HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 24, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

MILK DISPUTE.

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what progress has been made in negotiations to settle the strike in the metropolitan milk distribution system that has been inconveniencing so many people in the last few days?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although Conciliation Commissioner Gough, who is attending to this matter, brought the organizations together in a compulsory conference, I have not heard whether the dispute has been completely settled, but it was indicated yesterday that the position might be resolved in time for normal cartage to be resumed from tonight.

HOVERCRAFT.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Marine further information about a hovercraft service to operate between Spencer Gulf ports?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Transport has supplied me with the following information:

For some time, Miss Sylvia Birdseye has been negotiating with me on the possibility of obtaining protection for a period of 10 years of a hovercraft service to be operated between Wallaroo and the West Coast. These discussions have been at some length and I have informed her that at present there is no legislation that would require licensing of hovercraft in the sense of control of transport. Consideration of the desirability of licensing would be dependent upon the time when hovercraft would be likely to operate in South Australia, which at the moment is rather indefinite. Transport control at present operates in this State effectively only in respect of road passenger services, but under the provisions of the Road and Railway Transport Act, licences in respect of freight carriage will expire in 1968, and thereafter the roads will be completely open for freight carriage. This is the position pending the time when further legislation is introduced and passed following the report of the Royal Commission on State Transport Services.

It follows that, at the moment, there can be no guarantee of protection in respect of a licence involving control for a period of 10 years. Even if legislation existed effectively to control transport, it is doubtful whether any Government could give a guarantee for such a long period. I advised Miss Birdseye that these matters were not placed before her in any way to be obstructive, but to draw her attention to matters which will clearly need full consideration in deciding whether or not she will purchase a hovercraft. At the same time I have indicated that I, together with my officers, will be available for further discussions to assist her in any possible way. In addition, be it Miss Birdseye or some other person interested in a hovercraft service, it is necessary that they fully study the economics involved. The smallest hovercraft available, having a seating capacity of 38 passengers, would cost to land in South Australia, with the necessary spares, in excess of $300,000. Further inquiries made by my officers indicate that hovercraft are an expensive craft to operate, using considerable quantities of jet fuel per mile. This is an added expense over normal running. To be an economical proposition, the hovercraft would need an extremely high density of use, which is of some doubtful quantity at the present time. It also involves the possibility of increased fares.

There is no doubt that there will be a place for hovercraft operations in this State in the future, but the problem is as to whether now is the time to establish them. It should be borne clearly in mind that the Government is not taking an unconstructive attitude in this matter and that every step is being taken to assist Miss Birdseye. Undoubtedly, by being able to move from Adelaide to Wallaroo by motor transport or by rail, and then to cut across the gulf to Cowell by hovercraft, and then to Port Lincoln by motor vehicle, would mean a considerable saving of time, and I will give Miss Birdseye every assistance possible to help achieve this service if it is economically possible to do so. However, one of her major difficulties is the question of protection; at the moment the Government possesses limited legislation for the control of transport, and this in itself makes the position extremely difficult.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indeed pleased that the Minister of Marine in the Socialist Government is giving such encouragement to private enterprise to establish a service of this nature in South Australia. I think that some of the other Ministers in the Government would not give such encouragement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not reflect on other Ministers when asking a question.

Mr. Ryan: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is it the intention of the Minister to recommend to the Government the introduction of legislation on this matter, and does he consider it necessary to have a system of licensing for these craft?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member will realize that his question comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Transport. From conversations I have had with the Minister in regard to this important matter I know that he is giving serious consideration to what may be requirements in respect to legislation regarding this and other facilities for the purpose of the operation of hovercraft; that is,

provided that the people intending to operate such craft consider that it will be an economic venture.

WHYALLA RAILWAY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, concerning the topic on which a question has just been asked—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must obtain leave to make a statement.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask leave to explain briefly the question I intend to ask the Premier. I should like to know whether the Government will renew negotiations with the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner that commenced some time ago, and ascertain whether the Commissioner is now in a position to extend the railway line from Port Augusta to Whyalla. The Commissioner, having previously expressed favour for this proposal, has completed surveys made in connection with it. If the extension were effected, I do not think the South Australian Government would be involved in any additional cost whatsoever. The extension would provide what, after all, is our second largest country town with a direct railway route to the metropolitan area and to the consumers of the products made at Whyalla. Will the Premier again take up with the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner the question of extending the railway line from Port Augusta to Whyalla?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to take up that matter, and shall inform the honourable member as soon as the information is to hand.

ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. LAWN: I noticed in yesterday's press a statement by the Victorian Premier (Sir Henry Bolte) that Victoria had obtained a rolling stock contract. Will the Premier obtain from the Minister of Transport information about whether any contracts have been let to the Islington railway workshops with regard to railway rolling stock?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know that the South Australian Railways, in open tender, has received a contract approved by the Commonwealth Government for the construction of 86 bogey sheep vans for the standard gauge project at a cost of about $1,000,000. This work will be done at the Islington railway workshops.

PENNESHAW PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of about a fortnight ago relating to lavatories at the school residence and primary school at Penneshaw?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Advice has been received from the Public Buildings Department that it is proposed to undertake improvements to the toilets both at the school and residence with departmental labour. Work is currently programmed to commence about the end of October this year. Every effort will be made to achieve an earlier commencing date, but this will depend on the completion of jobs to which the department is already committed.

ELIZABETH SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. CLARK: As the Premier knows, for some time I have been interested in the wish of the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth to acquire a privately owned Olympic swimming pool for the benefit of the citizens there, and in its request to the Government for financial assistance towards making this purchase. Can the Premier say whether a decision has been made on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: An application has been made and a subsidy granted towards the cost of acquiring a privately owned Olympic swimming pool at Elizabeth. I am pleased to inform the honourable member that I have given approval for a Government subsidy on a $1 for $1 basis to a maximum of $9,000, to be payable at $3,000 for the financial year 1966-67 and for the succeeding two years. Under certain conditions it will be necessary for His Worship the Mayor to obtain the necessary certificates concerning the purchase of this pool.

GUM TREES.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether there has been any development following yesterday's motion for adjournment on the subject of the retention of the red gums on Montacute Road?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the Minister of Roads is fully aware of what transpired in this House yesterday, as far as I am aware he has had no reason as yet to change his decision that the trees should be removed and, in fact, that decision still stands.

Mr. LAWN: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain from his colleague whether about 30 acres of land was recently cleared in the vicinity of the gum trees

that were the subject of the debate in the House yesterday? If such a clearing occurred, will the Minister ascertain how many trees were destroyed during that clearing and whether the Minister of Roads received any protest concerning that destruction? Further, will he inquire what alternatives to his present decision were available to the Minister?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain that information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I may say that, in view of what was said in the House yesterday, I was extremely disappointed to hear that the Minister of Roads did not intend to alter his decision. Will the Minister of Lands, therefore, make personal representations and use his personal influence with his colleague, in view of what was said in the House yesterday on the question of these trees, to make an independent examination of all the alternatives and to come to his own independent decision on whether these trees should remain, or not?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not, because I am not aware of all the factors involved in this issue, as was the case with a number of members who spoke on it in the House yesterday. Some members admitted they had not visited the area. In fact, some said they had never seen it, whilst others said they had not been there for three or four years. Regarding the request for an independent decision in connection with my colleague's own assessment of the situation, I point out that this has already been made and it has been conveyed to the honourable member that my colleague personally visited the area and, even though his visit was for only an hour and a half, he made it at the most important time of the day and from it he gained knowledge and observed facts about the situation that undoubtedly had a bearing on the decision he has taken. He has already done all the things requested by the honourable member. Therefore, I am not prepared, as the honourable member suggested, to use my good offices to convince my colleague that he has not done his homework in this particular matter.

Mrs. STEELE: It is apparent from the answers given to the two previous questions that the Minister has not seen this afternoon's press, wherein it is stated that 40 red gums will be saved and that this announcement was made by the spokesman of the Campbelltown council, which is to be the authority to carry out the execution next Monday morning. If it is apparent from this report that 40 gums at least can be saved, I suggest that somebody has looked at the alternative proposals that have been discussed in this House and outside. Therefore, in view of this new development of which he is obviously unaware, I ask the Minister again whether he will take up this matter with the Minister of Roads.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has suggested, I am unaware of the turn of events regarding 40 trees being saved on the authority of the Campbelltown council. In view of this, I am prepared to convey the honourable member's remarks to my colleague. However, I want to make it quite clear to the House that I am one who would not for one moment want any trees destroyed if this course could be avoided, and I think the honourable member would appreciate this. Nevertheless, I sincerely believe that the Minister of Roads, in this case, applied himself to the problem, which was not an easy one and which is still not an easy problem despite what the honourable member has said about 40 trees being saved. In fact, the Minister had to make what I consider to be an extremely difficult decision, which he has made after long and serious consideration of the matter.

PORT PIRIE OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Education say when the occupation centre at Port Pirie will be opened and, if he cannot, will he obtain a report on the matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has advised that work on the Port Pirie Occupation Centre will be completed by Friday, September 2, 1966, with the exception of the connection of a drain to the town stormwater drainage system. Owing to tidal conditions, this connection will not be made until late December, but this will not prevent the operation of the centre. A teacher has been appointed to the centre, which will open at the commencement of the third term, namely, September 12, 1966.

PHOSPHATE SEARCH.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received a letter from the representative of the tuna fishing interests in Port Lincoln drawing my attention to the fact that a licence has been granted to a company to prospect for phosphates. The area included in this licence falls directly within the area where the tuna fishing vessels operate from Port Lincoln. He points out in this letter that the fishermen are a little concerned to know the basis of the prospecting operation. The press report on the matter

suggests that underwater television may be used. However, the fishermen are concerned to know whether explosives may be used and, if not for this particular operation, in the event of a licence to search for other minerals (possibly oil or gas) being granted in similar areas, just what this may involve for the fishing interests.

Will the acting Minister of Agriculture draw the attention of the Minister of Mines to this request? The fishermen do not wish to be obstructive in the matter or to raise unnecessary alarm, but they would like to know just what may be involved in this lease or other similar leases and whether or not the Minister of Mines would have a look at it with a view to endeavouring to reconcile, if possible, the interests of the fishermen and those of the people searching for minerals.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to convey the honourable member's request to my colleague and obtain what information I can on the matter.

LIFE JACKETS.

Mr. CASEY: Last week I asked the Minister of Works to bring before Cabinet the question of the advisability of the use of life jackets by people using fishing boats and other small craft in South Australian waters. Has this matter been before Cabinet? If it has, does the Minister now have any information for me?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, I promised the honourable member that I would take the matter to Cabinet. However, I overlooked the fact that this was one of the terms of reference of the committee set up to inquire into the registration of certain small craft and other associated matters. I have been advised that the committee has made inquiries on this matter and that it will make a recommendation soon.

EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAYS.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Earlier this session I asked the Premier about the state of the railway line at Lock. Does he now have a reply to this question?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have a report which states that the lines on the Eyre Peninsula railway system are subject to constant inspection and a substantial amount has been expended with a view to improving the physical standard of the track. The approximate expense on account of maintenance for the financial year ended June 30 last was $909,000, and it is expected that the sum to be spent during the current financial year will be comparable with that figure.

VICTORIA SQUARE FOUNTAIN.

Mr. LAWN: A statement appeared in yesterday's *News* concerning the fountain to be erected in Victoria Square which read:

It is understood that about 50 trees would have to be removed to make way for the diagonal roadways through each corner of the square.

In view of the discussion that took place in this House yesterday, it is clear that a number of members are opposed to the destruction of trees. Will the Minister of Lands say whether consideration can be given to the decision made by his predecessor to close Victoria Square, and will he see whether it is possible to revoke that decision because of the possible destruction of trees?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In my opinion, it would not be possible to revoke the decision of my predecessor because it would be dealt with under the Roads Opening and Closing Act. The Surveyor-General would transmit his decision to the Minister who, after making his decision, would transmit it to the Governor in Council. It would then receive the consent of the Governor and, therefore, I do not consider that the decision can be revoked. Nor do I think that, in the light of progress that has already been made, such action would be desirable.

FLATS.

Mr. COUMBE: Yesterday I sought information from the Premier in his capacity as Minister of Housing on the decision of the Housing Trust to stop standard flat building last year. The Minister said that the Government had not instructed the Housing Trust to cease building standard flats. At the same time, he could not give me further and valid reasons for this action. Therefore, will he obtain a report setting out the reasons for the cessation of the programme of standard flat building that was so successfully carried on by the previous Government? Further, will he advise if and when it is planned to resume building standard flats in the metropolitan area and in other districts?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain the necessary information for the honourable member.

GILBERT RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: At present, traffic uses the temporary bridge over the Gilbert River at Hamley Bridge under certain difficulties. The approaches are steep, and representations have been made to me that this year, in the likely event of a large harvest in the Hamley Bridge

district, it will be difficult for laden wheat trucks to negotiate the temporary bridge. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether the new bridge being built over the Gilbert River at Hamley Bridge can be completed before harvest?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

RENMARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CURREN: It was announced some months ago that plans had been prepared for a solid construction building to replace the present structures at the Renmark Primary School. As the project was examined and reported on favourably by the Public Works Committee, can the Minister of Education say why this project has not been included in the Loan works programme for the current year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Works Standing Committee heard evidence on the proposal to erect a two-storey, thirteen-classroom primary school building at Renmark on November 4, 1965. The committee inspected the site on February 22, 1966, and recommended the construction of the new building at an estimated cost of $340,000, on March 22, 1966. Further action in this matter is now dependent upon the availability of funds and, as this is a replacement building, it has not been given a high priority due to the need for new schools in rapidly developing areas.

MALAYAN STUDIES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the teaching of Malay and Malay Social Studies?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In connection with several statements made by the honourable member in introducing her question last week, I am informed that Malay A is taught in teachers colleges at evening sessions, so that teachers college students and teachers in the service may attend. Malay B is available for students only this year, but will probably be offered to teachers as well next year. There has been no increase in staff teaching Malay in teachers colleges. No consideration has been given to introducing a third-year course in Malay. Dealing with the honourable member's question, Malay was taken by Leaving Honours students in four high schools in 1964 and 1965. Because students in matriculation classes must study intensively for the matriculation examination in their fifth year, Malay has temporarily been dropped in high schools.

Consideration is being given to the re-introduction of Malay as a subject in high schools and to its introduction in technical high schools. In high schools this is related to the abolition of the Intermediate Public Examinations Board examination, and the consequent revision of high school courses. Malay will probably be introduced initially in fifth-year non-matriculation classes as part of a unit comprising Asian Social Studies. It will probably be introduced later in fourth-year and then in third-year classes. No recommendation has been made by the Education Department to the Public Examinations Board and, in the opinion of departmental officers, there is little likelihood of Malay being included in P.E.B. courses in the near future.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. BURDON: The *Sunday Mail* of last week headlined that the Clerk of the District Council of Penola said that he had not been misquoted by the newspaper. The intended inference was that this was a contradiction of a statement given to this House by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. I have read the Minister's statement and he did not say that the Clerk of the district council had been misquoted. Has the Minister made any other statement to which the article in the *Sunday Mail* could have referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I have not. The statement I made to the House last week was completely accurate, and it seems somewhat strange journalism to put in a headline that is obviously intended to mislead by suggesting that the Clerk is alleged to have been misquoted by me when I have made no such statement. Mr. Morrell, the Clerk, rang me following the publication of the article last Sunday to express his disturbance at the fact that the *Sunday Mail* had chosen to print the article in the way it had. He said that he had not been misquoted by the *Sunday Mail* and acknowledged that I never said he had been. He made it clear to me that while he had said to the *Sunday Mail* that he had not been misquoted, he certainly dissociated himself and the council from the tone of the original *Sunday Mail* article and its contents.

RELIEF PAYMENTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Supplementary relief given by what was known as the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department was based on two factors, the upper limit being established by the basic wage. Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether this assistance has been increased

as a result of the recent increase in the basic wage, or has the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, by increasing the pension, been taken into account to reduce the amount paid as supplementary assistance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No change has so far been made in the amount of public relief given, other than that certain of the means test qualifications have been relaxed. Certain disqualification factors that previously obtained under the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board are no longer disqualifying factors in granting public relief. Under the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board it was a practice, under the policy by direction of the previous Minister (because under the Maintenance Act public relief was granted at the direction of the Minister by the board), that income standards were fixed for families of varying sizes and these standards differed on the basis of whether Commonwealth pensions were paid or not. There was a different standard for those who were not on Commonwealth pensions from those who were, as to the total allowable income for the family. The amounts chosen appeared to have been quite arbitrary; they were not based on getting to the basic wage standard but appeared to be quite arbitrary figures. I have been unable to determine (and I have been into the history of this matter) precisely how those figures were arrived at. As a result of this, I found a number of anomalies were occurring in the payment of relief. The system obtaining when we took office was that there were these arbitrary allowable income standards, and the department paid the difference between the actual income from all sources, including child endowment and the allowable income standard, dependent upon the amount of rent being paid. If $6 a week rent was not being paid, the allowable amount was reduced.

We found so many anomalies in this system that a comprehensive study of the relief given in all States in the Commonwealth was made, and the whole matter was referred, as the first question to be determined and advised upon, to the Social Welfare Advisory Council, which is currently investigating the matter. In the meantime, I have directed that under no circumstances are reductions in the amount of public relief to take place. Under the previous Government, when the Commonwealth pension was increased, because that increased the income coming into the family, it reduced the difference between the allowable income standard and the amount coming in, and so public relief was reduced. That has not happened under this Government, and I have directed that it does not happen in these circumstances. As the Social Welfare Advisory Council's proposals on reform of the public relief system are not yet ready, I have asked the Director to prepare immediately some alterations to the income standards, so that allowances are made for the alterations in the basic wage and the proposed alterations in the Commonwealth pension system, and so that the graver anomalies will immediately be reduced.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In his answer, the Minister said that information was being obtained from other States. Can he say whether the Government intends to bring the standard of assistance in this State down to the level of what might be considered the Australian standard? The assistance that has been given to large families in South Australia over a long period has been much higher than that given in other States, although the relief given to small families has been fairly standard. The New South Wales Government at no time gave any assistance, above the bare basic wage, even to large families, whereas in South Australia assistance was given in excess of the basic wage to large families under certain conditions. Will the Minister be prepared to disregard the standards in other States if it is found that the Australian standard of assistance is lower than that already applying in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have already indicated that I thought that the standard in South Australia obtaining under the previous Government was inadequate, so I believe the honourable member can take it as axiomatic that it will certainly not be reduced. With regard to obtaining information from other States, this was done for the purpose of ensuring that we had the best information possible about the method of administration in this fairly complex field, because it is essential that our public relief assistance be fitted into the gaps in Commonwealth social services (and they are very real gaps) so that those people in need will get the best possible assistance. There has been no reduction in South Australian public relief; in fact, there has been an extension of it under this Government and we intend, so far as we are able within the financial limitations of the State, to give the best public assistance we can.

Certain things are done better in other States than they are done here, and certain other qualifications regarding public relief

in South Australia do not always obtain in the other States. Public relief was very much more recoverable in South Australia than was the case in other States. We have a further difficulty in South Australia in that we have maintenance recoveries through the same department as provides public relief. This position does not always obtain in the other States. Also, we have difficulties in fitting maintenance recoveries and relief payments in together. It is quite an administrative problem, which the Social Welfare Advisory Council is examining and will advise upon. However, I assure the honourable member that there is no question of reducing any South Australian relief because some other State may have an inferior system.

PHOSPHATE ROCK.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last month I asked the Premier what action was being taken to foster the use of local deposits of phosphate rock, to which the Premier, in part, replied:

My colleague, the Minister of Mines, reports that local deposits of phosphate rock are relatively small: the total known tonnage in five separate deposits does not exceed a few hundred thousand. This material is relatively low grade in usable calcium phosphate, and moreover has such large quantities of iron and aluminium that it cannot be treated for the production of superphosphates.

I was pleased to read in the *Advertiser* of August 13 a statement that phosphate deposits at Moculta, near Angaston, were to be mined to supply fertilizer for agriculture, and that the indications were that the deposits there were sufficient and of suitable grade to produce the required product. A new kiln would be moved into position on the following Monday. Can the Premier say what are the known quantities of phosphate rock at Moculta, and whether the industry referred to in the *Advertiser* is to be established at Moculta itself or in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As there seem to be some conflicting views concerning this matter, and rather than further complicate the issue, I will endeavour to obtain the information required, and ask the Mines Department to check the position. However, I think the process to be used is entirely different from the one normally used.

MARINO ROCKS SEWERAGE.

