

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 30, 1966.

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

### QUESTIONS

#### FLUORIDATION.

Mr. HALL: Whilst travelling in widely separated parts of the country during the weekend, I was twice asked what was the Government's attitude on the fluoridation of water supplies in South Australia. In view of this, can the Premier say whether the Government has any firm intentions about fluoridating metropolitan water supplies, and whether a country council may fluoridate the water supplies in its area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Both questions involve Government policy and, as yet, the Government has not indicated firmly one way or the other what are its proposals. The matter will be considered as and when time permits.

#### PARKSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about paving and drainage at the Parkside Primary School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have ascertained from the Director of the Public Buildings Department that the contract for paving and drainage work at the Parkside Primary School was let in April this year with a completion time of 10 weeks. The contract reached the practical completion stage on July 14, the only outstanding work consisting of the following minor items: adjustment to downpipes; fixing of seat slats and infants swings; and topping of floor to shelter shed. The contractor has been asked to attend to these matters at an early date. As I stated previously, wet weather caused a delay in the work, but further interruptions were caused when underground services were unearthed. However, in the absence of the headmaster, the deputy headmaster has expressed satisfaction with the work.

#### NAILSWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked several weeks ago about improvements to the Nailsworth Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Suggestions for improvements to the staff room and sick bay at the Nailsworth Primary School at an

estimated cost of \$1,141 have recently been considered and approved by the Education Department and returned to the Public Buildings Department which will now seek approval of the provision of funds to enable the work to be undertaken as soon as possible. The request for a new toilet block is being considered, together with one for new shelters at the school. Many similar works have been referred to the Public Buildings Department for planning, but the funds available will not enable all of them to be undertaken at present. A careful review of current requests and future commitments is to be undertaken by officers of the Public Buildings Department and of the Education Department shortly when priorities will be allotted to the various works. The Nailsworth proposal will receive full consideration at this time.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARY BOOKS.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Some days ago I asked the Minister of Education whether he would bring down a report on the selection of books for school libraries. I believe the Minister has had that report for several days, and I ask him for that information now.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The headmaster of the school concerned is responsible for the purchase of books for the school library. He exercises this control through the school teacher-librarian. The Education Department provides as much assistance and information as possible to enable a wise selection, but it does not prescribe the books which are purchased for school libraries.

School committees assist in the establishing and maintenance of school libraries:

- (1) by helping to raise funds which are subsidized by the Education Department; and
- (2) in many cases by holding "working bees" to prepare new books for circulation and to repair damaged volumes.

School committees have no jurisdiction in the selection of particular books, but schools would always welcome suggestions from the committees to assist in the selection of books to be purchased. The headmaster of the school could not possibly read all the books which are added annually to the library of a large school. The headmaster, the teacher-librarian and the staff read many of the books to be purchased, but in the main they are guided by the information made available to them in published lists of books which are appropriate for children of various ages. Useful lists of recent publications are printed in the *Education*

*Gazette* on several occasions each year. Similar lists are published by the Children's Library and the Public Library and the Children's Book Council of South Australia.

The Supervisor of School Libraries does not prescribe the books to be purchased by school libraries, but he does provide considerable assistance to help schools with the selection and purchase of library books:

- (1) He prepares the information to be published in the *Education Gazette*.
- (2) Selection of books is strongly featured at inservice conferences for teacher-librarians.
- (3) The Supervisor of School Libraries and the two advisory teacher-librarians visit schools to give help in all matters affecting libraries. Advice and useful suggestions for the selection of books are given during the course of each visit.

I believe this procedure is the correct one, and is quite satisfactory. I have examined the two books referred to by the honourable member and in my opinion they are not pornographic. The informant in this case is at liberty to approach the headmaster if he so desires, and the headmaster may withdraw the books in question from the school library, if he considers them unsuitable in the circumstances.

#### RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that Commonwealth Government authorities have had discussions with the Minister of Transport regarding the plans for the standardization of the gauge between Adelaide and Port Pirie. Can the Premier now report to the House on this matter? If not, will he obtain a report from the Minister?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not have any information on the matter, but I will refer the question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a report as soon as possible.

#### ABORIGINES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Sunday evening the Attorney-General spoke at the Malvern Methodist Church, in my district. I very much regretted that, as I was speaking in Scots Church in the city, I was not able to be there to hear him, as I had been invited to attend. It has been reported to me that at the church meeting the Attorney warned (gave a general warning, I suppose one could say) that this week there would be demonstrations by Aborigines in this place regarding the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill, especially directed to members of another place, and I understand that

last night the Attorney presided at a meeting in the city which had as its object the organizing of this matter. As the Attorney is apparently privy to all plans being made for this demonstration, I ask him when we may expect it to take place and who is likely to take part in it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the Bill was originally mooted, before its introduction, I discussed it with members of reserve councils and members of Aboriginal organizations in South Australia. The proposals were outlined to them in detail; they expressed their approval of them and asked that, if there was any way in which they could help in expressing their opinions in due course, they be informed. Throughout the progress of this matter I have sought to keep these Aboriginal organizations, not only in South Australia, informed of the measure. Earlier this year I was asked to give a paper at the Research Institute at Monash at which representatives of all Aboriginal organizations in Australia were present, discussed the measure and, with one exception (the Managing Director of A.L.C.O.A. I seem to remember), they expressed their approval of it. I have kept these organizations informed of the progress of this measure and, at their request, have supplied many of them with copies of the Bill and of the debates in this House so that they might be fully apprised of the views of all honourable members on this matter.

When certain views in strong opposition to the Government's declared policy were expressed last week in another place, and a proposal was mooted for referring the measure to a Select Committee without date as to when that committee should report to the Upper House, I informed the Aboriginal organizations, as I had previously done throughout the progress of the measure. They expressed the desire to gain further information on it, and, as a result, a meeting was arranged for them last night in Adelaide at which I could explain to them what had happened and they could question me about it, which they did. They asked for further detailed information, which was supplied to them this morning in writing. At this meeting last night they decided that representative groups of Aborigines from every Legislative Council district would wait on members of the Legislative Council to express their views, as electors particularly interested in this matter, to those Legislative Councillors.

Mr. Millhouse: It will not be a demonstration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. At this moment, so far as I am aware, they, as electors, are seeking to interview members of the Legislative Council to put forward not my point of view but theirs. That is their democratic right as citizens: they have a strong point of view on this matter, they want to express it, and I see no reason why they should not do so. They have sought to interview members of the Legislative Council on this matter as soon as possible. On this point, members of organizations elsewhere in Australia have expressed their approval of this course. Throughout the progress of this measure, I have had expressions of approval from bodies such as the Australian Board of Missions, the Federal Council for Aboriginal Advancement, the Anti-Slavery Society of the United Kingdom, Amnesty International, the National Union of Australian University Students—I could give a long list. All these organizations have wished to express their opinions on the proposals to delay this measure further, because it has been so long before this House that there has been ample opportunity for all necessary investigations. In consequence, Pastor Nicholls and Mr. Perkins have come to join with South Australian Aborigines in making these representations to members of the Legislative Council. Mr. Perkins, a former South Australian, who was brought up at St. Francis House, Semaphore, would be well known to the former Minister. He was one of those involved in the petition presented to this House by me preceding the passing of the 1962 Aboriginal Affairs Act. It is not a question of any disorderly demonstration; it is simply a showing by Aborigines, in proper discussion with their members of Parliament, of their views on this matter. I think that is the democratic right of every Aboriginal, as it is of every other citizen in this State.

Mr. HEASLIP: An article headed "Expects Aborigines to Demonstrate", which appeared in the *Advertiser* of August 29, stated:

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said last night he thought Adelaide would be the scene this week of a demonstration by Aborigines. He said the Aboriginal people throughout South Australia and in other States were very disturbed at the prospect of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Bill not passing through Parliament.

I ask the Minister, as Attorney-General (the holder of which portfolio, I believe, should try to maintain law and order), whether in making such a statement he was not inciting disturbances and causing unrest in a situa-

tion where there seems to be no unrest. By inviting (I do not know whether he invited them)—

Mr. Lawn: Question!

Mr. HEASLIP: I am asking a question, Mr. Speaker. By asking Aborigines or Aboriginal associations from other States to come to South Australia to lobby and take part in the debate on this matter, is the Attorney-General not causing unrest instead of preserving rest where at present rest exists?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is my duty as Attorney-General in this State to try to assist in the maintenance of the laws of the State. I have not done anything to the contrary, either in this matter or in any other. There is not the slightest reason why the electors of this State or of other States cannot demonstrate their views on a matter, and that simply means to show them forth.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It was different in the case of the gum trees!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course, that was not inciting unrest or creating disturbances on the part of members opposite! Obviously enough, the honourable member is trying to imply all sorts of things that were never contained in the statements by me. I did not invite persons from other States to come here: they said they were coming and they have come, and the reason they have seen fit to come is that this is a matter that concerns not only Aborigines of this State but also Aborigines throughout Australia and people overseas, too. Since the indigenous people of this country are the one comparable indigenous people never given land rights, the fact that such land rights are proposed in this Parliament is something that concerns all those interested in the rights of indigenous peoples. The people who have come here have seen fit to do so and to express their views, and I see no reason why they should not do that in a perfectly proper and orderly manner. I know of no projected disturbance of law and order and; if the honourable member thinks that the proper expression in an orderly fashion of the desires of electors is unrest in the community, I can only say that I do not think much of his ideas of democracy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On August 9 the honourable Minister said on the debate in this House:

If the honourable member tries to fight this Bill in the Upper House he will see what the Aboriginal people of South Australia do about it. They will be here in hundreds.

He then went on to say they had been telephoning him over the weekend about what they could do. The clear implication of the Minister's statement was that it was a warning of mass demonstration by Aborigines in this State.

Mr. Casey: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thank the member for Frome for prompting me to ask my question.

Mr. Lawn: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was just thanking the honourable member—

Mr. Clark: Just being insolent.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh! So I am being insolent—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not see the honourable member. The question will not be taken. I asked the honourable member to obey the Chair and to ask his question, and he refused. As he did not obey the Chair, I am not seeing him on that question.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General give the House an undertaking that he does not plan to organize any mass demonstration by any persons regarding legislation at present before Parliament?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member flatters my organizing powers.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And the time you have available.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. If Aborigines are prepared to come to this House in large numbers to listen to what honourable members have to say, I do not see why the honourable member or his colleagues in another place should have anything to fear. I hope they do not intend to hide what they have to say in this House.

Mr. HEASLIP: I refer to the people we try to look after—the Aborigines in the far-flung areas of South Australia and just over the borders in other States, who are so far away and so uneducated. Can the Minister say how they could appear here at Parliament House to talk with members of this House and of another place unless they were organized by somebody?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's question contains certain implications with which I wish strongly to dissociate myself. In this State we do not protect Aboriginal children or any other Aboriginal people. We have no policy of protection.

Aborigines neither need nor want protection: they want to be given the same rights and the same responsibilities as other citizens, and that is the policy of this Government. There are people who have come from far-away parts of the State to speak to members of the Legislative Council today, but for the honourable member to say that such people are uneducated is an insult to those people. I do not know who he thinks is uneducated in this regard. I suggest that he take the earliest opportunity to go outside the door and speak to some of the people in Parliament House at the moment: they will tell him whether or not they are uneducated.

#### SHOPKEEPERS' INSPECTIONS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: As it has been brought to my notice that some chain stores have been requiring customers to open their shopping bags for inspection, can the Attorney-General say whether that practice is within the rights of the shopkeepers concerned?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No shopkeeper has any general power of search of customers in his shop. If an offence is suspected, a private citizen may arrest another, but that, of course, may involve him in considerable difficulties if no charge is proved. However, it would be possible in my view for a shopkeeper to impose a condition on those going into a supermarket, that they enter the supermarket only on the condition that any parcels or bags taken in with them are available for inspection on their leaving.

Mr. Clark: Some put up a notice to that effect.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the notice is exhibited, I think shopkeepers have the right to insist on its being complied with, but there is no general power of personal search and, in the absence of such a notice, I think a shopkeeper could be in considerable trouble in trying to insist on any power of search.

#### COUNTRY SEWERAGE.

Mr. QUIRKE: During a debate last week I suggested that the Premier examine a proposal to provide for the drainage of effluent from septic tanks in country towns (in lieu of installing deep drainage) which, of course, could be undertaken at a much lower cost. I suggested, too, that in lieu of installing deep drainage the Government might subsidize such drainage work. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: At a conference held recently between officers of the

Engineering and Water Supply and Public Health Departments discussion took place as to which country towns would be seweraged by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and which towns would be encouraged by the Public Health Department to install common effluent drainage schemes because there was no possibility of a full sewerage scheme being approved for or constructed in those towns in the foreseeable future. The town of Clare came into the latter category. The Engineering and Water Supply Department does not intend at this stage to submit a scheme providing for a full sewerage system for Clare. In view thereof, the Department of Public Health will handle any proposals for a common effluent drainage scheme.

#### CAVE VALLEY DRAIN.

Mr. RODDA: About two miles of the Cave Valley drain at Naracoorte is worrying local residents. The trouble is largely attributable to the fact that water weed has overgrown the drain and, in some instances, herbage and other debris have blocked the drain. The all too few sharp showers in the district this year have resulted in the flooding of the Memorial Oval and in the inundation of some dwellings immediately west of the racecourse. Therefore, this drain requires cleaning up. I understand that two years ago, following representations from my predecessor (Mr. Harding), this drain was treated by the spraying of a hormone, which was designed to control the weed growth. From an inspection at the weekend, it appears to me that the hormone has not been as successful as it might have been, and the drain appears to require cleaning out. Therefore, will the Minister of Lands take up the matter with the South-Eastern Drainage Board to see whether it can facilitate the flow of the water next season by having the drain cleaned out?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to do that.

#### FREELING HOSPITAL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, a reply to my question of August 25 about a subsidy in respect of maintenance costs at the Freeling District Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Health informs me that he has granted approval for payment of a subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis to the Freeling District Hospital for repairs to the ceiling and roof of the laundry at an approximate cost of \$200.

