HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 4, 1966.

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

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

INDUSTRY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Press reports during recent months have referred to the decline in industrial activity in South Australia. Although the slowing down appears, until recently, to have been most acute in the motor and building industries, there is now evidence of decline in other industries, such as electrical appliances (especially the retail section), and surplus supplies of building bricks are accumulating. The share market prices continue steadily downward, indicating loss of confidence in investment although, at the same time, credit balances in banks, especially savings banks, are showing substantial increases. Over the weekend there were radio reports of further marked decreases in houses and flats (I have not been able to confirm these reports from the press), and this morning it was reported that two more industries at Elizabeth (Metal Manufactures Limited and cotton spinners Davies Coop Limited) were to reduce their operative staffs, and that both were to transfer some of their activities to New South Wales.

In view of this evidence that the State has ceased to grow industrially, that investment is declining and that unemployment is increasing and spreading to other industries, will the Premier, as a matter of urgency, consider the advisability of an approach to the leaders of industry to discuss these matters? Also, will he explore the possibility of convening a conference on a confidential or other basis with the Chamber of Commerce, the Chamber of Manufactures, and banking and financial interests (separately in the first instance and later jointly if deemed advisable) to discuss ways and means of recovering the former activity, and to determine what steps the Government can take in its own sphere and in concert with industry towards this objective?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As two organizations have been referred to by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I should, before answering the latter part of the question, give a complete report that I received this morning on this matter. With respect to Metal Manufactures Limited, this is an instance in which a firm has found it necessary to rationalize production in its various plants in order to obtain the major benefits of technological change. Metal Manufactures recently installed a large tube mill at Port Kembla, and has found it necessary to close down its old mill at Elizabeth to gain the greater benefits of the Port Kembla mill. Nine people were affected in the change which took place on September 14 to 16.

The firm is perturbed at the publicity that has been given to this move, and wishes it to be widely known that it is perfectly satisfied with its major operations in South Australia, and has every intention to enlarge its activities in this State. This is no reaction against State Government policy, but is an efficiency move within the firm similar to those which are being continuously carried on in hundreds of firms in the Commonwealth.

The demand for tube has been patchy and the firm considers that it must manufacture this product as efficiently as possible. Had the overall demand kept up for tubing, it may not have been necessary at this stage to close down its operations in South Australia, but this had not been the case. However, while the company may be taking off the tube production, it definitely has plans to expand in other fields.

With respect to Davies Coop Limited, this is a case of rationalization of activities between the firm's establishments in two States. Davies Coop has been producing cotton duck in two mills located in Sydney and Adelaide. In recent years there has been insufficient demand for cotton duck to utilize the capacity of the two mills, and for some years it has been running the Adelaide mill on an uneconomic basis. The firm has tried to obtain a greater share of the Australian market for this material, but has been unsuccessful. This included an approach to the Tariff Board, on an industry basis, three years ago, when an application was made for increased duties so

that the Australian share of the market could be increased from 15 per cent to 25 per cent. The Tariff Board decision handed down about 12 months ago has not resulted in any substantial increase in demand, and the firm can no longer carry on production at these two mills. As the Sydney mill has a higher capacity than the Adelaide one, and as it is more versatile and flexible enabling it to produce a greater variety of products, the firm had no choice but to close down the Adelaide mill.

About 45 employees will be affected over the next two months. However, the firm is attempting to place the persons concerned within its own factory—about 300 people will continue to be employed in other sections of its plant—and in other firms both inside and outside the industry. A spokesman of the firm said that this decision has in no way been brought about by State Government measures or by any factors peculiar to the State economy—

Mr. Millhouse: Fancy finding it necessary to emphasize that!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: —but, if the overall level of demand throughout Australia had been higher or if it had received a more favourable decision from the Tariff Board, it might have been able to continue operating both mills. The member for Mitcham's innuendo does not help the position. Let us not forget that unless we are prepared to buy Australian goods, whenever possible, the problem will only worsen. The Deputy Leader can laugh—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I am waiting for you to answer my question.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have commented on two propositions and, when I am ready to consider the matter at Cabinet level, I shall inform the honourable member.

Mr. HEASLIP: The State now has a Premier's Department to which is attached a Public Relations Officer. I am concerned about the unemployment situation in South Australia, particularly at Elizabeth. In reply to the Deputy Leader's question, the Premier said there were plans to expand in other fields. However, I am not sure whether he meant that statement to apply to Davies Coop (S.A.) Proprietary Limited or to Metal Manufactures (S.A.) Proprietary Limited. Can the Premier indicate the fields of expansion to which he referred and the direction in which the expansion will take place? Also, can he say what action the Premier's Department and the Public Relations Officer are taking not so much to promote new industries in South Australia but to hold the industries we already have, as this matter relates to the present unemployment position?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Industries Promotion and Research Officer of the Premier's Department is fully occupied in reporting on all matters having any connection whatever with the Housing Trust or with any information that might have been supplied by the Agent-General in London, and in ascertaining the possibility of the establishment of any industry. Obviously, a new industry cannot be established at a moment's notice. When the honourable member dispenses with the services of the women he now employs and uses male employees, this will relieve the unemployment position. Apparently, the honourable member did not understand the report I read realier that was obtained by my staff this morning. Cabinet will examine the proposals to which the Deputy Leader referred, but I do not know what more can be done at present, as Parliament has already approved of certain Loan Estimates. I have already approached the Commonwealth Government for $40,000,000 to financc a gas pipeline, and I hope this question helps rather than hinders me in my application. The way in which honourable members opposite twist everything to emphasize a down trend does not help the State's case as presented to the Commonwealth Government. I cannot interfere with the Commonwealth Government's legislative programme at this stage, but I assure the honourable member that the staff of my department is doing its best to obtain employment for people, to advise prospective new industries wishing to establish here, and to follow up any suggestion about the establishment of a new industry; it will continue to do so.

On Friday evening, an organization that employs many people informed me that it had asked for more bricklayers, but had been informed it might be able to obtain only six. That does not seem to be in line with suggestions that many bricklayers are unemployed. Such propaganda would indicate that the State was not doing anything and that the Premier's Department was not functioning in the interests of this State. However, it has always acted in the interests of this State, and will continue to do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I notice from the latest *Monthly Summary of Statistics* for this State that, again, in August the number of approvals for new buildings in South Australia has shown a marked decline. The figure for August is

719 as against 1,321 for July; for August of last year, 737, and for August, 1964 (when the Playford Government was still in office), 2,126. As these statistics seem to confirm the complaints that have been made by some trade union officials associated with the building industry, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to take positive action to try to reverse this most unfortunate trend?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already given information to the House not only about the building industry but also about other industries in this State. I do not intend to add anything to what I have said.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In this morning's *Advertiser* Mr. Stewart Cockburn refers to the fact that in the heart of Elizabeth there is an open space of about 248 acres owned by the Commonwealth Government which is apparently intended as the site for an army ordnance depot. He also refers to the fact that one-tenth of the unemployed people registered in South Australia come from the towns near this piece of land. He suggests that if the Commonwealth Government could be persuaded to go ahead with its ordnance depot, Elizabeth's present problems would be well on the way to a solution. Does the Premier consider there is any merit in the suggestion made by Mr. Cockburn? Will he make representations to the Commonwealth Government to ascertain whether it will go ahead with the erection of this army ordnance depot on the land referred to in an effort to provide an early solution to the unemployment problem?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already asked the Commonwealth Government to spend more of its money on building in this State in order to help the building industry, but I am prepared to take up this matter with the Prime Minister.

NORTHERN ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: Having often raised this matter over the last five or six years, I did not get far with the previous Government; in fact, I do not think I got even to first base. However, I am pleased to see that the present Government believes that roads in the Far North, which I represent, should at long last be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to that of the Highways Department. As the transfer will mean that only one authority will be responsible for roadmaking, which will be in the best interests of the State, will the Minister of Works say when the transfer is likely to be effected?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member included comment in his explanation of the question, and he knows very well that is not permissible.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is anticipated that the transfer will take effect as from January 1, 1967. I emphasize "anticipated" because a definite date cannot be established until negotiations between the Engineering and Water Supply and the Highways Departments have been completed.

FREE BOOKS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to a statement by the Premier in reply to the question of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. By "buying Australian" I take it that the Premier means that we should support in our case, South Australian industry. In further explanation of my question, I desire to quote two short paragraphs from the annual report of Mr. A. L. Slade, the Chairman of Directors of Rigby Limited, dealing with the question of the free school book scheme which the present Government is introducing.

Mr. Clark: Rigby Limited would have a vested interest, wouldn't it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member will allow me, these are the two paragraphs I wish to quote:

> In the year 1966-67 the first impact of the Government's free textbooks scheme for primary schools will have been felt by the book trade. We were hoping that the Government would adopt the subsidy system which has proved so successful and has been so easy to operate in the secondary schools. The Government chose the method of calling for tenders throughout Australia for large quantities of books which will be loaned to primary schoolchildren. Almost half the contract was awarded to interstate book sellers.

I want to emphasize that point in view of what the Premier said earlier this afternoon. The report continues:

> Fortunately, this company publishes many of the books used in primary schools and for that reason the blow does not fall so heavily on us. We will endeavour to transfer trained staff, who will become redundant under the Government scheme, to other departments in order to avoid retrenchments. We will also be forced to develop our educational trade more intensively in other States.

It appears from that report that at least one company in South Australia is suffering under the scheme. Can the Minister say whether it is a fact that almost half of the contract for free school books has been awarded to interstate suppliers, and, if it is, will the Minister

take steps to rectify this in the future interests of industry and commerce in this State?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Tenders were called for primary school books the same as they are called for requirements of any other department. I do not think the report the honourable member read out indicates the true position and I will bring down a full report.

CHANDOS AND BUCKINGHAM LAND.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For some years there has been considerable interest in the development of the out-of-hundreds area of Counties Buckingham and Chandos. On August 26, at an Upper South-East Local Government Association conference the Minister of Lands made an unofficial statement which was published in the local press. Last week I asked the Minister whether he would bring down a report on the whole area and say what his department proposed to do regarding future planning and subdivision. I understand that the Minister now has an answer to my question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member said, I did speak at an Upper South-East Local Government conference, at the request of the honourable member, and reports were published in the newspapers. I think that, in one case in particular, it was an accurate report of what I said. For the benefit of the honourable member and the House I have prepared a statement on the development of this country. Development of Counties Chandos and Buckingham has, as the honourable member will know, engaged the attention of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement and my department for several years, but it has not been considered desirable to proceed with development in these areas until such time as the techniques required for successful development were well established. It now appears that this situation has been reached, and during the past year work on the preparation of a fairly detailed soil survey plan has been carried out by officers of the Agriculture Department and a report has recently been made available.

Following receipt of this report, aerial photography of the area was put in hand and, although delayed on occasions by unsuitable weather, this has now been completed. Stereoplotting of the physical features of the area is about to commence, and it is anticipated that plotting and drafting of contour plans will be completed by the end of November next. Design of road patterns and section boundaries will then be undertaken. To ensure the best and most economical road design, my colleague the Minister of Local Government and his officers will be consulted before the road patterns are finalized, and the district councils concerned will be kept informed of developments.

Priority in the areas to be opened up will depend largely upon the access roads now available, and the future provision of further roads. For this reason, the first blocks will be situated in the area bounded by the Pinnaroo-Bordertown road and the State border, between the hundreds of Pinnaroo and Shaugh, and these will be followed by further areas adjacent to Box Flat and to the west of the Pinnaroo-Bordertown road. Preliminary examination of the first area indicates that at least 30 blocks should be obtained, and if present planning reaches its objective, the first blocks should be ready for gazettal about the end of 1967. Blocks will be offered in groups of 12 to 15.

The general policies being pursued follow along the lines recommended by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement in August, 1963. Subsequent departmental experience has not shown any need to significantly depart from these recommendations. The committee drew attention to matters of tenure, development techniques and land utilization, and to ensure that appropriate conditions can be prescribed and carried into effect, it is intended that allotments will be made under perpetual lease conditions.

The soil survey indicates that something over 75 per cent of the total area should be capable of development, and it is intended as a general rule that the area of each block will be about 4,000 acres of developable land. However, some modification of the areas in particular blocks may be necessary and variations will be made as circumstances require. Conditions relating to development will be determined and applicants will be required to follow proven techniques of development and land utilization. Subdivision of holdings will not be permitted until such time as it is established that development or changes in technique make such action desirable.

Although a number of inquiries have been made from interests having access to substantial capital to undertake development of this area, it will be the policy, initially at least, to offer blocks to individual applicants as it is considered that established farmers should be given the opportunity to develop this country. Although it is hoped that sufficient of these, possessed of the necessary ability and financial capacity, will be available, I am quite aware

of the heavy developmental costs that will be involved. If it should be shown that this land cannot be developed by individual applicants in this way, consideration will be given to other means by which it may be achieved. Amendments and additions to the Crown Lands Act to provide appropriate powers to administer the development of this land are receiving attention, and legislation will be introduced in time to allow allotments to proceed without any delay.

No delay has occurred in surveys through staff deficiencies, nor is it expected that any delay will occur in carrying out the ground and field surveys which are planned to commence immediately after design of roads and section boundaries are approved. The honourable member raised the question of survey staff on Tuesday, September 27, and I am able to assure him that the survey staff position has improved. The main recruitment of surveyors comes from the graduation of officers who are awarded studentships to study at the Institute of Technology. Six officers have graduated in the past two years, while two others are expected to complete their courses shortly. It must be appreciated that after graduation further experience and instruction is necessary before a graduate can become a licensed surveyor. As losses of staff in recent times have been confined to one officer, the staff position is now satisfactory.

SANDY CREEK SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 9 the Minister of Education stated that the Director of the Public Buildings Department had been requested to dispose of the old Sandy Creek Primary School building, residence and site. As I have now been contacted by a person who is interested in procuring the house either by purchasing, renting, or leasing it, will the Minister of Works bring down a report on this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Most of the buildings are sold by tender but there are circumstances where a person who is keenly interested can apply in writing to the department, and, on some occasions, arrangements can be made to dispose of the buildings without calling tenders. If the honourable member will supply me with particulars I shall be happy to see whether the department is prepared to enter into negotiations.