Mr. HUDSON: Some time ago I approached the Minister of Works in connection with the introduction of a sewerage scheme to serve Ruth Court and Emma Street, Marino Rocks. This scheme has been under consideration, but some of the local residents have recently been a little disturbed because of the overflow of effluent from the existing septic tanks. Will the Minister therefore take up the matter with his officers, and ascertain whether or not a decision on the scheme will be reached soon?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to do that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. G. A. BYWATERS.

Mr. BROOMHILL moved:

That two weeks' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Murray (Hon. G. A. Bywaters), on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

OMBUDSMAN.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing in this State the office of Ombudsman.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1138.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I listened with interest to the reasons given by the honourable member who moved this motion and by the member who seconded it for the necessity for the appointment of an ombudsman in South Australia. With great respect to them, I think that a number of criticisms could be made of the conclusions they drew from their researches, since the position in the South Australian Parliament pertaining to matters of public complaint is very different indeed from the position that applies in the United Kingdom Parliament and in the National Parliament of New Zealand. Quite different considerations obtain here, and it was for those reasons that the Government felt it should not rush into any proposals for the appointment of an ombudsman until it had examined the experience in those other countries and seen whether, in fact, that had any specific reference to the conditions that obtained here. But, Sir, this is not a motion for the appointment of an ombudsman, although it might well have seemed from the way in which it was debated by the mover and the honourable member for Albert that that was what it was intended to be: it is a motion for the appointment of a Select Committee to examine the question.

What can a Select Committee do about it? A Select Committee is useful to this House if, in fact, it can meet and obtain evidence readily available in South Australia from witnesses

who can give evidence from their experience and research which can be enlightening to the House, and the members of the committee can then draw conclusions from that evidence and make recommendations thereon. Where is that evidence to come from in South Australia, Mr. Speaker?

The position is, of course, that every member of this House has available to him the kind of material from which the honourable members for Mitcham and Albert have quoted. The Select Committee would have no more than that available to it. What then can such a committee achieve? If in fact we had some expert witnesses who could give personal opinions and who had wide experience in this matter which they could present on oath and be cross-examined on before a committee, that might be a very different matter indeed; but there are none of these in South Australia, and certainly none were mentioned by the honourable members to whom I referred. Where would such people be?

In these circumstances, it seems to me that a Select Committee would be a waste of time and money. Researches into this matter, if they are to go beyond the kind of material that is readily available to members, must be made overseas, because there is no ready evidence available in South Australia on this subject. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I oppose the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): We have just heard the Attorney-General summarily dismiss the idea of appointing a Select Committee in this matter. When I was in Victoria last February the Victorian Government had just sent a committee to New Zealand to inquire into this matter. On speaking to those members on their return I found that they were rather enthusiastic about the idea.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They spent all their trust funds.

Mr. McANANEY: Victoria has not been quite as bold as the Government of this State, in terms of money spent per head of population. As I say, those members were rather taken with the service that this ombudsman was giving to the New Zealand Parliament. It is to be hoped that action will be taken on this matter in Victoria soon, and that if the Attorney-General does not consider that a Select Committee is necessary here he will at least make use of all this information that he says is available in the library and in other places to form an opinion of his own on the desirability of an ombudsman. It is something that I consider is necessary.

Under our system here a member can ask questions and in many instances can ferret out information and thereby solve problems of his constituents. However, there are many cases in which he cannot do that, and I shall quote one instance where I think an ombudsman could have played a valuable part. When a Bill in connection with the River Murray Commission was before this Parliament certain provisions were made regarding the payment of compensation for land that was inundated. Under those provisions, a claim had to be lodged within a certain time. A number of people around Lake Alexandrina who were affected by flooding approached the South Australian Government with a view to obtaining compensation, but the Government was not at any time prepared to negotiate or even discuss the matter.

Although this is pure supposition, it could have been that the Government was trying to delay the matter until the period of five years or 10 years (whatever it was) had elapsed and those people could no longer have an effective claim. The matter had to go before an arbitrator, and considerable expense was involved before a decision was brought down. The magistrate who had charge of the case was very critical of the Government for its unwillingness to negotiate at any stage. It is in cases such as this that an appeal to an ombudsman could be made.

Since I have been a member of this Parliament we have dealt with legislation that permits the Potato Marketing Board to issue licences to potato washers provided those people comply with certain conditions. However, certain discretion was given to the board whereby if it considered that the issue of such a licence was not in the public interest it need not grant it. Undoubtedly, there is provision for an appeal to the Supreme Court, which can reverse a decision. In actual practice, the board has refused licences to washers because it maintains that a person cannot have a wholesale licence if he has a washer's licence, for it considers that that is not in the public interest.

Similarly, a co-operative has a washing plant but has not been granted a licence as a wholesaler because it already has a licence for washing. I have asked the people concerned why they do not appeal to the Supreme Court and endeavour to prove that it is not against the public interest to have both licences, but they say that it is too expensive. I think this is an instance of bureaucratic control, and that in such a case an ombudsman could serve some useful purpose. If we can

cut out a middleman and another person handling an article it must result in a cheaper article, and it must be in the public interest if something can be provided at a lower cost.

I believe there are many instances like this in which an ombudsman could play a part. Such a person could examine all relevant matters and reach a practical solution, and for that reason I support the motion. I think it is no longer possible for Premiers to argue that the present administrative systems or procedures or methods of redress are unique or so superior that there is no need for a remedy of this nature. The Professor of Politics in the Monash University said:

For every Government which has adopted the office of Ombudsman has simply responded to a condition which affects all Governments, the chronic dispostion of bureaucracy to commit the occasional error.

Who would blame bureaucracy if it committed an occasional error? It has reached such a tremendous size that somewhere an injustice must be done; nobody is right more than 75 per cent of the time, and anybody who attains even that standard is a genius. Because such matters arise, there should be some quick, efficient and cheap method of handling the problems and ensuring necessary corrections and redress of grievances. In the cases I have mentioned it is not always possible for the local member to obtain the necessary information and accomplish what should be accomplished. I again quote from the article by Professor Davis:

I can well understand that public servants may feel some uneasiness from a first and unexplained encounter with this institution. But I am quite sure there is no foundation for their fears. The Ombudsman neither displaces nor threatens the status of any existing adminstrative or political figure. On the contrary, the annual reports of the New Zealand and Danish Ombudsmen make it perfectly plain that the Ombudsman is as much a protector of the public service against irresponsible calumny as he is a defender of the citizen.

Therefore, I consider this officer could operate in both ways and it could be to the advantage of the public service as well of the individual, because we all know there are some irresponsible claims made by people. To continue with the quote:

If public servants need a familiar parallel it is in the status and the duties of the existing Auditor-General. This officer has exercised comparable powers of investigation into the financial conduct of Government departments for a very long time without bringing about the ruin of the principle of Ministerial responsibility or disturbing the normal confidence in the administrative process.

Therefore, I consider that no municipal authority or public servant need fear that such an appointment would take any matters out of the hands of those responsible for making political decisions and deciding matters of policy. It is only where an occasional breakdown occurs that the need for an ombudsman exists. I strongly support the motion because I consider that the appointment of such an officer would benefit all sections of the community.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I notice that most honourable members have the same trouble as I have in pronouncing this word. It is an ugly word and I hope, if ever such an appointment is made, that a different name will be given to the office. The tendency seems to be to place an additional "s" in the middle of the word.

Mr. Quirke: I would say he would be called "the Bud".

Mr. CLARK: Many names could be suggested; possibly he could be called Parliamentary Commissioner or Commissioner-General. I thought the mover and seconder of the motion made good speeches, and that has not always applied in debates of this sort. They had obviously given the matter considerable thought and conducted much research because it was clear that they knew a great deal about the subject. I think (and the Attorney-General mentioned this) that most speakers dealt with the need for the appointment of such an officer rather than the need for appointing a Select Committee to investigate the proposal. I will not debate that matter, because I do not wish to incur your displeasure, Sir.

I am doubtful whether any speaker proved the need for the appointment of a Select Committee; in fact, I believe many of the points made proved that such a committee was not necessary. I am, and have been for some time, interested in this subject and, although I am not biased, I may be hard to convince on this matter. I am open to conviction. At the recent Parliamentary conference in Wellington (at which I had the honour to represent this Parliament) the question of appointing an ombudsman was fully discussed. Sixteen speeches were made on that subject and if honourable members wish to examine those speeches I shall be pleased to make the report available. I believe a copy would also be available from the Clerk of Parliaments as well as from the Parliamentary Library. The only person at the conference who presented a

precise definition of an ombudsman was Senator B. H. Dunuwille, Deputy President of the Senate of Ceylon. He said:

Ombudsman is the name given to an institution or individual charged with defending the rights of the individual citizen against the injustice of officials.

I suggest that that could be regarded as an adequate definition. While speaking of the conference, I was interested to note the statement of the Hon. R. J. Jordan, M.P., Minister of Forests, Lands and Mines for British Guiana (since independence I believe it is simply called Guyana). He stated that Guyana was the first country (or would be, following independence) in the British Commonwealth of Nations to write the office of ombudsman into the Constitution. I shall now quote direct from that constitution as presented by Mr. Jordan:

The ombudsman will have jurisdiction to investigate complaints regarding the Acts, omissions, decisions and recommendations of prescribed public bodies or authorities, including statutory corporations and governmental agencies and their officers or employees which affect the interests of individuals or bodies of persons. The ombudsman will be concerned with faults in administration. It will not be for him to criticize policy or to examine a decision on the exercise of discretionary powers until it appears to him that the decision has been affected by a fault in administration, which would include discrimination grounds.

We have nothing of that nature in our Constitution, and I do not think, after listening to question time today, that there can be any Parliament in the British Commonwealth that has such easy access to Ministers of the Crown as we have in South Australia. If honourable members were to investigate the position they would find that no Parliament in the British Commonwealth has a question time as unlimited as it is in this House. As I have said, 16 speeches were made at the conference dealing with the appointment of an ombudsman. The majority were probably in favour, some were against, and some luke-warm. Delegates who spoke came from New Zealand, Malta, the United Kingdom, British Guiana, Ceylon, Ontario, India, Trinidad and Tobago, West Nigeria, Tanzania, Ghana, and Kenya. After hearing the speeches, I was still not convinced of the need to appoint such an officer. I am not taking sides, but trying to inform the House of important statements made on this topic at the conference. I shall quote from two speakers, one for and one against, and what I want to say is best explained in the words of these speakers. The Hon. J. R. Marshall, M.P., Deputy Prime Minister of New Zealand, and Leader of the New Zealand delegation, was in favour of the appointment, and the Right Hon. Emanuel Shinwell, C.H., M.P., Leader of the United Kingdom delegation was opposed to it. Mr. Marshall made an excellent speech when he introduced the debate, and said:

Many of us in the executive arm of Government, as Ministers or members of Cabinet or Executive Councils, carry responsibility for the exercise of power. But the detailed administration of the powers of the State extend down and through the wide-ranging machinery of Government operated by officials within the limits of their delegated authority. This exercise of the powers of State involves tens of thousands of officials making hundreds of thousands of decisions affecting millions of people. Where power is exercised it may also be abused, deliberately, maliciously or carelessly—positively by wrong action, negatively by failure to act when action is called for. In Parliamentary democracy which is the common inheritance of us all in this otherwise diverse assembly—

I have grave doubts whether Parliamentary democracy was the inheritance of all the delegates that were there. It is certainly not in the present set-up of Ghana and Kenya. Mr. Marshall continued:

—there are several built-in safeguards against the abuse of power: the Parliamentary Opposition: questions in the House; petition to Parliament; the complaint to the local member or the Minister; the press and the letters to the editor; and in appropriate cases the legal processes of the court. In spite of these safeguards it was possible for an eminent British Judge, Lord Devlin, to say just a year ago, "I believe it to be generally recognized that in many of his dealings with the executive the citizen cannot get justice by process of law."

It also sometimes happens that the bureaucracy of a modern State and its Ministerial head, may from motives of self-defence or self-preservation, refuse to recognize an injustice or remedy it. There is nothing quite so impenetrable as a Government department with something to hide, and nothing quite so impenetrable as an experienced Minister on the defensive.

Mr. Marshall, as a Minister, has had experience, but in amplifying the point he told an amusing story of a Minister travelling in his car with his private secretary and they lost their way. They asked a man working in a paddock to tell them where they were, and he said; "You are in your car." The Minister turned to his secretary and said, "That is a perfect example of a Ministerial reply: it is brief, it is true, and it tells you nothing you did not know before you asked the question." Perhaps South Australia is an exception to that rule about Ministers.

Mr. Millhouse: And perhaps not.

Mr. CLARK: It depends on which Government is in power. Mr. Marshall gave details of the reasons why New Zealand introduced the office of ombudsman. He referred to the limitations under the New Zealand Act and said that the ombudsman was limited to matters of administration; his work did not extend to the review of legislative or Ministerial policy; he may act on a complaint in writing from a citizen or on his own volition; he said that formalities are kept to a minimum, and that the fee in New Zealand is £NZ1, a charge that has a slight brake on the frivilous or the crank but is not high enough to deny a genuine complaint. All members know of one or two gentlemen who in the past have persistently bombarded us with correspondence.

Mr. Quirke: You will never stop them.

Mr. CLARK: Perhaps they have a kink. The nearest example of the experiment of an ombudsman is in New Zealand. Mr. Marshall gave the actual figures of the number of cases that have come before the office in New Zealand since its inception, and said:

In the past three years the N.Z. Ombudsman has received 2,265 complaints, of which 858 were not proceeded with for want of jurisdiction or other good reasons; 286 were partially investigated and either withdrawn or otherwise satisfactorily disposed of; 1,010 were fully investigated and 196 were found to be justified and remedial action taken; 814 were not justified and were rejected; and 111 are still under investigation.

Of the 2,145 complaints investigated, 196, or less than 9 per cent, were justified. Perhaps it is too early to work out statistically the value of the ombudsman in New Zealand: whether it can ever be worked out statistically is doubtful. Much thought should be given to this matter before we take such a step. In concluding his speech, Mr. Marshall made a valid point, and said:

Interest in the office of ombudsman is spreading to many countries. In February of this year 16 countries from South-East Asia met in Bangkok at a Conference of Jurists under the auspices of the International Commission of Jurists and adopted a resolution which reads: In the light of the experience gained in Scandinavia and New Zealand, it is recommended that the nations of this region should examine the possibility of adopting the ombudsman concept as a means of facilitating the correction of administrative errors and to minimize the possibility of maladministration. While adaptation to local circumstances will be necessary, it is understood that the basic principles underlying such a concept are: the complete independence of the office from the executive; its full and untrammelled power, including access to files and the hearing of witnesses to investigate complaints against the administrative actions of the executive, and the limitations of its power to recommendations addressed to competent legislative and executive organs.

Mr. Marshall concluded by saying:

It is for each country to decide whether it wants this institution as a further safeguard for the protection of its citizens against the abuse of power. I say no more than that New Zealand has tried it and has found it is good for us.

I must admit that some of the delegates supported those sentiments entirely. However, all of the New Zealand delegates stressed that the type of office instituted for the ombudsman in that country might not be quite what is necessary or, indeed, suitable in another country that sought to adopt it. Even after hearing all the speakers, some delegates were not greatly convinced; some were not at all convinced. I now quote remarks made by Mr. Emanuel Shinwell, who did not really like the idea of an ombudsman. Honourable members may know that Mr. Shinwell, who could be described typically as the "old war horse", is over 80, but is still physically and mentally keen. He is a striking individualist, and the type of speaker one enjoys, whether one agrees with his views, or not. He began his speech thus:

I am a devoted follower and supporter of the United Kingdom Government but this proposal for an ombudsman fails to evoke any enthusiasm in my breast. It is, in effect, an admission that the criticism of politicians in various democratic assemblies is justified. That is its sole purpose. I know how dangerous it is to forecast, but I venture to predict that in the course of time, after this experiment has exhausted itself or is on the verge of exhausting itself, somebody will devise a scheme for appointing somebody to look after the ombudsman.

Mr. Shinwell went on to say:

Politicians are under attack everywhere—Indeed, we witnessed that only last night—no matter on which side of the House they happen to sit. Tory Governments have been under criticism in the U.K. for the last 13 years, and the Labor Government is under criticism now . . . There is no politician, however eminent, who can say with justification that at any time he has been immune from criticism. What is the effect of this proposal? It is to enable people to ask more questions than ever they did before, to ventilate more grievances than ever they did before, and to imagine grievances. That is what is going to happen.

Mr. Shinwell went on to suggest that we (including, I suppose, all members of Parliament) must not weakly accept criticism of politicians, which the appointment of an

ombudsman implies. He did not suggest we should be immune to criticism. In fact, he stated that during his years of political life he had always welcomed criticism and tried to answer it. He went on to say that there was always press criticism, criticism from electors and internal criticism as well, and added:

We should reach the point where, as a result of excessive, exaggerated and extravagant criticism of politicians, the electors will no longer believe in representative Government. That is a situation which is highly dangerous.

Although we may not agree with some of these statements by Mr. Shinwell, at least, together with those made by Mr. Marshall, they make us wonder about the matter. Mr. Shinwell added:

Do not let us indulge in myths; do not let us indulge in the creation of legends; do not let us assume that every now and again, some device has to be promoted, submitted and presented in order to solve the problems that confront the electorate in various parts of the world. A member of Parliament is elected by the electors in a democratic and constitutional fashion. It is his duty to approach Ministers in order to ventilate the grievances of his constituents, and, if he feels, he should have the right to raise the matter in the House; on the adjournment, or to go to a Minister, and, if you like to use the term, deliberately intimidate a Minister until the grievance is in some way corrected. If a member does his job effectively, properly and courageously, without fear or favour, then there is no need for any adventitious aid in the form of an ombudsman. If it is put into operation, then let us exercise the greatest caution in the implementation of the proposal.

Frankly, I do not agree with all that Mr. Shinwell said. Perhaps a happy medium exists somewhere between the statements made by Mr. Marshall and those made by Mr. Shinwell. Personally, I am inclined to agree more with Mr. Shinwell's remarks. The Hon. M. Lambert, M.P., of Canada, said:

I, too, wish to issue a word of caution. The principle of the ombudsman is overly deceptive. If we as Parliamentarians do our job properly and remember the real source of the problem is our own performance, and if we get rid of so many of these boards of final decisions and *quasi* judiciary bodies, I think we will have eliminated many of the causes that might lead to the appointment of an ombudsman.

A statement that caused much amusement at the conference was made by the Rev. C. K. Dovlo, M.P., the Leader of the Ghana delegation, who said in part:

It appears to me that the man required for such a high position must be of such calibre and quality that I do not think his talents should be wasted in this way; he should be doing something more constructive. In the African countries we have very few such men and we would want to use them better; so I don't think this is a system I I would recommend to my Government. We have other means of settling complaints and the limited number of capable people we have could be better employed.

From my observations at the conference, the honourable and reverend gentleman could not have made a truer statement. People in his country strongly support a single-Party State. Although many of us often think that such a system is advantageous, I think such thoughts would occur only in the heat of the moment. We certainly would not advocate such a system. I am not claiming that the people to whom I have referred are experts, although many of them are experts in Government. I think that the arguments these people put forward are worthy of consideration.

I will now talk about whether we need a Select Committee to look into this matter. Over the last few years I have read much of the huge volume of information available. All speakers who favour the appointment of a Select Committee have referred to this information. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) concluded his speech mainly in reply to an interjection I made when he was talking about seeking information on this matter. I interjected, "I do not think it will be necessary to go further than the Parliamentary Library." The member for Albert, with his usual courtesy, more or less replied:

As I pointed out, a tremendous volume of evidence is now available to us, and comprehensive works have been produced on this matter. Therefore, I think most members would be able to find all the information they required in the Parliamentary Library, as the member for Gawler has suggested.

I suggest again that all the information we want is in the Parliamentry Library. These final words, spoken in a good speech by the member for Albert, were true words, in my opinion honestly meant and honestly spoken, and they are the best proof that a Select Committee is not necessary on this matter. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): It has been said that quick hammers save money and we saw a typical example of this this afternoon when the Attorney-General spoke on the motion and said that in our pauperized position nowhere in Australia would a Select Committee be appointed to take evidence on the question of setting up an ombudsman. The Attorney-General is probably less like an auctioneer than

anyone else of whom I know, but I have yet to see a quicker hammer than he gave to the motion.

In moving the motion that a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing in this State the office of ombudsman the member for Mitcham made it clearly obvious that he had done commendable research into the subject matter of the needs and workings of such an office in other countries of the world. He instanced with equal commendability his reasons why a Select Committee should be appointed to investigate the setting up of such an office in this State and, with the same clarity, he mentioned numerically the arguments commonly raised against the concept of such an office. Generally, with a well-reasoned address, he left it for members to seek out for themselves the benefits and desirability of such an appointment by this Parliament, by saying that he thought that the idea was important and that it should be studied. The member for Albert, in seconding the motion, gave a long history of the office of ombudsman, and his research and study is most useful to members as they approach the reasons for the appointment of such a Select Committee. For my own part I will support the motion.