#### BERRI EVAPORATION BASIN.

Mr. CURREN: I am concerned about the drainage evaporation basin at Berri. Because of the lack of flow in the river it has not been possible to discharge into the river any water from this evaporation basin, and this has resulted in the water level now being higher than normal. As concern has been expressed by landholders adjacent to the evaporation basin who fear that their holdings will be damaged by a high water table, can the Minister of Irrigation say what action will be taken to solve this problem?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As this matter concerns my department also, only yesterday morning I convened a conference on this matter with Mr. Gilchrist (Chief Administrative Officer, Land Settlements), Mr. Kinnear, who advises my department on engineering matters, and the Director of Lands. The department is concerned whether the evaporation basin is sufficiently large to contain the drainage that will flow into it this year, as it has not been possible, as the honourable member said, to release any of this water in the basin because of the lack of flow in the river. Although it is unusual to have these circumstances prevail for two successive years (and this has been the case), we do not expect that we will be unfortunate enough to have a third year when the flow of the river will be insufficient to allow us to discharge the water. So that we can overcome this problem, it is intended to improve the existing bankettes and to establish a series of new bankettes that will substantially increase the area over which the water will lie in the evaporation basin. By doing that, we hope that we can contain the problem this year.

#### TREE PLANTING.

Mr. QUIRKE: Last week I suggested to the Minister of Lands that when roads were widened, necessitating the removal of trees, the plan for this work should provide for the acquisition of sufficient land to allow young trees to be planted to replace those removed. Although I do not like to see big gum trees removed, I admit that in certain cases they must be removed. Therefore, I should like to see sufficient land acquired on either side of the road to provide for replanting. Has the Minister any information on this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I referred this matter to my colleague, who now reports that many councils are at present actively engaged in the purchase of land so that existing stands of trees can be preserved, or

new trees planted. In addition, both councils and the department are also planting new trees on road reserves where the width of such, or the configuration of the boundaries, makes planting possible. Although the department has not yet actually purchased land specifically for planting, this aspect would be considered if the circumstances made such action desirable. There is also a great need for encouragement of landowners, particularly in rural areas, to plant trees on their land adjoining roads, so that roadside vegetation can be achieved without danger or hazard to the motoring public. It is suggested that this could be more properly handled by councils rather than by the department.

#### RESERVOIRS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I have noticed that in the past few days the Minister of Works has been in a serenely happy mood, and I was wondering whether that was because of the knowledge that the reservoirs throughout the State were in a very good position regarding the quantity of water held. On Friday afternoon last, when I went to Mount Pleasant via the Warren reservoir road, I was agreeably surprised to notice that the Warren reservoir, which serves the major portion of my district, appeared to be practically full. Can the Minister say whether the Warren is at present filled to capacity? Is any water flowing over the spillway, and, if it is, to what extent will the South Para reservoir benefit?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, I am in a happier mood regarding reservoirs than I was a few days ago. We expected that the Warren would fill over the weekend to its maximum capacity of 1,401,000,000 gallons. However, on the latest report (which I have had only in the last few minutes) the Warren is holding 1,124,000,000 gallons, compared with 595,000,000 at this time last year. Water is still running in, and it is hoped that the reservoir will fill and then, of course, overflow into South Para. At this time last year the South Para held 7,030,000,000 gallons, and it is now holding 4,615,000,000 gallons. The Barossa reservoir, which at this time last year held 858,000,000 gallons, now holds 702,000,000 gallons.

The storage for the metropolitan reservoirs at this stage last year was 15,105,000,000 gallons, whereas on August 29 (yesterday) it was 15,682,600,000 gallons. It will therefore be seen that we are better off with our metro-

politan reservoirs and the Barossa and Warren reservoirs than we were at this time last year.

#### EYRE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: During the last two weekends I have travelled fairly extensively on Eyre Peninsula and have noticed that the trend towards the large-scale clearing of additional land is continuing and, indeed, accelerating, particularly in the area to the north and south of Arno Bay and in a line from perhaps Wharminda to the Eyre Highway, west of Darke Peak and Kimba. I would think that possibly 1,000,000 acres is being brought into production in and around that general area. The question arises, of course, as to what possibilities there are of supplying water to this land once it is carrying pasture and stock. It is not, generally speaking, land which readily runs surface water, and I imagine that the holdings are somewhat uncertain regarding catchments. In view of the obviously heavy requirements for water on Eyre Peninsula within the next five or ten years, can the Minister of Works say what steps are being taken to continue the exploration of the Polda Basin, which I believe largely holds the key to Eyre Peninsula's further water supply in the near future? I am not aware what programme is in hand for exploring that very large basin. Also, there is a possibility of a second reservoir on the lower Tod River, on which before I left office I had put in hand some investigation work. This also offers a possibility of a storage perhaps equal to the original Tod reservoir itself. I ask the Minister for information on both these matters.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member is aware, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, by arrangement with the Mines Department, is continuing investigations. I cannot tell the honourable member about any work to be done soon other than that foreshadowed in the Loan Estimates programme announced recently. However, I shall have the question examined and will forward a detailed reply to the honourable member as soon as it is to hand.

#### UNIVERSITY QUOTAS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was reported to me over the weekend that the Adelaide and Flinders universities intended to set up a joint body to handle admissions to both universities in 1967. This announcement has given rise to an anxiety that it may be the prelude to

the imposition of quotas in all faculties at either one or both universities from next year onwards, a situation in contrast to the situation that has obtained at the University of Adelaide hitherto, except, I think, for the medical faculty. Can the Minister of Education assure the House that this is not the prelude to the imposition of quotas in faculties from next year onwards? If he cannot give such an assurance now, will he take up the matter with the authorities at both universities with a view to obtaining such an assurance?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot give the honourable member any definite information on the question at the moment, but I shall be happy to get a full report and advise him. Of course, at present the universities may not have made a firm decision; they have not advised me about it, anyway.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister also ascertain whether the matriculation is still to be regarded as the entrance examination to the universities? Is it intended to allow students from other States to enter our universities perhaps in preference to South Australian students who may not have academic qualifications as high as those of their counterparts in other States? I point out that the examinations held in the various States are not completely parallel, so that it would be difficult to compare the qualifications required in this State with those in other States.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain a report on that matter.

#### SALT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At the latter end of last week an announcement was made that still another large salt-producing area was being developed in the northern part of Western Australia (I think Shark Bay was the locality), and I believe that about \$9,000,000 was mentioned as the development cost for the export of salt to Japan. As the northern part of Spencer Gulf is an area where salt can be produced probably more cheaply than in any other part of the world, can the Premier say whether all the negotiations that had previously been initiated have broken down, or whether there are still negotiations regarding development of the area at the northern end of Spencer Gulf?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Is the honourable member referring to the Leslie Salt Company?

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: No, since then—another one.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not been informed of it, and cannot answer that part of the question. I shall ask the Minister of Mines to investigate the matter further to ascertain what has been done. Whilst we were in the United States of America, representatives of the Leslie Salt Company said that that company would not enter this field at Port Augusta.

#### DAVENPORT HOUSE.

Mr. LANGLEY: A sum of \$22,000 is provided on the Loan Estimates for Davenport House in Millswood, and as this is situated in the Unley District, can the Minister of Works say what work is to be carried out?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me that he would ask this question, and the Director, Public Buildings Department, has informed me that the work to be carried out for the Social Welfare Department at Davenport House includes the provision of additional toilet facilities, modernization of the kitchen and laundry, a new garage, and general repairs, painting, and siteworks. This work, estimated to cost \$22,000 will be commenced about mid-October this year.

#### ROAD SIGNS.

Mr. McANANEY: Several accidents on main roads have been caused by motor cars colliding with heaps of rubble. There does not appear to be any uniformity of warning signs used on these heaps and recently I hit a heap of rubble on which there was no warning sign. A month later, when travelling in the opposite direction, I noticed a sign "Half road closed, drive slowly", but I saw nothing on the road for two miles. Several accidents have been caused because a wide heap of rubble had a warning light in the middle, and at dusk it is difficult to see the rubble. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether there is any uniformity of signs to be used at roadworks, and whether it would be possible for two flickering lights, one on each side, to be placed at the ends of the heaps of rubble to assist the travelling public?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter, and shall be happy to consult my colleague and obtain a report.

#### SHOW ALLOCATIONS.

Mr. HEASLIP: Last week, when asking the Minister of Lands in the absence of the Minister

of Agriculture a question about the reduction of 25 per cent in the subsidy granted by the Government to country show societies, I pointed out that the overall amount was small to the Government but an important contribution to these societies, which are doing such good work throughout the State. Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the question asked of my colleague and also his reply. The article in the *Advertiser* on Friday, August 26, has created some wrong impressions. Mr. Jenkins, President of the Mount Gambier Show Society, said, "It would be more difficult to spend heavily on improvements." Mr. Tucker, Secretary of the Remark Show Society, said, "Naturally this is really going to affect us, especially in facilities for the public." The member for Rocky River, as reported in *Hansard* in his question directed to my colleague during my absence, asked whether he was aware of any notification being given to country show societies informing them that this year their subsidy was to be reduced by 25 per cent.

There has been no notice of a reduction by 25 per cent as suggested. In fact, the Government has not reduced the overall amount of subsidies paid to country show societies, but, on the contrary, it has increased it. In 1963-64, £9,251 was spent for this purpose; in 1964-65, £9,839, and in 1965-66, £10,172 (\$20,344). Because the applications for building subsidies were greater than in previous years, and were paid at the rate of 25 per cent as previously with a maximum of \$2,000, this reduced the amount available for prize money subsidy, and instead of paying 20 per cent as in previous years, 15 per cent was paid. Even this payment required an excess warrant as the total payment exceeded the provision on the Estimates. It can be seen by this that the fears of both Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Tucker, with regard to building subsidies, are without substance. The Government is aware of the value of country shows, and will do all in its power to assist with subsidies in the future.

#### NORTH-WEST RESERVE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether investigations in the North-West Aboriginal Reserve undertaken by the Mines Department are still continuing, and, if they are, whether they are continuing with the acquiescence of the Aboriginal Affairs Department?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Arrangements are being made for Continental Oil to make its first drill on the reserve currently, under its oil exploration lease.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I meant the investigation into nickel deposits by the Mines Department.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Mines Department's survey of all minerals on the reserve is continuing with the knowledge of the Aboriginal Affairs Department. Applications by Mines Department officers for entry to the reserve are considered by the department and granted wherever they are necessary on conditions laid down as to behaviour and other matters. The Mines Department's surveys have continued on the North-West Reserve, and are continuing.

#### CADELL IRRIGATION AREA.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: During the weekend, when I visited the Cadell irrigation settlement, several settlers told me that the condition of the suction main, between the river and the pumping station that provides the irrigation water for the settlement, has caused trouble occasionally during the last two or three seasons, and some doubts existed about its present condition. The main irrigation season is about to commence, and with the high salinity of the river at present it will be awkward for the settlers if the suction main collapses and irrigation is disrupted. Will the Minister of Irrigation obtain a report about the condition of the suction main at the Cadell pumphouse?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to have the matter investigated and to ascertain whether the honourable member's fears are well founded.

#### PRISON INCIDENT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About a week ago I asked the Premier a question concerning an incident in which a prisoner Ween at Yatala Labour Prison had stabbed a warder. As the Premier said then that he would obtain information about the circumstances of the matter and the punishment being inflicted for that offence, can he now give me an answer?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not yet obtained a reply.

#### STRATHMONT HOSPITAL.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the building of the Strathmont Hospital?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As a result of the question on this matter raised by the honourable member during the debate on the Loan Estimates, I am informed that allowance is made in the provision "Preliminary investigations and design, \$100,000" for design work to continue during 1966-67 on the proposed hospital and training centre at Strathmont for the intellectually retarded.

#### TRAFFIC SURVEY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In reply to a question I asked last week concerning the report of the traffic research unit at the University of Adelaide, the Premier said that Cabinet had not been able to consider the committee's recommendations last Monday week because he had gone off to the launching of a ship at Whyalla. Can the Premier say whether Cabinet had an opportunity to consider the matter yesterday and whether it intends, as a result of its deliberations, to take action?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matter was not considered at yesterday's Cabinet meeting.

#### EGGS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, I take the opportunity to say that all honourable members are pleased to see the Minister again in his seat and in good health. Has the Minister any information about a likely increase in egg production in this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: First, I thank the member for Gumeracha for his kind remarks, and acknowledge my appreciation of the many expressions by members during my stay in hospital. As I have no information for the honourable member about an increase in egg production at the moment, I shall obtain a report for him.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I, too, am pleased to see the Minister, looking slim and fit, back in his place again. A leading article in the current issue of *Red Comb Poultry Journal* (one of the leading journals relating to the poultry industry in South Australia) states:

The last two or three months have indicated the public demand for standard eggs during the higher price period of the year and, of course, this grade of eggs has become very short. The producer agents have been doing their best to share the standard eggs they have available amongst those customers who have a fairly regular standard egg trade throughout the year, and the intermittent buyers of standards have had the left-overs, if any. To retain the goodwill of the stores (and their customers) who have this regular trade, some producer agents have been buying standards

from the Grading Agents, Red Comb in particular, but recently the Egg Board stopped the Grading Agents from supplying any more standards to producer agents until further notice. The result of this action is that the larger chain stores, and wholesale produce distributors, will benefit handsomely over the small grocers and the delicatessens, who are finding it hard enough to live now without being given a further kick by this untimely and ill-judged action of the Egg Board.

Will the Minister obtain a report from the Egg Board to ascertain whether the small grocers are indeed being discriminated against?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

#### UREA.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When explaining his recent Budget, the Commonwealth Treasurer announced that he would apply a subsidy on nitrogenous chemicals used for fertilizers and stock feeding. As one stock feeding nitrogenous supplement is urea, will the Minister of Agriculture ask his departmental officers whether there has been any recent development in urea as a stock food in this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

#### PREFERENCE TO UNIONISTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have any applications for employment in the Government service been rejected on the grounds, *inter alia*, that the applicant was not a member of a trade union?

2. If so, how many such applications have been refused?

3. Is preference to unionists the policy of the Government?

4. If so, is it the policy of the Government that applicants for employment be rejected, if they are not members of a trade union?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. Inquiries at the principal Government departments indicate that no applicants for employment have been rejected on this ground. Where more suitable applicants have been available than positions to be filled, preference is given to trade union members.

2. See No. 1.

3. Yes, as already announced.

4. See No. 1.

#### FREE BOOKS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government still intend to proceed with its scheme to make books available free for the use of primary schoolchildren?