RESTOCKING.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During the Estimates debate I asked the Minister of Lands whether the Government would implement the suggestion made in a letter from the Premier to the then Prime Minister that when the drought had broken the matter of restocking, with possible reduced rail charges, should be considered. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I said that I would have the honourable member's question examined and I have obtained information for him. As I said when he raised the matter, only one request for a rebate on the railage of stock has been received. This was in connection with stock returning to a property that is in another State, and the request was declined. Any applications for rebates of South Australian Railways Department charges on the transport of stock for *bona fide* restocking purposes will be investigated by the Pastoral Board and dealt with on their individual merits.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It appears from the Minister's answer that the Pastoral Board will determine any case on its merits. As that seems to be merely an application of a means test, will the Minister say whether that is so?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I said that cases would be dealt with on individual merits and no doubt this will have a bearing on the outcome of the case the honourable member has mentioned. That is the usual procedure, but the case I referred to concerned the railing of stock not within this State but from this State to another State, and for that reason it was declined. Generally however, the application is decided on individual merits, but the means test would be considered as well as other factors such as where the stock was coming from and where it was going to, and things of that nature. In order to clear the matter up, however, I will discuss this matter with the Pastoral Board and obtain a report for the honourable member.

TORRENS RIVER.

Mrs. STEELE: On Saturday last I was one of a party of people interested in the development of the Torrens River who, at the invitation of the Walkerville council, went on a bus trip along the lower reaches of the river from Hindmarsh bridge to the West Beach outlet. It occurred to me and to other members of the party that the banks of the channel adjacent to the outlet lent themselves to use for recreational purposes, and we thought that the planting of trees and shrubs and the provision of seats could develop a most pleasant area that would attract visitors to the spot. Will the Minister of Works call for a report on the feasibility of this suggestion?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am sorry that I was unable to join the party on Saturday. I received an invitation but prior engagements made it impossible for me to attend. I agree with the honourable member that much could be done to improve and beautify the banks of the river. This would add not only to the pleasant conditions of people living adjacent thereto, but would also add to the State's tourist attractions. As a committee (which will be enlarged soon) is inquiring into all aspects of the beautification of the banks, I will, in accordance with the request of the honourable member, call for a report and submit it to the House when it is available.

VINEGAR.

Mr. CLARK: Last evening a friend of mine, who is a grocer, telephoned and expressed much concern about vinegar prices. He said that from Thursday last no longer would vinegar be sold in flagons but that, instead, it would be sold in quarts. These flagons previously cost (in Gawler at any rate) 59c, 10c being allowed on the return of the flagon, making a price of 49c. The quart containers in which vinegar is to be sold in future (so my friend informs me) are not returnable and a quart will cost 38c. As this appears to be a considerable increase (if the figures are correct)—apart from the fact that the quart containers cannot be returned—will the Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, have the matter investigated?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know whether the price of vinegar is controlled, but I will have the matter investigated.

M.T.T. FARES.

Mr. HALL: I have received a letter complaining of the outrageous impositions on the fourth and fifth sections by the recent increases in Municipal Tramways Trust fares. The letter compares the increases in respect of these sections with those in respect of other sections. The writer complains that, during the 18 years he has lived at the fourth section, the fare for that section has risen from 4d. to 20c, whereas the fare for the sixth section has risen from 1s. to 20c. I am not sure whether this is for a return journey or not, but they are comparative figures. The increase is most unfair for travellers on the fourth and fifth sections, and it does not relate to the total length of the journey. Will the Premier obtain a report on the comparative rise in fares over a significant period that can be used to justify the present increases?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I emphasize that when this matter was introduced last session, particularly in relation to the third section, it was recognized that, from the point of view of both the management of the M.T.T. and its employees, any increase in fares would be restricted to the value of a silver coin. Recently, I reported to the House that any future increase in fares would be of the value of a silver coin. If other coins were used, it might not be possible to collect all fares, particularly for one section's travel, and give the necessary change. Further, the weight of the coins must be considered. However, I shall try to obtain the necessary information for the Leader.

GYPSUM.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture obtained from the Minister of Mines information about work done by the Department of Mines in its search for gypsum in the Morgan area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The deposit of gypsum north of Morgan is held by several persons under mineral leases. Current production is negligible. The deposit was examined in some detail by the Mines Department in 1960, and some experimental work carried out by the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. The material is low-grade and requires considerable treatment to make it marketable. It is not an attractive commercial proposition at present.

INNER SUBURBAN REDEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: In reply to a question I asked three or four months ago, the Attorney-General said that he hoped soon to have most of the submissions on inner-suburban redevelopment from the councils concerned. Can the Minister say whether all councils concerned have now forwarded their submissions? Further, following the inspection that the Attorney-General made last Saturday morning in company with the member for Burnside and me, can he say what progress has been made in this matter and whether he has been successful in attracting Commonwealth finance for the scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Hindmarsh, Kensington and Norwood, and St. Peters councils have made submissions. The Walkerville council indicated that its redevelopment proposals had already been communicated to the Government previously. The Unley council has not as yet put in any definite plan. We have not so far had submissions from the Thebarton or the West Torrens

council both of which I understand appointed a consultant. The submissions put in so far deal in fairly broad terms with the areas in which it is considered by the consultants and the councils that there should be complete redevelopment. This is based on a survey of housing and building in the particular areas. Some preliminary outlines of proposals for the kind of development that can be considered for redevelopment have been made but need to be studied in much greater detail.

It is expected that by some time next year we shall have some proposals that can be considered to the stage where we can see what kind of contracts can be let in these areas. Obviously, we cannot proceed until the Planning and Development Bill has been passed, because it contains the necessary provisions for redevelopment proposals. It is heartening to note that in Victoria some redevelopment has been successful in the Carlton area in letting out to building societies, particularly the Public Service co-operative, on a basis of acquisition at about $90,000 an acre. That is much more than we would have to pay in most of the redevelopment areas in the city of Adelaide and it may well be possible to have economic redevelopment without Commonwealth finance.

Up to the present the Commonwealth Government has not indicated that it is prepared to come to the party in the same way as has the United States Government and as, in fact, every State Government in Australia has asked it to do, as against the cost of redevelopment land. At the moment the Victorian Housing Commission is writing off about $1,300,000 a year on the cost of redevelopment land in order to use Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement money for its high-rise redevelopment projects. This would place a great strain on our programme, namely to contemplate anything of that kind in South Australia where we are still heavily committed to building individual houses. However, it may well be possible, given the financial investigations that will be made as a result of the submissions made by the councils, for us to have for the Planning and Development Authority next year the basis of a number of useful projects for redevelopment in the inner-suburban area.

BOOK SALES.

Mr. HALL: I have received a letter from a constituent, to whom I sent a copy of the Attorney-General's reply to a question I asked some months ago. In reading this letter, I am not trying to embarrass the Minister: I simply pass on information and ask his advice on the matter. The letter, which is from the Collier book company to this constituent of mine, states:

Your recent letters are to hand. It seems that the statements of the Attorney-General have unfortunately created a misconception in your mind. This company's contracts have always been settled with great care by the best lawyers available and have taken into account all aspects of the Book Purchasers Protection Act among other relevant considerations. These legal advisers do not agree with the Attorney-General. It would be regrettable if you were induced to make default under the contract by the broad statements by the Attorney-General, particularly as we feel sure that you, like us, entered into this contract in good faith. In your own interest, therefore, we urge you to remit the current arrears of $54 which are at present outstanding, so that your account with us may remain on a satisfactory basis.

I do not believe it is necessary to quote all the letter, although the Attorney-General is welcome to read it. In effect, the person concerned notified the company that if it returned the money paid he would return the books. Having previously asked a question here, I sent the purport of the Attorney-General's reply to the gentleman concerned. Although I cannot expect free legal advice in the House I ask the Attorney-General whether he stands by what he previously said about book purchasers and, in particular, about the question I previously asked.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Book Purchasers Protection Act provides that certain contracts not containing particular phrases and provisions are unenforceable. As the honourable member well knows (as he sponsored the original Bill in this House), "unenforceable" means what it says. I have advised all the people who have approached me on this matter that, if they are in any doubt, they should consult a solicitor as soon as possible to get advice on the proper course to take in relation to their contract. In some cases they might be advised to give notices of certain kinds. It would not be proper for me to give any blanket advice in this way. I can only point to the fact that none of Colliers' contracts that I have seen contain the provisions required of enforceable contracts under the Book Purchasers Protection Act. It would seem to me that in such cases most people would have a defence against any action brought by Colliers, but they should consult a solicitor as soon as possible.

HOPE VALLEY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: I have received correspondence from the Hope Valley Primary School Committee on the need for a new surrounding fence at that school, the existing fence being in a poor condition. I have been informed that in some places the wire is non-existent and posts are broken and ant-eaten. The main reason for the need for a new fence is that this school is surrounded by roads on three sides and the fence would prove a safety measure, as the children would then be forced to enter and leave through the gates (which as the Minister of Education will appreciate, is not always done at present). Also, dogs are becoming a nuisance as they are able to roam freely through the fence into the school yard. Previous requests have been made through the usual channels for the erection of a new surrounding fence. Can the Minister say whether this work has been approved and, if it has, when it will be commenced. If it has not been approved, will the Minister consider this request.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

RESERVOIRS.

Mr. CLARK: As we have recently had useful rains in this State, can the Minister of Works indicate the present holdings of reservoirs? Can he also compare those holdings with holdings at the same time last year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Regarding the Tod River Water District, the capacity of the Tod River Reservoir is 2,495,000,000 gallons, and the present storage is 1,380,200,000 gallons compared with 1,717,400,000 at this time last year. For the Barossa system, the position is as follows: Barossa reservoir (capacity of 993,000,000 gallons) is at present holding 583,100,000 compared with 849,000,000 gallons at this time last year. The South Para reservoir (capacity 11,300,000,000 gallons) is now holding 5,863,000,000 gallons compared with 7,004,800,000 at this time last year.

Regarding the main metropolitan reservoirs, Mount Bold reservoir has a capacity of 10,440,000,000 gallons and the present storage is 9,291,500,000 gallons compared with 7,713,500,000 gallons last year. The capacity of the Happy Valley reservoir is 2,804,000,000 gallons; its storage last year was 2,450,600,000 gallons, whereas this year it is 2,115,600,000 gallons. The capacity of the Clarendon weir is 72,000,000 gallons; its present storage is 63,800,000, whereas its storage at the same time last year was 70,600,000. The Myponga reservoir has a storage of 5,905,000,000 gallons; its present storage is 4,108,000,000 gallons, whereas its storage at the same time last year was 3,669,800,000 gallons.

The capacity of the Millbrook reservoir is 3,647,000,000 gallons; it is at present full, whereas it held only 1,909,400,000 gallons at this time last year. The Hope Valley reservoir has a capacity of 765,000,000 gallons; its present holding is 762,000,000 gallons, compared with 483,000,000 gallons at the same time last year. Thorndon Park reservoir has a capacity of 142,000,000 gallons; its present storage is 129,300,000 gallons compared with 128,600,000 gallons at the same time last year. The intake into the metropolitan reservoirs for the week was 992,600,000 gallons, the intake for the last 24 hours being 45,800,000 gallons.

Mr. HUDSON: Could the Minister obtain information on the likely saving in pumping costs for this financial year as a result of the storages currently being held?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to report that it is expected that the saving for the year will be considerable. Although I cannot give figures off-hand, I shall be pleased to obtain this information for the honourable member.

RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES.

Mr. COUMBE: During the Estimates debate I asked a question of the Minister of Education regarding Commonwealth grants for the four university residential colleges, all of which are situated in my district. Can the Minister now give me that information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The amount of $208,000 provided in the Estimates of Expenditure comprises:

	$	$
Recurrent grants of approximately $8,000 each to the four colleges, Acquinas, Lincoln, St. Ann's, and St. Mark's		32,000
Capital grants to complete arrangements for the 1964-66 triennium:		
Acquinas (approx.)	6,000	
Lincoln (approx.)	14,000	
St. Ann's (approx.)	100,000	
St. Mark's (approx.)	11,000	
		131,000
Estimate of capital grants required at the beginning of the 1967-69 triennium (details as yet not determined)		45,000
		$208,000

The recurrent grants are being made available by the Commonwealth without the requirement for the State to provide matching amounts.

The Commonwealth is providing capital grants on the basis of $1 for each $1 provided locally. In general, the local contribution in recent years has been one-half by the Government and one-half by the college itself. The amounts quoted above are gross, that is, they include Commonwealth and State contributions. The Commonwealth grant is taken to Revenue as received. The relatively small amount for capital for the beginning of the new triennium is in the expectation that new programmes will take some time to get under way.

DRIVING INSTRUCTION.

Mrs. STEELE: I was interested to read in last Friday's *Advertiser* that the first course for children who wanted to learn to drive would begin at Norwood High School today, and that there was to be a special opening ceremony at the school at 3.30 p.m. on Thursday, when the first practical instruction would be given. As we know, this course of instruction has been made possible by the gift of motor cars for this purpose by General Motors-Holden's. The Director of Education said, when making the announcement, that students enrolling for the course would pay a $10 fee to cover the cost of instruction. However, a spokesman for the Royal Automobile Association, whose trained officers are to give the driving instruction, said that such services were being given free to the Education Department by his organization for a period of six months. Can the Minister of Education say why, in view of the R.A.A.'s statement, students are being charged a fee? Is it intended that after six months the R.A.A. will charge for the continuance of such a service?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The fee of $10 is to cover the cost of the instructors' salaries. The offer by the R.A.A. relates to the beginning of the scheme, and instructors from then on will all be paid as the scheme extends. The fee of $10 has been worked out on the basis of its being sufficient to pay the instructors' fees while the scheme operates.