It is assumed without question that every citizen in a democratic country has certain rights as an individual, and it is the duty of Governments and Parliament to preserve those rights as far as is compatible with the general welfare of the community. All Government action, whether it be raising taxes, introducing Budgets, or amending laws, in some way or other affects the rights of the individual, and the individual has the right—and indeed the responsibility—of keeping abreast of the Government's legislative programmes, and he has the right to express approval or otherwise at given periods of time through the ballot box. During the term of office of any Government a citizen frequently finds himself confronted with some particular problem on which he appears to have no redress, despite the fact that the machinery of democratic government is geared to allow the citizen channels through which he may make his views known. Mrs. N. J. Caiden, in her article in the *Australian Quarterly* of September, 1964, said:

> The Government is responsible for the administration of the community's affairs to elected representatives of the people and every citizen may participate in the political process which, through the mechanism of political Parties, pressure groups and individual action focuses upon Parliament to ensure accountability. The Government is equally bound to act in accordance with the law and to follow certain legal procedures which are enforced by the courts. Finally, the citizen may contact the Administration itself directly which, responsive to political control, does not act arbitrarily, and in certain areas it grants the citizen a form of appeal through special administrative tribunals. The modern State has seen a growth of Government activity on wider fronts with new problems arising from the extension of the Administration's function into that of new fields. Accordingly, from sheer necessity, it has had to grant wider discretionary powers to Ministers and officials to make decisions concerning the rights of individuals. The magnitude and need for expedition of modern-day expansion virtually dictates the obligations to so vest such power. Conflict of opinion, perhaps with field officers, and misunderstanding between the Administration and the individual become more frequent, and although we can agree to the citizen's interests being subordinated to those of the community, we also say he is entitled to be treated as fairly as possible. He should know his rights or privileges have not been subjected to unnecessary invasion. Where large numbers of decisions of necessity have to be made, it is possible that the individual may receive less than due consideration from public authorities and he may find that the usual traditional remedies open to him are inadequate.

When I say this, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that the Government has specifically given any of my constituents the "run around". With the honourable member for Mitcham, since I have been a member of this House I have always tried to give a constituent's problem all the care and attention I have been able to. I can also truthfully say that Ministers have been helpful and co-operative: yet in some instances I have not been able to get to the bottom of the problem raised.

In one instance I did not give satisfaction and was vehemently advised about it, and the Minister of Lands would share this vehemence with me. I now learn that banded together with two of my distinguished colleagues from another place I am a "nest featherer, a back slider and a person who has no concern for a poor penurious soul in need of some fiscal bolstering". Of course, I share with the Minister only the vehemence. I do not suggest he is a nest-featherer. Be that as it may, we in the main rely on the integrity and the awareness of the Public Service and the commonsense of our public servants themselves to ensure fair treatment to

citizens regarding day-to-day problems as they arise. Public servants themselves are not a race apart but are ordinary human beings, each of whom has his own personal problems. Although these public servants sympathize with the public and treat them fairly, they are not infallible, and sometimes things can go wrong. Large numbers of cases to be handled, a back lag of work, dockets being mislaid, and things such as that all contribute to insensitivity.

The control of departments is exercised by the Minister, and any citizen who has a legitimate grievance may appeal to him. In this respect, South Australians have always enjoyed the open door of the Minister. Yet Ministers, too, are overworked. I say again that I am one who would support an increase in our Ministerial numbers, for Ministers cannot possibly know every detail of their department's functions. A Minister usually must confine himself to deciding matters of policy and delegate the day-to-day routine of his department to his officers, and in the case of a grievance he cannot be expected to know all the facts surrounding such a situation. It has to be left to the officer concerned to give the answer, which has to be accepted by the individual as chapter and verse, yet the remedy or solution may be even more unsatisfactory to him than when he started to establish grounds for complaint.

Of course, the Minister is answerable to Parliament, and members of Parliament have the right to ask any Minister to account for his actions. This was mentioned by the honourable member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) a short time ago. In addition, they can write or telephone departments on behalf of a citizen, and if the department is unco-operative they can ask a question of the Minister in Parliament. If a member is a member of the Party in power, he may for political reasons not wish to do this on the score that he might not wish to embarrass the Government. Of course, the most important defect with a member of Parliament is that when he wishes to remedy a legitimate grievance of the citizen he has to accept the assurance of the Minister that all is well and may carry out no investigation of the case on his own account. The citizen has the last and final step open to him when he believes that an official has acted illegally against him. This remedy is court action. However, legal process is both slow and expensive, and this field is beset with technicalities. Mrs. Caiden points out in her article:

The courts may not demand Government documents and have tended to take a narrow view of their function and not to inquire into the reasons behind Ministerial discretionary decisions. In these conditions, it is hardly surprising that cases in the courts have been surprisingly few.

Although it may well be that in our existing set-up on the whole all is well, there is no certainty that things have not gone wrong in any individual case, and in the prevailing conditions of "take the answer or leave it" the citizen is helpless to defend his rights unless he is given the right to know. With governmental administration growing in size and complexity, along with a comparable number of decisions being taken there seem to be inadequate traditional ways of redressing citizens' grievances.

My colleagues have already amply made known to the House means by which the office of ombudsman can assist citizens to seek redress for their grievances, and I do not intend to traverse the same ground. It has been pointed out that an ombudsman is a servant of Parliament, impartial between Parties, and in a somewhat similar position to the Auditor-General. The appointment would require only a small staff, and the expense attached to setting up the office would not be great. It would, however, afford to the citizen who thought he had a legitimate grievance and had no further formal means of redress an opportunity to write to the ombudsman stating his complaint and attaching all relevant documents. The members for Mitcham and Albert have dealt fully with the case for a Select Committee to inquire into this matter.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the deabte.

GREYHOUND RACING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McKee:

(For wording of motion, see page 830.)

(Continued from August 17. Page 1145.)

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): I support the motion moved so ably by the honourable member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee). As the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said, we on this side of the House are free to vote as we please on social legislation, and members of the Government are using this opportunity to vote as they please. The Opposition knows that members of my Party have this freedom, for the Labor Party acknowledges that this is a commonsense approach. I think we are getting a little tired of the type of argument put forward by the Oppostion on this aspect.

I have witnessed greyhound racing throughout Australia and in many other parts of the world, and I know that this type of sport has a great attraction for many people. Any sport that is well run is an added attraction to people in all walks of life. We all have things that we like to do. Having experienced greyhound racing I know that it appeals to and suits the wants of many people. I have seen greyhound racing at the White City, Wimbledon and Wembley Stadiums in England, and from my experience I know that it is the sport that is really enjoyed by many people in the lower wage bracket. Such people also own greyhounds. Greyhound racing in England operates in a similar way to race meetings, for they have their tracks and their methods of breeding. They also have events similar to the Derby, for instance. The way in which this sport is brought to the general public is a credit to the people who control it. In many cases the dog is trained at the track. It is enlightening to watch this sport with its many feature races, and in Tasmania, New South Wales and Victoria the sport is acceptable to many people. This State has lagged in social legislation, but now members will be able to give people in all walks of life the opportunity to follow this sport. I have attended at greyhound racing meetings in South Australia, and they will never reach the standard in other States and overseas if the meetings are conducted as they are at present.

Many staunch supporters of this sport have struggled for many years but have not had the opportunity to further develop it in this State. The meetings are well conducted but racing without a lure is a disgrace. It does not add much to the attraction of the sport and sometimes during races the pilot dog is caught, causing a re-run. Good reason exists why conditions for this sport should be improved in this State. Recently, in New South Wales there was a case of cruelty in greyhound racing—by a man tying a live rabbit to the mechanical lure to blood a greyhound. South Australia must avoid this, and all the tracks must be registered and opened for inspection by the authorities. Of the 41 racing tracks and 20 training tracks in New South Wales, only one case by an irresponsible person shows a small percentage of people involved in this sort of thing.

The offender was fined $98 and given a month's prison sentence, which was suspended when he entered into a 12 months' good behaviour bond. It is expected that breaches of proper regulations will occur, but just and apt penalties will be imposed. We must realize that this occurred at the same type of greyhound racing as we have in South Australia at present, and it forced the introduction of mechanical lure racing in Victoria and New South Wales to eliminate blooding practices associated with greyhound racing. Most people have had something to do with the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting in the last few weeks, and I am sure that totalizator betting is a fair way for people to bet at greyhound racing as the dividend is the same for everyone. All persons attending the meetings do not bet. I am not against bookmakers, but one of the fairest ways to bet at greyhound racing meetings is by totalizator. I hope the House will pass this motion so that a Bill can be introduced to assist a section of the community in a sport to their liking.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I object strongly to the line taken by the members for Stirling and Burnside in this debate. Both implied that the member for Port Pirie was acting under instructions.

Mr. McAnaney: Don't include the member for Stirling in that remark.

Mr. HUDSON: It was implied by the member for Burnside that he was acting under instructions and it was described by the member for Stirling as a snide and back-door way of testing the opinion of the House on a controversial matter. The member for Stirling said, "I am opposed to motions like this one." This motion is designed to test the opinion of this House, and the member for Port Pirie introduced it of his own volition without instructions from anyone, and as a result of his own decisions. He is free to do this, and his right to do it will be defended by members on this side. Opposition to this motion, based on the fact that a member of the Government Party introduced it, is a back-door way of trying to oppose the resolution whilst saying if it were put up in another form it would be supported. Members who take that line are not playing fair: they are trying to have a few bob each way.

In this type of resolution, every member makes up his mind and gives his opinion, and it is a valuable way of introducing this type of question. But first, we need to remember that the Notice Paper is a heavy one and that Government time for debate is limited. That was the case last year, too, and a number of important items of Government legislation lapsed last session because there was insufficient

time to debate and pass them. Any Government, on a social question when the opinion of the House is not at all clear, could well find itself in the position (if it introduced a Bill) of wasting members' time. It might well discover that when it came to a vote on the second reading no adequate support for it existed. However, in this case, I know of no Government decision. The member for Port Pirie was acting completely within the terms of his own conscience when he introduced the motion.

Mr. Curren: As a private member!

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, he was not acting under instructions from anybody. I will support the right of individual members of the House to bring matters before it for debate in this way. I think it is a perfectly valid and useful way to have matters debated. It would not be competent for the member for Port Pirie to introduce a Bill providing for all the things that are provided for in this motion, because such a Bill would involve money matters and, therefore, should be introduced only by the Government. Therefore, the honourable member had no alternative but to move the motion in private members' time. I support the motion; I think the present situation is another piece of hypocrisy that exists in South Australia's laws—laws which allow coursing of a certain kind to take place, and gambling or betting to proceed in relation to meetings conducting that coursing, but which do not permit the mechanical lure or a totalizator to be used at a greyhound meeting.

The motion removes that hypocritical aspect. In a sense, it follows on the debate on T.A.B. that took place last year which, as I have previously said, dealt with another hypocritical aspect in our whole approach to betting and gambling in South Australia. The legislation within the Lottery and Gaming Act is shot through with hypocrisy, and the community's general approach to this sort of question indicates that it does not support the letter of the law as laid down in that Act. Indeed, we received an indication of that last year when the lottery referendum was held. I am fairly confident that the preponderance of raffles of all sorts associated with just about every type of private organization within our community, and the extensive participation in these raffles of ordinary people who are members or supporters of those organizations, is some sort of indication of the general approach.

Generally, I regard the process of conducting greyhound race meetings with a mechanical lure, and allowing betting to take place at such meetings, as meaning no more than an extension of existing facilities that are permitted. In fact, in certain respects, the motion is milder than the one relating to T.A.B. that was carried in this House last year, because it is concerned, first, only to permit the introduction of the mechanical lure and a totalizator at meetings where a mechanical lure is used; and, secondly, to provide for the overall control of greyhound racing in South Australia. I was pleased to hear the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) point out that certain licensing provisions and restrictions may be necessary to control the sport adequately and to prevent the blooding of greyhounds, which at present is probably more prevalent in South Australia than it is in any other State. Although I suggest that greyhound racing has not such a wide public interest or is of such social concern as T.A.B., nevertheless, for those who participate in greyhound racing, it is a matter of great concern. If they wish to participate in this sport, they are placed under severe restrictions in South Australia—restrictions that apply to a minority, conducting a sport that interferes little with the majority point of view.

In fact, those in the community who object to live hare coursing and to the blooding of greyhounds could well say that with the introduction of mechanical lure racing live coursing could diminish. Therefore, something to which they previously objected could greatly disappear. Some of those who take no interest in dog racing but who are opposed to live coursing could well support this motion as a step in the right direction. I must confess that I have not been to a dog race, and have little knowledge of how it is conducted, but I am sure that the people concerned are capable of organizing their own sport in their own interests, in the same way as are the people who conduct trotting or racing meetings in South Australia. I see no reason for a distinction. Why should it be legal to conduct race meetings with horses or trotters and pacers, and not with dogs?

I think, as a matter of social history, that the people interested in dog racing tend to belong to income categories in the community lower than those of the people connected with horse racing. That may well be true and it may explain why horse racing has a relatively privileged position, while, on the other hand, dog racing has been much more restricted and much more closely confined. If this House is to take the view (and I think it will) that a lottery is desirable and that off-course betting

should be permitted, then, in relation to this matter, it is a simple consequence to support an extension of that view to include greyhound racing. As I have said, the extension is small and will provide entertainment for a significant number of people interested in this particular sport.

Although I may never in my life attend a dog racing meeting, I cannot see why people should not be able to conduct a dog racing meeting with a mechanical lure as long as they abide by the laws of the State and conduct their meetings in an appropriate and satisfactory manner. I have no doubt that those associated with the sport are law abiding and will be capable of handling matters associated with the introduction of a mechanical lure and of a totalizator.

I compliment the attitude taken by the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke); he is fairly direct in these matters. He said, in effect, that he would give his opinion on the matter regardless of the way it was introduced into the House. I hope other Opposition members will follow this attitude by saying whether or not they oppose the motion, and will not concern themselves, as did the member for Burnside in particular, with the way in which the motion was introduced. After all, as the member for Burra said quite explicitly, it might well be that the Bill introduced (if this motion is passed) will be something unsatisfactory to him and to other members, in which case he will be unable to support it. Nevertheless, within the terms of the motion, the honourable member believes he can support it whether moved initially by the member for Port Pirie or by the members for Stirling or Victoria.

Mrs. Steele: Is there any certainty that a Bill will be introduced?

Mr. HUDSON: There is no certainty at all because, despite the remarks made by the member for Burnside, there has been no Government decision about this matter to the knowledge of any member of my Party.

Mrs. Steele: Then it is a useless exercise.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Port Pirie was acting entirely within his own rights when he introduced the motion. It is not a useless exercise because an opinion expressed by this House (particularly an opinion expressed by a clear majority) is an opinion of which the Government must take notice. No member of the Government Party can guarantee that if the motion is passed a Bill will be introduced. I, for one, hope that if the motion is eventually agreed to the Government will introduce a Bill. Obviously the Government has problems to consider: it has problems of time and of attaching priorities to any legislation it brings before the House. If the motion is passed, a decision will still have to be made by the Government whether it will be prepared to introduce a Bill. For the life of me I cannot see anything wrong with the procedure that has been adopted. We should have heard nothing about this particular point at all had the motion originally been moved by an Opposition member instead of a member of the Government Party.

I should like to remind honourable members that, in relation to off-course betting (a motion on which was discussed last year), some confusion was created when the member for Frome gave notice of his motion. Some Opposition members said that members on this side were completely taken by surprise and knew nothing about the motion. I, for one, was taken by surprise and knew nothing about it, and I know other members on this side had not been contacted by the member for Frome, and that includes some Ministers. The member for Frome was completely within his rights in not contacting members. Of course, at a later stage, Opposition members adopted a certain line because they were put in the embarrasing position of having to make up their minds and say where they stood on a social question. They said they did not like the way the matter had been brought up for discussion.

Mr. Casey: They had not been put in the position of having to make up their minds on a social question before.

Mr. HUDSON: True, for years social issues were banned as a topic for discussion or for Government action. One of the matters about which people in South Australia felt most strongly was the lack of freedom that existed on many social matters. At least we have the position arising in this House and in South Australia as a whole where decisions are being made about these matters. The House consists of responsible members who, it is presumed, have minds of their own and are capable of reaching a decision on a question of this type. That is all the motion requires. I ask members to give their full support to it.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I have listened with great interest to the member for Glenelg try to justify the introduction of this motion and defend his colleagues by saying it was not introduced at the behest of the Government. I have heard him challenge Opposition members with not being able to make up our minds on these matters. I assure him that

is not so, because we are as competent to make up our minds as he is, and we have made up our minds on many matters. I have made up my mind on this matter, and I will tell the honourable member what I have decided.

Mr. Hudson: I shall be pleased to hear it. As long as you don't have five bob each way, I shall be delighted to hear it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Unley spoke, virtually, as though the Bill were before the House. The member for Glenelg said this method of introducing the matter was designed to save time and that more time would have been taken in getting through a second reading debate on a Bill on the subject. I disagree. I believe the matter could have been introduced in the form of a Bill and particularly at this time, because the Government is looking for sources of revenue and, as a Bill on this subject would embody a revenue clause, I would have thought it would be happy to proceed with the matter in that way. Unfortunately, the tragedy behind the history of tin hare racing in Australia, as I understand it, is associated with a gentleman called Swindle. I do not know whether he gave his name to the term "swindle", but he was aptly named because I gather that the proprietary companies originally set up, of which he was the promoter, were one of the reasons why the use of mechanical lures fell into disfavour.

Mr. Clark: That was some considerable time ago.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, 30 years ago. This restrictive coursing legislation has been on our Statute Book since 1927 without any amendment. I understand that that legislation was passed to try to prevent people from gambling at a time when gambling was looked upon as a vice. I think it is only a matter of time before we see provision made in the C series index for gambling, if we can have provision for cigarettes and other things, for it appears that gambling is becoming so much a part and parcel of the Australian way of life and that it is being so much encouraged that we may have to make provision for it. That is how I see the general trend of things.

I would have no objection to a Bill being brought into the House on this matter; in fact, I should like to see it. However, I will not give any assurance that I will support such a Bill. I respect the right of a member to be able to do just what has been done in this matter. I have introduced a motion myself, and I would be speaking against my own beliefs if I were to oppose the right of any member to move such a motion. However, I reiterate that this does not commit me in any way to supporting the Bill when it comes into the House, because, although I have said that there seems to be a tendency towards encouraging gambling, I do not approve (and I never have) of introducing ways of increasing the facility for gambling. This, of course, is exactly what we are doing here.

At the same time, I do not see why we should discriminate in this matter. If something is good enough for the owner of a racehorse or the owner of a trotter, it should be good enough for the owner of a greyhound. In my opinion, provided the sport can be run fairly and honestly and strictly controlled, there is no difference between any of these forms of sport, and I see no reason why a Bill on the subject should not be introduced into this House. I will support the member for Port Pirie in this move. However, I repeat once again that I will not commit myself to any Bill until I see exactly what it contains.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I understand that the member for Port Pirie wishes to take a vote on this motion today, so if I do not speak now I will not get the chance at all. I very much regret that the honourable member wants to bring the debate to an end today, because I should have liked a bit more time to consider this matter.

Mr. Ryan: You have only had three weeks!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you for your protection, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This matter is in the hands of the honourable member; if he insists on a vote being taken today I have to say where I stand, and I tell him straight out that I intend on this occasion to vote against his motion. I hope the member for Glenelg will not think any worse of me than he does now, although I think he probably will, in view of the speech he has just made.

Mr. Clark: He has a high regard for you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He has not told me of it. However, I am glad to have that assurance. I am not necessarily against the subject matter of the motion, and I may say that I have been shaking like a leaf in the wind about whether or not to support it. However, I have decided, on the consideration that I have been able to give it, not to support it. First, I do not want to be thought bound in any way to support a Bill that may be introduced. Here I jump perhaps the opposite way to the member for Albert, who has just spoken. I consider that if one votes for a motion of this nature one is bound, to some extent anyway, to support a Bill

on the subject, and I think that way regarding totalizator agency board off-course betting. Frankly, although I voted against that motion, because there is an expression of the House on that matter it must affect the way I will vote when it comes on. I do not want to be construed as being bound in any way either to support or reject any Bill that comes in. I make it clear that if a Bill comes in I will not necessarily vote against it but will have a look at it. I consider that if I supported the motion today there would be some obligation on me to support any Bill or at least the second reading of that Bill, and I do not want to be in that position.