2. If so, what is now the estimated cost of the scheme in the present financial year and the estimated annual cost thereafter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. The estimated cost of the scheme in the present financial year is \$563,000, less \$76,800 previously provided for free books to scholars of indigent parents. The estimated annual cost thereafter will depend on increased enrolments, price mediums and care of books. No firm estimate can be given at this stage.

#### TELECASTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What has been the cost to the Government of the preparation of the regular weekly telecasts on Channel 7 made by the Premier, since he took office?

2. Who is responsible for the preparation of these telecasts?

3. Who undertakes this preparation?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The replies are:

1. No specific figure can be given, as officers who may assist in this matter do so in conjunction with the ordinary duties of their office.

2 and 3. The Premier and officers of his department.

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

In Committee.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1363.)

Clause 8—"Enactment Part IIIa of principal Act"—to which the Hon. B. H. Teusner had moved the following amendment:

In new subsection 31m (4) after "declared" to insert "but shall not be available for a further bet on the day on which the dividend was declared".

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: When replying to the points I made in connection with my amendment, the Premier said:

It is wrong to suggest that, if a man backs a winner in the third race, he will have time to establish a credit for the fourth race: he will have to wait at least for the fifth race. This will not work because a bet must be placed at least 40 minutes before a race.

I am well aware of that. I do not suggest that if a punter backs a winner in the first, second, third or fourth race he could use the credit he had established with the board and bet on the next race after that on which he had won. I think the average Saturday meeting in this State consists of eight events, for while some meetings consist of only seven events frequently there have been nine-event programmes. I have noticed that there have

been several 10-event programmes in another State. If a person backs a winner on the first race in this State on a Saturday he can establish a credit with those winnings once the dividend has been declared, but seeing that there is a 40-minute interval from the time a person is able to lay a bet until the next race he could not use those winnings for betting on the next race. However, he could, with the winnings of the first race, establish credit to enable him to bet on the third race.

Assuming that he backs the winner of the third race he can then establish a credit, and he can use those winnings for a bet on the fifth race. Likewise, if he is successful on the fifth race he could, on a Saturday afternoon, in respect of a meeting of eight events establish credits for six races. A like position would apply with the Melbourne races, because if there were an eight-event programme he could continue to establish credit throughout the afternoon and then bet by credit on 12 events for the afternoon, including the six events in Melbourne. To satisfy myself, I had a look around a number of Victorian betting shops.

Mr. Casey: There are no betting shops in Victoria.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Well, T.A.B. agencies. I saw some things there about which I was not very happy. I noticed that it was possible to bet on four different meetings, and if that were the position in South Australia one could establish considerable credit on a Saturday afternoon and continue betting with the winnings. The Premier said that this would not work because the bet must be placed at least 40 minutes before the race. However, in this respect I direct his attention to page 6 of the New South Wales T.A.B. report for the year ended June 30, 1965. This report pointed out that it was unlikely that the time of 40 minutes would be reduced until some electronic or mechanical means was found to effectively and economically reduce collation times in branches or district centres. The report concludes as follows:

With this end in view, the board is observing with interest the introduction of computers in the Victorian and Western Australian systems.

Apparently Victoria and Western Australia are introducing or have introduced computers. However, the interesting thing to note is that in Sydney and the rest of New South Wales the time has been shortened from 40 minutes to 30 minutes, and this means that punters can

place their bets 30 minutes before a race. I believe the interval between races is 35 minutes. I take the view that it will not be long before Victoria will follow New South Wales and shorten the time from 40 minutes to 30 minutes, having introduced computers or some mechanical device whereby it is possible to collate all this information and transmit bets to the course totalizer in a shorter time. If this eventuates in Victoria, no doubt the time will come when South Australia will follow Victoria and New South Wales and the time will be shortened here, too. This will mean that it will be extremely easy for any person betting on credit, for he will be able to build up his winnings and bet throughout the afternoon. I said earlier that this clause discriminates between the cash punter and the punter who operates on credit, and I consider that there should be no discrimination between the two. I trust the Committee will carry my amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Premier say why the Bill does not provide for the accounts of T.A.B. to be audited by the Auditor-General? The auditor will report to the board, the board will report to the Minister, and the Minister will report to Parliament. This is not in accordance with the ordinary procedure of the Auditor-General, who reports to Parliament direct. Why is the ordinary procedure regarding public accounts not being followed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Because of its constitution, it will be known as an agency board. The definition of executive committees—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question before the Chair is that the words proposed by the member for Angas be added. Discussion on matters contained in another clause is out of order.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (12).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Heaslip, McAnaney, and Millhouse, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Rodda and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner (teller).

Noes (22).—Messrs. Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hall, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Majority of 10 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In new section 31s (2) (c) after "hospital" to insert "or institution".

This would make it clear that institutions such as the Home for Incurables and Minda Home, which are not strictly hospitals, could be brought within the definition of public hospitals and so be assisted from the Hospitals Fund.

Amendment carried.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say why no reference has been made to the Auditor-General, whereas under the State Lotteries Bill he must report to Parliament?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Proposals in the State Lotteries Bill provide for the setting up by the Government of a commission, which will be responsible for the operation of lotteries, and which shall be subject to the control of the Auditor-General. In this Bill, the one representative will be responsible to report to the appropriate Minister. Undoubtedly, if the necessity arose, the person responsible would seek the Auditor-General's assistance.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

After new section 31v to insert the following new section:

31w. (1) The Auditor-General shall annually audit the accounts of the board and shall make an annual report to the Speaker of the House of Assembly and the President of the Legislative Council on the state of the financial affairs of the board as at the date of the audit.

(2) The provisions of section 41 of the Audit Act, 1921-1959, as amended, shall, so far as they may be applicable to subsection (1) of this section, apply and have effect as if the board were a public corporation referred to in that section.

I do not accept the Premier's view that the board will be privately run. Obviously, it will not be, because in all its clauses the Bill authorizes the Minister to have certain powers. In fact, the board's residual accounts have to be paid into a public fund in the Treasury, so to suggest that the Government is not vitally interested is not in accordance with fact. Parliament should have direct oversight in this matter, especially in view of the way in which the betting shops got out of hand.

Mr. HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to rule on whether the amendment moved by the member for Gumeracha is not in conflict with new section 31g (2) in the Bill, which provides:

The board shall keep full and proper accounts of all its financial transactions and shall cause

those accounts to be audited annually by an auditor approved by the Treasurer.

Subsection (3) then provides for the board to include in its annual report to the Minister its audited accounts and an auditor's balance sheet. Subsection (4) provides that the Minister shall cause every annual report of the board furnished under this section to be tabled in each House of Parliament within 14 days, and so on. It seems to me that the member for Gumeracha is adding to the Bill a provision that directly conflicts with the earlier provisions to which I have referred.

The CHAIRMAN: When the honourable member raised the point of order, I was considering the amendment. The Bill has been on the file since August 4, but I have only just received this amendment. Other members have not had an opportunity to study it. The amendment would be inconsistent with new section 31g (2) and, as the Committee is unable now to deal with an earlier provision, I rule the amendment out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before you make a definite ruling, Sir, may I point out that there is no inconsistency at all. A provision exists in the Local Government Act that councils shall have their books audited, but there is also provision for the Auditor-General to audit councils' books if he so desires.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: That's about the weakest one you could suggest.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In ordinary circumstances, the board would have its own auditor, but the amendment provides for an audit on behalf of Parliament and not of the board. There is no inconsistency.

The CHAIRMAN: I have ruled the amendment out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved: That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

*The Speaker having resumed the Chair:*

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that during the discussion on the Bill the member for Gumeracha sought to insert a new subsection that I ruled out of order on the ground that it was inconsistent with new section 31g. The member for Gumeracha moved to disagree to my ruling on the grounds that the amendment sought to have an annual report audited by the Auditor-General presented direct to Parliament and that this was not contrary to any other provision of clause 8 or to any approved Standing Order.

The SPEAKER: I have had an opportunity to examine the Bill. I know that the Committee has already passed and agreed to the

proposition contained in new section 31g (2), as follows:

The board shall keep full and proper accounts of all its financial transactions and shall cause those accounts to be audited annually by an auditor approved by the Treasurer.

The amendment moved by the member for Gumeracha provides that there should be an audit conducted by the Auditor-General of the report presented to this House and to another place. It seems to me that it is competent for Parliament, if it so desires, to require two audits. It is not my function to speak of the wisdom or otherwise of this procedure: that is a matter for the decision of the House. My understanding of the procedure is that the House is custodian of its own affairs in that regard, and if it wants to insist on two audits it can do so. I rule that the amendment is in order.

In Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. I again draw the attention of members to the provisions of new section 31g. The auditors of this State are recognized, approved of or licensed by the profession they represent. I am confident that there are sufficient qualified auditors to audit any accounts. To the best of my knowledge, there is no provision for the Auditor-General to audit the affairs of the totalizator authorities in this State. The board will be responsible for off-course betting, and that organization will have certain obligations in this matter. It will not be involved in the operations of the totalizators on the courses, because the clubs provide for that and are responsible for the introduction of the totalizator where necessary.

I think the honorable member for Gumeracha chose probably one of the worst grounds for his argument when he referred to the Local Government Act. Probably he would know better than anyone else of the incompetence of some people in local government in his area, because a council there, having got into difficulties, found it necessary to call in the Auditor-General. The honourable member probably could have quoted many examples in support of his argument in this matter, but the example he chose was probably the worst of all. The honourable member opposed the second reading of this Bill, and now he has left it until the eleventh hour to move this amendment. In my opinion, the report of his actions will not make very good reading, in the light of the knowledge that really the Opposition entirely opposes the Bill. I ask

him in all fairness: is it an attempt to delay the Bill? I would have thought that if this amendment had been considered necessary it could have been placed on members' files long ago. We have stipulated that the accounts are to be audited by a competent person. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. CUMBE: It is apparent from what the Premier has said that we need the Auditor-General more than ever. The board is to consist of a chairman, to be appointed by the Government, and representatives of numerous racing and trotting clubs. These members will be persons of high repute in their own field, and representatives of reputable clubs. We know that when T.A.B. has been in operation for some years there will be millions of dollars' turnover in a year. No concrete reason has been put forward as to why the books and accounts should not be subject to the scrutiny of the Auditor-General. I should imagine that the members of the board themselves would welcome this audit by an independent Auditor-General, and I would have thought that the Government, too, would have welcomed it. I venture to say that not one member of the public who has followed this debate with interest knows that the Auditor-General is not to come into this matter.

Many semi-governmental and statutory bodies have their affairs audited by the Auditor-General. One need instance only the Municipal Tramways Trust and the Electricity Trust. The Premier pointed out that this board was not to be a Government organization. Well, the M.T.T. and E.T.S.A. are not Government organizations, but they receive grants from this Parliament. The Premier indicated that for a beginning it may be necessary for this board to receive grants from this Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We heard the word "guarantee", too.

Mr. CUMBE: Yes. This immediately places it in the same realm as the other bodies I mentioned that receive grants from the Government. Why should there be any objection in this matter? I suggest that if any member of the Government thought deeply about this matter he would realize that the effect of the amendment is to provide protection to the Government, to the members of the board, and to the general public. The amendment has nothing whatever to do with the general running of the T.A.B. as such in the conduct of meetings and the paying out of dividends:

it refers only to an internal audit carried out once a year by the Auditor-General, who will then report to Parliament. As the Speaker ruled a short time ago, this Parliament can see nothing wrong with two audits being carried out. I am sure that the people of South Australia would have greater confidence in the operation of this organization if they knew that its affairs were to be subject to scrutiny by the Auditor-General of South Australia, who is a completely impartial officer.

The Bill provides for a private auditor, but this provision does not apply in respect of any of the semi-governmental or statutory bodies that I know of. The Premier chose, with great delight, to ridicule the member for Gumeracha on his comment about the Local Government Act, which contains a provision that the audit may be carried out by the Auditor-General. Each council has its own qualified auditor, but the Auditor-General can investigate any or all of the books of any council and can comment on them.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose the amendment. I did not realize that it was within the competence of the Committee to do something idiotic and ridiculous.

Mr. SHANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. Is the honourable member in order in referring to this Chamber as idiotic and ridiculous? I do not think they are Parliamentary terms.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): I ask the honourable member to withdraw that remark.

Mr. HUDSON: I withdraw the remark but its meaning was that to carry this amendment would be idiotic and ridiculous.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: That is a reflection on the Committee.

Mr. HUDSON: No it is not, because the Committee has not yet voted on this amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman. The member for Glenelg, by inference, suggests that the member for Gumeracha is idiotic by moving a motion which, if carried, would make this Chamber idiotic.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold that point of order.

Mr. HUDSON: I am not responsible for any inference drawn by the member for Onkaparinga: I am responsible only for the nature of my remarks. It is nonsensical to provide for two annual audits, and Opposition members would have ridiculed the Government if it had so provided. It is complete common

sense and consistent with previous Parliamentary procedures to provide for a private audit where an organization, not under the control of the Government, is being established. This Bill provides that the Treasurer, if necessary, can require the T.A.B. accounts to be audited by the Auditor-General. A similar provision is included in the Acts that established the Flinders University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide.

Mr. SHANNON: No need exists for a double audit if the Treasurer, in his wisdom, appoints the Auditor-General as the approved auditor. Fractions cannot be ascertained until the race results are known, and nobody can predict what the unclaimed dividends will be. Over 12 months those two factors could represent a substantial sum. Although I find no fault with the relevant provisions in the Bill, I believe it is important to satisfy the public completely that the board will be administered fairly and squarely. Those responsible for sponsoring the Bill should welcome the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not satisfied with the remarks made by the Premier and the member for Glenelg. The member for Glenelg seemed to rely on the fact that Parliament had not required South Australia's two universities to be audited by the Auditor-General but, for his information, that is not in accordance with the usual practice or, indeed, with the practice in other States. As we frequently hear that it is wise to follow the other States, one would have thought that the member for Glenelg would have accepted the amendment as logical. The Premier has said that this matter does not concern us; that the board is to be appointed by the Governor and will handle moneys to be paid to the Treasury as well as to the Commissioner of Stamps and Succession Duties; and that this will not be a matter of audit, because it is too remote from the Government. Why did Parliament go to the trouble of authorizing the Auditor-General to audit the accounts of the Egg Board when it was created, even though it handled only primary producers' money? Everyone knows that a private auditor's report will certify only to the correctness of the accounts; it will not deal with questions of policy, extravagant administration, or social consequences that may arise. We desire somebody outside the board to report on its affairs, who will at least be able to take an objective view. Parliament appoints some of its members to the University Council to report on its affairs.