WHEAT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: For a long time (I think throughout the post-war years) the Government of the United States of America has imposed rather severe acreage restrictions on its wheatgrowers to ensure that the world wheat market would not be unduly loaded with surplus wheat. On May 5 this year the United States Government announced that the wheat acreage restrictions would be relaxed, and this could mean that the world supply of free wheat will increase. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative considers that a surplus of wheat will need to be held in South Australia, and whether it has made, or is making, provision to hold any surplus of wheat?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall refer the question to the co-operative for a reply. Members who heard the oration delivered this year by Dr. Callaghan, the Chairman of the Australian Wheat Board, would have been impressed by his optimism regarding the demand for wheat on oversea markets. Dr. Callaghan said then there was such a need for wheat at the moment that if any of the major producing countries were to fail through drought or other reason there could be a famine throughout the world, and in view of that statement I do not think there is any need to fear the effects suggested by the honourable member.

NAIRNE PYRITES.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about Nairne Pyrites Proprietary Limited?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matters concerning Nairne Pyrites Proprietary Limited are not exactly as the Leader has suggested. In the first place there was no loan by the Government of $1,600,000, but there was a loan by the Savings Bank of South Australia of $2,000,000 to the company, and that loan has been guaranteed by the Treasurer. Apart from providing for interest at very modest rates and for repayment at the rate of $83,530 a year, there are two other important provisions in the arrangements. These are as follows:

(1) that the Treasurer had the right if he should consider it proper to charge a commission not exceeding 2 per cent per annum on the amount of the guaranteed loan; and

(2) that he had the right at any time before maturity of the loan in 1975 to subscribe for $400,000 shareholding in the company but, if the company should give 12 months' notice of its intention to fully repay the loan earlier than 1975, that option must be exercised within the twelve-month period.

The company has been repaying the loan at the agreed rate, but up to August 31 last had made no voluntary repayments. At that date the net loan stood at $1,151,760. I have been advised that the company held considerable investments surplus to its early requirements which were earning interest at rates in excess of those payable by the company on the guaranteed loan. At the same time the Savings Bank had been experiencing some difficulty in

keeping up with the demands for homes finance in the face of a reduced volume of new deposits. Accordingly, it appeared to me reasonable that I should request the company that it should repay such of the loan as might be practicable without prejudicing its future operations and finances.

The company in fact offered to repay the full loan forthwith if I was prepared to waive the notice required and to forgo the options to shares in the existing agreement. I was not prepared to do this, but indicated that if the 12 months' notice required by the agreement were given I would give a decision upon the options within that period. The company has now advised that it would propose to repay voluntarily $650,000 within a month and a further $100,000 by June, 1967. This will leave $401,760 outstanding which I believe the company really requires for the efficient conduct of its business, and which it will not be bound to repay until August 31, 1975.

The Leader may be assured these agreed arrangements will in no way prejudice the company or the superphosphate industry, for the company was never pressed to repay more than it found it convenient to repay. On the other hand, the arrangements will be of major assistance to the Savings Bank in meeting the very extensive requirements for housing and other essential finance. I believe the arrangements made are much preferable to the alternative which was available to me, that is, to charge a commission upon the guarantee given, at least to the extent that the company's investments were in excess of its near future requirements.

BOTANIC GARDEN.

Mrs. STEELE: During the Estimates debate, the Minister of Lands undertook to obtain information for me regarding moneys spent on a new Botanic Garden at Mount Lofty and on work on the Torrens Bank in Botanic Park. Has he a reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding moneys being spent at Mount Lofty, during the past few years the Board of Governors, Botanic Garden, has been progressively purchasing the entire market garden area of L. G. Bonython, Piccadilly Valley. The amount on the Estimates for $3,000 is for a further 3¼ acres. This area is included in the total area decided upon by the board several years ago as necessary to establish the new Botanic Garden at Mount Lofty.

Regarding the control of erosion of the Torrens bank in Botanic Park, in 1955 the board advised the then Minister of Lands that the high level of the Torrens had caused erosion of the southern bank, and from time to time it has made further submissions regarding this matter. In 1962 the board again drew the attention of the Government to the erosion and the board was informed that an agreement would be drawn up between the Government and the Adelaide City Council to carry out sheet piling protection on the southern bank of the Torrens River. This was modified in a submission made to the Government by the council on June 16, 1965, when it was considered that stone pitching of both north and south banks of the Torrens River would need to be carried out. It was agreed that the Government would provide five-ninths and the council four-ninths of the total cost, with the council making staff available for the design and supervision of the work, without charge. This was agreed to in Cabinet on June 21, 1965, and the council advised ratification of the proposals in a letter by the Under Treasurer dated December 23, 1965. Initially the work was to spread over several years, but it is now proposed to carry out the work during the forthcoming summer. The level of the lake will probably be lowered and it is hoped that the work will be completed before the break of season in 1967.

SIT-IN.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the sit-in at the Barr Smith Library at the University of Adelaide last Thursday night which was organized as a protest against the limited library accommodation at the University of Adelaide and, I understand, as part of a much wider protest throughout the country. I recollect that it has been stated that the first casualty as a result of the Government's decision—

Mr. Broomhill: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —not to match a further grant from the Commonwealth for tertiary education—

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" having been called, the honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently my explanation was distasteful to the honourable member. I will ask my question. As a result of the success of the sit-in protest against limited accommodation at the university, will the Government reconsider its decision not to match any further subsidies being offered by the Commonwealth Government so that the extensions to the Barr Smith Library may, in fact, be proceeded with?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The suggestion contained in the honourable member's question is that the Government is not matching the Commonwealth Government's grants, and that is quite false.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't say that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the honourable member cares to look at *Hansard* to see what he said he will see that he did say that the Government is not matching the Commonwealth grants. In fact, however, the Government is matching them. The Government is not in a position to reconsider matching grants for the amount provided by the Commonwealth, except in connection with the matter to which I referred the other day. That matter was raised by the honourable member, and I told him I was not in a position to give any further information at that juncture. Concerning the library, I am well aware (and the Government is well aware) that it needs attention and that it has needed it for a long time. I noticed that when the speaker for the students was interviewed on television he did not place the blame on the State Government at all; in fact, he referred it somewhere else.

MIGRANTS.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent questions about the return of British migrants to their homeland and about supplying information to migrants intending to come to South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: British migrants come to South Australia under the auspices of the Commonwealth Immigration Department or the State Immigration Department. All non-British migrants come here under Commonwealth auspices. The State has no responsibility for, or control over, Commonwealth nominated migrants. State sponsored migrants come here under various schemes; namely:

a. Group nominations lodged by employers such as Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, South Australian Railways and South Australian Woods and Forests Department. Before such a group nomination is approved the employer is required to give a written guarantee that both employment and housing will be provided.

b. Personal nominations lodged by resident relatives or friends:

The nominator is required to provide accommodation and employment assistance. In some cases a maintenance guarantee may be required from the nominator; for example, for elderly folk or a widow with children.

c. South Australian Housing Trust nominees under the house purchase scheme:

Each family is required to have a minimum of £1,750 sterling and they are advised direct by letter from the State Immigration Officer of their employment prospects and approximate earnings without overtime. Nominations are rejected if it is believed that the nominee is not readily employable or lacks sufficient earning capacity.

d. Open market house purchase migrants recommended by the Agent-General are dealt with in the same manner as Housing Trust nominees except that they require minimum finance of £2,000 sterling.

e. Nominations lodged by approved private housing firms operating under the house purchase scheme:

These private firms submit their nominations to the State Immigration Department for approval. The minimum financial requirement is £2,000 sterling. If employment prospects and earning capacity are doubtful, the nominations are rejected or referred back to the nominating firm. Migrants are advised not to purchase a house until suitable employment is obtained. Each firm is required to give its migrant nominees employment assistance.

Nominations, when approved, are listed and scheduled air mail to the Commonwealth Chief Migration Officer in London. A copy is sent to the Agent-General. A copy of the employment note forwarded to the Housing Trust and open market house purchase nominees is included in the schedule. Therefore, when the Commonwealth selection officer in Britain interviews these applicants he has knowledge of the employment advice given. The Housing Trust officer in London is kept up to date with current employment trends. The Agent-General is given a monthly report on migration statistics, the current employment position and future prospects and housing loans.

Migrants are naturally concerned with employment opportunities at the time of arrival which is usually about six months from the time of lodging the nomination. No effort is spared to give as much accurate information and as much assistance on arrival as possible. A list of recent arrivals shows who were placed in employment mostly within 10 to 14 days of arrival. A list from R.D.C. Ltd. shows employment obtained for their recent arrivals. In both cases the results are pleasing. Other firms report that they are placing their nominees within 14 days of arrival provided they are not too selective. Whilst the employment position is not easy and some jobs (*e.g.*, in the building industry) are difficult to secure, overall our obligations are being met.

Some of the scare headlines in the press (*e.g.*, in the *News* last Wednesday to the effect that "starving" workers were quitting South Australia) serve no useful purpose and represent a serious disservice to the State.

Some nominees rejected by the State because of insufficient capital or inadequate earning capacity still come out as Commonwealth nominees under the "nest egg" scheme. Under this scheme they are left to their own devices from the day of arrival and I believe many of them get into difficulty. The State arrangements for British migrants have worked very well. Our numbers have grown to a high percentage of the Australian total, not because the Government has spent money on promotion, but because so many happily settled migrants have recommended the scheme to their relatives and friends.

EGGS.

Mr. McANANEY: I notice that a meeting is to be called by the Federal Council of the Poultry Farmers Association on October 11 and 12 in Canberra, at which the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry will be present. As I understand that the main issue before the meeting will be the control of egg production in order to avoid building up a huge egg surplus which could prove a disaster to thousands of poultry farmers in Australia, will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Egg Board whether there is a surplus and what is its proposed attitude to this question?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

ARBURY PARK.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the use of Arbury Park?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Soon after it came into office, the Government decided that the residence and 22 acres of garden surrounding it at Arbury Park should be used as a residential conference centre for the Education Department and other Government departments. This portion of the property has been named Raywood. The cost of alterations and equipment to convert the residence for this new purpose was $54,500. The first residential conference of the Inservice Training Programme of the Education Department commenced on July 7, 1966. Fifteen conferences attended by over 300 persons have been held since then, and a further 15 have been arranged for the balance of the year. It is expected that about 50 conferences will be held each year arranged by the Education Department and other Government departments. The holding of these conferences has already given a great impetus to the professional development of teachers.

Conference members pay $6 a day for board and lodging. Present capacity is 19 members and it is planned to increase this to 35 by building additional accommodation. The total running expenses, including salaries and wages of staff and contingencies is $39,400 a year, and receipts for board and lodging $21,000 a year. When the accommodation is increased it is expected that receipts will approximately cover running expenses. The staff includes two full-time gardeners whose employment was continued after the property was purchased by the Government. The grounds are open to the public on weekends.

The remaining 200 acres of Arbury Park will be used in the interests of the people of South Australia. I have established an Arbury Park Development Committee comprising representatives of the Education Department, the Highways Department, the Town Planner's office, the Stirling District Council, the National Fitness Council, and the Public Buildings Department to advise on developing the property to this end.

Leases are being prepared to enable the National Fitness Council to develop walking tracks through the area and develop several large areas for public recreation. The National Fitness Council will prepare an area bounded by Cox's Creek and the freeway as an overnight bivouac area. The Stirling District Council will lease two areas which it will develop as picnic grounds. A further portion will be developed as an Education Department camp school. Grazing rights have been granted to a local grazier for the time being so that grass growth will be kept down and bush fire hazards reduced to a minimum.

LAND PURCHASE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about expenditure on a small parcel of land in the hundred of Baker?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This money was used to repurchase the Commonwealth Government's interests in a small area which, having been purchased by it for war service land settlement, was now surplus to requirements.

BLACKWOOD TAXI SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Recently, a man was running a taxi service in Blackwood much to the convenience of local residents, as some city taxi companies are not very willing to come into the hills part of my district for fares. However, the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board has directed this man not to operate from Blackwood in future and I understand that he has, in fact, had to come to Adelaide to work in the city because he has a white plate. As this is causing much inconvenience in Blackwood and vicinity, will the Premier take up with the Chief Secretary (so that he may take it up with the board) the question of allowing either this man or some other person to run a taxi service in Blackwood for the convenience of local residents?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and I believe that preference should be given to the person who started the service.

MONTACUTE ROAD.

Mrs. STEELE (on notice):

1. What is the extent of the roadworks being undertaken on Montacute Road?

2. Are the roadworks to be extended, now or later, beyond Montacute Road, St. Bernard Road and Newton Road intersection?

3. What is the total estimated cost of the actual roadworks?

4. What is the cost of removing trees on either side of the road?

5. Is the Highways Department performing the work, or is the Campbelltown council acting as agent for the Highways Department?

6. On completion of the roadworks where is it envisaged that the traffic lights for a school crossing, adjacent to Newton Primary School, will be sited?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Montacute to Marble Hill Main Road No. 92 forms a part of the metropolitan road widening scheme. These roads require a road reserve width of 80ft. to provide for a 62ft. pavement between kerbs, and it is proposed to construct Montacute Road to this standard.

2. It is expected to complete the widening between Glynburn Road and St. Bernard and Newton Roads (including the intersection) during this financial year. Further widening east of St. Bernard Road and Newton Road is scheduled to commence during 1968-69.

3. The estimated total costs of the section mentioned in (2) are $160,000, of which the Corporation of Campbelltown is contributing 12½ per cent.

4. The cost of removing the trees was $3,699.40. This work was carried out by contract to the corporation.

5. The work is being carried out by the Campbelltown corporation on behalf of the Highways and Local Government Department.

6. The school crossing is proposed about 250ft. east of Hectorville Road on Montacute Road. This is subject to formal agreement with council.

ENFIELD GENERAL CEMETERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act most of which have been recommended by the Enfield General Cemetery Trust and the Auditor-General. The Bill also provides for the disqualification as a member of the trust of a councillor of the Corporation of the City of Enfield who ceases to be such a councillor. It confers on the trust power to borrow money for erecting a crematorium and effecting other improvements, and makes amendments relating to the investment of the trust's reserve fund, payment of members of the trust and other minor matters. Clause 3 of the Bill brings up to date the reference to the Municipal Corporation of the Town of Enfield in section 5 of the principal Act.