Secondly, I think we are going pretty fast at present regarding social matters. We have a Bill before the House for a State lottery, and we have another before the House to introduce T.A.B., and I think that is enough to digest at present in our community. Therefore, I do not think any harm would be done by allowing this matter of greyhound racing to wait. I know that the honourable member has said (and this may be so) that the Government is not bound to introduce a Bill if this motion is passed, but one cannot escape the suspicion that the honourable member has been encouraged by the Government to seek an expression of the opinion of this House. He tried to do it last year, but at that time the dog did not start, or something. As I say, one cannot escape the suspicion that he has been invited or encouraged to take this step. However, I consider that we should wait on this one. Therefore, for those two reasons (first, because I do not want to be construed as being bound at all when a Bill comes before the House, and, secondly, because I consider we are going fast enough at present in the relaxation of prohibitions in these matters) I propose not to support the motion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I also intend not to support the motion. What may be contained in a Bill that will arise out of this motion, if it is carried, is anybody's guess. Obviously, much of the detail that would be contained in the Bill is not contained in the motion. Following what we have seen in respect of other matters before the House at present, the expectation of some people will be sadly dispelled by what arises out of an approval that is not based upon specific terms.

Like the member for Mitcham, I consider that we have gone mad with this type of legislation, and I do not hesitate to say so. I believe this Parliament will not go down in history as having dealt with these matters wisely. Why at this time, when there are so many other problems before us, we have to concentrate on this type of legislation is something that I do not know. I can only assume (as the member for Mitcham has assumed) that this motion is designed to give the Government an authority or a direction to introduce this type of legislation. We have been told that a Bill on another subject arises because of a resolution of this House. Of course, although that cannot be said in respect of this matter now being discussed, there is no doubt that it is being inspired by the Government. If the Government wishes to bring in this type of legislation it should be introduced in specific terms so that we can see its safeguards and privileges, and what will be the social results of the legislation. We are asked to give the Government a direction to introduce a Bill: what that Bill will contain is anyone's guess. I do not intend to write out a blank cheque for the Government, which could promptly say that the Bill resulted from a direction given by Parliament. I shall oppose the motion, and probably the Bill, although I would consider the Bill if it were introduced. I do not approve of a direction being given to the Government to introduce a Bill on terms and conditions that are not shown in the motion.

Where a similar motion was carried last year the Bill introduced was not in the terms of the motion, but we were told that the Bill avoided weaknesses in the motion. This is a device to introduce another gambling proposition into the State and, if for no other reason than that, I oppose it. A Bill can be sponsored by the Government if it involves taxation, or by a private member if it does not. I do not know whether this motion involves taxation but, if it does not, the member for Port Pirie does not have to establish his case by an oblique motion: he can introduce a Bill, or a Bill can be introduced formally by a Minister. We have had similar legislation introduced by a private member, as was done by the member for Onkaparinga. This is a device to get general approval before the terms of the Bill are known, and in these circumstances I oppose the motion.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Some years ago I introduced a Bill dealing with mechanical lures for greyhound racing and, without the assistance of the then Premier, the Bill was passed. We have great freedom on this side in deciding on any question, whether social or

otherwise. The *modus operandi* of the member for Port Pirie is not in the best interests of the people he seeks to help, and he is wasting valuable time by debating a motion when it can be used to debate a Bill. He may say that he cannot introduce a Bill involving money matters, but if he has the support of his Party he could have the Bill sponsored by a Minister.

Mr. Hughes: He is not getting the support of all of them.

Mr. SHANNON: He may have sufficient. If this matter is so contentious that he doubts whether he will get a majority of his own Party, I suggest he is beating against a pretty stiff breeze. The Government should have introduced a Bill. This sport is properly controlled and conducted by the association, but this motion introduces a further opportunity to gamble, and any sport can be enjoyed without the incentive to bet. Greyhound racing can be enjoyed as I have seen it enjoyed at the Adelaide show, where spectacular events have been staged.

Mr. Casey: Surely, you are not judging other people by what they should or should not do.

Mr. SHANNON: I am judging only myself. I have always said that I am a law unto myself in regard to what I like or dislike. I believe the people interested in greyhound racing should adopt an approach similar to the one they adopted in 1956, and a little later when the former member for Stirling (the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins) introduced a Bill in the House. The fate of those measures is now well known. I would oppose the provision of betting facilities at greyhound racing, for I do not think it is in the interests of the people concerned or of the general public. If greyhound racing cannot be made a sport of sufficient interest to the people who participate, it does not deserve to thrive on gambling. I did not seek such a facility when I introduced my Bill and I do not intend to support the present provisions relating to the totalizator. If gambling is attached to the motion, I will oppose it.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I have listened with much interest to the speakers to this motion. Some members opposite, having declared their opinions outright, have opposed the motion which is a right to which they are entitled. It seems, however, that most honourable members agree that people interested in greyhound racing should be permitted to indulge in the sport of their choice. Most honourable members opposite (and the member for Onkaparinga referred to this) believe that a Bill should have been introduced on this matter rather than a motion. It may have been appropriate for a backbencher to introduce a Bill to enable greyhound racing behind a mechanical lure, but for that type of greyhound racing to be a success (and I am afraid I cannot agree here with the member for Onkaparinga) it is desirable that a totalizator be used. As that would entail revenue, the Bill would have to be introduced by a Cabinet Minister. However, I believe that honourable members will support the motion, because it is supported by the National Coursing Association and the greyhound racing clubs which have combined to form the Greyhound Racing Promotions Committee.

Mr. Alsop, the Chairman of the National Coursing Association, is also the Chairman of the Greyhound Racing Promotions Committee, so that disproves any argument that coursing people oppose this motion. They desire the motion to be carried, because greyhound racing in all other parts of the world is conducted with a mechanical lure. In addition, people in the Eastern States, in making an intelligent approach to the problem, have decided that mechanical lure greyhound racing is far better than any other form of greyhound racing. South Australia is the only State in which greyhound racing is restricted. As I have said, the support for greyhound racing in South Australia is increasing and, as more migrants arrive, the demand for this sport will no doubt increase even more.

Mr. Shannon: Without any betting!

Mr. McKEE: True, it is increasing now without the betting, but when a law cannot be policed, something must be done, namely, to legislate so that previous illegal practices under that law become legal. People interested in this sport are merely seeking equality with their counterparts in other States, and would welcome and appreciate the privilege of introducing mechanical lure greyhound racing in South Australia. It would enable them to enjoy the same social activities as those being enjoyed by similar sporting bodies in the other States. As the provisions of this motion seek to give the people concerned their just rights, I commend the motion to the House and hope that it is accepted.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (23).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Freebairn, Hudson, Hurst, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee (teller), Nankivell, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, and Walsh.

Noes (11).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Hughes, Hutchens, Millhouse, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 12 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

GAS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

That in the opinion of this House a Select Committee should be appointed to inquire into and report upon what steps should be taken to expedite the construction of a gas pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide and matters incidental thereto,

which Mr. Lawn had moved to amend by striking out "a Select Committee should be appointed" and inserting "the Government should be congratulated upon the action it has already taken in appointing a committee".

(Continued from August 17. Page 1152.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I wish to continue my remarks on a matter that I believe is of great importance to the State as a whole. I wish to develop some points I made last week on the motion. I said that the way to achieve the expedition of this programme in South Australia was to set up a South Australian gas trust, and to do it at once. I outlined what I thought should be, in general terms, the composition of the trust and I suggested what its duties and responsibilities should be. I based the structure of the proposed organization on the structure of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which has been so outstandingly successful in carrying out the functions of reticulating electric power throughout the State. I want to emphasize the point I was making last week that it would not be the function of the proposed trust in any way to interfere with or abrogate the responsibility of existing statutory or private bodies.

Within the whole project of utilizing natural gas in this State there are three principal components. The first is the people who explore and discover reserves of natural gas, in this case at the Gidgealpa and Moomba fields particularly. They are people who have invested considerable sums of money as a speculative venture and, of course, in the hope of reward. There is no speculation, not even on dog-racing, without hope of reward—and that is quite proper. They have risked their funds on the expectation of striking something worthwhile, and they have discovered something worthwhile. Admittedly, they have been supported in their exploratory work by Government funds in the form of Commonwealth grants. Of course, this is part of Commonwealth policy with which I entirely agree. If we are to have worthwhile exploitation of our natural resources in the field of oil, gas and so on, we should offer inducements to people to increase the capital which they are prepared to provide in order to undertake the responsibility and the not always rewarding expenditure of searching for these valuable products. On every score of equity and from the point of view of sheer expediency, it is obviously essential that we encourage the explorers for minerals and liquid and gaseous fuels and that we should give them every possible inducement to continue their researches.

As the history of the State unfolds, it is more than a little interesting to realize that in possibly the last 20 years we have come to regard the far-flung more arid parts of our State not as just purely cattle country with little productive capacity, but as a cause for some excitement because of the prospect of what may lie underneath them in the form of valuable minerals. It is interesting to recall that, as finance has been available for investment in exploratory work through the auspices of private enterprise and as the Government (and particularly the previous Government) spent a great deal of money and organized extremely thorough geophysical and aeromagnetomical surveys of the interior of our State, the result has been the uncovering of useful and, in some cases, promising bodies of minerals. Therefore, I think it is essential that we should certainly not discourage but, by every means possible to us, encourage, within the limits of equity, the effort of private enterprise to explore and later on to exploit (and I use that word in its proper rather than its derogatory sense) the deposits that they may discover. That is the first factor in this triangular set-up that encompasses the utilization of natural gas as a whole.

I think, too, that in the price they are able to obtain for their gas this factor of encouragement should also be observed. In other words, I do not think it would be good business in the long run for the State to drive a bargain so hard with the owners of the gas that they would be discouraged from making further exploratory effort, and this will require a nice judgment on the part of the authority in determining what is to be paid for the gas at the well.

I do not care who is doing the negotiating, whether it be the trust I propose, the Minister of Mines, the Electricity Trust, or some other

authority. The fact is that negotiating still has to be done. I think these facts should be borne in mind. It is a fact also that gas is worth virtually nothing at the wellhead. Until it is utilized in some way or another (the obvious way, of course, is to pipe it to the areas where it is required for industrial and domestic consumption and for power generation), it has very little value. It has a potential value, but the actual value depends on utilization, and this is a strong card, of course, in the hands of the purchaser of the gas.

On the other end of the pipeline are the consumers. We do not quite know at present who the consumers will be, although we know who some of them will be. We know, for example, that a great deal of gas will be needed in future years for the generation of electricity. Although other sources of power are available, if gas is equivalent in value or a little cheaper it will be used in very large quantities for power generation. Its employment in this field is extremely important, not only for the savings it can possibly effect in the price of electricity but also in the savings in oversea currency which its utilization could make and therefore, of course, benefit the national economy accordingly. We may be able to use oil, and at the moment I know that the Electricity Trust has long-term and very favourable contracts for the supply of oil for power generation. However, so far we do not have any producers of oil in the Commonwealth with the exception of one and possibly one other coming up in Western Australia, and we are at least, I think, 95 per cent dependent upon imported supplies of liquid fuel. Therefore, the utilization of our own power is important in the national economy.

Possibly the next biggest user would be the South Australian Gas Company. I make it quite clear that nothing I propose to write into the composition or duties and responsibilities of the trust is in any way intended to limit or curtail or abrogate the activities of the South Australian Gas Company, which has proved to be a most efficient company. It has lived with the times, it has a modern and enlightened outlook regarding the needs of the community, and I think it has in every way fulfilled its obligation under the charter that was given to it. Therefore, I believe it should be enabled to continue. That company must have supplies of gas to sell to its consumers, and it must either generate the gas itself or do as it is doing very largely now, namely, purchasing gas from other sources. There is no reason at all why this procedure and this structure should be interfered with. It is the problem between the producer of gas and the retailer of gas which is of concern to us here in this motion.

Much more exists in the matter of building a pipeline than might appear to the uninitiated, yet there is no problem that is in any sense insuperable and there are no technical, economic, legal or practical problems that pose any very real difficulty. I came to the conclusion after talking to people in this business on the other side of the world that perhaps we in Australia are a little ultra-cautious in our approach to some of these matters and that some of the problems that loom very largely in our thinking are just matters of very ordinary and everyday concern to people overseas. I instance things such as traffic problems, tunnels, underground railways and that sort of thing which so far we have deemed to be beyond our resources but which are just matters of ordinary routine in many places of the world. This very thing applies with the transmission of natural gas. People in San Francisco are using gas that is produced in Edmonton, Alberta, some 1,500 miles away, yet they get it at a price that is cheaper than oil, cheaper than bottled gas, and cheaper for most of their purposes than electricity. Therefore, we can see just what are the possibilities of natural gas.

As you would know, Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest expenditures in which the housewife in these colder countries of the world is involved is the central heating of the home. It is not unusual at all for a family in an average size house in some other countries to spend between $38 and $45 (American) monthly on fuel for heating a house, and this goes on for four or five (and sometimes seven) months of the year. Of course, that introduces a factor into this matter which does not apply in our climate, for although central heating may be desirable (and it is tending to increase in this State) it is not of such vital concern to us in our climate as it is in others.

I introduced this matter into the discussion because it is an illustration of the fact that there is no real technical, legal, or physical problem in the construction of a gas pipeline. Some countries operate their pipelines at very high pressures and thereby get a high efficiency throughput, and they are constantly developing new techniques. They have developed steels for making pipes which are capable of still higher pressures, and they are using higher boosted pressures of the actual gas in the line to match up with the better material that they

have for construction. I found that the steel companies had recently developed a steel which had a strain capacity of about 60,000 lb. yield strength and 75,000 lb. tensile strength, which is an improvement in the last few months against the previously best steel they had, which had only a 52,000 lb. yield strength.

They are operating these pipelines at a pressure of 930 lb. a square inch, and they are using a cathodic covering which protects the outside face of the pipe from corrosion; and by virtue of the fact that they demand from the producing well a high degree of purity and complete absence of corrosive chemicals in the gas, they are able to pipe the gas in pipes that are unprotected both internally and externally. This means a large saving in the cost of the transmission line. The principal of one company told me that these improvements had resulted in a 7 per cent improvement in the economic efficiency of a given pipeline. We can use this experience and start much further along the ladder of economic efficiency than those people did years ago. It is no problem to determine the right size of pipe, as when the consumption requirement is determined a polyflow meter is used. Then it is necessary to determine the degree of compression and boostering required, but this has been reduced to an exact science. No serious reason exists why we should not bring the gas to Adelaide within a short time.

At present, our problem is mainly financial, but I believe that money is available from many sources for this kind of project. It has been well known in South Australia for many years that when semi-government utilities go on the loan market, applications are generally over-subscribed almost before the loan opens. This has happened with the Electricity Trust and the South Australian Gas Company. When other States' loans have had to be heavily underwritten, the loan applications in South Australia are filled without difficulty. Any instrumentality of this kind that is a trust investment with the backing of the Government will attract all the money required, as it will enable interested parties to participate in the financing of this venture. We can obtain this money at a reasonable rate of interest. If the loan were floated at the ordinary rate applicable on the market at present for utility debentures or shares, it would succeed. We cannot expect to get money more cheaply than that unless the Commonwealth Treasurer comes to the party and offers money at more advantageous terms, but this is unlikely.

For the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement we obtain money at 1 per cent less than the current bond rate, but the gas venture is not equivalent to that. The Commonwealth Government and Loan Council are limited in the amount they can solicit from investors. What are we waiting for? I listened to the member for Adelaide last week when he used a document prepared on behalf of the Government that was most informative. However, it was well known that when gas was discovered at Gidgealpa some doubt existed about the reserves available, as it was a difficult geological field not conforming to the normal pattern, and it was difficult to determine whether it was a series of small pockets or one large field of gas. Towards the end of 1964 and early 1965, efforts were made by the Mines Department and others to determine the field's capacity.

The member for Adelaide will recall that when Parliament adjourned at the end of 1964 it was suggested that a short session in 1965 might be necessary to deal with legislation when the reserves at Gidgealpa were proved to be adequate. Unfortunately, progress was not possible to that extent, as results were not obtained until later in 1965. Further exploration indicated a fairly certain quantity of gas in the field. I think the honourable member estimated that 427,000,000,000 cub. ft. would be sufficient to supply the requirements of consumers in the metropolitan area for about 10 years, but having done some arithmetic, I believe he was rather conservative. I think we would need about 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day to make the pipeline an economic proposition, but I agree that we would probably use much more gas after a few years had passed than we would use in the first years of the project's implementation. The consumption could well increase to 150,000,000 cub. ft. a day. However, the life was too short; it was no use attempting to build and amortize a pipeline over 10 years. It would make the venture too costly and the gas, when it reached Adelaide, would be so costly that industry would not use it.

Unless it is favourably priced when it reaches Adelaide, it will not pay industry to convert from its existing fuel to the new fuel, and it would be no advantage industrially or commercially. The new fuel must be better priced than the fuel at present used. The Government at the time initiated a feasibility study, and engaged a company for this purpose. The honourable member reported to us last week that the study showed that a pipeline from Gidgealpa was economically attractive, provided sufficient reserves could be established.

I accept that and, frankly, I do not think it needs an expert to arrive at that conclusion (although that is no reflection on the company engaged to do the work). Provided the gas has a reasonably high calorific value, in line with world standards (and I believe the Gidgealpa gas is rather better than the average world standard), it can be economically piped to Adelaide if sufficient reserves exist. Indeed, I think that was the general opinion contained in the report.

Shortly after my return from overseas, I learnt that the Premier had been questioned on what the Government was doing about this project and about what had happened, in effect, to the Bechtel report. Nothing appeared to be happening, and we did not know what was going on in the Government's inner circles. On July 21 the member for Gumeracha asked the Premier whether he would make available for honourable members' perusal the Bechtel Pacific Corporation's report on the pipeline, to which the Premier, after giving a preamble, replied:

However, since that report was submitted, the availability of a quantity of gas at Moomba No. 1 and Moomba No. 2 has become known. I am advised that, although the report has some value, it has no value as far as the economics of the gas position at present are concerned. I have already informed the House regarding the strikes at Moomba No. 1 and No. 2 wells. Neither of these wells has been fully tested but the report is considered to be out of date because of these discoveries. The Minister of Mines considers that there is no point in making it available.

In other words, the Premier said at first that the report had some value but, after qualifying that statement, he implied that it was of no value. When, in effect, chided by the member for Gumeracha's motion, the Government was encouraged (if that is the right word) to put a statement into the hands of the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn). The honourable member, in referring to the Bechtel organization's report, said:

This study showed that a pipeline from the Gidgealpa area was economically attractive, provided that sufficient reserves could be established.

What has happened to the arithmetic in the meantime? We have it on the authority of the member for Adelaide that the only thing lacking in the first Bechtel report was evidence that the reserves at Gidgealpa were established. Now, the fact that the reserves at Moomba Nos. 1 and 2 are established, to my mind, answers the question. If the Bechtel report was worth anything when it was first tendered, it is certainly worth much to us now, for the only objection in it has been removed. The member for Adelaide went on to advise us that the Government was searching about to get further information. I believe we were told at one stage that Bechtel had been asked to submit another report. We were also told last week:

In this connection, early in July this year contact was made with an organization undertaking feasibility studies in the Eastern States, to point out to that organization the desirability of including South Australia in its calculations. An assurance has now been received that an evaluation of the possibility of establishment in South Australia will be carried out.

The honourable member declined to give the name of the organization concerned, although I do not argue about that. But how many reports does the Government want? It seems to me that we are merely killing time; I cannot work it out. The original study by the Bechtel Pacific Corporation undoubtedly worked out a programme for bringing gas to Adelaide on the assumption that sufficient gas existed. Now that the shortage of gas in the field has been overcome, I see no reason why we should not take up the Bechtel report as it was first submitted, and proceed with the project. The member for Adelaide said that the Government was refining the details of its case for submission to the Commonwealth Government and trying to have everything sewn up and made water-tight, so that no detail would be left unspecified in the approach to the Commonwealth. I am wondering when something will happen. The Opposition introduced this motion but, in his amendment, the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) suggests that we congratulate the Government on what it has done. That would be congratulations for nothing. That is not a political remark and I would make it to my own Premier if we were in Government. Why are we not getting on with this matter? I do not know and I do not think anybody knows. To turn this motion into a motion of congratulations is so laughable that there is no need for further comment. The member for Adelaide gave the following summary to his official statement on behalf of the Government:

What this Government has done and what the previous Government did not do is on record, and I placed this information before the House this afternoon.

What he said next was a tragedy. He said:

The next move by the Government will depend on the reaction of the Commonwealth Government. When the data is available, approaches

will be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to establish a pipeline. I cannot hazard a guess where we will go from there.