Mr. Shannon: The member for Glenelg is one of them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Not that he has given us anything of use up to now! The lotteries legislation provides for the Auditor-General to audit the authority's accounts. The Premier has not given one good reason why the Auditor-General should not audit the board's accounts and report to Parliament the same as he reports on the accounts of the Electricity Trust and the Tramways Trust, which are semi-government undertakings. Last year I tried to move an amendment to provide that the Auditor-General should audit the affairs of the council in my district, to which the Premier referred. That was supported by the Opposition but conveniently shelved by the Government. The Government does not want the Auditor-General talking about policy, for it fears that he may present a rather disconcerting report. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment, because no logical reason has been given why the Auditor-General should not audit these accounts.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Before the Bill was drawn up every phase of this matter was considered, and information was obtained on all points. The taxpayers' money will not be involved in the setting up of the board, as this will be the concern of the organizations to which the Bill refers. Therefore, the Government will not provide any money.

Mr. Shannon: It'll get some money out of it, though.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I hope it does: I hope it gets plenty. The auditor appointed will undoubtedly be licensed and competent, and the Auditor-General has enough to do at the moment without being involved in this matter. If the Government were in any way involved in providing funds, I would say that the Auditor-General should safeguard those funds. However, I have confidence that the auditors of the State will do a good job not only in the interests of this organization but in the interests of the State at large. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier said that if the Government had a financial interest in this scheme he would not complain about the Auditor-General's looking after the Government's interest. However, the Government has a vested interest, because money will come back to the Treasury through T.A.B. As the Premier said, the Government expects large contributions to general revenue from this source. There are a couple of imponderables involved in the way of fractions and unclaimed

dividends with which the Government should be concerned. The Government should make sure that the unclaimed dividends fund is not unnecessarily dissipated by the organization's employing people in cushy jobs. The Auditor-General would draw attention to any extravagance. However, a paid auditor will be concerned only with certifying that the books and accounts are a true and correct record of the financial transactions; as he will be an employee of the organization, he will wish to content himself purely and simply with his auditing functions. With others on this side, I do not oppose the legislation. If I did oppose it, I would allow this clause to stand in its present form because clauses like this could result in the organization's degenerating into an untidy mess, and it would fall into disrepute with the public. I point out that there have never been complaints about Auditor-Generals' reports.

Mr. CASEY: I am surprised to hear the member for Onkaparinga say that this organization could slide into an untidy mess. Just what sort of auditors does South Australia have? There must be several hundred auditors auditing the books of various companies in this State, and I do not know of any untidy messes apart from an isolated case. To cast aspersions on the auditors of the State is too silly for words. The member for Gumeracha could have debated the Bill when it was before members last week, but he apparently thought he could find a loophole. He was Premier of the State for many years and he did a good job, as I have said before. However, I must point out that I consider the Bill covers the situation entirely. I have full confidence in the members of the board, who are and will be reputable businessmen, who know the value of an audit. The report will be laid before both Houses of Parliament. I can just imagine what the honourable member for Gumeracha would have said if this sort of thing had been put forward when he was Premier and Treasurer: he would have scoffed at the idea. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member for Frome apparently does not appreciate the problem that arises in the Bill as it is at present drafted. True, there are ample provisions for a report to be laid before Parliament. However, the honourable member has not stopped to consider what that report will be. It will be a report on the operations of the T.A.B., and it will be drawn up and presented by the board itself. Is it

conceivable that we will see in the report that the board has extended its activities unnecessarily? Will we see that the board has been extravagant in its administration? Will we see in the report that the operation of T.A.B. is having an undesirable effect upon the community? I say "No" to those questions. Because the board will be reporting on its own activity, what we will see is that it is doing a good job.

It is not the adding up of the figures that is of concern here: it is the report in which we are interested. It is significant that in some activities (even semi-government activities), where we have previously provided for the Auditor-General to give a report and to audit the accounts, we have even gone above that and said that there shall be a triennial report in some instances on the entire activities. The Abattoirs Board and the Housing Trust are two cases in point. Why are honourable members so anxious that the operations of the board shall not see the light of day? What are the honourable members for Glenelg and Frome seeking to hide? Even the Betting Control Board is reported upon by the Auditor-General. If the honourable member's concern is that some of his constituents might become concerned about T.A.B., I assure him that he need not worry because they are already concerned about it. The Auditor-General is the only officer that can report directly to the Speaker, and his report cannot be revised or curtailed in any way.

Mr. Coumbe: He is completely impartial.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

Mr. Shannon: And he particularly takes note of extravagance when he sees it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There is hardly any public activity in this State that he does not audit and report upon. Do honourable members opposite say that we do not get an advantage from that state of affairs? I remember that when I was Premier we used to have a question almost every week about when the Auditor-General's Report would be presented. In fact, there would have been a strike if we had tried to deal with some of our public accounts without his report being on the table. Why have members opposite suddenly changed their tune in this respect? I believe that the Bill has been deliberately drawn up so that we will not have a report from an outside independent authority, and that is all the more reason why we should press forward with this amendment.

Mr. CASEY: In reply to a question raised earlier by the member for Onkaparinga, I point out that at present the unclaimed dividends and fractions are not subject to audit by the Auditor-General. Until I obtained a copy of the honourable member's amendment a short time ago, I did not know what it meant, because although he referred to accounts he also spoke about the activities of the T.A.B. What is it that he actually wants to be subject to report by the Auditor-General?

Mr. QUIRKE: Although I have no great concern about who is to audit the accounts of this board, I support private auditing companies, with whom I have been associated for a long time. If a person asks one of these companies for a report on his business he will get a report equal to anything the Auditor-General will give him. Under this Bill, all the Premier would have to do is say, "I want an auditor's report on the business", as a condition to appointing them. I do not know whether honourable members really mean it, but I think some of their remarks are a grave reflection on an extremely honourable institution of auditors, and that is something that I do not like.

Invariably, auditors appointed with the authority of the Premier thoroughly examine accounts, because in case of their failure to do so they would practically write themselves off as a business company. On my personal experience, we would get a most exacting appraisal from a competent group of auditors. Private auditors are of inestimable value to companies because the auditor is employed to ensure that the business operates on proper lines. I do not care whether the Auditor-General is appointed or not, but I support private auditors, whose reports have been of great value.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not discredit private auditors in any way. Provisions for establishing a private audit were approved without comment from me, and a private auditor will still audit the books and the audit will be submitted with the annual report of the board. However, under the Bill, the auditor is not allowed to report, but only to audit the accounts showing the receipts and payments and the income and expenditure of the board. The report comes from the board, not from the auditor.

Mr. Quirke: It would be a fool of a board if it did not ask for a report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In answer to the member for Frome, I want a

report from the Auditor-General in addition to a financial report.

Mr. Casey: You will get it in any case.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No: the report comes from the board, but I should like to hear what the Auditor-General had to say.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Rodda and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (21).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Quirke, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Although I realize that a previous provision prevents minors from betting in agencies, is it intended to make regulations pursuant to new section 31v (c) to exclude minors from T.A.B. premises? From what I observed in Victoria, I have no doubt that minors were able to bet by handing money over and instructing somebody over the age of 21 to bet on their behalf. Further, I realize that the Bill makes it an offence to broadcast or televise racing events in T.A.B. premises, but I observed Victorians listening to race commentaries on transistors just outside agencies, and entering the premises to continue betting shortly afterwards.

Mr. Casey: A person could sit in a motor car and listen to the races over the radio.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A person with a child in a pram cannot be prohibited from entering T.A.B. premises to lodge a bet. Although protection must be given so that agencies can be conducted properly and so that, for example, intoxicated people cannot create a nuisance, my observations revealed that the agencies functioning in Melbourne and suburbs were conducted in an orderly manner. True, no provision exists that prevents a person from listening to a broadcast in his motor car, but I point out that dividends can be collected only on a subsequent day. I saw what the old betting shops were like and I would not be a party to re-introducing similar places into the State. In this case it is most desirable to have authority under regulations to see that these agencies are conducted in an orderly manner.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—"Tax on winning bets."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

To strike out paragraph (a) and insert the following new paragraph:

(a) by inserting after passage "by that person" in subsection (1) thereof the passage "before the relevant day".

This is the most far-reaching amendment the Committee will consider. It is designed to entirely eliminate the winning bets tax after the beginning of the operation of T.A.B. in this State. This will be accomplished by making a simple insertion in section 44a of the Act. By my amendment, the winning bets tax would operate only before the relevant day. Since my amendment was put on the file, the Premier has listed a subsequent amendment which also has significance in respect of the relevant day. His amendment would mean that the relevant day could occur any day during the 13 months following the appointed day. The consideration of this amendment should not be influenced by the Premier's subsequent amendment which, if it were successful, might alter the operation of the relevant day. During the second reading debate, I submitted a table showing several alternative schemes to the Premier's proposal.

In 1964 members opposite spoke against the winning bets tax, and if they adhere to what they said then they will now support my amendment. However, during this debate some members opposite have said they will not support my amendment but they have not said why they have reversed their views. In 1964 the Premier (then the Leader of the Opposition) said:

The object of this Bill is to increase the bookmakers' tax by 50 per cent whilst still retaining the iniquitous winning bets tax, and to my knowledge ours is the only State in which a winning bets tax is imposed.

The member for Port Pirie referred to it as the "Playford tax", and other members opposite made derogatory remarks about this tax. If they were genuine about their statements at that time they would support the amendment. We are increasing taxation on the racing industry by licensing T.A.B. in South Australia. Unless the winning bets tax is removed 12 months after the beginning of T.A.B., we are not likely to see any future Government suddenly deprive itself of revenue fully committed in the expenditure programme. During my speech on the second reading, I put forward a proposal that would enable the

Government to remove the winning bets tax entirely without a reduction in its present return in taxation.

The member for Frome said that I wanted to reduce taxation by over \$1,000,000, but that was a rather ridiculous statement. I pointed out that scheme 3 of my alternative schemes would provide that if the Government averaged the returns from the second and third years of operation of T.A.B. the revenue would not fall below the rate of taxation the Government now obtains from the racing industry. The member for Frome talked of the \$1,000,000 as proposed Government income. However, it is fatuous to talk of it in that way. While he was speaking, the member for Stirling interjected "Will it affect the clubs' share?" The member for Frome replied:

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

It is difficult to know the full import of his statement, but he would be correct if he referred to the winning bets tax. I believe that the clubs would lose only a small amount in revenue, and that the return from increased attendances that would inevitably follow the removal completely of the winning bets tax (which, of course, affects on-course attendances) would more than offset this.

Mr. McKee: The member for Gumeracha would not agree with that.

Mr. HALL: I only hope the member for Port Pirie agrees with it. If he follows his previously expressed opinions in this place he will vote for the amendment. In fact, if he does not do so he will be somersaulting. I am precluded from moving that the turnover tax be increased from 1½ per cent to 2 per cent, because that is the prerogative of the Premier and Treasurer. However, there would be an obligation on him to so raise the turnover taxation to make up some of the leeway that would be lost in abolishing the winning bets tax on stakes. I believe that many people support the complete abolition of the winning bets tax. I have shown previously that if we averaged two years' financial return to the Government we would find that there was no reduction in the taxation.

The expected rates of income are based on the findings of the Betting Control Board in the report it made on T.A.B. following visits to other States some years ago. I believe that the estimated figures of turnover given by that board are the most authoritative we can

take for doing this reckoning. I believe, therefore, that the sums the Government can expect to gain from T.A.B. are realistic when they are calculated on this basis. If the Government is realistic when it says that this Bill is not revenue-producing as its main purpose (and that has been claimed by some members of the Government), then there is no reason at all why the winning bets tax should remain. If, however, this Bill is designed simply to bring in additional Government revenue on a much higher rate in the total sum, obviously the Government will not vote for this amendment. I put it to the Premier and the members of his Party that there is no reason other than that he regards this as a revenue-producing measure why he should not accept an amendment to remove, on the relevant day, the winning bets tax entirely from stake and winnings.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Leader to seriously consider refraining from making a test case of this amendment. I refer the Committee to the provisions of new subsection (3) of section 44a. Probably no member has said more against the imposition of a winning bets tax on the stake than I have said. I acknowledge and frankly admit that over the years I have always opposed it. I have never gone out of my way to question the tax on the winnings, but I have always opposed the imposition of the tax on the stake. Whether or not this measure is accepted as being a revenue-producing one, the plain fact is that this Government has introduced legislation that does not alter the existing state of affairs for the time being. However, we have stipulated that the matter will be reviewed not later than 13 months after the T.A.B. commences operation.

I intend to introduce a further amendment after the Committee has disposed of this one. I believe we can accept that in 1964-65 the winning bets tax on investments totalled about \$400,000 and that in 1965-66 it totalled about \$387,000. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment. I ask the Leader to consider his amendments up to "before the relevant date" as a drafting proposition at this stage. The Leader referred to increases in turnover tax. If we retain bookmakers we expect them to extend to the public the best possible odds, but if turnover tax is increased the less opportunity they have of doing that. The extra  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent has not improved racecourse betting with bookmakers, but the Government does not intend to reduce either it or the tax on investment. Members of the public do not seem to

be objecting to the fact that those who bet on totalizators in the future will lose 14 per cent of their investment. Whether they bet with T.A.B. or go to the racecourse they will still lose 14 per cent, as this is deducted by T.A.B. But should those betting with bookmakers not pay anything? People betting on the totalizator, whether on or off the course, have to bet in multiples of 50 cents irrespective of whether they bet through an agency or on the course. Should they lose 14 per cent while those betting with bookmakers lose nothing? I ask the Leader to use his amendment as a test vote so that we will know where we are going, but I ask the Committee to reject this amendment entirely.

Mr. HALL: I am not sure what the Premier wants when he asks me to accept this as a test case, because that is what I want the Committee to do.

The CHAIRMAN: The Leader has moved to strike out paragraph (a) of clause 9 and to insert certain words. We are dealing with the amendment in two parts.

Mr. HALL: Whether or not there is any reason for not putting the whole amendment, I accept that ruling. The Premier is disobeying the instructions, as proposed by the member for Frome, when he refers to the  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per cent existing tax on turnover and states that it is wrong to raise it to 2 per cent. This Chamber passed a motion and, by doing so, indicated that it wanted T.A.B. to operate in South Australia on the same lines as it operated in Victoria. Raising the turnover tax was included, but the Premier has seen fit to make alterations.