Clause 4 inserts in the principal Act a new section 6a, subsection (1) of which provides that if a member of the trust who was appointed on the nomination of the city of Enfield was, at the time of his appointment, a member of the Enfield Municipal Council, he shall cease to be a member of the trust and vacate his office as such upon his ceasing to be a member of that municipal council. Subsection (2) provides, however, that subsection (1) shall not apply to a person who, before the Bill becomes law, was a member of the trust and whose term of office had not expired at such commencement. In other words, the section will apply only to members of the Enfield Municipal Council who are appointed members of the trust after the Bill becomes law. Clause 5 inserts in the principal Act a new section 24a under which the trust may, with the consent of the Minister, borrow money for the purpose of constructing a crematorium or of effecting other capital improvements. The repayment

of such borrowings may be secured by mortgaging any land within the cemetery which is not used for burial purposes.

Clause 6 amends section 25 of the principal Act by enabling the trust to apply its revenue in the repayment of moneys borrowed pursuant to section 24a and in payment of interest thereon and expenses incidental thereto. Clause 7 amends section 26 of the principal Act by extending the trust's powers to invest its reserve fund in securities guaranteed by the Government of the State or the Commonwealth, or in securities guaranteed by or under the authority of a State or Commonwealth Act, or by the Treasurer of the State. Clause 8 amends section 31 of the principal Act by striking out the upper limits for members' fees, namely, £50 in the case of the chairman and £25 in the case of other members. This will enable the fees to be fixed having regard to changes in money values. Section 33 at present makes it mandatory for the trust, upon request by any religious denomination, whatever its strength or constitution, to set apart portion of the cemetery for the burial of persons of that denomination. Clause 9 amends the section so as to make it merely permissive for the trust so to do. This Bill is in the nature of a hybrid Bill and, in accordance with Standing Orders, was referred to a Select Committee in another place. The committee recommended passage of the Bill in its present form.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Medical Practitioners Act, 1919-1955. The principal amendments proposed in this Bill are as follows:

(*a*) to make it clear that a person shall be eligible to annual registration under the Act only if, in addition to having the degrees, diplomas or qualifications mentioned in section 19 of the Act, such person has served as a resident medical officer at an approved hospital for a period of 12 months;

(*b*) to alter the existing system of registration of medical practitioners under the Act to annual, provisional and limited registration;

(*c*) to increase the powers of the board with regard to registration and discipline of medical practitioners;

(*d*) to provide for suspension from practice of a medical practitioner suffering from mental or physical disability;

(*e*) to confer power upon the board to review accounts of medical practitioners for professional services rendered;

(*f*) to provide for the registration of specialists; and

(*g*) to provide for the registration of foreign medical practitioners qualified in certain countries outside Australia and the Commonwealth and to establish a Foreign Medical Practitioners' Assessment Committee to examine foreign medical practitioners and to make recommendations to the board in connection with applications for registration of foreign medical practitioners.

I now intend to deal with the individual clauses in the Bill. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act which deals with the arrangement of the Act and inserts a new Part IIIa (Registration of Specialists). Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by inserting a new definition of "approved institution". This definition is important in connection with the requirement of compulsory post-graduate hospital service. Under the existing section 30a of the Act, which is repealed in clause 19 of the Bill, the board has to proclaim every hospital as an "approved institution". There are many hundreds of such hospitals throughout the British Commonwealth. It is considered therefore that the board should have power to accept 12 months' compulsory post-graduate hospital service in any hospital which the board approves. The new definition of "approved institution" would enable this to be done.

Clause 5 amends section 5 of the principal Act which deals with the constitution of the Medical Board. Section 5 (2) provides that one member to the board shall be nominated by the persons registered under this Act and for the time being resident in the State. This member has always been the nominee of the Australian Medical Association (S.A. Branch). Practically all medical practitioners resident in this State and in active practice are members of the Australian Medical Association and any nominee of that body to the board would be a true representative of the profession in this State. There was only one election held under this section (in 1964), when a practitioner, also a member of the A.M.A. stood

against the official nominee of the A.M.A. No campaign was conducted by the latter, but he was successful and received approximately 70 per cent of the effective votes. As both candidates were members of the A.M.A., this election, which entailed a great deal of organization and expense, could have been avoided by the matter being settled within the A.M.A.

I should mention in this regard that South Australia is the only place in the British Commonwealth where an election for a Medical Board position is provided for in this particular manner. In the United Kingdom the British Medical Association nominates members of the General Medical Council of Great Britain. In New South Wales the A.M.A. (New South Wales Branch) also nominates members to the New South Wales Medical Board. It is therefore considered that one member of the Medical Board of South Australia to represent all practitioners of the State should be nominated by the A.M.A. (S.A. Branch). This clause provides accordingly. A consequential amendment in clause 8 of the Bill amends section 10 of the principal Act and clause 27 amends section 39. Clause 6 of the Bill amends section 8 of the principal Act and extends the tenure of office of each member of the board from two to four years. The terms of board members in other parts of the British Commonwealth vary from three years to an indefinite term. This is considered desirable so that the experience gained by members of the board may be more effectively utilized.

Clause 9 of the Bill amends section 18 of the principal Act and states, in effect, that the provisions of this Bill will not affect the registration of any medical practitioner who is registered before the passing of this proposed legislation. Clause 10 amends section 19 of the principal Act. This section deals with the qualifications of medical practitioners for future registrations. The effect of the amendment is that as from the passing of this Bill a person shall not be entitled to be registered under this Act unless, in addition to the qualifications specified under this section, such person has served for a period of 12 months as a resident medical officer in one or more approved institutions and produces evidence to the board that such service was performed and completed to the satisfaction of the competent authority controlling such approved institution. Provision is made in this clause for the Registrar to exempt any person from this requirement of service as a resident medical officer if he possesses any of the qualifications mentioned in section 19 of the Act and satisfies the board that he has, for such period in excess of 12 months as the board may determine, had experience in medicine or surgery which the board considers to be equivalent to the period of service of 12 months as resident medical officer. This clause, however, makes it clear that unless a person has been so exempted he will not be entitled to full registration unless he complies with all the requirements of section 19 as amended.

This requirement of service as a resident medical officer in an approved institution is by no means a new requirement. A similar requirement is at present written into the Act in section 30a which is being repealed under this Bill. Most of the other provisions of section 30a have, I may mention, been incorporated in substantially the same form in clause 14 of the Bill. Clause 11 inserts a new section 19a in the principal Act and provides for the registration of certain foreign medical practitioners. There is little need for me to go into the reasons for inserting this provision into the Bill. Honourable members are well aware of the serious shortage of medical practitioners in the State particularly in rural areas. The Government therefore as a matter of urgency felt that something must be done to relieve the position and it is thought that this present proposal will do a lot in that direction.

Before a foreign medical practitioner will succeed in his application for registration he will have to satisfy the board that he has a qualification granted in any country that does not give reciprocity on medical registration with South Australia. Such qualification must be regarded by the board as not being lower in standard than a South Australian qualification. Further, the board will satisfy itself that the foreign applicant for registration possesses medical or surgical knowledge, experience and skill which in the opinion of the board is of international standing or of special value to the State, and that he has an adequate knowledge of English and is of good character. Once the board is satisfied as to these matters it may register the applicant without reference to the Foreign Medical Practitioners' Assessment Committee. If, however, the applicant has not the high standing, etc., referred to in paragraph (*b*) of this section, the board will refer the application to the Assessment Committee. Subsection (2) of the new section refers to the Second Schedule and it is this schedule that deals with the establishment and constitution of this committee, the appointment of members thereon and the

procedure and functions of this committee. I consider it appropriate therefore to deal with the Second Schedule at this time.

The Assessment Committee will consist of eight members appointed by the Governor, of whom four shall be the heads of Departments of Anatomy, Physiology, Pathology, Microbiology at the University of Adelaide, one shall be a senior practising physician, one shall be a senior practising surgeon, one shall be a senior practising obstetrician, and one shall be a senior practising general practitioner. Each of these practitioners shall be selected by the Governor from a panel of three names chosen in each case by the board and submitted to the Minister. Provision is made that if the board does not submit a panel of names the Governor, on the recommendation of the Minister, may appoint a suitable person. Any applicant foreign medical practitioner whose qualification is acceptable to the board, and who has been resident in South Australia for not less than three months, may apply to the board to be registered. The application may, unless the board decides to register the applicant itself under section 19a, then be submitted by the board to the committee who may examine the applicant and require him, if it thinks necessary, to undergo any appropriate examination conducted, arranged or approved by the committee, or any course of study or training, and upon being satisfied as to the matters previously mentioned, the committee may certify to the board that the applicant is a fit and proper person to be registered under the Act. This scheme of registration of foreign medical practitioners will remain in operation until June 30, 1972, but the cessation of operation will not affect any registration already made thereunder.

There are two matters in this schedule upon which honourable members might wish further explanation. I refer to the residential qualification and the duration of the application of this section and schedule. Government has introduced the requirement of residence in this State for not less than three months (which appears in paragraph 3 of the Second Schedule) as a precautionery measure. It is impossible at the present time for the board to forecast how many applications from foreign medical practitioners to practise in this State might be received. There is a danger that without this residential qualification requirement the Assessment Committee might be inundated with applications for registration from foreign doctors who may be residing interstate or overseas. This could constitute a considerable embarrassment to the board and the committee.

A further and equally valid reason for the insertion of this requirement is that it is considered by the board that applicants for registration should be encouraged to spend some time in the State to adjust themselves to our standards and requirements. Applicants will then be in a better position to prepare themselve for the committee's examinations by pursuing appropriate studies in our clinical schools. The board is aware that this requirement might cause some hardship in the isolated case, but generally it is felt that these persons will not have any great difficulty in finding some kind of employment where they have not the private means to maintain themselves during the preparatory period. In Victoria, where a similar residential requirement has been in force for some time, the experience there is that very few cases of hardship have come to light. All applicants have managed to survive in one way or another. Government has adopted a similar cautious approach to the duration of the period in which this new provision will operate.

The Government, acting on the advice of the board, thinks it desirable that initially this new scheme of registration should not last for more than six years. If, however, at the end of that time it is found that there is need to extend this scheme for registration for a further period of six years, then the provisions of this schedule could be extended for that further period. Victoria, which has provisions similar to those proposed in the Bill, has taken the same cautious approach to the matter.

Clause 12 amends section 20 of the principal Act which provides for applications for registration. The board under this provision can refuse an application if it is satisfied that the applicant is not entitled to be registered under section 19 of the Act or if he is not of good fame and character or has been removed from any register of practitioners. Under the existing provisions of the Act, if a medical practitioner's qualifications are in order the board has no power to refuse registration even if he has been de-registered for infamous conduct in another State or country. The board must register him and then hold an inquiry into his infamous conduct before it can recommend to the Supreme Court that his name be removed from the South Australian register. The proposed amendment would rectify this position because the board would be given

power to refuse to register a medical practitioner if he had been de-registered elsewhere or was otherwise unfit for registration.

Clause 13 amends section 22 of the principal Act which deals with the payment of registration fees. This clause provides that a person who is registered under this Act shall, on or before September 30 in each year, pay to the board such annual practice fee as may be prescribed by the board for the year commencing on the first day of January next following, and if after receipt of a notice by the board at his last known place of residence the fee is not paid by November 30 next following, his name will be removed from the register. If a person's name is removed from the register under this clause or under section 26 or section 27b of this Act, his name may be restored upon application where his name has been removed under this section or section 27b and upon order of the Supreme Court where his name has been removed under section 26 of this Act, provided an applicant pays such restoration fee as may be prescribed. Under this proposed amendment there will no longer be the need to pay what is at present designated a renewal fee, and each registered person will pay an annual practice fee. The provisions of this clause with regard to the payment of an annual practice fee will not apply to persons registered under the Act who have paid a commutation fee of $10.50 in respect of a registration fee and all renewal fees. Payment of a commutation fee for life membership in lieu of what will now be called an "annual practice fee" will cease after the commencement of this proposed legislation, but the position of those who have already paid a commutation fee will not be affected.

Clause 14 repeals the existing section 24a and re-enacts a new section 24a and is designed to provide for a new form of limited registration in the Act for particular categories of medical practitioners. This new section confers powers upon the board to issue a certificate of limited registration to the following categories of persons:

(*a*) persons who have passed the examination for admission to the degree of Bachelor of Medicine or Bachelor of Surgery of Adelaide university but have not been admitted to those degrees;

(*b*) persons entitled by virtue of any degree or diploma granted either in South Australia or elsewhere to be registered under the Act but such persons have not complied with the provisions of paragraph (*e*) of section 19 of this Act. This refers to the requirement to serve for a period of 12 months as a resident medical officer at an approved institution; and

(*c*) persons who hold a degree in medicine or surgery of a university or medical or surgical school in a country outside South Australia and such persons are in South Australia or propose to come here in some capacity connected with teaching, research or post-graduate study in medicine or surgery and have been recommended by the governing body of a teaching or research institution to the board as being suitable to pursue such course of teaching, research or post-graduate study in medicine or surgery in South Australia.

The holder of a certificate of limited registration under paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) above may, while occupying the position of resident medical officer of an approved institution, practise medicine and surgery while at such approved institution. A person who practises medicine or surgery outside such approved institution will be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding $200.

With regard to persons in category (*c*) mentioned above, the certificate may be subject to such limitations and restrictions upon the practice of medicine and surgery as the board thinks fit, and any such certificate shall in the first place be issued for a period of not more than two years. It may be extended up to a period of three years. While a person is performing the services of a resident medical officer as prescribed by section 19 (*e*) of this Act and for purposes of that service or while pursuing a course of teaching, research or post-graduate study for the purposes for which the certificate was granted he shall be deemed to be a person registered under this Act.