Are we going to leave the matter there? I consider this is more important to the State than was Leigh Creek coal, and those people who know anything about Leigh Creek coal know how important that was to the State. On what the member for Adelaide said, if Father Christmas does not come in his reindeer-drawn sleigh and cannot get down the chimney then we get no presents. I venture the opinion that Father Christmas will not turn up in this matter. So many demands have been made on the not illimitable resources of the Commonwealth Government that I believe its answer will be "No". If that is its answer, it will have resulted from the same circumstances (but not to such a tragic extent) as face the South Australian Government in financial matters. I think the Commonwealth Treasurer will say that the Commonwealth Government is fully committed and will not commit itself further in this year. So we wait another year and hope.

This matter is far too important to South Australia to let it rest there. I emphasize the fact that the member for Adelaide made an official statement on behalf of the Government. He admitted that, and said that his speech was prepared for that purpose. All he said was that if the Commonwealth Government did not play Father Christmas he could not hazard a guess where we would go from there. What I have said in this debate has been intended to be of some help and encouragement to the Government so that it could perhaps tell the people of the State where it is going in this matter. I hope that, instead of making a silly amendment to the motion to pat itself on the back for nothing, the Government will get really serious about the matter and examine what I have suggested or examine any other alternative that may have occurred to it and get down to the business of devising an alternative if finance is not available from the Commonwealth Government, which I believe the Government itself fully expects to be the position. Therefore, the Government should not pin its hopes on this finance and attempt to put the baby into the Commonwealth's lap, because the Commonwealth already has many babies in its lap. However, I do not suggest that we do not have a just case. All I am doing is facing realities.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I am glad to hear you say you think we have a just case.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I say it deliberately; I think we have a just case but not all just cases receive full recognition. If I came along to the Treasurer of this State at present and asked him for money for a worthwhile cause I think he would have to say that he was sorry and could not provide it. I believe that is what the Commonwealth Treasurer will say to this Government on this occasion. If the Commonwealth Government cannot provide assistance we should have something up our sleeve, but we have nothing up our sleeve at present. I emphasize the supreme importance of getting on with this matter. It might be argued that we are getting on satisfactorily at present because we have reserves at Leigh Creek and available contracts for fuel for the Electricity Trust for quite a few years, and that with the markets of the world today we could make further contracts. However, I have pointed out the futility of relying on these things, and the desirability of utilizing our own fuel.

We must encourage people to continue exploring on the fields. They must be assisted financially, and the Commonwealth Government is doing just that. However, it is no encouragement to the people who own the gas at Gidgealpa and Moomba to leave them sitting there with the gas in the well. We want to get people to keep on putting money into mining companies that will chase around and dig holes in the inner crust of the Far North of the State or on the continental shelf, Yorke Peninsula, or anywhere else they think they can find deposits. They will not put money into these ventures unless they can sell the product they discover. The gas discovered at Gidgealpa has been known to be there for quite some time. In the last few months good reserves have been discovered at Moomba.

A few hundred miles to the north and within economic reach is the Mereenie field at Palm Valley where I understand inexhaustible supplies have been discovered. Let us consider what has happened in the United States of America and Canada despite the fierce competition there. Gas from Edmonton in Canada supplies San Francisco and gas from Texas is piped to Los Angeles. Edmonton serves Ottawa, Detroit, Chicago (the industrial settlement of the United States), and Indianapolis, and gas is piped across to New York and down to Washington. If the whole of the United States can be covered with a network of gas pipelines originating from wells in the northern and southern parts of the country, then there is nothing we could not do in South Australia.

We have the material at hand and the only problem is to get the gas from where it is to where we want it.

In this debate I have tried to set out the means of doing just that. I hope the Government will give some credence to my remarks on this matter. I have tried to be practical and not unduly political, and I believe I have offered some suggestions to the Government that could be of assistance in overcoming some of these problems. I thank honourable members for their patient hearing. If I have anything to offer the House as a result of the work I did overseas, I am pleased to make it available.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): In rising to oppose the original motion, I take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford). In all sincerity, I congratulate him on being chosen Father of the Year for 1966.

Mr. Lawn: Tell me what he fathered this year?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member for Wallaroo is expressing the sentiments of us all.

Mr. HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know whether I would be in order in quoting from the *News* on this subject.

The SPEAKER: No, the honourable member may not do that.

Mr. HUGHES: I did not expect that you would permit it, Mr. Speaker, but as the honourable member who has been selected Father of the Year was the mover of this motion I hoped that I would be allowed to do so. I take the opportunity of congratulating the honourable member on being so selected and also on the very fine photograph of him with his lovely little granddaughter that appeared on the front page of the *News* today.

I listened attentively to the honourable member when he was moving this motion, to which an amendment has been moved by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn). I was disappointed with the effort of the honourable member for Gumeracha, because it seemed to me that he played politics on a matter that most people were hoping most sincerely would be above Party politics. Practically everyone I have spoken to who has been associated with our natural gas discovery has expressed this as being one of almost incalculable benefit to South Australia. The honourable member said that a large and important industry requiring natural gas had been lost to South Australia because of the inactivity of the Government and the Mines Department. However, he very carefully, I would say, refrained from using any names in support of his claim, because I think he knew that what he said when he moved the motion was not quite correct. He tried to make capital out of a report in the *Advertiser* of July 28 that quoted Mr. Barnes, the Director of Mines, as saying that the natural gas age in Australia was closer than most people realized, and that there was every indication that South Australia would be using gas within five years.

I think that when he made that statement the Director was suggesting that the supply of gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide was perhaps closer than most people realized. I do not see anything wrong in Mr. Barnes's statement. I would have been most disturbed if he had said "five years or over", but when he kept within the scope of a specified time (and therefore it could mean next year or next month or even next week) I did not see anything wrong at all with the statement. Therefore, I fail to see what the member for Gumeracha was trying to say to the House in connection with Mr. Barnes's statement. The honourable member tried to link up the statement with the suggestion that before a pipeline is built we should look elsewhere for natural gas. However, I point out that it has never been suggested that the construction of a pipeline should be held up pending further investigations into natural gas deposits. This is further substantiated in a special report by the Director of Mines that appeared in the *News* of August 5. As time is short, I shall wait until next Wednesday (if the debate is to continue on that day) to quote from that report. Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

THE BANK OF ADELAIDE'S REGISTRATION UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT 1892 ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

Consideration of Select Committee's report.

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table the report of the Examiner for Private Bills (Mr. Combe) as follows:

As Examiner for Private Bills I have to report that the amendments made in this Bill do not involve any infraction of the Standing Orders.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) moved:

That the report be agreed to.

Mrs. STEELE seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: I hold in my hand a copy of the Bill certified by the Clerk to be a fair print in accordance with the Bill as agreed to by this House on report.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank the House for its courtesy in permitting the swift passage of this Bill through this Chamber. It is not a contentious matter, and the evidence taken by the Select Committee disclosed no opposition to any facet of the Bill. The minor amendments were made largely as a result of the work of the Parliamentary Draftsman, and do not materially change the policy laid down in the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAW OF PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.57 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 23. Page 1261.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the general principle of the Bill introduced by the Government to provide for off-course totalizator betting in South Australia. The Bill has some history, as all members know, and stems from the motion introduced by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) last year. To refresh the memories of members, I shall read the motion, which was:

That in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria.

It is a matter of history that that motion was passed but, even though it was passed by a majority of members, the T.A.B. measure now before us differs in one or two important particulars from the wording of the motion. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) moved an amendment, and the motion, if so amended, would have read:

That in the opinion of this House a Bill should be introduced by the Government to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament.

Although the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham was defeated, it could very well have been passed. This Bill has been based on the general wording used by the member for Mitcham, and the precise wording of the motion moved by the member for Frome and passed by the House has been ignored by the Government. The winning bets tax is not now levied in Victoria, but we find that, in this Bill, that tax is still retained. The attitude of the Government seems to suggest that the winning bets tax is here to stay. However, I consider it to be a most unfair tax. I think it will become known as "the Walsh tax", and I do not doubt that racegoers, investors and punters will refer to it as such.

I should like to comment on what I ascertained about T.A.B. in Victoria when I visited that State a couple of years ago. As members know, one of the results of that visit by the present Leader of the Opposition and myself to Melbourne was that the Government of which I was a back-bench member supported a form of off-course betting in a 14-point plan at that time. That proposal did not receive from racing clubs the support that we considered it should have received.

There is not much doubt in my mind that there is a fairly general demand for some form of off-course betting. A Gallup poll conducted a couple of years ago showed that about 46 per cent of South Australians were in favour of some form of legalized off-course betting, about 23 per cent were opposed and 31 per cent had no opinion. I must give credit for the consideration shown to the present Leader and myself when we visited Melbourne. The Chief Secretary (Mr. Rylah) placed his officers and the facilities of his department at our disposal.

Mr. Hughes: There was only one thing wrong with your visit there.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: What was that?

Mr. Hughes: That they did not keep you there.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Wallaroo is being unkind this evening. It is not his usual tendency to be unkind, and I know he is only being facetious.

Mr. Rodda: Would the member for Wallaroo be in favour of the winning bets tax?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: He would be. I think he believes in class taxation, and the winning bets tax no doubt appeals to him very much. I was impressed by the system of T.A.B. in operation in Victoria. On the Friday that I was there I visited many offices in the central city area, in the industrial suburbs and in

other parts of Melbourne. I am satisfied that the physical set-up at least, in T.A.B. offices in Victoria is satisfactory. There is nothing objectionable about them at all. There is none of the old unhappy association that we had with betting shops in South Australia before the Second World War. My memory of betting shops is rather dim, but I can recall a not very pleasant shop at Owen, a small town not far from my home.

On the Saturday of our visit to Melbourne we saw the racing-minded public visiting T.A.B. offices and making investments. The set-up was orderly and there was nothing to which anyone could object. One of the most significant factors to me (and something that I had not been led to believe existed) was the relative rarity of people under 30 years of age patronizing T.A.B. It seems that people in the middle years and older are interested in it and that the younger generation does not seem to be so. One of the arguments advanced by the opponents of T.A.B. is that it will corrupt young people, but my impression of T.A.B. in Victoria is that that is not so.

I also spent some time looking at the telephone betting system there and concluded that, in general, it was one that would best suit South Australia. I think I said that in the House upon my return. Victoria is a small densely-populated State with about three times as many people as South Australia has, and the area of South Australia is about four times that of Victoria. We have few large country centres and it seems to me that the telephone system would suit this State.

Mr. Hudson: We have a greater percentage of population in the metropolitan area.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, but my understanding of T.A.B. is that it will provide a system of betting for people who do not live close to racecourses and who cannot reasonably be expected to attend race meetings to enjoy their sport.

Mr. Casey: That is your definition.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think it is a reasonable interpretation. I am supporting a system of T.A.B. to enable people living remote from a racecourse to bet legally. One of the features of the Victorian system is that it does not pay out winnings on the same day as the investments are made, which is a good thing. I am happy to see that in this Bill this aspect is incorporated. I was in Western Australia in 1962, and again this year, and was rather disappointed with the way in which the T.A.B. offices were conducted in that State. On one Saturday evening in a large country town about the size of Gawler I visited a T.A.B. office and found that it was taking bets for a trotting meeting and paying out after each race. The hotels in Western Australia stay open until 10 p.m. There was a steady migration between the hotels and the T.A.B. office. Our Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) will be distressed to hear this: most of the people migrating between the hotel bars and the T.A.B. office were Aborigines. It was heart-breaking to see the way the T.A.B. system, which paid out after each race, was functioning.

Mr. Lawn: You are not advocating that system, are you?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No.

Mr. Lawn: I just wanted to clear up that point in my mind.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I believe a system providing for paying out on the first business day following the holding of a race meeting is the most desirable. I must admit that I had a small flutter on T.A.B. Being a bachelor of some mature years, I thought I would try my luck on a double. From my feeble memory, I think the horses I backed were Fleet Miss and Shy Lover. Fleet Miss was a gay young frisker and won her leg of the double handsomely; Shy Lover was a grave old plodder and came home second from the tail end of the field.

The racing clubs must bear a deal of the blame for the fact that some form of T.A.B. is not operating in South Australia at present. In the time of the previous Government I was most disappointed with the attitude of the racing clubs. I thought they were not being helpful; and in one or two instances they were indeed quite offensive. One letter they wrote me tried to point out that the influence of the churches in South Australia was not very great. I thought the racing clubs were descending to a low level by doing this.

Mr. Casey: What has that to do with the Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making my speech in my own way. It is noticeable that not many members opposite have spoken. I am following a member on this side of the House, and it can only mean that we shall not have more Government speakers on this Bill, which is disappointing.

Mr. Lawn: The Government members do not want to waste time.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Apparently, they are not prepared to support legislation prepared

by their own Ministry. The letter I received from the racing clubs relating to—

Mr. Casey: On this Bill or some other Bill?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —the influence of churches in South Australia reads in this way:

Enclosed is a booklet describing T.A.B. system of off-course betting, and a copy of a letter which is being sent with the booklet to all Ministers of religion in South Australia. The purpose is to publicize the facts about T.A.B., which is now successfully operating without fuss and bother in other States and New Zealand. In these places, T.A.B. has had the following effects: Off-course betting has been transferred from illegal to legal channels and proceeds are being used to benefit the whole community. People wishing to bet can do so without breaking the law. Far from encouraging gambling, the "forbidden fruit" aspects have been removed. Country folk are not being discriminated against. S.P. operators are being rapidly wiped out.

In a moment or two I shall produce evidence to show that S.P. operators are indeed being greatly restricted in their activities, and this is one of the aspects of T.A.B. that appeals to me. The letter continues:

S.P. bookmakers and some church leaders have been the chief opponents of the proposed system. We can ignore the S.P. men who would lose their present "Robin Hood" type public prestige with the advent of T.A.B. and concentrate on the churches. There is evidence which suggests that the power of churches to influence voters on moral questions is far less than most politicians believe.

I shall not read the rest of the letter, but it made out a case against the churches, which I thought was poor tactics, not directed to gaining them very many friends.

Regarding this aspect of the stamping out of S.P. bookmakers, I am indebted to the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney), who has lent me a copy of the Victorian *Hansard* dated April 23 of this year, in which the Hon. G. J. O'Connell, the member for Melbourne Province, asked the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to illegal betting:

How many prosecutions for illegal betting were recorded in the Victorian courts during the years 1964 and 1965, respectively, and to March in the present year?

The Minister of Agriculture, who obviously represents the Chief Secretary in that place, replied:

The answer is:

Year.	Prosecutions.
1964	173
1965	97
1966 (to and incl. of March 31, 1966)	21

It will be seen from those figures that the prosecutions to conviction have decreased to one-half in the short space of slightly over a year. So this type of T.A.B. is desirable.

As honourable members know, the Playford Administration proposed to introduce a form of T.A.B. that we, as Liberal and Country League members, thought would provide a means for people to bet legally off-course, yet not encourage unnecessary gambling. The unexpected hurdle we encountered was the racing clubs. I do not know why they resisted our form of T.A.B., because, if they had accepted it readily at that time, South Australians would have had the benefit of an off-course betting system for the last 18 months or so. Late in the life of the Playford Ministry, in October, 1964, some six months before we went to the polls, after much negotiation with the racing clubs the then Premier received a communication signed by Mr. Reid, the then Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club, which read in this way:

As chairman of the committee which has been appointed to negotiate with the Government on off-course betting facilities I would advise that the committee has further examined the plan put forward by you on behalf of the Government. The committee are prepared to accept the 14-point plan with the undermentioned four amendments.

After listing them, he continued:

1. To distribute any profits upon a stake-money basis rather than attendance.

2. That the Government will give consideration to extending the hours of operation of country agencies so as not to place interstate betting or trotting at a disadvantage . . . We give a positive assurance that we are not interested in providing for re-investment at these agencies.

3. We would like and understand that you will agree to make provision for no country trotting club to be adversely affected as a result of the removal of the winning bets tax on the punter's stake.

4. We agree to the installation of a telephone centre for the metropolitan area. It is appreciated that upon further consideration you would be prepared to provide for more than one office for the servicing of telephone betting in the metropolitan area.

There, we have, within only a few days of the 1964 prorogation, the racing clubs finally agreeing to accept our proposals for T.A.B. Had they co-operated more fully in the first place, there would have been time to legislate so that South Australians (particularly country people) would have the undoubted pleasure of being able to follow their hobby.

During the 1964 debate the member for Port Pirie, in making an excellent contribution to the measure, emphasized that he wished to

get rid of all bookmakers (the bag men) completely. His statement is without ambiguity or equivocation, but I think the honourable member is at variance with popular opinion in Port Pirie. I, possibly in common with other members, have received a letter from the Port Pirie Bookmakers Association that clearly states that its members have canvassed the position in Port Pirie and have found a popular demand there for the retention of betting shops. That letter states:

We, the members of the Port Pirie Bookmakers Association, are justly proud of the good reputation that our licensed premises have with the citizens of Port Pirie and the surrounding districts. In the 20 years since our premises were reopened after the war not one complaint has been made to the Betting Control Board, the Port Pirie council, or the Police Department, *re* the manner in which they are conducted. When it became known that certain parties were interested in changing the system of betting in our city to that of tote betting, a very strong and vigorous protest was made to the Government by our local citizens; this protest was in the form of a "petition" headed as follows:

> We the undersigned citizens of Port Pirie and district earnestly beseech the Right Honourable the Premier and the Government of South Australia to allow the present off-course betting facilities available at Port Pirie to remain in their present form.

This petition was signed by 2,300 citizens who use the premises, and additional written support was received from over 20 organizations, headed by the Port Pirie City Council, the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council, the Port Pirie Chamber of Commerce, and the Port Pirie Branch of the R.S.L., the balance of the letters being from sporting, cultural and charity committees. This written support is of such a strong nature that we are sure that you would be interested in reading same, and we have taken the liberty of enclosing copies for your perusal. We have also formulated a plan of off-course betting, which is based on the Port Pirie set-up, and we are enclosing a copy in the hope that some aspects of it, at least, could be of assistance to you.

Mr. Rodda: What percentage of Port Pirie's population would that involve?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not sure but, taking the signatories to the petition and the members of other organizations listed, it would add up to more than half the city's population. As the popular press of Port Pirie is adamant that betting shops must go, the member for Port Pirie is apparently in a cleft stick. The *Recorder*, of August 22 last, clearly states:

Port Pirie Betting Shops must close: The people of Port Pirie have the right to plea for the retention of their betting shops but we cannot make fish of Port Pirie and flesh of Naracoorte.

The same publication, in the previous week, stated:

Provision should be made to close down the Port Pirie betting shops with the introduction of T.A.B. in South Australia.

There, we have an interesting comparison with statements made by the member for Port Pirie, statements appearing in the popular press, and the general attitude of the Port Pirie community. Undoubtedly, the retention of the winning bets tax in this legislation will be greatly resented by the racing public. It is most unfair that one class of society should be drastically taxed whilst another class is not.

Mr. Hudson: Is that why you supported the 14-point plan of the previous Government?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The interjection of the member for Glenelg reminds me that the South Australian Jockey Club generously entertained one Government member, recently, hoping to obtain his support.

Mr. Hughes: It entertained me, too.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When the winning bets tax was introduced in a measure before the House some years ago, we heard these statesmanlike words emanating from the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is now Premier of the State:

We should consider it as a compulsory saving to offset the inflationary tendency.

That was a rather illuminating statement. He waxed rather eloquent about the turnover tax and the winning bets tax and also said he thought that grandstand bookmakers should be charged an additional halfpenny stamp duty. He continued:

The reason for the distinction between the grandstand bookmaker and the derby and flat bookmaker is that the latter holds much less money than the former although he writes double the number of tickets and therefore pays double the amount of stamp duty.

I do not want to spend more time on the remarks made on that occasion by the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but they indicate that he must have entertained some doubts about the reasonableness of the winning bets tax. However, we find in the legislation the Government has introduced that the winning bets tax has not been swept away.

I wish to refer to the constitution of the agency board. It seems to me that, as T.A.B. was designed ostensibly to serve people who live in districts removed in some measure from centres of population, it should contain a very generous proportion of representatives from the country racing and trotting clubs. I am most disappointed that the Country Trotting Clubs Association of South Australia will be

entitled to nominate only one member on the board, but I am pleased to see that South Australian country racing clubs will be permitted to nominate two members. I realize I shall have an opportunity in Committee to speak about this matter further, but I suggest that it would be fairer for country trotting clubs to receive more representation.