Mr. Casey: What's that got to do with T.A.B.?

Mr. HALL: That is a typical remark from the member for Frome. The Premier is adamant that he will not accept a rise in turnover tax in lieu of the winning bets tax. The public using these facilities would desire that to happen, and so would the racing clubs as it would increase attendance at racecourses. The Premier does not seem to be siding with anyone I know. I should like to know who will benefit from this provision, if it is not for the convenience of the race-going public who desire the removal of the winning bets tax even at the cost of increasing the turnover tax. I suggest to the Premier that it will be entirely up to him whether we call it the "Walsh tax", or not.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I should be the last person wishing to deny the member for Gumeracha his title as father of this tax. I

have heard that Victoria's racing fraternity is seriously considering introducing legislation dealing with revenue similar to what is provided in this Bill, although I am unable to say whether the tax will be called the "Playford tax", the "Walsh tax", or the "Bolte tax". Let us not forget that this is a revenue-producing tax for the Government. However, I do not know of any State in the Commonwealth that has offered as much assistance to its racing fraternity as this State has. Not only did the tax provide the Government with revenue: the racing clubs received their share. The Bill seeks to ensure that revenue obtained from an off-course totalizator will balance out with the present tax imposed on the punter's investment. If that takes place within less than 13 months of the relevant date, the winning bets tax will be lifted, because I shall then seek to amend the legislation accordingly. Under no consideration will the tax go beyond the 13 months stipulated in the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We have heard today many statements about the best way of obtaining revenue for the Government. This provision has been introduced with the approval of the racing clubs, the Government and the racing clubs to receive their respective shares. However, if the winning bets tax is eliminated completely, I venture to suggest that T.A.B. will not get off the ground within 12 months. The clubs must provide the capital to establish the agencies, including staff and salaries, before one cent in revenue is obtained. Surely, we must consider those responsible for providing revenue for the Government. I agree that the winning bets tax on the punter's stake should be removed as soon as possible, but to do so within 12 months will leave the racing clubs with hardly anything at all.

Mr. Hall: How much will they lose?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The racing clubs received \$143,876 on last year's balance sheet, and would lose that sum if the tax were completely eliminated. I support the Leader in regard to lifting the turnover tax. Taking Victoria's per capita investment of \$40, the South Australian clubs would gross \$1,540,000 in the first year, and the Government would obtain \$2,099,648 net. In the second year, the net receipts of the clubs would be \$1,590,500. Out of that they would have to pay their various expenses and it is estimated they would receive only about 3 per cent of the 8½ per cent from T.A.B. receipts to which they are entitled. In the second year the Government would receive net earnings of \$2,409,648.

In the third year the clubs would receive \$1,590,500 gross and the Government would receive net \$2,879,648. In the fourth year the winning bets tax could be wiped out completely because it would be more than offset by the return. In the fourth year the clubs would receive \$1,648,000 gross and the Government, without the winning bets tax, would receive \$2,142,148 and, if the winning bets tax were retained, \$3,182,148. The clubs would not receive a proportion of the winning bets tax in that figure. In the second year to which I have referred the clubs would receive nothing from the winning bets tax. In the fifth year the clubs would receive \$1,768,000 and the Government would receive, without the winning bets tax, \$2,382,148, and with the winning bets tax \$3,422,148. In the sixth year the clubs would receive \$1,828,000 and the Government would receive, without the winning bets tax, \$2,502,148, and with the winning bets tax, \$3,542,148.

When the winning bets tax is eliminated, the Government should consider increasing turnover tax to 2 per cent. If that were done (if the winning bets tax were eliminated and the turnover tax on bookmakers increased from 1½ per cent to 2 per cent) the result would be that in the fourth year the clubs would receive \$1,755,554 and the Government \$2,249,702. In the fifth year the clubs would receive \$1,875,554 and the Government \$2,489,702. In the sixth year the clubs would receive \$1,935,554 and the Government \$2,609,702. Should we eliminate the winning bets tax immediately or should we continue it? I suggest to the Committee that the winning bets tax less the portion on the punter's stake should be maintained for at least three years so that the clubs will receive some benefit from the capital they have invested to establish T.A.B. in South Australia. For some years, stake money at race meetings in New South Wales and Victoria has increased to such an extent that these meetings have attracted the best horses, a result of which has been increased attendances at the meetings. If the clubs in South Australia receive increased revenue then this State will attract the best horses also.

The Premier said that people have complained about having to pay the winning bets tax. The other day I met a former prominent owner who said that he had kept a record of the bets he had made over the previous 12 months and had found that he had paid a great sum in winning bets tax. I told him he was lucky because he must have backed many winners to pay that amount in winning

bets tax. That fact had not occurred to him. I told him that the idea now was to remove the tax on the punter's stake. This portion of the tax has been obnoxious. The Betting Control Board estimates that it has amounted to 30 per cent of the revenue. If the tax on the punter's stake is removed I believe that the winning bets tax should be maintained for years so that the racing clubs can recover the capital they have invested. The Government receives a net amount of  $5\frac{1}{4}$  per cent and, although the clubs receive  $8\frac{1}{4}$  per cent, when they pay administration expenses it leaves them with a net 3 per cent.

Mr. Burdon: Would the abolition of the winning bets tax cripple country racing?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Many country clubs would have to be eliminated. Once the revenue lost by removing the tax on the punter's stake has been made up, we should increase the turnover tax by  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent which would benefit the Government and the racing clubs.

Mr. HUDSON: I oppose the amendment. What the Government intends to do involves a reduction in the amount of winning bets tax paid by punters of about \$400,000. The member for Ridley said that this amounted to about 30 per cent of the total tax, and that it would be eliminated. The sum involved in this is \$400,000 a year. That is a very substantial concession, and I suggest to the Committee that, in view of the current financial situation that faces South Australia at present, it is as big a concession as can be made. It is a concession that removes one of the main objections that punters have to the winning bets tax. It is true that some punters object to paying any winning bets tax at all. However, for many punters the main gripe relates to paying winning bets tax on their investment.

I said earlier that because of the prevalence of each-way betting the tax on punters' investments represents almost 30 per cent of the total winning bets tax. Any Government faced with the kind of deficit that this Government is faced with at present could at best not do more than make the concession that it has made and still act responsibly. Nobody can reasonably expect the Government at this juncture to go along with the million-dollar deals advocated by the Leader of the Opposition. One week the Leader is screaming to this place about the deficit and accusing the Premier of plundering the trust funds, and the next week he is proposing to give away \$1,000,000 of extra Government revenue. What sort of consistency is

there in that? Worse than that, a few weeks ago the Leader proposed giving away \$1,500,000 of additional revenue from land tax. I think the Leader likes writing those cheques for more than \$1,000,000. However, I suspect that the electors of this State will discover that the cheques will bounce. In fact, the Leader indicated as much in his remarks in introducing this amendment, for he said, in effect:

If it is not taken off now, we are not likely to see any future Government remove the remainder of the winning bets tax.

No doubt he said that in order to give himself a let-out. Let him tell the Committee that he will eliminate the winning bets tax completely should he ever become Premier and Treasurer of this State. He was challenged to say that if he were ever elected to office he would reduce land tax by one-fifth, and he said that he would not make that commitment. I suggest that in his introductory remarks this afternoon, when he said that we were not likely to see any future Government remove the winning bets tax if it were not removed now, he was giving himself a let-out on this matter as well. Let me remind honourable members of some of the discussion that took place on the Loan Estimates debate recently. The member for Mitcham said about the Premier, in one of his more abusive moments:

I am trying to save the State from his folly.

The same honourable member, speaking on the Public Purposes Loan Bill, attempted to move an amendment to prevent any use of trust funds. He should save that amendment for the time at some future date when the Leader of the Opposition is in a real position to hand \$1,000,000 out week after week, for that is when it will be needed; it is not needed at the present time. The Leader, at page 1249 of *Hansard*, said:

The Government has not come to grips with the run-down of the State's finances.

At page 1067 he said:

We have seen the trust funds raided to make up a deficit.

At page 1068 he said:

The Treasurer has said that he has milked the trust funds—that he has raided them.

Even though the Treasurer did not, in fact, say that, that was what the Leader accused him of doing. The Leader went down to the South-East over the weekend, and he is reported in the *Border Watch* as saying:

Our main concern at present is the \$9,000,000 running deficit that was incurred during the last financial year.

He has even exaggerated by \$1,000,000; apparently he did not think the real figure of \$8,000,000 was enough. This is his main concern, yet he had the audacity to get up a few weeks ago and try to give away \$1,500,000 in the face of the current financial position.

Mr. Casey: He must be a million-dollar baby.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I suggest that he would run the State out of trust funds more quickly than would anybody else. Let us see how honest and consistent members of the Opposition are in their attitude. The member for Stirling (and we have heard him prate about the deficit) feels strongly about the deficit. Is he prepared to get up and support the Leader in his amendment?

Mr. McAnaney: You read my speech in the second reading debate. Mine is the only consistent view put forward so far.

Mr. HUDSON: I heard the honourable member's speech. Now that the member for Stirling has accepted a stamp duty of 5½ per cent on totalizators (and he has accepted that, because I have not heard him oppose the clauses of the Bill that apply to that), to be consistent he would want a turnover tax on bookmakers of 5½ per cent, because the main point he was making was that we should have the same rate on both.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The point is that what it boils down to is that it is a revenue tax.

Mr. HUDSON: That is not correct. The member for Flinders is putting a misleading picture, because the whole thing is not a revenue measure. Revenue is part of it, obviously, but the main purpose of the Bill is to establish legalized off-course betting. At the same time, it does mean projected extra revenue for this Government. I am prepared to get up here this afternoon and justify that position, in view of the fact that we have a deficit. I am not prepared to be irresponsible and try to give away \$1,000,000 of that extra revenue at this juncture. If the finances of the State were in balance, then it might be possible to be more generous in this matter.

Mr. Hall: Whose fault is it that the finances are not in balance?

Mr. HUDSON: To use the Leader's phrase, there was a running down in the State's finances (that is, an excess of expenditure over revenue) of \$7,500,000 in 1964-65, and whose fault was that?

Mr. Hall: We did not have this mess, did we?

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader is only trying to create a misapprehension in the minds of the people that this is a mess, and at the same time he is trying to curry favour in the most unpleasant way with the racegoers' association and with other punters by proposing something which he (as a responsible Treasurer of this State if he were ever elected to that position) knows he could not fulfill.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. HUDSON: Last year, when the motion moved by the member for Frome was debated, many members spoke, but I do not recall any reference to the winning bets tax or the raising of turnover tax to 2 per cent. One feature of the Victorian system was that when T.A.B. was introduced no change occurred in rates of tax imposed on the racing industry, and all the additional revenue for the Victorian Government was an increase in Government revenue. For the last financial year additional revenue to that Government was about \$5,000,000. Perhaps the words "similar to Victoria" implies that the South Australian Government is entitled to receive a similar increase after allowing for the smaller population of this State. Who pays winning bets tax? The Betting Control Board report states that at race meetings from 60 per cent to 70 per cent of bookmakers' turnover occurs in the grandstand enclosure, so that the bulk of the winning bets tax is paid by the wealthier punter who bets in large sums. I have been told that the tax affects the working man, but the relief will assist those on higher incomes and, as bookmakers will tend to shorten odds, some relief will go to them.

When T.A.B. is established and the revenue to clubs and the Government is known, this will not prejudice the granting of further relief from this tax. The punters investing large sums are not representative of the ordinary working people. If any Opposition member, who has been creating a song and dance about the deficit in discussions on the Loan Estimates, supports this amendment he demonstrates to the people of South Australia his irresponsibility and is saying to the people, "You must not take any notice of what I said about the deficit, I was just playing politics. It was really hogwash, because if I get the opportunity I shall promise a \$1,000,000 here and a \$1,000,000 to the next bloke." My million-dollar friend on the other side has been able to find a few million dollars in recent

weeks. Because of the current financial position of the State and because we do not know how successful T.A.B. will be, any estimate of possible turnover is only an estimate, and no responsible Government can do more than this Government has indicated it is going to do, that is, to meet the main grievance of punters by removing the winning bets tax from the punter's stake. I hope all members treat this amendment with the contempt it deserves.

Mr. HALL: That is a peculiar argument from the learned ex-lecturer in economics, in that the Opposition is incorrect in criticizing Government expenditure, as it is not its fault.

Mr. Hudson: I didn't say that.

Mr. HALL: It is implied.

Mr. Hudson: No, it is not.

Mr. HALL: The member for Glenelg said that it was wrong for the Opposition to criticize the deficit.

Mr. Hudson: I did not say that. What I said on another occasion—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: The member for Glenelg criticized the Opposition because it advocated increased expenditure and is advocating now a tax that will not be as high as he intended it to be. The Opposition advocates a reduction of the present tax. We do not know what socialistic ventures the member for Glenelg may have in mind, but we are not responsible for his mismanagement of financial affairs. He has quoted remarks attributed to me in South-Eastern papers, and has criticized me for saying that the State's deficit was \$9,000,000. The Premier said that there was an aggregate run-down during 1965-66 of \$9,240,000.

Mr. Hudson: The deficit is \$8,000,000, as you well know.

Mr. HALL: Why does the honourable member twist things? I said that it was a running deficit, and everyone at the meeting knew to what I referred. I said it was the loss on last year's operations, a running deficit. It is ineffectual for the member for Glenelg to say it is \$7,500,000, and then to say it is \$8,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: For 1964-65: you don't listen, do you?

Mr. HALL: I accept the correction, but the honourable member should be more accurate. He cannot throw aside the responsibility of the deficit by criticizing the Opposition. The deficit is something resulting from Government policy, and we should be able to criticize it. We have been criticized because we will

not eliminate portion of the land tax and the winning bets tax when we return to office. The member for Glenelg must know that if these expenditures are included in the Budget they must necessarily be supported in the future. It is futile for us to assume that we can ignore expenditures which have been voted in this Parliament and which are expected to continue year after year.

Mr. Hudson: You talk about increased turnover from T.A.B.; surely, you could eliminate the winning bets tax because of increased turnover.