The existing section 24a which is repealed was designed to cover the temporary registration of persons who have passed the examinations of the University of Adelaide for admission to the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Bachelor of Surgery but have not been admitted to those degrees. This provision, as far as it is known, is unique in Australia and the British Commonwealth. In its application it has created some anomalies, particularly with regard to the application of the existing section 30a dealing with compulsory post-graduate hospital experience. The effect of the provision has been to permit general practice before the

hospital year has commenced. This is not considered at all desirable and such persons should be covered by a form of limited registration. The introduction of this additional class of registration will bring this State into line with the procedure adopted for registration in other States and Great Britain. Subclauses (10), (11) and (12) of this clause are substantially the same provisions as appear in subsections (5), (6) and (7) of section 30a of this Act which is being repealed by this proposed legislation.

Clause 15 amends section 25 of the principal Act and has the effect of enabling the board to decide what new or additional qualifications of a registered person should be inserted in the register. Clause 16 inserts important amendments to section 26 of the principal Act. The first amendment appearing in paragraph (*a*) of this clause is designed to clarify the meaning of the existing paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) of this section. It is considered highly unlikely for a qualification to be withdrawn or cancelled by the university, college, or other body by which it was conferred as distinct from the authority which registered the medical practitioner, and so a new paragraph (*b*) is inserted in lieu thereof which makes it clear that the authority which registered such person and has withdrawn, suspended or cancelled such registration should be the body referred to in this paragraph and not the university, etc., which conferred the qualification.

The second amendment introduced by paragraph (*b*) of this clause inserts an additional provision whereby the name of any person may be removed from the register if such person has been certified to be a mental defective or is suffering from any mental or physical infirmity which renders him incapable of practising as a medical practitioner. This has to date been an omission in our Act, and it is felt that such a provision should at this time be inserted. It is a provisoin that appears in legislation in most of the other States.

The third amendment to this section proposed in paragraph (*c*) of this clause is designed to confer upon the board powers to deal with any registered person who is guilty of infamous conduct in any professional respect. The board would have power to censure him or require him to give an undertaking to abstain from such conduct or suspend his registration for a period not greater than 12 months. These powers, it will be noted, provide an alternative method of dealing with such person to that prescribed by section 26 (1); that is, removal from the register. The powers that are conferred upon the Medical Board under this provision are, it may be stated, no wider than powers conferred upon boards to discipline members of other professions in this State under existing Statutes; for example, veterinary surgeons, dentists and physiotherapists.

The other provisions of this clause deal with the circumstances under which the board shall not suspend a person from registration, and they also confer power upon the board to annul a suspension and further provide that any person suspended shall have a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. I may mention that this aspect of the Bill has been discussed with the judges of the Supreme Court who agree with these proposals.

Clause 17 inserts a new section 26a in the principal Act. This is also an important amendment and provides for notification to the board by a medical superintendent or by a registered medical practitioner of any registered person who is receiving treatment in any hospital or mutual institution and who is considered by the medical superintendent in charge of such hospital or mental institution (or the practitioner attending him if he is not in a hospital where there is a medical superintendent) to be incapable of exercising his profession satisfactorily. The board is empowered to suspend such registered person from practice. The latter has a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The board, however, may itself cancel the suspension. Any person so suspended from practice under this section shall be deemed not to be registered under this Act. In subclause (9), a penalty provision is inserted which lays down the penalty not exceeding $200 if any person contravenes the provisions of this section. This provision is considered necessary so that the public may be protected in any case where a medical practitioner is suffering from some form of mental disease, etc., which prevents him carrying out his duties satisfactorily, and is designed to stop such person from practising his profession while so incapacitated.

Clause 18 inserts new sections 27a and 27b in the principal Act. Section 27a provides that a registered person must notify the board of a change of address within three months of any change of address as appearing in the register, and if any registered person fails to do so he is liable to a penalty not exceeding $10. Section 27b enables the board to remove the name of any registered person from the register who fails to reply to any letter

addressed to his last address, as appearing in the register, requiring him to confirm if he has changed his address or residence. Subsection (3) of this section enables the board to restore any name removed from the register pursuant to this section upon payment of a restoration fee.

Clause 19 inserts a new Part IIIa in the principal Act, which deals with the registration of specialists in South Australia. This amendment again fills a gap in an existing Act. It is considered desirable that this State should make provision for the registration of specialists. It may be of interest to honourable members if I mention that the establishment of a Specialists' Register has been considered desirable by various hospital and medical associations for some time, more particularly in connection with medical benefits obtainable under the National Health Act. Queensland has had such a register operating satisfactorily for some years, and Western Australia has a limited Specialist Register for workmen's compensation purposes only. The other States have had the matter under consideration for some time but have not as yet made provision in their legislation for it.

In section 29a (1) the Governor may, upon the recommendation of the board from time to time, by proclamation, prescribe what branches of medicine shall be deemed to be a specialists' branch of medicine in relation to which a person may be registered as a specialist under this Part. Subsection (2) lays down the requirements that the board will demand before registering a person as a specialist in this Specialist Register. The applicant would have to satisfy the board that he has gained special skill in a particular specialty proclaimed under this section by practising exclusively in that specialist branch of medicine, or partly in that specialist branch of medicine and partly in such other branch of medicine whether in a hospital or otherwise as the board may approve, and further that he is the holder of a prescribed degree or diploma, approved by the board in the specialty to which his application relates, of a university or other institution recognized by the board as authorized to grant that degree or diploma, and the degree or diploma is recognized by the board to be a higher degree or diploma in that specialist branch of medicine.

This subsection (2) will come into effect on a date to be proclaimed. This will give the board an opportunity to make the administrative arrangements that are necessary in compiling a register for specialists. In subsection (3), however, a person registered under this Act may be deemed to be a specialist for the purposes of this Part if he holds or has held an appointment in a specialist branch of medicine or surgery in a hospital approved by the board and for such period as the board may determine, or if he is or has been engaged in practice in a specialist branch of medicine or surgery for such period as the board considers adequate to confer skill in the specialty. This provision enables persons to be regarded as specialists provided they comply with the requirements of this subsection, even though they may not be able to comply with the more rigid requirements of subsection (2) of this section. This provision, however, is something of a transitional nature, and it is expected that when there are sufficient numbers of persons who have the qualifications mentioned in subsection (2), recourse will no longer be made to subsection (3).

Therefore, provision is made in subsection (4) for the Governor to cancel any such proclamation, but the cancellation will not affect the registration of any person who has already been deemed to be a specialist and registered as such in the Specialist Register. Clause 22 inserts new sections 31a, 31b and 31c in the principal Act, and confers power upon the board to review accounts of persons registered under this Act and to reduce accounts where it considers them to be unreasonable. The other provisions of this clause are of a consequential nature. The other amendments proposed are of a minor nature, and are designed to correct anomalies, remove obsolete provisions in the Act, or to improve its administration.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CAMBRAI AND SEDAN RAILWAY DISCONTINUANCE BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Railways Commissioner to take up the railway line between Cambrai and Sedan. The Bill is in the usual form, clause 4 empowering the Commissioner to remove the line and dispose of the materials thereof, and clause 5 providing for the effect of removal. This particular portion of railway was closed by order of the Transport Control Board with the approval of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works as from December 1, 1964. The board was satisfied that there would be other transport

facilities for serving the area previously served by this portion of railway which was authorized in 1914 by Statute.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 30. Page 1426.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I oppose this Bill on several grounds. Any legislation designed to promote lotteries is not designed to improve the economic conditions of the country. On many occasions I have heard that all we have to do is to establish a lottery here and we will automatically gamble ourselves into prosperity; but any person holding that view will not hold it for long, because there is nothing in the promotion of a lottery that will add to the national wealth, our total income, or the standard of living of the people. The statement that a lottery will improve our economic conditions is fundamentally unsound, and any argument that we will support charities better through a lottery and be financially better off cannot be supported.

It is significant that States that have had lotteries for many years have had more difficulty in financing hospital institutions than this State, which has not had a lottery, has had. The overall financial position of the States that have had lotteries for many years has not been as satisfactory as the position in this State. No argument can be advanced to support the view that a lottery is necessary for the economic survival or recovery of this State. I am fortified in my opinion by the fact that the Butler Government appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into this question.

The Commission, selected after much consideration, consisted of two members from the House of Assembly and two from another place (one from each side in each instance). I should say that three of the Parliamentary members of the Commission were noted for their broadmindedness. The Chairman of the Commission (the late Mr. Justice Piper), who enjoyed a high reputation, went on to enjoy an even greater national reputation as a result of his services to the Australian community.

The two Opposition members appointed to the Commission were the Leader of the Opposition in another place (Mr. Frank Condon) and Mr. Beerworth from the House of Assembly, who was a Port Augusta licensed victualler. The two Liberal members were Mr. (later Sir Collier) Cudmore from another place and Mr. Horace Hogben from the House of Assembly. Three of those Parliamentary members were more likely to report in favour of a lottery than to report against one. However, after the Commission had taken evidence both in this State and in other States, and after it had seen the conditions applying in New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, and Tasmania (Victoria at that time did not run a lottery), it was rather significant that members of the Commission unanimously refuted the argument that a lottery would be advantageous to South Australia and strongly opposed its introduction.

The Parliamentary Paper containing the report of that Royal Commission is on members' files. One of the greatest objections of the Commission to a lottery was in the undesirable advertising that took place. Secondly, the Commission considered that the running of a lottery in South Australia in competition with those existing in the Eastern States was not economically practicable. The Commission took evidence from the Under Treasurer of the day (Mr. R. R. Stuckey) who was firmly of the opinion that it would be difficult for a lottery to be economically established in South Australia in competition with lotteries in the other States that were being drawn more frequently and offering larger prizes.

The Commission generally condemned the standard of agencies in some of the other States, the frequency with which they were established, and the way in which they were being conducted. It has been fairly accurately estimated by competent people that about $1,200,000 a year is invested by South Australians in lotteries in other States; indeed, it would be difficult for anybody to deny that fact; and it would be impossible under the Constitution to prevent its occurrence. Nor can we deny the fact that a referendum held on this question was overwhelmingly carried in favour of a lottery, but I believe that this Bill does not conform to the terms of that referendum.

In any case, the circumstances in which the referendum was held rendered it nothing more than a consultative referendum, because no Bill was placed before the voters. Indeed, I am certain that many provisions of this Bill would not have been approved by many people who voted affirmatively. It was not a question of holding a referendum, for instance, under the Constitution of Australia in accordance with

which the Bill had first been passed by Parliament, so that the Bill's precise terms were known, and so that the elector, having been informed by the advocates and opponents of the measure's pros and cons, was merely asked whether he approved the legislation. In this case, the question was placed before the people in a broad sense, and the Bill before the House does not conform to that question.

Mr. Casey: To which clauses wouldn't the people have agreed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall give the honourable member my precise reasons for saying that the Bill does not conform to the question placed before the people.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That happened with the totalizator agency board resolution, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is another example of a resolution being passed by the House and a totally different Bill being introduced, but I shall not deal with that matter now. The question of the honourable member for Frome does not in any way embarrass me because I want to put the facts before the House. The question that was submitted to the people was this: "Are you in favour of the promotion and the conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?" It was clear that this was to be a Government-run lottery: the Premier said it would be. It was a compromise resulting from a conference between the two Houses.

Mr. Casey: You moved the amendment in this House.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I want to show how much authority the Government will have over the lottery. The Government has been careful to avoid assuming any authority over the lottery. The Bill contains no definition of the control. Usually, a Bill concerning a project under Government control provides that the man controlling it is the Minister or some other person, but here there is no definition in the Bill at all. Indeed, the term "Minister" only comes into the Bill to a very limited extent on two or three occasions, Perhaps I can explain to the honourable member what authority the Minister or the Government will have over the running of this lottery. Clause 4 of the Bill provides:

(1) For the purposes of this Act there shall be a commission which shall be known as the "Lotteries Commission of South Australia".

(2) The commission—

(*a*) shall be a body corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal;

(*b*) subject to this Act, shall be capable of acquiring taking or letting out on lease, holding, selling and otherwise disposing of real and personal property;

(*c*) may in its name sue and be sued;

(*d*) shall hold all its property for and on behalf of the Crown. . . .

(3) In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister; but no such direction shall be inconsistent with this Act.

So the commission will be subject to the direction of the Minister, but no such direction shall be inconsistent with the Act. Further on, the commission in its discretion is empowered to do all sorts of things. I ask the honourable member who was interjecting a few moments ago in what way the Minister can exercise any authority whatsoever over the control of this activity? Has he power for instance, to say, if an agency is to be opened next to a church, that the agency is in an undesirable place? He has not. The Minister has power to prevent the delegation of authority, and that is about the only power he has. Does any member believe that this commission is under the control of the Government of the State? This autonomous commission will have complete power to license as many agencies as it likes. It will have complete authority to carry out any type of promotion it likes. The honourable member who was interjecting is very silent now. This commission is not under the Government of the State.

Mr. Casey: You are making the speech, not me.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member was helping me a moment ago.

Mr. Casey: I thought you needed help at the time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The commission will not be subject to the Government of this State. The Government will merely appoint the commission. It has power to appoint another commissioner if there is a vacancy, but in running the lottery it has no power whatsoever. The Bill is designed in that way because the Government will want to repudiate rapidly some of the things the commission will do. This Bill is not in accordance with the questions that were placed before the electors. Compare this Bill with last year's legislation concerning the Railways Department. Last year the Government introduced a Bill that amended the legislation so that the Railways Commissioner in future

would take directions from the Minister on all occasions, if the Minister so desired; but this Bill expressly provides that, so long as the commission operates within the terms of its Act, it is not under the control of the Minister at all.

Mr. Burdon: In others words, you are not prepared to accept the decision of the people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Like so many other things that the Government has undertaken to do, the Bill in its final form is not what people expected it to be.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is false pretences.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, I do not think it is. I do not believe many members opposite had anything to do with drafting this Bill. The member for Mount Gambier probably did not see the Bill until it was introduced, and I doubt very much whether he understands it now. Whoever was responsible for drafting this Bill, it is not in accordance with the question submitted to the people. I would like to return to the statements on advertising by the 1936 Royal Commission. Paragraph 94 of the Commission's report states:

In Western Australia the lottery is extensively advertised and advertisements are exhibited outside the agents' shops and stalls. The agent who does the most advertising sells by far the greatest number of tickets and earns approximately £5,000 gross a year in commission.