A feature of the Victorian system that does not greatly impress me is that in the smaller country centres the officers in charge of T.A.B. agencies are not salaried officers of the T.A.B. authority but work on a commission basis. I understand that people who have a franchise from the T.A.B. organization to accept a commission in return for their services receive about 3 per cent commission on net turnover. I am referring to the report of the Betting Control Board on its inquiries into T.A.B. betting in Victoria and Queensland in 1964. The report states:

An agent receives 3 per cent commission on net turnover, with a minimum of £21 per week; if a city agent, he is required to provide a cash bond for £250—if a country agent, one for £100; he is responsible for employing the necessary staff, for lighting, heating and cleaning, for error losses, and for fidelity and workers' compensation insurances. All other expenses of the agency are borne by the board—furnishing and equipping, rent, race lists, tickets, stationery, telephone, etc.

Finally, I suggest that it might be wise in Committee to provide that in South Australia no persons shall be employed on a strictly commission basis and that all officers in T.A.B. establishments shall be paid a straight salary by the T.A.B. authority. I support the second reading.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I am sorry if I disappoint the member for Light, because I think that about three-quarters of an hour ago I heard him say that no member on this side would follow him in this debate.

Mr. Clark: It seems longer.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. However, I guarantee the honourable member and other members opposite that I shall not be long.

Mr. Freebairn: I look to you for advice.

Mr. LAWN: I am just coming to that. My only reason for speaking in the debate is that I wish to give certain Opposition members some free, friendly, fatherly advice.

Mr. Clark: It is necessary.

Mr. Casey: Did you see the front page of the *News*?

Mr. LAWN: The *News* may have been a bit premature in its front page article today. Somebody asked me who the former Leader of the Opposition fathered this year, but I will father the present Leader of the Opposition in a friendly manner. He is new to his job and he has a heavy responsibility, which I appreciate. However, I do not think he can complain about the way members on this side have treated him. We have been tolerant and friendly and have not been vicious in any discussion we have had concerning him since his appointment. I appreciate the assistance most honourable members have given me since my appointment as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. This is a new job for me, and it carries heavy responsibilities. I am sincere when I say that I appreciate the assistance most members have given to me.

The advice I shall give to the Leader tonight will be given in a friendly manner. Last year we carried a motion, the result of which is this Bill. In a debate on another motion this year it has been said that if members support a motion asking the Government to introduce a Bill they are not necessarily bound to support the Bill entirely. I appreciate the comments of members opposite on this point. In Committee, they will be entitled to move amendments to this Bill. However, I point out to them what some of their amendments might mean. I could not quite follow what the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) really meant and what his views on the Bill were. He said that this proposed scheme would mean 6 per cent tax on the course totalizator, 5¼ per cent on the off-course totalizator, 3 per cent on bookmakers' turnover on races in other States, and 2 per cent on their turnover on races in this State. Later, in reply to an interjection from the member for Glenelg, he advocated increasing the tax and, when asked what rates should apply, he said he would leave that to the Government. At least the honourable member knew that he could not move to have a certain rate fixed but unfortunately the Leader of the Opposition did not appreciate that fact. However, the member for Stirling suggested that the rate could be 4 per cent. He said, "The Government can make it 4 per cent right through if that is how much the Government wants." I think the honourable member was suggesting a minimum.

Mr. McAnaney: No.

Mr. LAWN: I have quoted the honourable member.

Mr. McAnaney: It could go up or down.

Mr. LAWN: I have quoted the figures given by the honourable member.

Mr. McAnaney: The Government can make it what it wants.

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member wanted the rate to be able to be reduced to 1 per cent he would have said so. He sort of struck an average, and he said that the Government could make it 4 per cent right through if that is what it wished. I have some sympathy for the punters, and I do not want to raise the tax on them.

Mr. McAnaney: Well, you have done so on the totalizator.

Mr. LAWN: I will come to that. The honourable member is speaking of the 14 per cent in respect of the on-course totalizator. I want to see the racing clubs improve these totalizators and their on-course facilities, and if they do not I shall be on the back of this Government to reduce the percentage allotted to them. They are getting 1¼ per cent (the difference between 14 per cent for on-course and 12¾ per cent for off-course) to improve their on-course totalizator facilities for the punter.

Mr. McKee: And the punter gets a pretty tough spin.

Mr. LAWN: I want to see them start to improve these facilities, otherwise I will be asking the Government to lift that 1¼ per cent.

Mr. McAnaney: It is at the end of three years that the Government is going to take that extra 1¼ per cent.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member cannot mislead me.

Mr. McAnaney: It is in the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I do not intend to enter into an argument with the honourable member. This Bill proposes to lift the winning bets tax on the stake after a period of 12 months has elapsed. I suggest to the Government that clause 9 might be altered to leave in the 13 months as the maximum period and to take out the reference to 12 months, for then if it decides in the meantime to lift the winning bets tax it can do so without having to amend the Act.

Mr. McAnaney: Why does the Government want twice as much when it goes through the totalizator?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is not going to get me into a lengthy argument. The punter wishes to have these off-course facilities and is anxiously waiting for us to pass the legislation as quickly as possible. I have every sympathy for the punter. In fact, if I had to raise an army of men and lead them into battle I could not wish for a finer body of men than the South Australian punters. They never whimper one little bit; they are never beaten; they go out in wind and rain; and they endure discomfort.

Mr. Quirke: When the wind changes they turn.

Mr. LAWN: No. They take knocks with philosophical grins, and they cheerfully challenge hopeless odds. You cannot beat them.

Mr. McKee: They back up every Saturday.

Mr. LAWN: They would get any man who leads them into battle a chestful of medals.

Mr. Rodda: Do they ever beat the books?

Mr. LAWN: I have every respect for South Australian punters, and I do not want to delay their having these facilities. Last year we had a motion seeking the introduction of legislation for a system of totalizator agency board off-course betting similar to the Victorian legislation. I am pleased that the honourable member for Light made it clear just now that he prefers the Victorian method to that adopted in Western Australia, because I agree with that. In his speech the Leader of the Opposition said:

> Of course, the Bill now before us provides for a system with significant departures from that operating in Victoria.

That is not correct, as the honourable member for Light and other honourable members know. Unfortunately, the Leader did not make himself familiar with the contents of the Bill, because he said:

> It may be an administrative matter for the board to determine, but it seems to me that a person with substantial winnings from, say, the first race of the day could establish credit and re-invest on a subsequent race on that day.

His colleagues knew he was on dangerous ground when he was suggesting that this credit does not operate with the Victorian totalizators, and they immediately came in to try to help him. However, the Leader went on to say:

> No, this provision does not refer to telephone betting.

Mr. Casey: He does just not understand the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: No, and I am trying to give him some fatherly advice and put him back on the track. The credit facilities provided in Victoria and provided in this Bill mean that a punter can lodge credit with a totalizator. I know punters in South Australia who have lodged that credit, and they ring up or they write over and place their bets.

Mr. Freebairn: They telephone mostly.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. The Victorian people would mainly telephone, and they would be able to bet on the first, third, fifth and seventh races. Because of the time factor they would not be able to bet on every race. Honourable members opposite tried to help the Leader by pointing out to him that this credit was there

for the punters so that they could lodge their bets by telephone. However, he was adamant that that was not the position. The Leader then referred to me and to other members, but he did not come back to explain his opposition to the credit provision in the Bill, nor did he explain why he was denying that the Bill applied to telephone betting. The Leader also said:

I had always envisaged that its introduction would coincide with the removal of the winning bets tax. It will be futile for any member to say that the public does not hold this view.

When we passed the motion last year there was nothing in it to say that the Bill when it was introduced should remove the winning bets tax. The Leader went on to quote something I said on October 22, 1964, when a Bill introduced by the Playford Government to increase the turnover tax was before the House. He quoted me as having said:

In addition to the 1½ per cent turnover tax which the bookmakers will pay from money they receive from punters, the punters will pay a 2½ per cent tax on winning bets. It is not 2½ per cent tax on their winnings: it is 2½ per cent on what they collect.

I was obviously criticizing the 2½ per cent tax on the stake, and the honourable member either did not understand what I said or he just does not understand the Bill, because this Bill provides for the lifting of the winning bets tax on the stake between 12 months and 13 months from the passing of the legislation.

Mr. McAnaney: You pay on the stake if you bet on the tote.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Stirling knows that if clause 9 is not passed the winning bets tax will continue on the stake and the winnings for ever and a day until such time as further legislation is introduced into the House.

Mr. McAnaney: Until such time as the Government wakes up.

Mr. LAWN: This Government has introduced legislation to give effect to what I was seeking (as referred to by the Leader), namely, the lifting of the tax on the stake. The punter wants the tax lifted on the stake.

Mr. McAnaney: What about when he bets on the tote?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member can oppose that if he wishes, but the punter wants the tax lifted on his winning bet and on the stake. This Bill lifts it on the stake after a period of 12 months. I suggested that the Government may, within 13 months, lift that tax, as that is what the punter wants. The Leader said that he intended to move an amendment to lift the turnover tax to 2 per cent but I understand that a private member cannot introduce amendments or Bills to increase such a tax. Although the Leader has foreshadowed this amendment, whether he can do so is a matter for discussion later. The Leader suggested that the members of the board should include a punter. How is he to be selected? I am a punter.

Mr. Casey: What is your definition of a punter?

Mr. LAWN: It is not mine, but the correct definition of a punter is a person who bets in large sums. Perhaps that is the reason why the Leader has foreshadowed this amendment, but is he asking for a representative of the big punters? I do not know, but if he means any person who bets, how can we select him?

Mr. Quirke: Doesn't it mean anyone that bets?

Mr. LAWN: No, because a punter is one who bets in large sums.

Mr. Quirke: What is a little punter?

Mr. LAWN: A two-bob bettor. I would be a two-bob bettor, and do not claim to be a punter.

Mr. McAnaney: The Government is appointing members to boards all the time without election by people they are to represent.

Mr. LAWN: Is the honourable member suggesting that a meeting of punters should be called to select a representative?

Mr. McAnaney: Aborigines are to be appointed to the trust, but are to be selected by the Government.

Mr. LAWN: A selection can be made of Aborigines because they are localized, but how can the Government get punters together and organize them to nominate someone? If the honourable member is suggesting that the recently formed Punters Association should nominate a person, I won't have a bar of that.

Mr. McAnaney: I am telling you the Government's procedure with other Bills.

Mr. LAWN: I hope the second reading will be carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I do not intend to cast a silent vote on this Bill. I am not an expert on these matters but I know something about a few basic features, and I do not intend to support the Bill. Each member has his ideas about this matter and I do not object to others taking a view opposite to mine, but I hope they extend the same courtesy to me. Last year, when this matter was before members on the motion of the

member for Frome, I spoke at length on the desirability or otherwise of extending facilities for wagering in this State and of the result that I thought would follow from the introduction of this legislation. I shall not reiterate what I said, but I suggest that some claims made seemed to be invalid and would not be borne out by subsequent events. For example, it was claimed, and perhaps still is, that the introduction of T.A.B. in other States had not resulted in an increase in gambling. That is palpably incorrect, as the Victorian turnover figures which I quoted and which were available last year, have shown a steep increase.

Mr. Casey: That doesn't prove your point, does it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The member for Light reminds me of the incidence of S.P. betting. If he looks at the figures that I gave last year, I think he will satisfy himself that, even on the basis of the wildest claims made regarding S.P. betting in Victoria, if the whole of it were eliminated it would not account for more than about 30 per cent of the volume of T.A.B. betting. As far as the diminution is concerned, I am not able to prove or disprove that some S.P. betting has been eliminated. I think I proved conclusively last year that, although there had obviously been some transfer from illegal betting to legal betting with T.A.B., it was impossible to be satisfied that the whole of the increase in T.A.B. betting had been at the expense of S.P. operations.

Mr. Hudson: It is possible to prove—

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is not possible to prove anything about that, because the member for Glenelg knows that, at the best, the figures given about S.P. betting in Victoria could have been only a guess: there are no statistics on that. The increase in T.A.B. turnover in Victoria is much greater than is involved in the transfer from S.P. betting to legal operations.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: According to the South Australian Betting Control Board inquiry, 20 to 25 per cent of T.A.B. bettors in Victoria were new bettors.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate that. I do not think any of the protagonists of T.A.B. will argue that there has not been an increase in the number of people engaging in betting since the introduction of T.A.B. in Victoria. Although it was claimed and hoped by the protagonists of T.A.B. that it would not increase the volume of betting in that State, the reverse has resulted. There is not the slightest doubt that the steep increase in turnover in the few years that that system has been operating in Victoria shows that many more people have been involved in attempting to back winners.

My own view, which I put forward with sincerity, is that we are not doing the community much good by introducing this legislation. By providing facilities and dressing up in respectable clothes the practice of gambling on race horses, we are enticing many people into this field who would not otherwise be involved. Everybody knows that betting is a mug's game and that we are not helping the economy of the country or the housewife's budget by engaging in it. By extending this facility, we are not helping people to make ends meet, or to meet commitments on house purchases and hire-purchase generally.

Because that is my opinion, I do not go along with this legislation. There is always the argument that it is better to provide legal methods for gambling than to force people who cannot resist the temptation to gamble to do so illegally. If there were an equal diminution of illegal gambling to the increase in legal gambling, perhaps that argument would have some merit, to that extent at any rate. However, I think that, if there has been an increase in overall investments, this issue is more a moral one than a legal one. I am concerned with both aspects but, so far as the long-term aspect and the effect on the community are concerned, the moral argument probably has greater force.

Some time ago the Playford Government proposed a form of off-course totalizator betting. The main purpose of that proposal was to ensure that people far away from the metropolitan area were given facilities for off-course betting rather more readily than were the people in the city, who were close to the home of racing and who could, without travelling any great distance, go to the course, invest their money and see the races. That was one of the important principles in the previous proposals and I said I would go along with those proposals, provided certain limits were placed on them. That was one limit placed on them and I was prepared to go along with that.

Although I did not like the principle of off-course betting, I considered that the people in the country districts were under some hardship if they desired to follow the sport, as compared with the people in the city, who had facilities available to them. This Bill does not propose to do any of those things in quite the same way. I am sure that development will

be along the same lines as has taken place in Victoria, where many offices were established in the metropolitan area at first and, out of the financial strength resulting to the T.A.B. from the many investors and the large amount of money invested, offices were establish in the country areas.

I would have preferred another arrangement. The proposal in this Bill does not conform to the main principles of the offer made by the previous Government to the racing authorities. However, I say that, if we are to have T.A.B. in this State, I agree wholeheartedly with certain provisions. I am not sure about the composition of the board, but I am not expert on that matter and I appreciate that those who have framed the legislation had some difficulty in determining what would be the composition of the board and, in particular, who should be represented.

I think I know enough of the history of racing and trotting in this State to know that there would be some difficulty here and I do not propose to criticize the Government about membership of the board. However, I think there is merit in the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition that the public ought to be represented. The members of the public are very concerned in this matter. As the board is composed at present, the only person who will not have direct interest in the organization of racing is the chairman. He is the only person in this group who is not directly involved in the business of racing. I think for that reason the proposal that the public should be represented on the board is sound. After all, it is the public's money that is to provide the income for the board. The people who conduct racing as a business will not be contributing anything to the income of the board unless they become punters, which of course some do and some don't. But, only in so far as they are punters will the board get any income from them. I know they will have in their hands for employment in their clubs and various organizations substantial funds, which will derive from the operations and profits of the board, but I believe that as the Totalizator Agency Board is an organization set up to handle public investment in this field, the public could very well be represented on the board, as one of its members.

I do not know whether the proviso that the South Australian Country Racing Clubs Association's representative should be 20 miles from the General Post Office to the north and 20 miles from the General Post Office to the south goes far enough from the metropolitan area. I presume the framers of the legislation consider it does.

Mr. McAnaney: It cuts out at Strathalbyn.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. I looked at that and I also looked at Gawler. However, after all is said and done, I do not know whether, in order to represent country racing clubs, we should not go beyond those points. I do not know whether Gawler is in fact a metropolitan or a country club. If honourable members will look at the amendments on the file they will see that the proposed 30 miles is to be reduced to 20 and, if I read it correctly, Gawler is more than 20 miles from Adelaide, which would leave Gawler open to representation as a member of the Country Racing Clubs Association. It is my view that, if Gawler is not in fact a country racing club, it is a metropolitan club. To a large extent, the same applies to Strathalbyn.

Mr. McKee: When you were in Government you always said that Gawler was in the country.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In terms of the definition of the metropolitan area, Gawler is in the country. I stand to be corrected: I thought that the amendment applied to both subclauses (7) and (8). I am pleased to know that that is not the position. I said just now that there were some matters in the Bill that pleased me. One of them is a point on which I have always held strong views—that there should be some control over the ages of people permitted to operate under T.A.B. Therefore, I was looking for it and was pleased when I found that the Bill was definite as regards betting by minors. As far as I can see, the clause is drafted fairly tightly so that this will not occur. Similarly, I was pleased to observe that entertainment in any shape or form within a T.A.B. agency is also specifically prohibited. I know that the Government has been at pains to see that the premises of T.A.B. agencies shall not deteriorate to the point that occurred in the operation of the old betting shop, because I think everybody would agree that they were in many, though not in all, cases not a credit to the people who ran them; nor were they a credit to the community at large. New section 31k (3) states:

No announcement, notice or information, whether oral or otherwise howsoever, shall be made, published or given to members of the public at any such office, branch or agency in respect of any event except the name, starting time and location of the event, the condition of the track, the names, handicaps, barrier positions and totalizator numbers of the horses in the event, the weights carried by the horses,

and the names of the riders or drivers in the event, and the result of, and the dividends payable in respect of, the event.

I am wondering what happens when at the last minute a horse is withdrawn from a race by order of the stewards—whether the people proposing to bet on that race ought not to have that information beforehand. I often listen to radio broadcasts of races and know there are occasions when something happens and a horse is scratched at the last minute.

Mr. McKee: It can happen when the horse is in the hands of the starter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be. There is no provision for that information to be conveyed to people lodging their bets with a T.A.B. agency.

Mr. McKee: They are in the starter's hands.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Perhaps those people who are experts in this matter can look at this clause to see whether or not there is a point in what I say, because it would cause a problem if information of this sort that ought to be known by punters was not available to them. So I suggest to those people who know more about these things than I do that they look at this to see whether the drafting of this provision is not a little too prohibitive.

Mr. McAnaney: I think that is in the machinery provisions.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The clause is very tightly drawn and states that no information or notice whatsoever except the things that it does permit shall be given, and one of the things it does not permit is a display of information such as I have mentioned. I noted that in passing and thought I would mention it.

Another point on which I want clarification is this. It has always been held that it was undesirable for provision to be made so that a punter could re-invest his winnings from one race to another. Most honourable members are opposed to the system of "backing up" all the afternoon—at least, I am opposed to it, for it is not a good thing. It is in fact proposed under the Bill that winnings shall not be paid out on the day of the race, that they shall not be paid out until the first business day following the race. I heard honourable members in this debate supporting that provision, and I support it. It is provided here that for cash betting the dividends shall not be paid to the investor until a later day. A penalty is provided if that is done, but for telephone betting where credit has been established, it does not apply. If honourable members sincerely want to avoid this problem, they ought to look again at subsections (3) and (4) of new section 31m. New section 31m (3) states:

No agent, officer or servant of the board shall pay out to any person who has made a bet at any office, branch or agency of the board any dividend in respect of that bet on the day on which the event on which the bet was made was determined.

New subsection (4) provides:

Notwithstanding subsection (3) of this section, a dividend in respect of the bet made by a person at any office, branch or agency of the board may be credited to a credit account established by that person by the board at any time after the dividend is declared.

Under that a telephone bettor who has established credit will know if he wins $5 on the first race it will be credited to his account, and that he will be able to re-invest the dividend by way of a telephone bet on a later race on the same day. A sharp difference is established between the man who bets in cash in the office and the one who, having established credit, bets by telephone. I do not favour the distinction: the cash bettor is just as genuine a customer of T.A.B. as is the telephone bettor. It has been stated tonight that most of Victoria's T.A.B. betting occurs by telephone, which means that, in effect, most of the T.A.B. customers will be able to re-invest winnings from earlier races on later races that same day.

Board agents are apparently to work on a commission basis. I am opposed to that, first, because it is unnecessary and, secondly, because it is undesirable. Having agents work on a commission basis is exactly opposite to the claims of T.A.B. proponents. It has always been stated that it is not desired to encourage people to bet. Although that may not always have been honestly stated, I think it has been honestly stated in this place. People urging us to establish T.A.B. in this State have consistently said that their purpose and desire was not to extend gambling facilities or practices. Naturally, the commission agent depends for his remuneration on the amount of business he transacts. He becomes an agent to accept the business that may come to his office, but being an ordinary human-being he is anxious to extend his work so as to increase his income; therefore, he solicits for business. That is contrary to the stated objectives of T.A.B. protagonists.