Mr. HALL: I believe the figures calculated by the Betting Control Board are far more accurate than those supplied by the honourable member. It is utter nonsense to say that I am currying favour with the racing clubs. The member for Glenelg, like his Premier, has not brought forward any real reason for opposing the amendment, except to say that we have run into a deficit and need more money. That the member for Glenelg cannot maintain the State's finances on an even keel is no reason why we should impose taxes here. I am merely advocating the stipulation of a certain time when T.A.B. will be receiving a sufficient turnover and when a reduction in the tax sought by the Government will be possible.

Mr. SHANNON: The little man who may bet in the derby can less afford to pay the winning bets tax than can the wealthy man in the grandstand. I am concerned at the effect the present provision will have on illegal gambling; undoubtedly, it will encourage the starting price bettor who will not pay a winning bets tax.

Mr. Casey: He never has.

Mr. SHANNON: No, but we were hoping that T.A.B. would eliminate him. What will happen if Budget deficits continue to be the order of the day? Already, the Government has used moneys from trust funds but, if it thinks that last year's was a bad season, I am afraid to think what will happen if we do not receive appreciable rains soon.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I hope the honourable member can link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON: I hope to, Sir. We are promised that this unpopular tax will be removed when the Budget position permits. However, I do not expect the coming year to be a fat one; we shall have to have much rain soon if it is to be even a reasonable year. The Government is using this tax to bridge its finances and I do not complain about that as long as it is clearly understood. Various

estimates of the likely return from T.A.B. have been given, but nobody can make more than an intelligent guess at this stage about what this return will be. In view of what the Premier has said, it seems unlikely that the winning bets tax will be removed by the Government in the foreseeable future.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Committee should support the amendment. For two years racing clubs have stated that they would receive more from T.A.B. than from the winning bets tax. The winning bets tax was introduced as a result of a deputation from the racing clubs and, on one occasion, the member for Ridley moved a motion to abolish this tax but the racing clubs of the State formed a deputation to ask that it be continued. However, the most interesting point to arise this evening is that the Premier and the member for Glenelg have now stated that the Bill is designed to produce revenue. Previously it was said that its main purpose was to enable country people to place a legitimate bet. However, now the member for Glenelg has said that the Government cannot afford to give away \$1,000,000. The Bill imposes a far heavier tax on the people than the winning bets tax imposed. This is a 14 per cent tax, whereas the winning bets tax was 3½ per cent of which a quarter went to the racing clubs. South Australia has received substantially less revenue from gambling than other States because its Government has never promoted gambling for revenue-producing purposes. This Bill is fundamentally wrong because, in order to raise revenue, it permits gambling. The Government cannot refuse the amendment on financial grounds because it will receive more from T.A.B. than it has received from racing in the past. No-one can argue that the Government's full share of 5 per cent under this scheme is not greater than the three quarters of 3½ per cent that it received before.

Over the years members opposite have called the winning bets tax the "Playford tax". I now renounce my rights in that regard, and henceforward it can be known as the "Walsh tax". The honourable members for Glenelg and Frome will not be able to get much satisfaction out of it, but for what it is worth I hand it over to them. I am only surprised that so quickly they are able to see so many virtues in the winning bets tax when previously as a Party they saw so many disabilities in it and so many injustices to the small man. We have heard the Premier and other Government members expound in this

place how iniquitous this tax is, yet we find now that the Premier is conferring with the Victorian Premier and persuading him to follow suit in this matter. Apparently we are able to announce here the features of the Victorian Budget even before it is delivered.

In my opinion, it is not a good thing to develop gambling as a prime means of financing our Budget. I consider that if the winning bets tax is retained it will undoubtedly mean that the attendances at the courses will get less and less and that at the same time there will be a great stimulus to S.P. bookmaking. I hand over to the Premier all proprietary rights in the winning bets tax, and I support the Leader of the Opposition in his attempt to remove it.

Mr. CASEY: I have heard the member for Gumeracha speak on many occasions—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: And you'll hear him again.

Mr. CASEY: I consider that on this occasion he definitely spoke with his tongue in his cheek. A short time ago the honourable member concocted what became known as his 14-point plan. He had the sanction of his Party in that matter, and he claimed that he got the racing clubs to agree to it. The present Leader of the Opposition went all the way in supporting that plan. Did the member for Gumeracha on that occasion consider the winning bets tax? Of course he did not. He went a step further, because he was going to increase the turnover tax by ½ per cent, which would have meant more revenue. Yet this evening he tries to suggest that this winning bets tax should not exist. The honourable member himself introduced it into this place, so he condoned the idea entirely. He had a golden opportunity, when he presented this 14-point plan for T.A.B. in South Australia, to show how dinkum he was and to abolish it, but he did not do it. The fact is that he knew he could not do it. The present Leader supported the honourable member at that time, for when he spoke on this measure last year, when it was introduced as a private member's motion, he said:

T.A.B. has been a live issue for a couple of years, but we, as a Party, went to the last election stating that we would introduce a system of T.A.B. We could argue about the degree and extent to which it would have operated, but in my view it was not extensive enough.

Not a word was said then about the winning bets tax. However, members of the Opposition are now attempting to show that this is purely a revenue-producing measure. The

whole idea of T.A.B. is to give people an opportunity to bet legally. If revenue is derived from it—

*Members interjecting:*

Mr. CASEY: We have laughter from members of the Opposition. Apparently they knew all about this with their system of T.A.B. If they are dinkum in this, why did the former Premier not advocate the abolition of the winning bets tax in his 14-point plan? He cannot answer that.

Mr. McKee: He is not laughing now.

Mr. CASEY: No. The present Leader supported the honourable member. We have heard him say tonight that members on this side have shown a complete reversal of form from when we were the Opposition. He said that members of my Party in the past have always advocated the abolition of the winning bets tax. I can remember speaking about that tax on one occasion, and my impression always was that the iniquitous part of it was that it applied to the stake. I get around quite a bit in country areas, and what I have heard leads me to believe that if the winning bets tax was removed the country racing clubs would go out of existence. Only last Saturday I discussed this matter with the chairman of a country racing club in the member for Burra's district, and that person said that if we abolished the tax entirely 99 per cent of the country racing clubs would cease to exist. This would happen in the Leader's district, as well as in the districts represented by the members for Angas, Stirling and Flinders.

Mr. Hall: Don't be airy-fairy; tell us how much money would be lost.

Mr. CASEY: The Leader claims to be an expert in these matters, and he has come to light with all the figures under the sun. However, I do not think he really knows much about it. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) said that the retention of the winning bets tax would encourage people to bet with S.P. bookmakers. My answer to that is that people who bet with those bookmakers do so only because they cannot get a bet any other way, and that T.A.B. will give them an opportunity to bet legally. If people still want to bet with S.P. bookmakers, I suppose they will do so. However, from the statistics compiled in Victoria over the last few years it is obvious that the number of such bookmakers has decreased considerably. It is not suggested that those bookmakers have been eliminated entirely. However, all the money that was channelled to those bookmakers is now being

channelled into legal betting. A few years ago when T.A.B. was contemplated in New South Wales 6,000 illegal bookmakers came out into the open and offered the Government there \$20,000,000 a year in advance for the right to operate and control off-course betting in that State.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It has not stamped out illegal bookmakers in New South Wales.

Mr. CASEY: Naturally, as it has been in operation for only 12 months.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: For more than 12 months.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, a little more. However, it has reduced illegal bookmaking. Illegal bookmakers in that State did not want T.A.B., because they knew people would use it rather than bet illegally. That was the opinion of the Royal Commissioner, who estimated the illegal betting turnover at \$500,000,000 a year. Before this offer was made by the illegal operators, many people had scoffed at this figure. I do not think we can estimate accurately how much money is now being bet illegally, and nobody betting in this way pays winning bets tax. However, I do not think people look at it in this light: they merely wish to bet legally and, if fortunate, collect on the next day. I hope the amendment is not accepted.

Mr. HALL: I should like the member for Frome to say how much money the racing clubs will lose.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: He does not have to answer.

Mr. HALL: No, but if he does not his argument falls down.

Mr. Hudson: Your argument falls down.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member does anything to knock down other members, but the content of his argument is not impressive to this Committee or his Party.

Mr. CASEY: If the honourable member refers to the report of the Betting Control Board for the year ended June 30, 1965, he will see how much was paid to country clubs. Country clubs receive about 25 per cent of the winning bets tax, and by using these figures the honourable member will see what a big loss these clubs will suffer if this tax is no longer levied.

Mr. HALL: I understand from the Bill that the clubs will receive for the first 12 months their full share of tax on stakes and winnings and for the second year after the relevant date 50 per cent of the previous year's tax, so in effect they will receive 1½ years of winning bets tax, and then no more. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. Hudson: Correct.

Mr. HALL: If my amendment is carried, they will receive their first year's tax but not the following half year's tax. If the amendment is carried, obviously the rest of the Bill will have to be tidied up. The Betting Control Board's last report shows that racing and trotting clubs shared \$344,000, so \$172,000 would be half a year's share. The honourable member cannot substantiate his case. If the clubs gave up \$172,000 in one year, that would remove for all time the winning bets tax, and this would result in increased attendances at the courses. It may be said that this would injure clubs for one year, but it would not permanently injure them. Many people are being led up the garden path on this issue. We are talking about revenue for six months, not for all time.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Betting Control Board's report for the year ended June 30, 1965, showed that racing clubs received \$287,752 from the winning bets tax, and in the previous year they received \$268,968. This measure provides that the tax will not be levied on the punter's stake, so the clubs will lose about \$84,000.

Mr. Hall: That is at the relevant date.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: We do not know what the relevant date will be. The Treasurer said it could be less than the 13 months previously proposed. If it is within 12 months, obviously the Treasury will lose 30 per cent of this income, which for 1964-65 was \$1,108,298. This afternoon I said that the Government was taking the winning bets tax off too soon and that the clubs should have been given a chance of recouping themselves for expenditure to establish T.A.B. However, the winning bets tax on the punter's stake should be taken off as soon as possible. The member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford) referred to a motion I moved in November, 1954. My motion was as follows:

That this House is of the opinion that the principle of applying the winning bets tax to the amounts invested by racegoers is unjust.

I said that, in principle, the motion meant that the tax now imposed on stake money involved in winning bets should no longer apply. The motion was not for a complete lifting of the winning bets tax. The member for Gumeracha, who was Treasurer at that time, opposed the removal of any tax at all. I did not advocate the complete abolition of the tax. If it is removed, even after 12 months, the racing clubs will lose revenue and, at the same time, will have to meet the cost involved in

providing a system that will mean increased revenue from the Treasury.

Do not let us kill the goose too quickly: let the golden goose produce many golden eggs and let the tax remain until revenue from T.A.B. enables the racing clubs to recoup their initial expenditure. The member for Onkaparinga said that no-one has any idea about how much could be collected from T.A.B. This matter has been examined by the board in Victoria and an accurate assessment can be obtained by applying the Victorian figures to South Australia on a per capita basis.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) tried to make the point that the introduction of T.A.B. had practically eliminated illegal betting in Victoria, and he also cited instances in New South Wales. However, the higher the taxation, the greater is the incentive for an illegal bookmaker to operate. The Bill provides for a deduction of 14 per cent and the winning bets tax has also been retained. In February, 1964, the Betting Control Board, in its report on inquiries into T.A.B. betting in Victoria and Queensland, said regarding Victoria:

It is considered that a number of bettors would not travel more than half a mile to bet if an illegal bookmaker were more accessible.

Later in the report the board said:

The opinion of T.A.B. officials was that an agency is effective greatly to reduce, if not to eliminate, illegal betting within a radius of about half a mile from an agency.

About 300 agencies are operating in Victoria, and particularly in the outer metropolitan area of Melbourne, at distances of half a mile or a mile apart. The winning bets tax and the deduction of 14 per cent will be an incentive for illegal bookmakers to operate. The *Sunday Mail* of June 4, 1966, contained the following report from Sydney:

S.P. men make joke of T.A.B. Highly-organized S.P. operators in New South Wales are making a joke out of the introduction of T.A.B. in the State. In some areas of the State, particularly the Riverina and in the big industrial centre of Wollongong, managers of T.A.B. agencies are complaining bitterly that S.P. opposition is ruining them. T.A.B. officials at Wollongong and Warragong, south of Sydney, recently protested that S.P. betting shops were operating within yards of their premises. An official at Warragong said that T.A.B. there was getting only a quarter of the punters and none of the big ones. Last month the General Manager of the T.A.B. in New South Wales, Mr. J. P. Robertson, complained that T.A.B. branches in Wagga, Albury, Temora and Cootamundra were meeting intense and sometimes overwhelming opposition from local S.P. shops.

The retention of both taxes will encourage S.P. bookmakers, who will be able to offer more lucrative odds to the punters, who will then bet illegally. I support the Leader's amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Ferguson, Hall (teller), Heaslip, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the Leader of the Opposition wish to proceed with his other amendment?

Mr. HALL: No, Mr. Chairman.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In new subsection (3b), in the definition of "the relevant day" to strike out "a day twelve months after".

This gives the Government the opportunity to lift the present tax, particularly that on investment first, as soon as possible, and the longest it can remain is 13 months after the relevant day is proclaimed.

Mr. HALL: If the relevant day is proclaimed six months after the appointed day, how does that effect the racing clubs' income from the winning bets tax during the first full 12 months? Do they receive a lower amount from this source because less is collected in the six months?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Last year the tax received on investments was \$387,000. If the amount is reached by the 13th month the clubs would have received an equal proportion, so they could not be any worse off. Their income from T.A.B. would be more than they would receive from the winning bets tax on investments.

Mr. HALL: If turnover is greater and, at some time in the latter stages of the first 12 months, the winning bets tax equals the previous amount of winning bets tax, is it likely that the relevant day will be proclaimed? No doubt this will not occur before a period of 11 months has passed in the year.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

In new subsection (3b), in the definition of "the relevant day" to strike out "(11)" and insert "(12)".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 12), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I do not want to take up much time on the third reading, but there are two reasons why I wish to say a few words on it. The first is that we have been debating for a considerable time an important amendment that has not been accepted, and that may affect the way in which some members vote on the third reading. The second and more important reason is that, in the voting in the division on the second reading, there was a mix-up in the pairs. I know that one member is recorded as having paired for the Bill when he desired to pair against it, and I believe another member who desired to pair for the Bill is recorded as having paired against it. On the third reading, to clarify the position, I shall call for a division, so that we can see who is supporting and who is opposing the Bill.