Of course, $10,000 in 1934 would be worth $40,000 today. The report continues:

One advertisement published by him in the *Daily News*, Perth on May 6, 1936, is reproduced hereunder:

NOTHING TOO GOOD FOR MOTHER.

What is home without a Mother?
What is Mother without a home?

Mothers' Day reminds us all that here is where the rest of us come in. After buying Ma a box of chocolates, a new coat or dress, and a few other things, speculate 2s. 6d. for Mother to win £2,500, £1,000, £500, or £100, where there's Always a Chance at WHITTY'S FOR WINNERS, next G.P.O., Perth.

Wise Mothers nowadays will also buy one for themselves.

That is the sort of thing this Bill encourages. True, the Bill provides penalties in respect of advertising. When I first read them I thought that the position here would not develop into the unsatisfactory practice that applies in other States. Clause 19 (7) provides:

A person shall not distribute, display or publish or cause to be distributed, displayed or published, by any means, any notice or advertisement which states or from which it could reasonably be inferred:

(*a*) that he or any other person is an agent of the commission;
(*b*) that he or any other person is authorized to sell tickets in any lottery; or
(*c*) that he or any other person invites any person to purchase from him a ticket in a lottery. Penalty: $200.

I thought that provision would solve some of the problems that the Royal Commission showed to be rampant and undesirable in lotteries in other States. However, subclause 8 provides:

It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment:

(*a*) for an agent of the commission or any person authorized by the commission to sell tickets in a lottery conducted by the commission, to display within or outside premises at which he is so authorized to sell such tickets a notice or notices bearing the words "Lottery Tickets Sold Here" without the addition of any other words, symbols or characters.

The Bill starts off by making it an offence for a person to give this information and then it provides that it is not an offence if the person who does it is an agent of the commission. Clause 8 (*d*) provides:

It shall not be an offence . . .

(*d*) for any person, who is requested or authorized by the commission to do so, to print, exhibit or publish, or cause to be printed, exhibited or published any notice, placard, handbill, card, writing, sign or advertisement of any lottery, or of any proposal for any lottery.

Therefore, the first paragraph of that clause states that it shall be an offence to do certain things; the next paragraph states that it shall not be an offence to do them if a person is an agent of the commission; and the last paragraph states that it shall not be an offence if a person goes in for mass advertising on behalf of the commission. Although the Bill appears to start off by prohibiting this obnoxious advertising, it finally gives persons authorized by the commission complete power to advertise without any restriction and without the possibility of restriction from the Minister. As the Minister has no power to stop advertising, lotteries could be advertised on every television channel every night.

In my opinion, this is undesirable and, again, it is removed from the question submitted to the people. The people voted that they wanted a Government-controlled lottery; however, the

Bill does not provide for that, for the commission will control the lottery. The Minister cannot proscribe any advertising approved by the commission. In fact, he is prohibited from giving directions to the commission and the Bill provides that the commission can print anything it wants to print. This is completely undesirable and is not in the best interests of the State. Whatever members opposite might say, it is not in accordance with the question submitted to the people. The 1936 Royal Commission showed how undesirable this activity can become.

The Bill has many other peculiarities. One part of clause 19 (9) is interesting, as the Government has often given notice that it intends to amend the Evidence Act to apply the Judges' Rules in South Australia. I do not know whether clause 19 (9) is commonly used, but I understand it to be a new provision. It states:

A person who carries out or has carried out any duties or functions in relation to or in connection with the promotion or conduct of a lottery under this Act shall not fail or refuse to answer truthfully, to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, any questions asked of him by the Auditor-General or a person acting under his authority, notwithstanding that such answer would or might tend to incriminate him, and shall not fail or refuse to disclose to the Auditor-General or person acting under his authority all books, documents, vouchers and things which are in his custody or power relating to the lottery or to the promotion or conduct of the lottery.

If a person is suspected of murder he does not have to answer incriminating questions but, under the Judges' Rules, he has to be warned not to answer such questions. Here, on a simple matter of the conduct of a lottery a person has no statutory defence, and what has always been a common defence is taken away. This shows how hastily and how ill advised is the development of this Bill, in which the general principle of evidence established in every country of the world is set at naught without any reason.

The necessary information about this Bill has not been supplied to Parliament. The financial implications have not been explained: no Government member knows them, and none knows its cost to the Loan programme. Everyone knows that it will cost a large sum to establish the lottery, because the Treasurer has publicly said that. The financial terms in the Bill are decidedly ambiguous, and if any Minister challenges that statement I shall give chapter and verse. On the face of it, the financing provision seems to be simple and straightforward, and anyone not considering the Bill closely will accept it at its face value. Clause 16 (7) states:

Until there are sufficient moneys in the Lotteries Fund to meet the expenses of administering the affairs of the commission, the Treasurer may, from time to time, make to the commission, from moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, such advances on such terms and conditions as he thinks fit.

Anyone reading that would assume that, as the first means of establishing the lottery, the Treasurer would bring before Parliament an appropriation, either in the Estimates or the Loan Fund, setting out what sum was intended to be spent. But it does not mean that at all. The Treasurer has not introduced any appropriation for the establishment of a lottery; it is not in the Loan Fund; and it is not in the Estimates. Obviously, the Treasurer does not intend to bring down any appropriation. What is the purpose of the Treasurer, or his advisers, in including this clause if it were not intended to bring down an appropriation to give effect to it? I cannot read the mind of the Treasurer, but I am sure that he wants to make it an approved project. If that is done the Treasurer has considerable discretion in applying money to it and can do so without obtaining the formal approval of the Committee of Supply to the expenditure. Section 32b of the Public Finance Act, 1949, provides:

(2) Where—
(*a*) there is no Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work; or
(*b*) there is an Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work, but the amount appropriated is insufficient for the complete carrying out of the work,

the Governor may by warrant authorize the Treasurer to advance any public money not exceeding the amount stated in the warrant for the purpose of the carrying out or continued carrying out of that authorized Loan work.

(3) When money has been advanced under this section, the first Public Purposes Loan Bill introduced after the advance is made shall contain a provision authorizing the borrowing of the amount of money so advanced, and its application to the Loan work for which it was advanced.

(4) When such a Bill is passed the amount of money thereby authorized to be applied to the Loan work for which the advance was made, shall be applied to recoup the public money out of which the said advance was made.

(5) The section shall apply in relation to authorized Loan works authorized by any Act whether passed before or after this Act.

Although I may be wrong (obviously, I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with a Treasury officer), I believe that the difference in the relevant provision in this Bill is that it relates to an authorized purpose and enables the Treasurer to advance money at least before he obtains appropriation by Parliament. That is why no appropriation has been provided this year in either the Loan Fund or the Revenue Budget for the establishment of this activity. Frankly, I believe a lottery falls a long way behind the provision of schools and hospitals and other public works, and that if we pass the Bill the lottery will receive higher priority than such matters as those.

That is why we should make it clear, so that everyone will know where we are going, that no money shall be advanced by the Treasurer for this scheme until the specific appropriation has been placed before Parliament and until Parliament has seen what is involved. Otherwise, the Treasurer will be able to make advances in favour of the lottery at the expense of other activities at a time when money is urgently needed for the real development of the State. If the provision in the Bill does not mean that, why is it included? If it means only that the Treasurer can include in the Loan Fund or Revenue Estimates an appropriation of money, he does not need this clause at all: he needs only to include it in the appropriation. I see behind this clause something that is particularly dangerous to the State's welfare, because the Treasurer, without any further approval whatsoever by Parliament, could make substantial advances to establish a lottery, which would only act to the detriment of other State activities.

I think the House fully realizes that the Treasurer at present does not have money to spare for a scheme such as this. For those reasons and for many others that I have not troubled to canvass today, I do not support the Bill. In fact, I strongly oppose it, for I do not believe it is in the best interests of the State or of the poorer people in the community. After all, lotteries have a particular attraction for people on lower incomes. In addition, it is a form of taxation the Treasurer hopes to obtain. I am not debating the morals of the matter or the fact that a person may wish to invest 50c or $2 in a lottery. However, I say advisedly that many people in the lower income group will invest money foolishly in a lottery, led astray by the belief that by that investment they will be on "easy street". That just does not happen in a lottery of this description, 40 per cent of whose proceeds will be taken by the Government, in any case. One only has to invest in two and a half lotteries, and the investment has gone. The Bill will not raise the State's standard of living or represent a good method of extracting taxation. In its present form it contains many undesirable characteristics.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I have said that the member for Gumeracha, during his term as Premier of the State, was the dictator of the Liberal Party and the dictator of the State. If anybody doubted my statement, he would certainly have no doubts about it now, after listening to the honourable member this afternoon. He strongly disagreed with State lotteries; indeed, I think we can say that he disagrees with any lottery, although the people, by a majority of two to one, have said they desire a lottery. The honourable member's speech this afternoon proves conclusively that the people's wishes do not concern him.

Mr. Ryan: What was the referendum held for?

Mr. LAWN: What is the principle of our Parliamentary system? We claim to be a democratic country, but that was not so under the regime of the Liberal Party. The wish of the people never concerned the previous Government; the member for Gumeracha implemented his own policy.

Mr. Ryan: As a minority!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. When I came into the House I asked the honourable member, as Premier, to consider establishing a State lottery, to which he replied "No". He said it would not be financially advantageous to South Australia, because South Australia was then a claimant State, and that whatever we gained by way of a lottery we would lose in the Commonwealth Grants Commission's recommendations. I did not disagree with that statement of the ex-Premier; financially, the State would probably have been no better off. However, when South Australia became no longer a claimant State I asked the then Premier whether, in view of the changed circumstances, he would reconsider the matter. The answer was again "No", and although a referendum was taken to the people last year, he still says that a lottery is not good for the people.

Mr. Hudson: He still thinks it is poison in the hands of children.

Mr. LAWN: Yes; he even reflected on the people's intelligence when he said they did not know what they were voting for at the referendum. The people who elect the members

of this Parliament apparently do not know what Government they will get, or what policies will be implemented!

Mr. Clark: Or what legislation!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The Liberal and Country League has won many elections, but it has no policy. Anyone who asks at the Liberal and Country League Office on North Terrace for a copy of the Party's policy is given a book in which there are rules but no policy. I do not know whether that will change because of the change in leadership, but everyone knows that the ex-Premier, the member for Gumeracha, dictated the policy of the Party. I do not think there can be a change of leadership in the Liberal and Country League as long as the shadow of the member for Gumeracha shows on the member for Gouger.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You don't think he is back-seat driving, do you?

Mr. LAWN: I do. One has only to see what goes on in the House to know that.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't the ex-Premier say at one time that the people would not accept it, because they rejected it in 1916?

Mr. LAWN: I think he did. This afternoon the honourable member referred to something that happened 30 years ago in the days of the Butler Government, which appointed a Royal Commission. If the ex-Premier thinks the people were children then, surely he must admit that they have grown up in 30 years, or does he think the people of South Australia never grow up? The commission may have been guided by the fact that South Australia was a claimant State. The member for Gumeracha went back to 1933 to refer to an advertisement in a Western Australian newspaper.

Mr. Ryan: He lives in the past.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Port Adelaide has taken the words out of my mouth. The ex-Premier is still living in the past. He said that this Bill did not conform to the referendum proposals and likened it to the Bill for the introduction of the totalizator agency board system of betting, which he said did not conform to the resolution of the House last year.

I do not wish to discuss the T.A.B. Bill now, but it is pertinent to point out that the debate in this House has proved that, whilst the Bill itself conforms to the T.A.B. system in Victoria, the amendments moved by members opposite, if accepted, would have made the Bill such that it was not in comformity with the Victorian system. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) moved an amendment for no commission, the Leader of the Opposition moved an amendment for no credit, and the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) wanted to be able to telephone every T.A.B. agency. They are three distinct diversions from the T.A.B. system in Victoria and they show that members opposite wanted to divert from the resolution adopted last year.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Wasn't there an amendment about betting tax, too?

Mr. LAWN: It was the honourable member who interjected who introduced that tax. However, as soon as he went out of office, everybody wanted to do away with it.

Mr. Langley: It was in operation for 14 years.

Mr. LAWN: I do not know how many years it applied but I told people who spoke or wrote to me that, while the Playford Government was in office, no-one had approached me about the tax but that, once the Government changed, everyone wanted it abolished. I said that, unless the T.A.B. Bill were carried, the tax would continue, and the statement by an honourable member of another place has proved that. If the T.A.B. Bill is carried, it will lift the winning bets tax on the stake.

Mr. Hudson: The *News* says they are split on the issue.

Mr. Lawn: They are split on every issue.

Mr. McAnaney: But you try to say that we have to do as we are told.

Mr. Casey: This is as between Houses.

Mr. Nankivell: You tell us we are all one Party. How do you work that out?

Mr. LAWN: Press statements by L.C.L. members do not hoodwink me. The statements are for public consumption. Take, for example, the statement by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that he is not elected as an L.C.L. member of the Legislative Council. Does the member for Stirling disagree with that statement?

Mr. McAnaney: I wouldn't have a clue.

Mr. LAWN: I do not think I need discuss that matter any further. The member for Stirling would not have a clue about anything. According to the member for Gumeracha, this Bill does not conform to the referendum proposals. The referendum asked the question, "Are you in favour of the promotion and conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?" Nothing could have been clearer than that. Further, the title of this Bill is as follows:

A Bill for an Act to provide for the promotion and control of lotteries by the Government of the State; to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1966, and for other purposes.

Nothing could be clearer than that. Clause 4 provides that for the purposes of the Act there shall be a commission, which shall be known as the Lotteries Commission of South Australia. No honourable member can tell me that that is a private enterprise commission: it is a Lotteries Commission under the control of the Government. Clause 4 (2) (*d*) provides that the Lotteries Commission shall hold all its property for and on behalf of the Crown. Clause 4 (3) provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister; but no such direction shall be inconsistent with this Act.