If the T.A.B. is to function as it ought to function, and to accept the business that comes to it in a proper, orderly and business-like way, it ought to be able to pay its agents a straight-out remuneration sufficient to

attract decent agents, without dangling before them the prospect of a commission to increase their turnover. I think there would be no difficulty in the board paying agents a salary as against a commission. The Government intends to channel its percentage of the profits into a Hospital Fund. Although I know that is generally accepted by the public as being a proper way to use the profits from such activities, the fact is that the State's hospitals require a certain amount of attention from the general taxpayer. The Government is obliged (T.A.B. or not) to expend certain moneys on this item. Although our hospitals can always do with more money (as everybody can) I do not think it can be fairly said that they have suffered any great handicap, in comparison with hospitals in other States of the Commonwealth, by virtue of the fact that the Governments (past and present) have been niggardly.

Mr. Casey: Do you think the money should go into Consolidated Revenue?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It will do so. That is exactly the point I wish to make. It is pious and idle for us to say to ourselves or to the electors at large that profits from T.A.B. and lotteries will go into hospitals. I have no doubt the profits will be paid into a special fund but, to the extent that they are paid into that fund, the Treasurer will be relieved of his normal obligation to subsidize hospitals from the general fund.

Mr. Casey: Is that what you would do?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sure that is what the Treasurer will do. That is a fact of life wherever it has been tried. The profits from T.A.B. and lotteries (if there are any) will be in the Treasurer's hands. It is necessary for him to support hospitals by providing about $10,000,000 a year and, whether or not he obtains T.A.B. or lottery money, he will still be obligated to pay it out. But if the profits go into a special Hospital Fund, the Treasurer will not have to use money from the general fund.

Mr. Casey: You can criticize him at the appropriate time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall, but I think this is an appropriate time. I think we are deluding ourselves, as well as the public, if we try to justify the introduction of T.A.B. or lotteries in this State on the understanding that it will provide special assistance for hospitals. It will not do so. It will not be a bonanza for the hospitals. Reports from other States (I think from New South Wales—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And Victoria!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Only recently the Victorian Premier suggested that a case should be made out to the Commonwealth Treasurer for special assistance for hospitals in that State, notwithstanding that Victoria's T.A.B. turnover rose, I think, in the last year by about $120,000,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Much more than that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That was the figure I saw; I do not know how much it has increased in the last two years. The clause which provides that the money shall be paid into a special fund for the benefit of hospitals is just a pious hope because, in fact, all it will do will be to save the Treasurer some money he collects from another source for hospitals. We are reaching the stage where, with some other State Governments, we rely more heavily each year on funds derived from taxation on social practices in this country, which, in my opinion, is not good, solid and healthy finance. I have said that I do not intend to support the Bill and I have given my reasons fairly and honestly for opposing it. I hope the Bill will not be carried although I am not sanguine that my hopes will be realized, because I believe most members favour it; I do not object to that. This is a matter on which each member can exercise his own opinion, and I have exercised mine. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I intend to be brief because I believe not much more can be said about the establishment of T.A.B. in South Australia. Last year, on a motion dealing with the introduction of a measure in the House, I said I would support a Bill so long as it provided for certain things. One of my main objections to betting stems from my knowledge of the betting shops of the early 1930's. I believe they were a disservice not only to racing but to all people in South Australia. They were far from a benefit to the community and their abolition did not happen soon enough. However, I realize that there are still betting shops at Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: I think the Western Australian system is the best system.

Mr. BURDON: When I spoke on the motion last year, I said that I had seen T.A.B. operating in most other States. Irrespective of what the member for Port Pirie says about Western Australia and what applies in New South Wales and Queensland, I am satisfied that basically this Bill provides for a T.A.B.

system similar in most respects to the one now operating in Victoria. That is why I support the Bill. I come from the South-East of the State, which is adjacent to Victoria. I know of the large amount of starting-price betting that takes place in the South-East and of the large sum of money that is channelled over the border on each racing day. I do not believe South Australian people are any different from pepole in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, or anywhere else. I have heard people say that we should not have lotteries and so on, and for some time South Australia has been the "odd man out" in some of these things. I do not believe we should go into these matters willy-nilly. The establishment of a T.A.B. system similar to that operating in Victoria will prove itself over the years.

Since T.A.B. was established in Victoria stake money for races in that State has rapidly increased. Mount Gambier, with a population of about 17,000 people, has feature races with stake money of about $140. However, at Casterton and Coleraine over the border in Victoria the stake money is often about $400. Also, I do not dispute that much of the money previously invested with S.P. bookmakers has been channelled into the T.A.B. in Victoria. Of course, S.P. betting has not been completely eliminated in that State. The best part of the profits of T.A.B. in Victoria has been put to useful purposes. The racing clubs in Victoria receive a hand-out, as do some of the charitable institutions in that State. Nevertheless, the Victorian Government is still short of money for its charitable institutions, including hospitals. Unfortunately, this position will continue in a rapidly expanding State where essential services have to be provided. It is happening in every State in Australia, and there is never enough money to satisfy everybody.

However, in States that have T.A.B., money that was formerly invested with S.P. bookmakers is channelled through T.A.B., and everybody gets something out of it. Only a certain section of the community gets anything out of money invested with S.P. bookmakers—the bookmakers themselves. The agencies in Victoria are conducted in a way that will be suitable for South Australia. I am completely opposed to some systems I have seen operating in other States. New section 31ka (1) provides:

No waiting rooms or seating accommodation shall be provided or made available for the use of members of the public at any office, branch or agency of the board where off-course totalizator betting is conducted.

That is a 1,000 per cent improvement on the arrangements in the pre-war betting shops. New section 31ka (2) provides:

No broadcast or telecast or other description or communication, whether oral or otherwise howsoever, of any event shall be provided or made available for members of the public at any office, branch or agency of the board and no radio or television set, receiver or loud speaker or similar device, whether owned by the board or by any other person shall be permitted or suffered by the board to be brought into or to remain in any part of an office branch or agency of the board that is open to members of the public.

As no information in relation to what is taking part at the racecourse will be available in the T.A.B. agencies, no incentive will exist for people to remain there. They will go along and conduct their business in the same way as they would conduct business at a banking agency. I have seen the system operating in Victoria for some years; I know that the standard has been maintained there, and I believe it will be beneficial to all if such a high standard is maintained in this State. I certainly will not be a party to having any lesser standard here than exists in Victoria.

The Bill provides for the lifting of the winning bets tax on the punter's stake not later than 13 months after the commencement of T.A.B. This simply means that at any time before then the Government may remit this tax. However, it is obligatory under this Bill for that tax to be eliminated after 13 months from the day on which T.A.B. commences to operate. The Bill follows very closely the lines of the Victorian system regarding betting by telegram, telephone or letter. It is incumbent on the punter to have a credit established at a T.A.B. agency, and it will not be possible for him to bet by these methods unless he has a credit established. With the provision for telephone betting I believe a person could bet on the first, third, fifth and seventh races on the programme. Any moneys that may be won can be credited. As this would represent only a small percentage of betting on the T.A.B. system, I do not see anything wrong with it, and I do not believe that this method would allow indiscriminate use by the public of the betting facilities.

I believe that the benefits provided for in the Bill have much to commend them. I consider that the people of South Australia are entitled to have this system, which is similar to the one in Victoria. I would go so far as

to say that as a result of our observations we have incorporated in this Bill the best features of the systems operating elsewhere. The member for Stirling seemed to be advocating a punters' representative on the board. I do not know whether he is an organizer for a punters' league, but if he is I can assure him that I will not be joining that league. I can also assure him that I would not be a candidate for such a position.

Mr. McKee: There would be a few aspirants, I think.

Mr. BURDON: Yes, and possibly a person might find such a position a little more lucrative than punting. Although I am not a betting man myself, I do not see a great deal of evil in it. I believe it is the fairest and best system of legalized betting that has been devised, and I hope that the Bill will have a speedy passage through the House so that the racing clubs can get on with the establishment of T.A.B. in South Australia and thereby derive, I hope, some of the benefits that have accrued to racing clubs in other parts of Australia. The State will gain some revenue from the measure, and some revenue may also flow to public institutions in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I oppose the Bill. The Premier, in introducing it, did not make much of a song about the reasons for it. In fact, many of the reasons given for similar legislation were curiously absent from his explanation of the reasons for introducing this Bill. However, he was quite candid in one respect, for he said:

> The main purpose is to give effect to the resolution passed by the House of Assembly on October 20, 1965.

We were not told that the Bill was designed to stop illegal betting or that it was designed to give the country punter an opportunity to have a bet legally, which were the reasons previously given for this legislation. Incidentally, the motion to which the Premier referred was sponsored by the Government and supported by the Government for the purpose of providing a reason for the introduction of the legislation. Let us be quite frank about this Bill. I had discussions over a period of years with persons interested in the establishment of T.A.B. in South Australia, and in my opinion the reason for this Bill is purely and simply a financial one in that the racing clubs desire to get more money from its activity. In other words, its purpose is to foster gambling for the purposes of profit.

Mr. McKee: It was the result of public demand, the same as it was with the lottery.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is to foster gambling for the purposes of profit, and nothing more. When I was Premier I offered a scheme to the racing clubs which they accepted at that time without qualification. However, all the pressure in the discussions was for establishing premises in the metropolitan area: there was no pressure for the establishment of premises in the country, although a case could have been made out for such people who are not able to attend a racecourse and yet wish to place a bet legally. The whole pressure of the legislation is for the establishment of agencies and branches of the T.A.B. in the metropolitan area, which is where the bulk of the profits will come from.

As I believe that its purposes are fundamentally wrong, I do not support this Bill. We will never serve the people of South Australia by cultivating the instinct to gamble, which is strong in any case. When the honourable member who has just resumed his seat said that the Government and the racing clubs would get something out of this measure, he was correct, but obviously some people will be worse off, and these are the people who can least afford to lose the money.

The Victorian experience has been that the establishment of T.A.B. has encouraged gambling. Since its establishment, the T.A.B. turnover figures have increased yearly, and they are still rising at an embarrassing rate. We are no longer hearing about the glorious success of T.A.B., as the people who started it are already embarrassed by its success. It is already in the same category as the poker machines in New South Wales, which have taken charge of that State.

Mr. Casey: What about T.A.B. in New South Wales and Queensland?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I listened to members opposite without interruption. If the arch-priest of gambling in this State wants to make a contribution, we shall be pleased to hear him speak. We have been waiting to hear from him. However, he purposely desires to be the person to close the debate. Many of the things in this Bill will not give satisfaction to many people in his district, and in due course there will be a revulsion against T.A.B. I know something of the history of this matter. You, Mr. Speaker, were in this House when the betting shop system was established in this State, and you and I saw what happened. This was supported

largely by both sides of the House, but its success was such that, if the war had not intervened and an order under the National Security Regulations, which I was empowered to make, had not closed them, they would never have been closed. The public reaction at that time was such that at the next election both Parties (which were equally responsible for the establishment of betting shops) had such a reversal that 15 Independent members were elected to this House. This showed the revulsion of the public resulting from the fact that we had let loose something that was uncontrollable.

I wish to draw attention to one or two features of this present Bill to show how uncontrollable it will become. When betting shops were established, we at least named the controlling body the Betting Control Board so that there was some semblance of control. However, the instinct to gamble is strong in the Australian people and I regret that, at a time when so many other problems are confronting us, this Parliament seems to have so much time to discuss the extension of gambling yet has so little time to deal, for instance, with problems associated with the house building industry and other things that have a big bearing on the family life and the development of this State.

I know from a previous vote that this Bill will be carried, but it will not have my support, because I believe that ultimately it will create a problem that will grow as it has grown in Victoria. I heard today from a responsible authority that an estimate made in Victoria since the basic wage increase of $2 a week showed that more than half of this money had gone into increased T.A.B. turnover.

Mrs. Steele: That is a startling thing.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is. From the astronomical increase in the volume of betting, the number of agencies and the number of race meetings it can be seen that, whereas T.A.B. was introduced to provide a means whereby a person could have a moderate bet, it has extended so that it has become a State problem. I will refer to one or two of the loose definitions in this Bill that show that it is designed primarily not to give a reasonable opportunity for a person to have a bet but to provide money for the Treasury and the racing clubs. That is the beginning and end of it: in other words, it is designed to promote gambling for the purposes of revenue and profit. I do not believe that legislation based on these grounds is fundamental or that it will raise the standard of living or improve the home life of this State. Indeed, I believe it will have a detrimental effect in many ways. Let me show how wide this Bill is. First, I refer to the definition of "event", which means a race and includes, where the case so requires, two races selected by the board for the purposes of any totalizator conducted by the board on which a double event bet may be made. New paragraph 31j (1) states:

The Board may conduct off-course totalizator betting on any event scheduled to be held within the Commonwealth or New Zealand and for that purpose may itself conduct an off-course totalizator or, by arrangement with a licensed racing club or licensed trotting club, as agent of the club make use of the totalizator used by that club for off-course betting on that event.

Honourable members know that under the Lottery and Gaming Act at present the number of race meetings is controlled. I believe that about 53 meetings are allowed in the metropolitan area each year, with certain racing clubs holding meetings. In Victoria the number of meetings on which T.A.B. operates is about 600, so that we must realize that the totalizator will be opened not only when races are conducted but on every normal business day of the week. Not enough race meetings are conducted in South Australia and Victoria, and it will be necessary for T.A.B. to operate on little up-country meetings in Queensland or New Zealand. That is what has happened in Victoria.

Mr. Casey: That is not true: either you don't know or you are talking nonsense.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Race meetings that have no meaning at all in Victoria are covered by T.A.B.

Mr. Casey: That is not the case.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If it is intended that T.A.B. will operate only on South Australian meetings why is it that we have to go elsewhere in Australia and New Zealand? Of course, this will become big business, and will be successful for the Government and racing clubs. The amount deducted from the money invested by the public will be 14 per cent. The public cannot win because that amount will be deducted, but it is the public that will pay. This amount is shared by the Government, the management of T.A.B., and racing clubs, but it will not help the welfare of the community. The member for Port Pirie wants it both ways: he wants T.A.B. and he wants betting shops.

Mr. McKee: Of course.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member goes further than his colleagues.

Mr. Hughes: He wants the lot.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and he wants the best of both worlds. I think the Government has been accommodating for him because if I read the Bill correctly, it is expressly designed to give the honourable member the best of both worlds.

Mr. McKee: I want T.A.B. for the people of South Australia. I do not think it is fair that I should have those advantages while others do not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe the member for Port Pirie will find a revulsion in his district against the overdevelopment of gambling in the community, as will the Government.

Mr. McKee: Who put the betting shops in Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The then member for Port Pirie combined with the then Treasurer to introduce a betting shop system, but if history repeats itself the member for Port Pirie may suffer the same difficulty as the previous member suffered.

Mrs. Steele: He is shrewdly keeping out of the debate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Every honourable member is responsible for his vote, but I do not intend to support the Bill. The Bill also provides for benefits to hospitals. The Treasurer, being big-hearted, has an amendment on file to add "or institutions," which is to show how generous the Government is with funds provided by this system. The money is to be paid to the Treasury, to be paid out on the recommendation of the Minister and on a vote of Parliament. It is in exactly the same position as other money collected by the Government to provide services. It will be paid into the Treasury and will merge with other moneys; it will be a book entry in the Treasury, and in due course, the Minister, as he does now, will recommend that certain hospitals need support and the support that now comes from other taxation will be assisted by the revenue paid from this system. I do not object to that provision, except that I believe that our hospital system is in a better financial position than are others in other Australian States. The moment this matter is brought in as a support for hospitals, much of the charitable support that hospitals receive from the community at present will be taken away, and I point out that a great amount of charitable work is done for hospitals.

Let me refer to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. The assistance given to that hospital does not arise from the fact that it is a better institution than the Royal Adelaide Hospital: they are both institutions of the highest order. However, it is known publicly that the Royal Adelaide Hospital is receiving sufficient Government assistance to cover its costs, whereas the Adelaide Children's Hospital is not in that position. It receives some Government assistance but is largely supported by charitable organizations and the people set out to see that it is maintained.

I consider that the negligible amount of additional money that the hospitals will receive from this Bill will be offset by the loss of charitable assistance. I support the amendment that has been outlined by the Leader of the Opposition. This matter was the subject of an inquiry by the Betting Control Board, which pointed out that the winning bets tax system and the T.A.B. system could not operate successfully side by side. I am not sure that it is in the best interests of the Government and the racing clubs to try to make the systems operate side by side, because attendances will undoubtedly fall off if that is done.

When the betting shop system was in full swing, the number of people who went to the racecourses was really only sufficient to enable the meetings to be conducted. In that period a bullet could have been fired on a racecourse without anyone being hit. There is no limitation on the number of agencies that can be established under the terms of this Bill, or on the method of conducting the agencies. When T.A.B. started in Victoria, it was to be a beautifully impartial system that did not in any way seek to induce people to use its facilities. It was going to be impersonal, with the atmosphere of a bank.

However, experience showed that it was not possible to conduct anything but large agencies by that method, and many agencies developed in the country were conducted by women upon a commission basis. They are still conducted on a commission basis and I doubt that they can be conducted profitably. After all, the purpose of this Bill is profit and I doubt that agencies could be conducted profitably on any other system.

I have not had the opportunity of checking the day to day developments in Victoria since the election, but at that time the country agencies were conducted on the basis that the board established the premises, paid the office expenses, provided the telephones and gave the person operating the agency a net 3 per cent of the business conducted. It was interesting that, at the commencement of the

system, the number of women who patronized T.A.B. represented 5 per cent of the patrons.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There was a guaranteed minimum of about $40.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There may have been that guarantee, too. Anyway, there was a percentage basis. When T.A.B. had been operating for only a couple of years, the number of women visiting the country offices was 25 per cent of the patrons. Perhaps I am old-fashioned but I do not consider that this country, and this State in particular, will improve the standard of the people by encouraging gambling. I am not going into the rights or wrongs of gambling, because I am not qualified to speak on that. I am not saying that, if a person has a small bet on a horse, he does something wrong. However, I say with all the conviction that I have that, although this Parliament cannot make laws to make people good, it should not make laws to encourage gambling. Gambling, in extreme, is nothing but economic waste.

In those circumstances, I propose to vote against the second reading of the Bill and hope it will not be carried. If it is carried, I propose to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which at least gives effect to all the protestations that have been made by members opposite that the winning bets tax is an inquitous tax that should be taken off as soon as possible. Here is an opportunity to take it off.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I do not propose to speak at length, but I desire to refer to two particular facets that have been given as the major reason for the introduction of T.A.B. in South Australia. The first is that it will overcome the unhappy arrangement in every country town today regarding the operation of the illegal bookmaker. The next reason is that the profits will assist the financing of our charitable institutions.

Some evidence is fresh in my memory, although it was taken some years ago. A special committee was appointed by this House to look into our institutions in South Australia. We took evidence in every State except Western Australia; we did not go there. Dr. Lindell, who was then the Chairman of the Hospitals and Charities Commission in Victoria, told our committee of inquiry that he was jealous of the standard of hospitals in South Australia. He said, "Your system seems to encourage to come forward and support your institutions the type of individual that in Victoria we do not have." For the last few years they have had some support from the T.A.B. system in Victoria, but it is not very encouraging to us to hear the Premier of Victoria (Sir Henry Bolte) crying because his accounts will not balance and he is in trouble and cannot keep the State hospitals and services going without further money from the Commonwealth Government. So I have some doubt about the ultimate goal of extra cash for charitable purposes.

I agree with the comments made by my two colleagues, the members for Gumeracha and Flinders, that the tendency will be to discourage the charitable traits of many of our people. I suppose we have all had some experience of our wives working for various charitable causes. I have had that experience. My wife has been working until recently with one of the auxiliaries of the Adelaide Children's Hospital, raising money for that hospital. This sort of thing is taking place on a State-wide basis. No doubt many honourable members have a similar story to tell. I am of opinion that, if the general public react as I expect to the moneys to be raised by this means and by our proposed State lottery, they will say, "Why should we work and carry this burden any longer?" It is a burden that falls upon the shoulders of a few, for only a handful of people in any community do the actual work. They will say, "Why should we work if these funds are to be made available from sources established by the Government in South Australia—the State lottery and off-course betting?" I doubt whether we shall be able to replace from these new sources the moneys that at the moment come from the efforts of these brave-hearted women, who do more money-raising in this field than men do. They will close down and we shall not be able to make up the monetary deficiency. That is my first point.

