or affect me in my district, I point out that those statements have been made time and time again, and the majority of my electors know precisely where I stand in this matter. Once when I was approached about this matter I said, "This is a principle of mine. If I do not sacrifice it, will you pass me over?" There was no answer.

I believe a lottery is dishonest, deceitful and undesirable. I believe it can be advantageous only to the promoter and that nobody else can gain anything from it. It has been said that the Government will make something out of a lottery but, if that is so, it is to the discredit of the Government, because the public cannot win.

Mr. Freebairn: That is how the New South Wales Government lost its life!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) put it, one individual wins to the detriment of thousands; the public cannot win. Returning to the question of a lottery for the State, I believe that South Australia could not profit by having a lottery, because (as the honourable member who has just resumed his seat made it clear) lotteries in the other States are well established, and, of course, the people in those States have been accustomed to dealing with, say, Tattersalls for years, and will continue to deal with it. I have seen the lotteries operating in other States, and they are undesirable and deceitful. Every few steps we see somebody advertising lottery tickets, with some display

leading us to believe that, by buying a lottery ticket at that particular place, we cannot miss.

Mr. Quirke: We can't win!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That is the whole point.

Mr. Quirke: Everybody knows they are only gimmicks.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not convinced that, by going in to buy a lottery ticket, people will overcome all the difficulties that confront them.

Mr. Quirke: I live in constant hope.

Mr. Jennings: So do I, but I've never taken a ticket.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It spurs them on, only to die in despair. In spite of all this, however, I am prepared to support a referendum, because I am a member of the Australian Labor Party. Our Party is prepared to welcome into its membership people of all religious beliefs and with different outlooks, provided they subscribe to a certain policy. Therefore, our Party is not prepared to bind its members on any social question whatsoever, and it leaves its members entirely free to vote as they wish on social questions. Our Party is not prepared to force the Government to say "Yea" or "Nay" on any social question, and so any such question may be decided by way of referendum. While I am strongly opposed to a lottery, I have no right to force my views on this matter on the rest of the people.

As a Minister, I shall accept (possibly regretfully, but I hope with joy) the decision of the people on this question. It has been said today that an elector will not have the opportunity to take sides on this question, but that is rather a weak argument, because a person can go to the polling booth and simply have his name crossed out, without casting a vote at all. Therefore, the undecided will remain undecided, if they wish. I was delighted to hear the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) refer to the Royal Commission in 1936, and while my views are practically the same today as they were then, I could not (and would not with any certainty) say what the outcome of a referendum would be, because we do not know what the public is thinking at this moment.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't looked at the Gallup poll taken 12 months ago.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The change in outlook in regard to many social questions since 1936 has been considerable. Therefore, I believe that this is an opportune time for

a test, and a test can be made. Being a democrat, and a member of a democratic Party, I believe that this is one opportunity to let the people decide for themselves, and I sincerely hope (and make this declaration now) that if a referendum is granted I shall be working for a "No" vote.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(Second reading debate adjourned on August 3. Page 796.)

Bill read a second time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause extending testamentary capacity to persons not under the age of 18.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

New clause 5a.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move to insert the following new clause:

5a. Sections 5, 6 and 6a of the principal Act are repealed and the following section is inserted in the principal Act in lieu thereof:

5. (1) No will made by any person under the age of eighteen years shall be valid.

(2) Subsection (1) of this section shall not apply to a will of a person who died before the date of the commencement of the Wills Act Amendment Act, 1965, but shall apply to a will of a person who dies after that date (whether the will was executed before or after that date) and sections 5, 6 and 6a of this Act, as in force immediately before the commencement of the Wills Act Amendment Act, 1965, shall continue to apply to a will of a person who died before the date of commencement of the Wills Act Amendment Act, 1965, as if that Act had not come into operation.

This amendment makes a substantial alteration to the law, in that it provides that a person of 18 years of age or over may make a will. At present, one must be 21 years of age or over before one legally has testamentary capacity. I urge briefly some arguments for lowering the age of testamentary capacity to 18. There is already a provision that servicemen on active duty may make a will before the age of 21 during time of war. Apart from that, 21 years is an arbitrary age fixed I do not know how long ago, but certainly it appeared in the Wills Act of 1837, and in the

original British Wills Act, of which ours is substantially a copy. Nowadays, however, that is too old. People younger than that are now earning good incomes and are, therefore, acquiring assets. The age at which people marry customarily nowadays is lower than it used to be, many being married before they are 21, and it seems only right and proper that they should be entitled to dispose of their property by will should they die before reaching the age of 21. In my view, they are capable of doing so, and the time has come for us to recognize what is, I suppose, the earlier maturity of our community by giving testamentary capacity to those under 21 and over 18. My amendment seeks to substitute 18 for 21 in the relevant section of the Wills Act, which means that a person will in future be able to make his will on the day before his 18th birthday. I made mine on the day before my 21st birthday, my first opportunity of doing so.

This amendment is in line with one made in Victoria a few months ago, where the age was lowered to 18 in precisely the same way as I now propose. New subsection (2) states:

Subsection (1) of this section shall not apply to a will of a person who died before the date of the commencement of the Wills Act Amendment Act, 1965, but shall apply to a will of a person who dies after that date,

even though the will is executed before this Act comes into operation. The Bill affects only what happens after the date on which the Act comes into operation. I commend this amendment to the Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The Government is happy to accept this amendment. It is Government policy that the age for the making of a valid will should be decreased to 18 years. The only reason why this was not originally included in this measure was that the Parliamentary Draftsman was instructed to consider the implications of generally giving capacity in numbers of ways to people of the age of 18 years rather than 21. It had originally been intended that this amendment be introduced as part of a comprehensive measure affecting other modes of dealing with property and assets by people under the age of 21.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, September 1, at 2 p.m.