I think I have read sufficient from the Bill to prove that the Lotteries Commission will be set up by the Government to conduct State lotteries for and on behalf of the Government and that the commission will act within the terms set out in the Bill and under the control of the Minister. All members will have the right to ask questions of the Minister about State lotteries. When the Estimates were before members recently the member for Gumeracha discussed at some length the appropriation of money from lotteries. This House could not through its Estimates appropriate moneys from these lotteries if they were not State lotteries. The honourable member also commented at length about publicity and advertising.

Mr. Ryan: He has not studied the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: I do not think he has. I think the honourable member will admit that he has very little knowledge of lotteries. He does not believe in lotteries and he has not participated in them. Although I do not criticize him in any way for that, it means that he does not have a knowledge of lotteries. I have seen lotteries as they have been conducted in other States.

Mr. Casey: No doubt you have taken a ticket.

Mr. LAWN: I have, and at present I have to send away to another State to do so. I want to be able to take a ticket in a lottery here, so that some of my money will go to help hospitals here instead of helping hospitals in other States. The majority of people in South Australia have said that they want to do the same thing. I have objected strongly to what takes place in other States. As one walks along the streets there one has "Lucky Fred" slogans and all the rest of it thrust under one's nose. We also see advertising in some places to the effect that so and so sold, say, the first five prizes in the last 15 lotteries, and that sort of thing.

The member for Gumeracha has also said that members of this Party have no say in the drafting of Bills such as this, but in making that allegation he is speaking from his own experience, for no member of the Liberal Party played any part in drafting Bills introduced by the Playford Government. The present Leader of the Opposition, who is no doubt looking to the future, said in a speech he made before some organization recently that he believed the rank and file members of Parliament should have a more active say in the legislation coming before the House. When I read of that statement I wondered whether the Leader knows what happens in our Party compared with what happens in his Party. Members on this side of the House play a major part in determining what legislation comes forward.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You take orders from the Trades Hall.

Mr. LAWN: We decide it here. The honourable member is a liar.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member for Adelaide has made a remark to which I take exception. He said, "The honourable member is a liar."

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Adelaide said that, he is out of order.

Mr. LAWN: I will withdraw those words, Mr. Speaker, and say that what the honourable member for Alexandra said was a terminological inexactitude. The honourable member need not go white.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You know very well I can prove what I say.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member knows that members of this Party play a major part in determining the type of legislation they want. The drafting is done by certain other people, but the members of my Party determine the type of clauses we want in a Bill such as this. Clause 19 (7) states:

A person shall not distribute, display or publish or cause to be distributed, displayed or published, by any means, any notice or advertisement which states or from which it could reasonably be inferred—

(*a*) that he or any other person is an agent of the Commission;

(*b*) that he or any other person is authorized to sell tickets in any lottery; or

(*c*) that he or any other person invites any person to purchase from him a ticket in a lottery.

That provision is clear, and it will effectively cut out the advertising to which the member for Gumeracha referred. The clause goes on to say:

It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment—

(*a*) for an agent of the Commission or any person authorized by the Commission to sell tickets in a lottery conducted by the Commission, to display within or outside premises at which he is so authorized to sell such tickets a notice or notices bearing the words ''Lottery Tickets Sold Here'' without the addition of any other words, symbols or characters.

An agent may display only a sign ''Lottery Tickets Sold Here'': he cannot call himself ''Lucky Fred'' or ''Lucky Brookie'', or anything like that, and he cannot say how many first prizes he has sold. However, the member for Gumeracha did not refer to these things, and he argued that the commission itself could advertise. As I have said, the honourable member has not had experience of lotteries. Mr. Speaker, I ask this question: if we had State lotteries and the commission itself could not advertise, how would people know the results of the draw? I invite any honourable member to answer that question. The commission must have that right, but the agents must not publish anything: all they can do is display a sign ''Lottery Tickets Sold Here''. The Government in this Bill has done everything possible to try to stop the publicity that occurs in other States, so any condemnation by the Opposition on this aspect is not valid.

Over the last 12 months anonymous letters have appeared in the newspapers on this matter. Those writers have stated that supporters of lotteries have claimed lotteries will solve all hospital problems. I replied to the last letter I read a few weeks ago, signed by "ex-Victorian", but my letter was not published even though I signed it and gave my address. During the last year I have seen all the publicity for and against lotteries in this State, and a statement published under my name was issued in support of a lottery. Not one member on this side of the House has ever said that lotteries will solve hospital problems. All I say is that lotteries will ease the problems of our hospitals. I could not visualize lotteries completely eliminating the problems but, if lotteries in South Australia succeed as they have in other States (even if they do not do quite so well financially), the hospitals will receive more money, and over the years this will ease their problems. If we reach the position where the hospitals have no debts to pay, they can start easing the burden on patients by charging smaller admission fees. Although hospitals will never be completely free of financial problems, they will be able to increase patients' amenities, provide better services and reduce fees. I have never said that they will be free of financial problems. I do not believe they will be, because the more money they have the more they will spend in the interests of the patients. The Government hospitals and the community hospitals will spend more money, and I hope that the private hospitals will, too. I see that the member for Flinders is laughing.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think it is a good confidence trick.

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member does not think the hospitals will increase their amenities and provide better services and hospitalization for their patients as a result of what they will obtain from the lotteries, then I think—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I shall be agreeably surprised if they do.

Mr. LAWN: I think he will be surprised, because Government hospitals, and subsidized hospitals, and community hospitals will; there is no doubt about that. I have faith in even the private hospitals, that they will, too. I have greater faith in them than has the member for Flinders, because I think they will pass on as much as possible to the patients.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, if they get it.

Mr. LAWN: Does the honourable member consider that Parliament will not appropriate money to the hospitals?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I shall have a word to say about that when I get around to talking about it.

Mr. LAWN: The money will be appropriated by this Parliament.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, I understand all that.

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member does not think they will receive anything he thinks either that the lottery will not show any profit or that Parliament itself will not pass any appropriation for hospitals. That is all I have to say. I hope the Bill has a speedy passage and that we shall not have any obstruction in another place, or even in this place.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I believe that, when the people went to the polls for a referendum on a lottery, although they knew nothing of what would be in the Bill, they voted in favour of the principle of establishing a lottery. Although I oppose the principle of establishing a lottery, I support the second

reading of the Bill, because I publicly stated on several occasions before the referendum was held that, if a majority of the electors in my electoral district voted in favour of a lottery, I would support a Bill coming before this House.

Mr. Casey: You think differently from the member for Gumeracha on this.

Mr. FERGUSON: The member for Adelaide said that the Bill providing for a lottery would not solve all the hospital problems. We find that in like legislation before us a red herring is drawn across the trail suggesting that charity and hospitals will benefit greatly from the introduction of such measures. I believe that in this case the hospitals will not receive any great sum: in fact, I do not think that hospital boards throughout the length and breadth of South Australia are expecting any great contributions from lotteries.

The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) had something to say about hospitals benefiting from the establishment of lotteries in South Australia. She said:

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. Mr. Brookman then interjected:

The badge days will go on just the same.

Then the member for Burnside said:

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

The member for Unley then had this to say:

Do they go on in New South Wales?

I assure the member for Unley that definitely they do go on in New South Wales.

Mr. Coumbe: And in Queensland.

Mr. FERGUSON: When I was recently in Sydney, on a particular Friday badges were being sold on the one day for two different charitable institutions. So we do not want to fool the public in this State into thinking that the introduction of a lottery will be so good that it will provide all the money necessary for charities and hospitals and will enable the various organizations to do away with badge days.

Mr. Rodda: Lotteries will not create much wealth.

Mr. FERGUSON: The work of the various charitable organizations in South Australia is to be commended, as is the feeling for charity that permeates the South Australian public and causes it to contribute to the various charitable organizations. A lottery in South Australia will be set up by a commission, as has been described by the member for Gumeracha this afternoon. We have seen something of the operation of lotteries in other States. Most honourable members will be opposed to the establishment of lotteries as they exist in Western Australia. I hope the commission will not set up agencies of the sort operating in that State, but that it will wisely consider where agencies are to be established in South Australia. I support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): First, I should like to clarify what the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said when he accused us of living in the past. Surely the Labor Party was living in the past when it decided that it had to hold a referendum. Why did it have that? The reason is that many years ago it was put into the State Labor Party's platform that a referendum had to be held before a State lottery could be established. If, in the intervening period, the people of South Australia had not changed their views on this, there would have been a risk; but, now that the people have changed their views and some 84 per cent of them indicated in a Gallup poll that they wanted a lottery, what did this up-to-date Party do? It had to hold a referendum, because it was hide-bound by its State platform, and it had to put the people of this State to the expense of $100,000 in order to carry out what was in its platform, and not have the matter determined by members of this House. Members opposite are quiet because they know that what I say is true.

Mr. Lawn: We still couldn't satisfy the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. McANANEY: I thank members opposite for showing by their silence that they agree that they wasted $100,000. This money was needed for more essential purposes. The member for Onkaparinga spoke words of wisdom when he said the lottery would do nothing for the people of South Australia.

Mr. Hurst: When did the member for Onkaparinga speak on this?

Mr. McANANEY: I am sorry: I meant the member for Gumeracha. The member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) said the lottery would be a good thing because in New South Wales 500 people were provided with employment in one section of that lottery and 79 somewhere else. What a waste it is to put people into employment of this type! This type of thing does not create any wealth at all and, perhaps, this is where the whole philosophy of members

opposite breaks down: they do not realize that to get anything in this world one must produce something of value.

I do not agree with the member for Gumeracha in opposing the Bill. About 10 or 20 times as much money is wasted in smoking as will be wasted on lottery tickets, but although I do not smoke I cannot oppose smoking. If one argues that wasteful things should be cut out, many things would have to be cut out. We must accept the fact that people have the right to do what they will with their lives, and unless we are prepared to allow them to do as they wish we will not have progress. If people want a lottery, we must accept that and establish a lottery.

I was happy to see, in examining the operation of lotteries and the totalizator agency board systems in other States, that young people were not greatly involved. As people become more educated they find a wider range of interests, and betting does not appeal to them as much. It is only when people are in humdrum jobs and when the excitements of youth no longer interest them that they seek to relieve the monotony of their lives by investing in a lottery or with a T.A.B. agency. Mainly those in the middle-age group invest in lotteries. I do not think we should worry about the younger generation, because it has so many other interests. Therefore, I support the Bill.

Undoubtedly some aspects of it could be improved. A definite weakness exists regarding advertising, because the Bill enables the commission to authorize its agents to do certain things. The only control that the Minister or Parliament has over the commission is to stop it from doing anything that is not provided in the Bill. However, the Bill gives the commission power to instruct an agent to carry out certain advertising. In no way is that advertising restricted and there is nothing to stop the commission (if it so desires) from telling an agent that he can call himself "Lucky Fred", advertise the lottery in that way, or carry on with any other form of advertising at all.

Although I believe people want a lottery and that the facilities must be provided, I do not think we should allow a system to develop such as that in Western Australia, where every little tobacconist's shop sells lottery tickets and lottery tickets are forced before the notice of the public. If people want to gamble they should be made to do certain things. The question has been raised whether the population of South Australia is big enough to support a lottery. I believe it is, but we must be careful in the early stages because a lottery with a large prize may take a fortnight or a month to fill. If it took that long, people would not support it. On investigation in other States, I have found that people like to invest the smallest possible sum in a lottery. In Queensland quarter-share tickets are available, and many people buy them. I believe we should start with a $6,000 lottery. Lotteries with a prize of that sum are conducted in Western Australia. If we had small lotteries they could be drawn more frequently and the interest of people would be maintained.

I do not think that it does people much good to win a large prize in a lottery. Members may have noticed that, in some cases, it has not been long before the families of winners of British football pools have disintegrated. A prize of $6,000 would enable the winner to pay off the mortgage on his house and maintain his present standard of living, or enjoy a standard only slightly higher. This is far better than to have a person find himself with a large sum of money in his hands all of a sudden. He would not appreciate it, it would be quickly dissipated, and it need not necessarily bring happy results. If lotteries are to be economical, it will be necessary to start with small prizes and have frequent drawings.

Mr. Ryan: Is there any difference between winning money and having it left to you?

Mr. McANANEY: I think it has been proved in the past that where the member of a family who had the money retained all control of it until he died and then left it to a son aged about 45, quite often the result was trouble. The modern method is to give children responsibility by handing over some assets to them when they are still young.

Mr. Ryan: Do you say that in all cases where people win a lottery unhappiness results?

Mr. McANANEY I never make sweeping statements like that. The honourable member should know the dangers of making sweeping statements, because last Friday night he said that Port Adelaide would win. I support the Bill, under the conditions I have stated.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I am amazed that this Bill is regarded by at least one member opposite as the first of a trinity of principal measures to be introduced this year. This Bill is not as important as are two others to which he referred, namely, the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting and the proposed insurance legislation, and that is the opinion of most electors in my district.

A referendum was held last year on the proposed establishment of a lottery in this State, and I was pleased to note that most of my constituents opposed the setting up of a Government lottery.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are too many honourable members carrying on a conversation: it must be disconcerting to the member for Angas.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: It is in deference to the wishes of my constituents, who expressed their views at the referendum, that I, too, oppose this Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support this measure.

Mr. Ferguson: Are you switching?

Mr. CASEY: That is one thing of which I have never been guilty. When I say I will support something I stick to it through thick and thin.

Mr. Ferguson: In this Chamber?

Mr. CASEY: I cannot understand what the honourable member means. I was amazed to hear the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) expound his theories, because this is a good Bill.

Mr. Ryan: That proves how little he knows about it.

Mr. CASEY: We get much laughter from Opposition members to interjections from the Government side, but we have never had an honest and complete explanation of this laughter. Perhaps it is a type of no-confidence measure that confronts the Government at one time or other. Clause 4 (3) provides:

In the exercise and discharge of its powers, duties, functions and authorities, the commission shall be subject to the control and directions of the Government of the State acting through the Minister; . . .

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

Mr. CASEY: The member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) tried to mislead the House on the interpretation of certain clauses in the Bill. He often makes a point of placing completely wrong interpretations on clauses in Bills. Clause 13 of this Bill provides:

Subject to this Act and the directions of the Minister not inconsistent with this Act the commission may . . .