My second point concerns the S.P. bookmaker. I think we shall be encouraging him—for two reasons. The first is that the dividend to be taken out is being increased from the present 12¾ per cent to 14 per cent; the second is that we are continuing with the winning bets tax, so that the S.P. bookmaker operating in any reasonably sized country town will have a handsome margin with which to compete against the totalizator dividends, which will be declared after the 14 per cent is taken out. If he can keep a fair share of that 14 per cent, he has a handsome working margin and, although there is some risk in carrying the bag, any bookmaker with a decent bank behind him knows that on the average over a period he has to win. He can hardly lose if

he has a reasonable margin with which to compete against the totalizator. If he has a reasonable margin with which to fix his price over that of the totalizator, he will be on the safe side in the long run. If he is an illegal bookmaker he does not pay any winning bets tax, so he can offer a better shade of odds. If a man wants to be on the favourite, the illegal bookmaker can offer half a point better, for he can well afford to do so. He has the money in his bag to do it with. For these reasons I doubt whether this legislation will get rid of the S.P. bookmaker. There has been much winking of the eye at what has been going on for a long time in South Australia.

When I was a boy working in my father's business in Currie Street, bookmakers operated in every hotel. In the old Crown Inn a man named Blinman operated as an illegal bookmaker in those days. He finished up being a wealthy man. He used to say, "Give me the small bettor, the man who takes long odds. I am happy to take it in little bits." He operated almost with no risks at all. He had nits adroitly sited all over the town to tip him off, and I do not recollect his ever being caught for illegal betting. Occasionally, men of that type get caught, but nine times out of ten those who are caught are agents for a principal, who is never caught. The man with a bag is never out in the open. The bookmaker who is the banker is never out in the open to be caught. As a matter of fact, I do not think he is ever known; it is difficult to discover his name. His agent handles things for him and, if the agent is caught, the bookmaker pays the fine.

Mr. McAnaney: Does he go to gaol for him, too?

Mr. SHANNON: If he goes to gaol, I expect he gets reasonable compensation.

Mr. Quirke: And he probably looks after his family as well.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes; that is right. The man who takes all the risks and acts as the agent is well paid for it. He knows that he takes all the risks, while the other man sits back. Of course, the S.P. bookmaker needs a decent bank behind him. These are factors that lead me to suspect that we shall not easily rid ourselves of the S.P. bookmaker. In fact, I make this prognostication now: depending upon the assiduity of the law, we shall have an increase in S.P. bookmakers under this system, for the two reasons I have given—an increase in the take-out of the totalizator pool (the 14 per cent) and the continuing of the imposition of the winning bets tax in assosiation with it. I have one further point and then I am finished. This worries me almost as much as the other points. As one who was a member of Parliament when we passed legislation in the 1930's setting up betting shops, I am prepared to accept any criticism levelled at me for what we did then. It certainly was not in the State's interests; it was one of the blots on our escutcheon, in my view. I am a little fearful that we may be entering into a similar field, especially as we are not certain of the basis on which T.A.B. agencies will be established. How scattered will agencies be? How many agencies will be established in large country towns like Whyalla and Mount Gambier? How many agencies will be needed to handle the business offering in those cities? I am inclined to think they will be pock-marked with rather doubtful betting shops. An agency can be called nothing else but a shop: a person enters it to lodge a bet with the agent. Here, I endorse the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition, who rightly pointed out that by paying him on a commission basis an agent will be encouraged to seek business, because the bigger the turnover the bigger his weekly profit.

We may be encouraging betting rather than merely providing for the establishing of legitimate off-course betting. Although I generally attend a race meeting once a year (at Oakbank, and I occasionally attend the Adelaide Cup meeting), I am neither a racing fan nor expert, but go to a meeting purely for the sake of an outing. However, I fear that a system may be established that will finally bring discredit on Parliament, similar to the discredit that was brought on it previously. I was a lucky survivor in 1929, for my Party went to the country 29-strong, returning with only 15. The Labor Party, too, was nearly annihilated, and returned with nine. That was obviously the public's reaction to something that was not in the interests of the society. Are we moving towards the establishment of a similar type of institution in our midst? Will agencies spread intensively throughout the State, employing commissioned agents who will be encouraged to seek patronage? If that is so, some of us will have some accounting to do later in the piece.

I shall not oppose the Bill, for I have no objection to properly regulated gambling, provision for which is made in the Bill. But I object to its encouragement; it is bad economics to encourage the wasteful expenditure of money by people who can frequently

ill-afford it. Gambling has a peculiar kink, in that the wealthy man does not worry about losing $10, $20 or $200, but the man struggling to keep his family gambles to win. He desires something additional to his weekly pay cheque, but, as a rule, loses. Indeed, on the law of averages, he must lose. Only the bookmaker and the totalizator cannot lose. The totalizator takes 14 per cent as soon as it receives a bet, so a person taking only $2 to a meeting can kiss it goodbye. Many factors associated with gambling are unhealthy.

Mr. Ryan: Haven't you ever had a bet on the "Recovery Stakes"—the last race?

Mr. SHANNON: That is a bookmaker's harvest. I am told that the bookmaker, being fully aware of the punter's idiosyncrasies, raises the odds a little in the last race to encourage him. Many a punter will be tempted by an extra half point, but he almost invariably doubles his losses, instead of balancing them. I should not like to see facilities provided outside towns of a reasonable size. I should like agents, too, to be employed as servants of the board and not given the incentive to seek business. On this basis the repercussions that I fear may not eventuate. I ask the Government to be cautious in this matter.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I have listened to the speeches with interest—

Mr. Quirke: Are you going to declare yourself tonight?

Mr. McKEE: I declared myself on the motion introduced last year. It is a pity the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) is not in his seat, because I think he said I opposed the establishment of a totalizator agency board on that occasion. That is not so; I support T.A.B. because I believe it will be of benefit to the people of the State. As a member of this House I must have the interests of the people of the State at heart and support legislation that I think will be of some benefit to them.

This Bill provides for a facility that has been denied people in the country for many years. The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) believes that people will eventually turn against this measure as they turned against betting shops before the war. However, I refer him to the experience we had recently when a referendum on the establishment of a lottery was held and 71 per cent voted in favour of the lottery. This Bill is another social measure and there is public demand for it. I have gained the impression that people are for it and I think most honourable members have gained a similar impression. The member for Gumeracha said that T.A.B. would encourage gambling. All I can say is that apparently the honourable member does not travel around his district on Saturday afternoons or on afternoons of other race days for, if he did, he would see that T.A.B. could not encourage much more gambling than is already taking place with S.P. bookmakers.

Mr. Shannon: What if the agencies have runners?

Mr. McKEE: I should say that the member for Onkaparinga knows that he can place a bet at most of the hotels in his district. I support the Bill because it gives an opportunity to people to have a bet without breaking the law when they are unable to attend a racecourse. However, a large percentage of people who bet now with S.P. bookmakers will continue to do so and break the law because I believe the Bill does not go far enough.

Mr. Shannon: Are you talking of the moral law?

Mr. McKEE: I believe the Bill will provide for a mild form of off-course betting. By that I mean that the person who does not desire to break the law and believes he should reform will use T.A.B. rather than S.P. bookmakers, but many small bettors will continue to bet with S.P. bookmakers because by so doing, when they are fortunate enough to back a winner, they will be able to collect their winings as soon as correct weight is declared. That is how the Western Australian system operates. If a person is lucky enough to back a winner (and I say a man must be lucky because, although I do not bet much, I do not back many winners) he should be able to collect his winnings.

Mr. Shannon: The Bill is for a system similar to the Victorian system, not to the Western Australian system.

Mr. McKEE: I do not think the Victorian system goes far enough.

Mr. Shannon: You cannot collect winnings straightaway in Victoria.

Mr. McKEE: No, a person can collect his winnings only on the next business day, which is generally the following Monday. However, if a person goes to the T.A.B. agency with about $2, bets $1 on a horse and is fortunate enough to back a winner, he may win, for instance, about $5. However, he cannot collect that because the agency will not pay out on a Saturday. In Victoria there are people known as scalpers—they are the people who buy up

tickets at the stadiums and sell them later to those who were unfortunate enough to forget to obtain them before they were all sold. What happens in Victoria is that these scalpers offer to pay a person say, $4 or $5 for his ticket, which is worth $6.

This applies also to bigger betters who may be offered $18 for a ticket worth $20. These scalpers operate in hotels to which the person who may have backed the winner will go after the race. I have received reliable information that this practice exists in Victoria. Recently I had lunch with a member of the Victorian Racing Club who, I think, would be fairly well informed about what is happening with this form of T.A.B. in Victoria, and that is what he told me. I see that the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) is smiling. Good luck to him! The people of Peterborough will be able to bet without breaking the law, and that is one thing I like about the Bill. However, I still say it does not go far enough. I believe that if a man has backed a winner he should be able to collect as soon as correct weight is declared.

Mr. Shannon: Isn't that fundamental to gambling? They want to know their fate and collect as soon as they can.

Mr. McKEE: Of course; they are entitled to their money, and if they want to play it up they should be allowed to do so.

Mr. Shannon: This is another argument that the Bill encourages the S.P. bookmaker.

Mr. McKEE: In Port Pirie we have a form of betting whereby people can collect their winnings when correct weight is declared. That is why I do not think T.A.B. would survive in opposition to the betting shops at Port Pirie because, in addition, names and weights of horses are displayed in the betting shops.

Mr. Shannon: They even get information on shorteners.

Mr. McKEE: That is one matter on which I think there should be improvement at Port Pirie. The betting shops get a second reading of prices but on the course a third reading of prices is given. In the event of some money being bet on a horse causing its price to shorten or in the event of another horse's price lengthening, without the third reading of prices it is possible that a false favourite can be created, which affects the investments of some people.

Mr. Shannon: You have convinced me that there will still be S.P. betting.

Mr. McKEE: Of course. In fact, S.P. beting will survive on T.A.B. The person who does not want to break the law, and is breaking the law now, will bet with the T.A.B. agency. In a debate in 1964 I said that I would support total T.A.B. and I still adhere to that. I do not think you can make fish of one and flesh of the other so that if the bookmakers in Port Pirie are to be sacked then all bookmakers should be sacked. The bookmakers in Port Pirie are not young men and they would find it difficult to find other employment if they desired it.

Mr. Shannon: They would be good agents, wouldn't they?

Mr. McKEE: I suppose they would, but these people have their houses in Port Pirie.

Mr. Shannon: They could operate agencies in Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: There would be no need for 10 agencies in Port Pirie. The honourable member knows that T.A.B. would not operate with that many agencies in Port Pirie. As I said, I agree with total T.A.B. and if bookmakers at Port Pirie are to be sacked then bookmakers on the course should also be sacked. Let us get rid of all bookmakers and have total T.A.B. When I say this I know that nobody will recommend it, so that I am undoubtedly on safe ground. When the honourable member for Gumeracha was Premier of this State he often said that the sport of racing was a very important industry. In fact, I think that was said when betting tax was being debated in this House not so very long ago.

I agree with the honourable member that racing is an important industry, for hundreds of people are directly or indirectly employed or associated with the racing industry in this State, yet because we are the only State that does not have T.A.B. our racing industry is at a very low ebb. Our best horses are trained here but they are taken to other States to scoop the big prize money that can be provided there because of the operations of T.A.B. Honourable members know that the stake moneys not only for feature races but for some other races in Victoria are invariably bigger than they are in this State. Even at such places as Bendigo and other Victorian towns big stake money is offered. The big prizes offering over there are attracting the best horses from South Australia, and our leading jockeys are also going to the other States because they can earn bigger money. Representatives of the racing clubs in South Australia have told the public that T.A.B. is necessary for the survival of the racing industry in South Australia. I think the member

for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) would agree that that is so. I am sure he would admit that to own, train and race a horse today is a pretty costly business.

Mr. Shannon: It is a rich man's hobby.

Mr. McKEE: It has become that, but it has not always been so.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is called "The sport of Kings".

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and perhaps it is. To feed, train and race a horse, and to pay acceptances, riding fees and that sort of thing costs a sizeable amount, and that in itself provides an incentive for people to ride and race horses in the States that offer the bigger stakes. I support T.A.B. because it will ensure that the racing industry survives and it will give people an opportunity to have a bet. However, I still say that the Bill does not go far enough.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): It gives me great pleasure to support this Bill. Contrary to what members opposite have implied, I, like the honourable member for Port Pirie, maintain (as I did when I introduced a motion on this topic last year) that T.A.B. is desirable because it will give the general public an opportunity to bet legally. I still maintain that that is the prime purpose of the Bill. I have the greatest respect for other people's opinions, and particularly those of church people who have voiced their dissatisfaction with any form of gambling. As I said last year, I admire these people. However, I think members in this Chamber should not be guided by outside influences, for they are entitled to make up their own minds.

The honourable member for Gumeracha, who spoke earlier, is an unusual member in many ways. I remember that last year he accused me of being rather sanctimonious about the measure that I introduced, and this year he went even further and accused me of being the "arch-priest of gambling". I have also been called "the member for Rome" and the "member for Newcastle", and I am wondering where this is going to lead. Perhaps I have been elevated this evening. As I told the honourable member last year, I am not a gambling man. In conversation with another person this evening, I recalled that the last time I went to a metropolitan race meeting in South Australia was during the Second World War. I think any difficulties that come before this Chamber should be resolved by the members here and not by pressure groups outside.

Members know the intolerable conditions that exist in South Australia today regarding having a bet, and I think this Bill is the answer to that problem. If we look at the findings of the Royal Commissions from all over Australia we find that they all recommended that the best system that could be introduced into any State was the off-course system of totalizator betting. Members opposite have not referred to this Bill in any shape or form. In fact, the member for Gumeracha spoke about everything except the Bill, and when he mentioned one item in the Bill he even got mixed up with that because he did not understand it. He spoke about the term "event" that appears on page 5 of the Bill, and then he went on to confuse it with the same word where it appears on page 11, although the two things are totally different: they have nothing in common whatever. When the Leader of the Opposition spoke he did not even know the correct position with regard to telephone betting in Victoria. The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) prompted him and tried to correct him, but the Leader still insisted that he was right in what he was saying, whereas he was completely wrong. Honourable members know this.

This Bill provides for a system of totalizator betting that is as near as practicable to the system that operates in Victoria today. The motion that was introduced last year sought the introduction of a Bill to provide for a system similar to the one operating in Victoria. I have taken the trouble to consult several dictionaries in the Parliamentary Library, and I have extracted the definition of the word "similar" from *Collins* and the *Oxford Dictionary*, which I selected at random. I find that "similar" means "like or nearly like, a close resemblance". I think the system being provided bears "a close resemblance" in nearly every respect to the system operating in Victoria.

I see that the honourable member for Mitcham has a deep frown on his brow. I doubt whether the honourable member understands T.A.B. as it operates in Victoria. I know that the member for Light and the Leader of the Opposition, when he was an ordinary member, spent about a day and a half in Victoria investigating this matter. They consider that as a result of the visit they are now experts on the way T.A.B. operates there. I have been in Victoria on many occasions but I still do not know many of the finer points about the way T.A.B.

works there, although I know the practical working side of it.

Recently I travelled to Melbourne with the Parliamentary Draftsman (Mr. Ludovici), whom I congratulate on the way he has drawn up this Bill: he has done a wonderful job. We learned from Victoria everything that it knew about T.A.B., and that is incorporated in this Bill, but I think we have improved on the Victorian system. For instance, we have provided that members of the board will be remunerated for their services. I pointed this out to Mr. John Dillon, the Under-Secretary of Victoria, last year when he told me that members of the board in that State were not paid for their services. I told him I did not think that was fair, as these people spent much of their own time and did a wonderful job, and that they should be paid. He admitted that this was one mistake that Victoria made initially.

Mr. Ryan: Have they rectified it yet?

Mr. CASEY: No, but they intend to do so. However, we have provided for this in our Bill. It is in small ways like this that we have improved on the Victorian system. About two weeks ago members were shown a colour film on the Victorian system, the commentary to which was by Mr. Roland Strong. It was produced by the Totalizator Agency Board in Victoria, and I think members who saw it recognized the advantages gained by totalizator betting in that State.

Mr. Ryan: They certainly have no resemblance to the old betting shops.

Mr. CASEY: None whatever. The member for Gumeracha, like nearly every other member opposite, referred to the Bill as a revenue Bill.

Mr. Quirke: Members opposite as a whole?

Mr. CASEY: The members opposite who have spoken. I do not think the Government set out for this to be so, but no Government (I include the previous Government) would accept anything that would reduce taxation. Can honourable members imagine the previous Treasurer agreeing to something that would have meant less money for the Treasury? Each member opposite to whom I have spoken, including a previous Minister, has told me that he would never in any circumstances agree to any suggestion for reductions in taxation.

I will deal now with the 14-point plan the former Treasurer put to racing clubs, which had either to accept it or practically go under. He proposed that turnover tax would be increased to 2 per cent, which would have increased Treasury finances by about $270,000. Another proposal was that the proceeds from interstate betting would be equally divided between the States and the clubs, and that the winning bets tax on the stake would no longer be charged. That is a little different from what we heard today from the present Leader of the Opposition, who wants this tax to be removed completely. This Bill provides that the tax will no longer be levied on the stake.

Mr. Hudson: Without raising the turnover tax.

Mr. CASEY: That is so. I think most punters agree that the winning bets tax on the stake should be abolished, and this is provided for in the Bill. It will operate in 12 months, or not later than 13 months after the relevant date. Under the previous Treasurer's 14-point plan, the racing clubs would have received on extra $88,000 and the Government $92,000.

Mr. Hudson: Quite apart from other things.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, this was only what appeared on the surface. However, the present Leader of the Oppoistion wants us to reduce taxation by over $1,000,000. I do not think members opposite are really dinkum in their attitude. I know the previous Treasurer would not have had a bar of this, yet members opposite roll this sort of stuff up to us!

Incidentally, T.A.B. is a very big undertaking in which large sums of money are involved. The present turnover in Victoria is about $120,000,000 annually. However, it must be remembered that the Royal Commission was told that S.P. bookmakers were handling over $400,000,000. Last year I inquired in Victoria about the number of tickets issued, and I think members will be staggered when I tell them the figure was 140,000,000. This shows the size of the operation the board is being asked to deal with.

The member for Gumeracha is incorrect in saying that the Victorian T.A.B. operates on races in the far outback of Queensland. Nothing is so nonsensical. In Victoria bets can be made on interstate races (Adelaide and Sydney) on Saturday, and at times on Queensland main races, such as the Doomben Cup and the Doomben Ten Thousand. We would do this under the same conditions. I cannot envisage that South Australia will run a totalizator on New South Wales races, except on such races as the Metropolitan, the Epsom or the Sydney Cup. Saying that we

will run T.A.B. on meetings at Woop Woop is too silly for words. The member for Gumeracha was trying to rake up as much false evidence as he could. If T.A.B. is to be successful it is important that the board is not placed in a strait-jacket, as it must have room in which to manoeuvre.

Mr. Nankivell: It sounds a bit shifty to me.

Mr. CASEY: Not at all. The board administering T.A.B. will have to raise money. Some members opposite have no idea how T.A.B. operates. The Government will have no financial obligations in establishing it; the board will be responsible for financing it. If the board is financially embarrassed, as the Leader's amendment will try to make it, it will not succeed.

Mr. McAnaney: Will it affect the clubs' share?

Mr. CASEY: The honourable member spoke on the Bill but seems to have no idea how T.A.B. operates. It does not affect the clubs.

Mr. McAnaney: You are implying that the Leader's amendment would take money away from the clubs.

Mr. CASEY: No. It will not cost the Government anything to operate T.A.B. Money will be borrowed by the board to set up agencies throughout the country and metropolitan areas; it will have to purchase or rent agency premises and buildings, which will have to be furnished; and staff will have to be hired. More than 7,000 people are employed in T.A.B. operations in Victoria so it is an industry in itself. Opposition members seem to be under a misapprehension about the Hospitals Fund. The member for Gumeracha said he thought that people were being hoodwinked about money passing into this fund. The Government has done the correct thing; this money will be channelled into a special fund. The ex-Treasurer knows how to manipulate money in the Treasury, because of his experience. The Dividends Adjustment Fund has been inserted as a result of advice from the Victorian authorities, who were financially embarrassed because several horses won and paid less than 50c, which had been guaranteed by the board. Our fund provision goes further than the Victorian system, and will help to clear up matters of this kind. I commend the Bill to the House: it is an excellent measure covering every aspect of T.A.B. as it operates in Victoria. We have learned by the mistakes made in that State and have incorporated in the Bill all the attributes from that State's system.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (25).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Broomhill, Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Freebairn, Hall, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (7).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hughes, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mrs. Steele.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Stott. Noes—Messrs. Pearson and Teusner.

Majority of 18 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 25, at 2 p.m.