The House divided on the third reading:

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

Noes (9).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Ferguson, Heaslip, Hughes, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 16 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

The SPEAKER: Before putting the question "That the Bill do now pass", I wish to say that pairs are not recognized officially but that they were accurately recorded in the official Votes and Proceedings on the second reading as follows:

The following pairs were handed in at the table during the day's proceedings—

referring to the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill (T.A.B.) second reading—

For: The Hon. G. A. Bywaters and the Hon. T. C. Stott. Against: The Hon. B. H. Teusner and the Hon. G. G. Pearson.

Bill passed.

## STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 1200.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): It is becoming a habit, immediately after dealing with one matter concerning gambling, to rise to speak about another. We have dealt with a lottery referendum and dog racing.

The Hon. R. E. Loveday: That wasn't a Bill.

Mr. HALL: No, but it dealt with an expression of opinion. Now that we are dealing with a lottery, we begin to wonder whether we are devoting our time to debate as seriously as we might.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You would have been debating 10 o'clock closing if you had had your way.

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Agriculture is noted on a certain blue paper for his remarks about lotteries. Unfortunately, I have just mislaid that gem. Both the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Works voted for a referendum concerning the lottery. The Minister of Works said definitely that conducting a lottery was a deceitful practice for which no decent Socialist could vote. I thought the emphasis he placed on the matter rather twisted the meaning of the debate. Literature circulating in churches in my district held up those two gentlemen as champions of the anti-lottery cause. The blue paper was resented by churches in my district.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: And in mine, too!

Mr. HALL: The Ministers' double representation, bearing in mind their vote in this House, became apparent to the people attending those churches. However, the contradiction reached such proportions that I, having voted against the referendum, was being criticized for supporting it, while the two Ministers were being complimented in my district on opposing it. Be that as it may, I am recorded in *Hansard* as expressing my true opinion on lotteries when the Bill for a referendum was previously before the House. I said I was not against a lottery but against giving the Government a blank cheque to establish something, the details of which I did not know. This Bill is obviously the result of the referendum—a direct instruction from the people of South Australia that they desire a lottery. Indeed, they spoke in no uncertain terms on the matter.

South Australians were willing to give the Government not only permission but, I believe, an instruction to introduce a lottery, without their having been told exactly what the provisions concerning that lottery would be. They were far less cautious than those of us on this side who voted against the Bill. That being their prerogative, I hope the people of this State will not regret their decision. As I said when I spoke to the previous Bill, I will certainly not oppose this measure. I previously said that I did not oppose lotteries as such, but wished to know the details which the Government had in mind and which it had kept to itself for so long during the debate in this House. Members will recall that it was well into the debate on the Bill for a referendum before the Government gave any indication of where any profits from lotteries might go. However, I support the Bill with the reservation that it is about time Parliament started to consider matters affecting the development of the State. Members opposite can glory in this brief interlude of fame brought to them and their Party by their involvement in these matters. However, the time will soon come when the State will need increased development and an increasing Loan programme each year—not the type of Loan programme with which we were presented this year.

I have obtained figures of lotteries in other States that may be of interest in estimating the size of the lotteries to be held in South Australia. These figures indicate what the State can expect in revenue and how much turnover will be involved. The investment on lotteries in New South Wales in 1964-65 was \$48,800,000 and the prizes paid out \$31,200,000, representing 64 per cent of the total money invested in lotteries there. That State held 385 lotteries in that year. For the same year, the money invested with Tattersalls in Victoria was \$21,200,000 and 170 lotteries were drawn. The total investment in Queensland on lotteries was \$14,400,000, the prizes were \$9,200,000, or 64 per cent, and 187 lotteries were drawn. The staff employed on lotteries in Queensland numbered 79 with 547 agents. In Western Australia, \$3,800,000 was invested and the prizes were worth \$2,200,000, or 58 per cent of the investment. Donations made from lotteries in Western Australia amounted to \$1,000,000, or 26 per cent of turnover. In 1964-65 in Victoria, the Government income from lotteries was \$6,800,000 from a \$21,200,000 investment. Probably South Australia can most easily be compared with Western Australia where the 1964-65 investment was \$3,800,000 and the

profit \$1,000,000 with a 58 per cent payout in prizes.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That State would be a little farther from the competition of the Eastern States.

Mr. HALL: Yes, it would be more self-contained in its operation of lotteries and not subject to the attraction of Tattersalls to the extent that South Australia would be. The payout in Western Australia is 2 per cent less than that guaranteed in the Bill. It would appear that the guaranteed minimum payout of 60 per cent in the Bill was arrived at by the Government after proper study of payouts in other States, which seem to have averaged about 60 to 62 per cent. I understand that the figure of 60 per cent in the Bill is to be a minimum and will not limit the maximum, although I believe the minimum and maximum will become the same figure, because the Government will obviously be looking to obtain as much revenue as it can get, for whatever it can get it will never satisfy its needs.

It would have been informative if the Premier had given more figures on what would be involved in setting up lotteries in South Australia. It would have been of service to members and to the people generally if the Premier could have said what investment would be needed. Undoubtedly there will be difficulties in the early stages. Some details have been given (I believe by Government members) to the effect that two drawings a month will be held in the initial stages. This would result in 24 lotteries a year, which would compare unfavourably with the Queensland total of 187. I do not have the figure for Western Australia, but I believe it would be well above 24. Of course, South Australia will be affected by its close proximity to Tattersalls in Victoria, which has been popular with South Australians for many years. Therefore, I believe it will be some time before the Government shows any profit from lotteries, and even longer before the profits to the Treasury are worthwhile. It may be some time before we can equal the Western Australian investment in lotteries. The New South Wales lottery was established in about 1931; Tattersalls moved into Victoria in 1953; the Queensland lottery was established in 1916; and the Western Australian lottery was established in 1954. The figure of \$3,800,000 for Western Australia is likely to be stable because it is for a year a decade after the inception of a lottery in that State. The only reason one would think that this figure would increase would be that living

standards or population had increased. South Australia has one-quarter of the population of New South Wales, one-third of that of Victoria, and two-thirds of that of Queensland. On a population basis, we cannot expect big business for some time in South Australia.

The Bill hands to a commission the responsibility of how the lottery will be established. We are not told of many matters on which the commission must decide as it examines the subject of lotteries in South Australia. However, as long as Parliament is able to examine this I believe it is probably the best way to bring about lotteries. It would be hard for Parliament to stipulate the many items that must be examined by the commission, which would be best able to look at these matters in the light of business interests of the day. The Premier must have some idea of what it will cost to set up the lotteries and of the sort of shops in which lottery tickets will be available—whether barbers' shops, drapery shops or grocery shops.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: I assure you we won't be getting Tom the Cheap Grocer to do it.

Mr. HALL: It could well be, if the Premier is looking to promote this, that Tom the Cheap Grocer would do a good job for him. Seriously, if the sale of lottery tickets is to be remunerative for businesses, some of the smaller shops should be considered, and perhaps the barbers' shops of the State would be a good avenue for the sale of tickets. I should like to know what the Premier has in mind on this aspect. His Party must have considered these matters, and I do not believe that it is handing everything over to a commission without having some ideas on it. I hope that in Committee the Premier will elaborate on these points.

It is interesting to note in clause 15 that the Auditor-General is to report on the activities of the commission. Parliament failed (because the Government failed to support a move in this direction) to provide that the Auditor-General should report on the operations of the Totalizator Agency Board in this State. The Auditor-General is to be Parliament's watchdog in this question of lotteries, and if it was good enough to so provide in this Bill why was it wrong to provide that he should oversee the operations of the T.A.B.? In my opinion, this question is almost unanswerable. Clause 15 (2) provides:

The Auditor-General shall, whenever he deems it necessary, inspect and examine the property of the Commission and audit the

books and accounts of the Commission and, as soon as practicable after the end of each month, shall make a report to the Minister on the state of the affairs of the Commission as at the end of that month.

In addition, clause 15 (5) provides:

The Minister shall cause every monthly report of the Auditor-General made in accordance with subsection (2) of this section to be tabled in each House of Parliament within fourteen days after it is received by the Minister, if Parliament is then in session, or, if Parliament is not then in session, within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

Therefore, there is a very tight control on where the commission is going. It is to be looked at frequently, and as often as the Auditor-General thinks necessary, and therefore he will know just what is going on with the bookkeeping and the financial transactions of the commission. This is rather strange in the light of the fact that this Government today refused this type of audit for the T.A.B.

I notice in clause 16 that there is to be a Lotteries Fund from which surpluses shall be paid to the Hospitals Fund. I take it that is the same Hospitals Fund in the Treasury to which profits from the T.A.B. will be paid. From the Hospitals Fund, which has as its source those two facets of gambling, disbursements are to be made to the hospitals and to other institutions in South Australia as named by the Premier in his amendment to the T.A.B. Bill. I believe the Premier has said somewhere that this money that is given to hospitals will be in addition to the money they now receive through vote of Parliament. However, I am rather intrigued by the fact that both the T.A.B. Bill and this one contain a clause specifying how this money is to be appropriated for hospitals. Clause 16 (6) provides:

The moneys transferred to the Hospitals Fund in accordance with subsection (4) of this section shall, after making any payments made under subsection (5) of this section, be used for the provision, maintenance, development, and improvement of public hospitals and equipment for public hospitals in such amounts as the Treasurer shall, upon the recommendation of the Chief Secretary (but subject to appropriations for the purpose which Parliament may from time to time determine), approve.

In both Bills there is this reference to an appropriation determined by Parliament, and this would seem to indicate that this money will eventually be part of the major vote that we now consider yearly for public hospitals in this State. Unless the Premier can categorically say that this money will be in addition to the money the State will normally pay to

hospitals, I shall have my suspicions that eventually through this method of normal appropriation it will become part of the general support for hospitals coming now from the Government and will in fact unload the general burden from the Revenue Budget of this State. This is another point that I should like the Premier to clear up in Committee.

Clause 9 deals with a number of matters, including advertising. I am pleased to know that there will be no advertising other than in the prescribed manner, and that the only notice that can be displayed outside a shop selling lottery tickets is "Lottery Tickets Sold Here". I believe this is necessary, otherwise throughout this State there would appear much competitive advertising that would tend to increase gambling in this State. Knowing that this question was thoroughly ventilated when this House considered the Bill providing for a referendum in this State, I believe that the main points of discussion now rest in Committee. As I say, this is a Bill which does not set out in much detail how the lottery is to be established. I am not saying that this is entirely a bad thing, for I believe the commission will need freedom of action in establishing the lottery in South Australia. However, I say that the Premier should be required to give this House much more information than he has yet given. I believe he owes it to the House to give more details of the financial implications of this Bill.

We need once more to re-establish in South Australia attention on development. We know now, in our present difficulties, where our employment stems from, and we know that it is impossible to gamble ourselves to prosperity. We know, too, that the public of any State needs a greater goal than just these facilities that we are establishing with this spate of so-called social legislation. With those few remarks, I support the Bill, and in Committee I shall ask the Premier questions regarding the ramifications both of the setting up of the commission and of the profit that may be expected from it.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): As the referendum on lotteries held last year recorded a "Yes" vote on a State basis, the figures at that time being 344,886 for and 142,196 against, I support the Bill. It is worth noting that on that occasion the Barossa District, which I represent, also recorded a "Yes" vote, 7,257 voting in favour and 3,658 voting against—a two to one majority in favour. However, as I do not wish to hide behind these figures as a reason for supporting this Bill, I should like to state

that I personally support the setting up of a State lottery in South Australia. In addition to this, the referendum held on this matter was an election promise of the Labor Party at the last State elections, and the holding of it honoured yet another election promise of our Party.

I am pleased that the Leader of the Opposition is supporting this Bill, and that he supports lotteries. I heard his views with some interest, although I did not agree with all of them. He said he thought we should be spending more time in this House wisely debating in particular development legislation, but most voters in this State voted in favour of a lottery, so they must think that the introduction of this Bill is wise. The Leader referred to two Ministers who spoke against a lottery when debating the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill. The reason why these Ministers are now supporting this Bill is that the people have voted in favour of it, and they accept the majority decision. They have said publicly that they will help to make a lottery work.

I was pleased that when he introduced this Bill the Premier said it had been prepared after a close study had been made of the lotteries conducted by Tattersalls in Victoria and the Lotteries Commission in Western Australia. The five other Australian States now have lotteries: this is the only State without one. Lotteries in the other States are conducted under Government management or control. It is pleasing that Tattersalls was chosen for the study, because this is the oldest continuing public lottery in Australia, having been established in Sydney in 1881 by George Adams, who was then the licensee of Tattersalls Hotel. This was the headquarters of Tattersalls Club, the members of which belonged mainly to the racing fraternity of the day. Although the sweepstakes were on horse races and were restricted to patrons of Adams's bar, he visualized the possibility of holding a big public sweepstake. This he called the Tattersalls sweep, and he ran the first on the Sydney Cup in 1881. Because of its success others quickly followed, although at this time Adams was concerned mainly with attracting patrons to his bar. However, because these sweepstakes were conducted so fairly, they became well known through Australia. Adams obtained patrons from other States, and consequently a large postal business developed. This forced him to engage a clerical staff, and he then decided to conduct lotteries as an enterprise for profit.

In 1893, the New South Wales Government passed an Act declaring such sweepstakes illegal, so Adams decided to move to Queensland and conduct his business there. The Queensland Government then legislated to declare his activities illegal, so in 1895, with his staff, he shifted to Tasmania, where the Government of the day was in financial difficulties following the bank smash of 1892-93. The Tasmanian Government saw this as an opportunity to recover from its financial difficulties, and passed an Act licensing Tattersalls in that State. Right from the first, the lottery was a complete success, as the Van Diemen's Land Bank, which was in liquidation, got more than market value for its assets that were disposed of by the lottery while the winners of the lotteries received valuable prizes.

The first sweep was drawn in Hobart in 1896, and from that time Hobart became the home of Tattersalls sweeps, which were conducted as simple lotteries with cash prizes under the name of "cash consultations". These lotteries were decided by a simple draw of tickets and later of numbered marbles from a barrel. In addition, Tattersalls ran an annual sweepstake on the Melbourne Cup. As it was a private company, its balance sheets were not published, but the Premier of Tasmania said in 1953 that Tattersalls was paying 61 per cent of the ticket money in prizes, 29 per cent to the Tasmanian Government in lottery tax and stamp duty, 5 per cent in salaries and expenses, and 5 per cent as profit to shareholders in the company.

In 1954, the Victorian Labor Government made an agreement with the trustees of Tattersalls estate, and the company transferred to Melbourne. This meant a considerable financial loss to the Tasmanian Government, and to offset this it issued a licence for the establishment of Tasmanian Lotteries, but I understand that this has now gone out of existence. In 1960, the Tasmanian Parliament amended the Racing and Gaming Act to enable the Treasurer to enter into an agreement with the appropriate Minister of the Crown of another State under which the promoter of a lottery in that other State could sell lottery tickets in Tasmania. That is the way it is being conducted now. Under this arrangement, Tattersalls now sells lottery tickets in Tasmania, the Treasury receiving 15½ per cent of the subscriptions. The amount received by the Tasmanian Government is of interest.

Receipts in 1964-65 were \$146,500, compared with \$145,392 in the previous year.

In 1916 the Queensland Labor Government gave permission to a committee to conduct an art union in aid of patriotic funds. At that time the First World War was in progress. The first prize was a golden casket, and this lottery is known by that name now. By this subterfuge the law against lotteries was circumvented. This art union was so successful that others followed. In 1920, after the war ended, the Government gave permission for the golden casket art unions to continue in aid of hospitals under the control of the Department of Health. It became by stages a legalized State lottery, the first in Australia entirely controlled and managed by a Government, under special legislation. In 1944 the State Lotteries administration was transferred to the Department of Justice. From July 1, 1920, to June 30, 1964 (the latest figures available) distributions of profits have aggregated \$60,556,968 to hospitals and medical and dental institutions and \$3,565,118 to other charitable and health activities. The following is a summary of net profit in Queensland that has been transferred to hospital, motherhood and child welfare trust funds in the last five years:

Year.	Amount. \$
1960-61 . . . . .	2,840,150
1961-62 . . . . .	2,956,558
1962-63 . . . . .	3,000,450
1963-64 . . . . .	3,109,042
1964-65 . . . . .	3,131,442

It can be seen from these figures that in each year the profit has been slightly larger than in the year before. In New South Wales a public lottery was first held as long ago as 1849. However, here in South Australia, in this year of 1966, we still have not a State lottery! The New South Wales lottery was a public lottery and was drawn in Sydney in order to dispose of some land and property of the Bank of Australia, which was then in liquidation. However, controversy arose regarding the legality of the lotteries, so they were discontinued.

Then, as I have stated previously, George Adams, whose business was known as Tattersalls, established his sweepstake in Sydney in 1881 and, by so doing, technically avoided the law of the day against lotteries. In 1930, when the Lang Labor Government passed an Act to establish the New South Wales State Lottery, they became legalized and began operating in August 1931. Although

the lotteries were criticized at the time, they were continued by successive Governments. In addition to the State lottery in New South Wales, an art union is conducted in aid of the War Veterans' Home, and there are other lotteries, including the Opera House lotteries that were introduced in 1957 to help to provide funds for the building of the Sydney Opera House.

Regarding the financial aspect in New South Wales, a sum is apportioned from the proceeds of the sale of tickets in each lottery for prizes and the balance is paid to Consolidated Revenue or, in the case of the Opera House lotteries, to the Sydney Opera House Appeal Fund. In the year ended June 30, 1965, an amount of \$11,469,860 was paid into the Consolidated Revenue Fund. It is worth repeating that in that State the profit is paid to that fund.

When the Premier introduced this Bill he explained that not only had the position in Victoria been examined but that a study had also been made of the operation of the Lotteries Commission in Western Australia.

By the Lottery Control Act of 1932, the Government of Western Australia appointed a lotteries commission to establish and conduct the Western Australian Charities Consultations, as they are known in that State. Of course, these are, in effect, State lotteries, although they are managed autonomously by the commission. In Western Australia the profits are disbursed by the commission to beneficiaries named by it at its discretion. Since the inception of lotteries there, the profits have been distributed principally to hospitals, and also to other organizations that operate solely in the public interest. In the year ended June 30, 1964, an amount of \$1,285,434 was distributed and in the year ended June 30, 1965, an amount of \$1,167,658 was distributed. I should like to have been able to give the House figures of the previous years but they are not available.

I have already stated that Tattersalls transferred operations from Tasmania to Melbourne in 1954 and, of course, this caused a considerable loss of revenue to the Tasmania Government of that time. In Victoria, the Tattersalls Consultations Act of 1953 provided that within seven days of the drawing of each consultation duty equivalent to 31 per cent of the total amount of subscriptions to the consultations would be paid to Consolidated Revenue. In each year an equivalent amount is paid out of Consolidated Revenue in such



Association. After negotiations with the Association, a charities consultation committee was set up in Perth in 1932. A Bill in 1954 repealed the previous Act and enacted permanent legislation and, if members care to read the second reading explanation by the Minister introducing the Bill, they will realize that this was done because of the immense success of the lottery between 1932 and 1954. On reading the Bill introduced into the Western Australian Parliament in 1954, I was interested to note the similarity between it and the Bill introduced here.

Mr. Shannon: Do you expect as many agencies here as they have in Western Australia?

Mrs. STEELE: Not for some time. It will be interesting to see how the lottery develops in this State, as it will have to compete with well-established lotteries in other States.

Mr. Shannon: You can fall over the agencies in Western Australia.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, I agree. That is an undesirable feature. This Bill seems to have largely been based on the Western Australian Bill, but I am not suggesting that we should follow it absolutely otherwise we will introduce, although I hope not, some of the undesirable features, one being that there are too many horrid little kiosks and lucky charm shops where one can buy a charities ticket. I endorse what the Leader said about the preoccupation in which we are indulging at present with respect to Bills dealing with gambling or the promotion of gambling. For some weeks we have concentrated on this type of legislation: all the Bills seem to have as a basis the need or intention of the Government to increase its revenue by means of lotteries or gambling. The third reading of the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill was passed this evening, and now we are dealing with a Bill to provide a lottery, the profits of which are to be put to the same use as profits from T.A.B.

Last session, most members spoke at great length on the Bill introduced to provide for a referendum for a lottery. Much ground was covered and much was said that need not be repeated.

We are breaking new ground in South Australia and, as the Leader said, because of this we are entitled to be told more than is stated in this Bill. It is obvious that much power, responsibility, and control is to be given to the commission to be set up under this Bill to organize, administer, and control a

lottery system in this State. For this very reason—the fact that it is new ground, new legislation, and something of which we have had very little experience—Parliament is entitled to more knowledge of this Bill than we have been given in the second reading explanation. Therefore, like the Leader, I hope that in the Committee stage the Government will be prepared to answer questions on which honourable members are anxious to have information.

As I have just mentioned, it is interesting to realize that this Bill gives the Government power to set up a Lotteries Fund, similar to the fund to be set up under the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill. We are told that the profit from the lottery, after the expenses and prizes have been met, is to be placed in a fund at the Treasury to be known as the Hospitals Fund. This is interesting because, when the Bill for the holding of a referendum was introduced in the last session, much was made of the fact that the profits of a lottery (if it was decided by referendum to have one) would go to charity. Now, in this present Bill, we are told that the profits are to go to specified hospitals. It is on a parallel with the misleading information we had on T.A.B. when last session a motion was moved by a private member for the purpose of testing out the feelings of the House.

We were then told that certain things would be done but, when the Bill was introduced into this House, we found that these conditions were not written into it. Again, in the case of this Bill dealing with lotteries, we were led to understand that the profits would be devoted to charity, but we are now told that they will go to certain hospitals. In this respect, of course, the Bill differs very much from the Western Australian Lotteries (Control) Act, because that Act states (and this approximates much more closely to the ideas that I think honourable members had, that profits from lotteries should go to charity) in section 4:

“Charitable purpose” means any purpose which is designed to raise funds for all or any of the following—

- (a) any public hospital in the State as defined in section 2 of the Hospitals Act, 1927;
- (b) any free ward at any private hospital in the State;
- (c) the relief of former sailors, soldiers, airmen or nurses of Her Majesty's sea, land or air forces resident in the State,
- (d) any institution in the State for the instruction or care of the blind, deaf or dumb—

and the word "dumb" should be stricken from the record because there are really no dumb people.

- (e) any orphanage or foundling home in the State;
- (f) any home or institution in the State maintained wholly or in part for the reception of dying or incurable persons in indigent circumstances;
- (g) any body incorporated under the laws of the State which distributes relief to sick, to infirm, and to indigent persons;
- (h) any body whose activities include dispensing voluntary aid or medical or nursing advice to expectant mothers, nursing mothers, and children under the age of sixteen years;
- (i) any body incorporated under the laws of the State which provides relief or assistance to the dependants of deceased ex-servicemen;
- (j) any object which in the opinion of the Minister may be fairly classed as charitable.

I have quoted those provisions because I believe it is the public's opinion (or it was until the details of this Bill were made public) that the profits would be devoted to all kinds of charity. How often have I been selling badges for various charitable organizations in the city streets and been told by many people, "Ah! Wait until next year when we have our lottery: then we shan't need any of these badge days, because all of these charities will be helped by the profits from the lottery." All I can say is, how wrong is the belief of the general public! It is specifically stated in the Bill that the profits will go only to certain hospitals.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The badge days will go on just the same.

Mrs. STEELE: Yes; there is nothing to suggest that they will not.

Mr. Langley: Do they go on in New South Wales?

Mrs. STEELE: I am talking about South Australia and the feelings of the public in South Australia that, with the coming of the lottery here, badge days will be a thing of the past. It is stated that the profits are to go to public hospitals. Clause 16 (8) defines "public hospital" as meaning—

- (a) any hospital which is under the ministerial control of the Chief Secretary—

and I assume it would mean the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—

- (b) any hospital to which Part IV of the Hospitals Act, 1934-1962, applies or is deemed to apply.

I imagine that this provision would cover subsidized hospitals, as we see them in the list provided in the Loan Estimates, and probably community hospitals. Then:

- (c) any other hospital or institution which, in the opinion of the Chief Secretary, is not carried on for the purpose of profit to its owner or shareholders and is approved by the Governor as a public hospital for the purposes of this section.

I take it that within that provision would come the Adelaide Children's Hospital, the Home for Incurables, probably the Queen Victoria Hospital, and similar hospitals. It is specifically restricted under this Act to hospitals. Therefore, any idea that the public of South Australia had that charities might benefit was badly founded.

Another point that occurs to me is whether or not as a result of this legislation now before us other organizations such as sporting clubs and charitable bodies will be permitted to run what are known as raffles and sweepstakes because, although I have read the Bill carefully, I can find no specific reference to whether or not this will be the sole lottery conducted in the State or whether raffles, sweepstakes, "art unions" and things of that nature will be permitted to go on alongside this lottery run and controlled by the Government. I said earlier that I felt that Parliament would want to know more detail than we had been given in the second reading explanation and had gleaned from a perusal of the Bill itself. As members of Parliament, we are entitled to know the estimated cost of setting up such a lottery. Most of us who have bought lottery tickets in other States of the Commonwealth and have gone into the head offices of lottery organizations have realized the big staff needed to run an organization of this kind, the extent of necessary office accommodation, and the expense involved in the provision of the means by which the lottery is drawn. I referred to that earlier when I mentioned the complicated set-up there was in Western Australia with the barrel and the numbered balls.

In those days it cost plenty. What would be the cost today, with our mounting expenses here, I should not like to say, but it would not be a small amount of money. All this has to be considered at a time when everyone knows (and it has been continually stated here in this House) that there is a great shortage of funds standing to the credit (rather it should be referred to as the "discredit") of the Government. Everyone knows that State funds are

well into the red, and yet we are now to be involved in the heavy expense of setting up this organization. I think that, during the debate on the Bill for a lotteries referendum, the Minister of Works gave the House his understanding of the cost involved in establishing a lottery: it exceeded \$6,000,000. That seemed a fairly extravagant estimate for such an operation, and I believe that the cost would probably be nearer \$1,500,000. Will the staff recruited be regarded as public servants within the terms of the Public Service Act and participate in the Superannuation Fund? I hope that the Government will answer these pertinent questions in Committee.

Is it intended that more than one consultation will be held at the one time, as happens in other States where tickets of varying value for varying stakes are issued simultaneously? What happens if a consultation is not filled? We must remember that South Australia is the last State to embark on such a scheme, lotteries in all the other States now being well established and functioning successfully. Probably the cheapest lottery in Australia today is the one run by our sister State, Western Australia, where the cheapest ticket in the smallest consultation is 25c, the first prize being \$6,000. We shall have to consider the pricing of tickets and the stakes to be offered if we are to compete successfully with the other States. Although the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) said that, having our own lottery, we shall witness the cessation of vast sums leaving this State, I believe that, if this scheme is to be successful and if we are to prevent money crossing our borders (both east and west), we shall have to fix a competitive price and stake, bearing in mind the attraction of the well established lotteries both in the Eastern States and in Western Australia.

Filling each consultation will be one of the greatest problems that the proposed organization will have to solve. Whereas the Lottery and Gaming (T.A.B.) Bill, which was passed in the House tonight, refers specifically to the

age at which people can bet, this Bill does not refer at all to the minimum age at which a person can purchase a lottery ticket. Many children today, who receive pocket money far greater than the sum required to purchase a lottery ticket, will be tempted to purchase a ticket. I do not think that our laws would permit children to receive prize money; it would be paid into a trust account for them to collect when they attained 21 years of age. I believe this is something worthwhile; the Bill should be amended to provide a minimum age at which a minor can buy a lottery ticket. This is necessary to protect young people from being encouraged to gamble in this way, because a lottery is just another form of gambling. In a lottery a person tries his luck against a few thousand or even 100,000 other people; the odds are much greater and we should try to dissuade young people from becoming involved in this form of gambling. The only way to do this is to provide a minimum age at which a person can purchase a ticket.

I hope that we will not see in South Australia (and I think provision is made to prevent it in the Bill) the little kiosks or shops set up for the sole purpose of selling people lottery tickets. Such a shop takes in the gullible public by stating that it is the kiosk that sold the lucky ticket that won the last sweepstake. They are most undignified and always look such shabby places. We might well learn a lesson from having seen these places in other States and thus make sure that similar ones are not established in South Australia. With those remarks I support the Bill, and I hope that, in Committee, the Premier will supply me with the information I seek.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 31, at 2 p.m.