Therefore, my interpretation (and that of the people responsible for the Bill) is that the Minister can direct the commission on the siting of agencies, and on other matters pertaining to this clause. To say that the Minister is not specified in the Bill is poppycock. Every Bill presented to the House referring to a Minister must be specific on that point. The Acts Interpretation Act clearly defines a Minister as follows:

"Minister" means the Minister of the Crown to whom the administration of the Act or enactment in which the term is used is for the time being committed by the Governor, and includes any Minister of the Crown for the time being discharging the duties of the office of such Minister: . . .

The statement that the Minister is not defined in the Bill is without foundation. Clause 19 refers to the normal advertising conducted by a lottery agency and to ticket selling. As the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) has covered that provision, I shall not weary the House further. This is a good Bill; indeed, South Australians have decisively shown that they desire a lottery in this State. It is wrong that South Australia should for years have been the outcast of the States; uniformity should exist throughout the States, and one State should not be set apart from any other. The referendum on this matter was clear and concise, forcibly borne out by the fact that few informal votes were registered. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): At the outset, I am not opposed in any way to a Bill establishing a lottery, although I may be able to offer helpful criticism of this Bill. It clearly provides for the establishment of the commission, agencies, penalties, audits to be presented to the House, and regulation-making powers, which are all necessary and good provisions, and with which I think everybody agrees. From the way in which it is suggested that the lottery should be run, it seems that it will get away to a good start and will run reasonably well. However, I am afraid that people who voted at the referendum, which was convincingly carried in favour of a lottery, received the wrong impression that badge days, for example, would disappear for ever. I am afraid that, like the poor, badge days will always be with us, because the lottery to be established by this Bill will support hospitals and not charities in general.

Whether that point was made clear to the people I cannot say; nevertheless the wrong impression was obtained by many, and badge days on which many charities heavily rely, as is the case in other States, will continue. Those of us who have been in Sydney on ribbon days, as they are called there, know of the extensive work carried out in support of the various charities functioning in that city. It is hoped that the lottery will be run at a profit from which hospitals will benefit. Indeed, I hope

hospitals will benefit, although I know that some hospitals in other States are in debt. The Geelong Hospital, for example, readily comes to mind as a hospital that is functioning in the red, in spite of its situation in a State that conducts a fairly large lottery.

I hope the extra money resulting from this lottery when it is functioning will materially help the hospitals defined in the Bill and in the way in which the Treasurer has announced. The Bill relating to a totalizator agency board necessarily and correctly laid down certain procedure and provided penalties for people under 21 years who invested at an agency. This Bill, however, specifies no minimum age at which a person can purchase a lottery ticket. Whilst I realize that buying a lottery ticket is quite different from placing a bet—

Mr. Casey: Is a minimum age specified for a person who buys a raffle ticket?

Mr. COUMBE: I agree with the honourable member, but I suggest that the Government consider this matter either by inserting an appropriate provision in the Bill or by way of regulation. The commission may wish to regulate in that regard. A mother may send young Willie around to the corner shop to buy household requirements and to enter an agency to buy a ticket. Whether that was desirable or not could be argued. Perhaps some minimum age should be provided, such as 14 years or 16 years. However, I am not suggesting any particular age.

Mr. Casey: Do you think a minimum age should apply in regard to raffles?

Mr. COUMBE: As the honourable member knows, most raffles are illegal.

Mr. Casey: The ones I am speaking about are legal.

Mr. COUMBE: Most raffles are illegal. Devious devises are designed to get around the law, such as asking what day tomorrow is. In my opinion, that is stupid.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Does that make them legal? It is assumed it does.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. Honourable members are caught in this way when they go to functions where raffles are held. I suggest that the Government examine the matter to see whether tightening up is required. If we are to have lotteries, let us have them operating correctly from the start.

Mr. Quirke: A child can send to Tattersalls for a ticket, and nobody queries that.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but that does not excuse the action or overcome the problem. The financial aspects of the scheme are interesting. A lottery, to be successful, has to make a profit. It is laid down that 60 per cent of the amount received will be provided for prizes. The financial aspect boils down to how soon the lottery will be returning income to the Treasury so that hospitals can benefit. The Treasurer did not say in his second reading explanation how great the impact on Government funds would be. He may not have been able to do so, but it would be of advantage to honourable members to know the cost to the Government of getting the scheme operating.

Clause 16 provides that public funds can be used by the Treasurer to start the scheme. Money will be required to set up the administration, to appoint the commission, to hire buildings, to print tickets and forms, and to get agencies going. Perhaps no-one knows what the cost will be, but we should be given some information about it, because we are dealing with a Bill that will be a charge on the public purse at the outset. I should like the Treasurer to give us an idea of how much this will cost and for how long it will be necessary to draw on public funds to get the scheme operating. Obviously, he knows it will cost money, because he has included the provisions contained in clause 16.

There is also the matter of how much patronage we shall attract to our own lottery. Every other State has a lottery and Tattersalls in Victoria is particularly successful. It is common knowledge that many South Australians invest in Tattersalls' sweeps in Victoria and that many also invest in the Western Australian lottery. The fact that much money goes to other States now is no guarantee that all that money will be invested in our lottery, because we shall not be able to offer the inducements by way of prizes and stakes that are offered by the other lotteries that have been operating for a longer period.

The amount of patronage we are going to attract to the lottery, not only at the beginning but after it is established, is an imponderable. We must have regard to our population in considering the amount that will be diverted from other States. I do not think much money will come here from other States, because our prizes and stakes will be necessarily much lower than those offered in the other States.

Another important aspect is that, if frequent draws of lotteries are not held, the whole scheme may be a flop. The secret of any lottery, apart from conducting it on sound financial grounds and seeing that every possible security is provided, is to fill lotteries quickly and obtain a speedy turnover. Unless lotteries are held frequently in South Australia, we

shall not be as successful as we hope to be and our hospitals will be waiting for a long time to get from this source the funds that they are hoping to get. The filling of lotteries quickly is a fundamental requirement.

In New South Wales, where lotteries have been conducted for many years, 385 lotteries were conducted in 1964-65. That is more than one a day, and the number held each day is higher if we take out the Sundays. Many lotteries are being conducted simultaneously in that State. In Victoria the figure is 170 a year and, in Queensland, 187. I have not figures for Western Australia or Tasmania. This is big business at any time and one can see that these lotteries are extremely successful, mainly because of the range of ticket values offered and also because of the large turnover and rapid filling and drawing.

I suggest that, when we start our lottery, we shall not be able to conduct them more frequently than, perhaps, once a fortnight. That would give us about 25 a year. People who invest in the lotteries will not want to wait too long before the drawing.

Mr. Rodda: They won't be extravagant in buying tickets, will they?

Mr. COUMBE: There will be many fewer tickets sold and people will not let their heads go as much as they would if more lotteries were conducted. If we make a success of holding one a fortnight, we may be able to step up this rate.

Mr. Clark: Actually, no-one knows how many we may have.

Mr. COUMBE: No. It is a matter of trial and error. However, when the commission announces its first drawing, it will probably have to make a decision and forecast for, say, the next six months and say that there will be one lottery every week, or every two weeks, or as the case may be. There may be variations regarding the prizes and the prices of tickets in order to cater for different types of investors. These matters can be determined only by trial and error and by finding out the public's attitude and support to lotteries. Looking at the financial aspect of it, we can see that we have several aspects to explore, including the cost of establishing the lottery and the costs of administration generally. I would think a period of some months would elapse before a cent came back in revenue. Other important factors are how much patronage we are going to attract and how frequently we can hold a lottery.

Most of us have observed in every other State in Australia how tickets are sold and how lotteries are conducted. I have watched this in each State of the Commonwealth. I was in Hobart once when the Tattersalls sweep was conducted there, and I had the pleasure of attending and witnessing the draw, which was conducted under the strict supervision of the Treasury and the Police Department. I saw then that every possible security measure was taken to see that nothing untoward occurred. Having seen tickets sold in every State of Australia except South Australia and the methods used to sell them and to promote lotteries (and in some cases the high-pressure salesmanship indulged in and the various types of slogans used), I am very pleased to see provisions in this Bill for the strict supervision of advertising and the conduct of the agencies.

I hope that when the commission gets around to appointing agents it will use a great deal of discretion in, first, appointing the agents who will sell the tickets and, secondly, deciding where the shops will be. I would imagine that many agencies would be in tobacconists' shops and in delicatessans. However, I hope discretion will be used in selecting the site of the shop where tickets are sold and the type of person who will be in charge of selling them, for I think this is essential to the good and efficient running of a lottery.

Already some small shopkeepers in my district have approached me to find out whether they will be eligible to sell lottery tickets, so it is obvious that a number of people are quite anxious to get into this business, which apparently can be lucrative. Not only will it be lucrative from the commission's point of view, but also (I think this is behind the thinking of the shopkeepers, and I do not blame them for it) the selling of a ticket brings a potential customer to buy something else probably of more value to the shopkeeper than the commission he will derive from the sale of the ticket.

I repeat that I have no opposition to the Bill, although possibly a little smartening up of some of its clauses may be necessary in Committee. I conclude by saying that now we have decided to have a lottery I wish it well. However, the remarks I made on this lottery question last year are stil germane. I said then that I was not opposed to a lottery so much but that I was opposed to the form in which the question was being introduced into the House. Now that we have a Bill and the whole question is spelt out, I offer no opposition to it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I have a few comments to make on the measure before us. As I think members would expect, I am not a supporter of the Bill. I know that in saying that I am probably trying to swim upstream doing the backstroke, because the tide is running heavily against me in this matter. All I say on that point is that for reasons which I consider very important to me personally I cannot support the measure. I do not suggest that I am some peculiarly upright kind of person. I concede that every member has a right to his own views. For instance, I know that many other members do not think as I do, and I do not think any the less of them for holding an opposite view.

When this question was before us previously I said (and I have said it in this place on a number of occasions) that I could not support the introduction of a lottery, and I think my constituents know that I will not be supporting it. For that reason, and also because the question is important to me personally as a matter of principle, I am not supporting this measure. I hope I am wrong in this, but I say very sincerely that I fear that members of this House in five years' time or perhaps a little longer will possibly regret the introduction of some Bills to this Chamber during this session and last session because of the effect that will accrue to the community at large.

Mr. Casey: But this was the wish of the people.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not disputing that at all. I simply say to the honourable member and to this House that for reasons that are important to me I am not able to support the Bill. I have some comments to make on what I think are defects in the structure of the Bill. First, there is rather an interesting feature which runs right through the various clauses and which seems to put the Bill in a class apart from almost any other legislation that normally comes before the House. It is, indeed, in every way a special Bill. For example, clause 14 (1) states:

> Notwithstanding any other Act or law—
> (*a*) The promotion and conduct of any lottery under and in accordance with this Act and the doing of anything incidental or ancillary to such promotion and conduct shall be lawful;

Subclause (2) states:

> A lottery promoted or conducted under this Act by the Commission shall be deemed not to be a lottery or a sweepstake within the meaning of the Lottery and Gaming Act.

In other words, this is an exception to the Lottery and Gaming Act, and that Act, because of the fact that this Bill is expressly excluded from its provisions, does not have any bearing upon it. We find the rather curious anomaly that the little church lottery or charity lottery that might be promoted by some people in a village somewhere is still illegal, while the major proposition in this Bill is clearly excluded from the provisions of the Lottery and Gaming Act. The little charity show, which is considered by most people to be pretty harmless, anyhow, is still illegal.

Mr. Coumbe: Yet it probably has a worthier object.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and I shall come to that. The pieces of string, the number of peas in the bottle, the guessing competitions and all the rest of it, are still illegal, but we can have a lottery run by the State on a State-wide basis. The latter has many features which in my view put it more in the illegal category than the little show around the corner that is run for a local charity. That is a curious anomaly, to my way of thinking, and I should think it must appear that way to other members of this House. There will be great discontent in the community when the little private guessing competitions, lucky dips and all the rest of it that are now considered to be either on the fringe or illegal are still to be under the blanket disapproval of the Lottery and Gaming Act, while here we are able to operate a State-run lottery legitimized, or made legal anyway, by the provisions of this measure.

Mr. Quirke: Don't do as I do!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This is a curious Bill, in that it is placed completely outside the ambit of this kind of legislation. This terminology occurs in a number of other places in the Bill: "Notwithstanding any other Act or provision" this Act shall be legal.

Again, in clause 18 we see the words "notwithstanding any law to the contrary, whether relating to infants or persons under other legal disability or otherwise". It is the phrase "notwithstanding any law to the contrary" that I am speaking of at this moment that places this measure completely outside any other provisions of the law of property, the law of minors, etc. Hence, it is placed in a class apart. Then, again, in subclause (8) of clause 19 we see the words:

> It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment . . .

The drafting of this legislation again places it outside challenge by any other law of this State. I know that this is a convenient method of overcoming the drafting problems and it ensures that the Bill is confined to itself and is not encumbered by the provisions of any other Act. I wonder why it is necessary to do it in this Bill. It occurs with great frequency. Again, we see in subclause (10) of the same clause:

> Notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act, proceedings for any offence against this Act may be brought within the period of three years after the commission of the alleged offence or, with the consent of the Minister, at any later time.

In other words, here is a special provision again applying to this Bill that excludes it from the provisions of the normal time limit for proceedings for offences that apply in other legislation. This Bill is excluded from all those things, so again it is placed in a special category. I do not know that the objects of this Bill justify this particular attention but it is there and I point it out because it seems to me to be a curious position. Whereas honourable members have addressed themselves to the question of advertising under this Bill, I agree that one of the possibilities that I foresaw has been also foreseen by the Government in its instructions to the Draftsman regarding the drafting of this legislation. It has agreed with the contention expressed by a number of members in earlier debates, that it is not desirable that the sale of tickets and the advertising propaganda which is so obvious and perhaps a little nauseating in other States should be allowed to operate here.

I approve of that, because Western Australia and Queensland are the two States that are outstanding in my memory in this matter. Every few yards up the footpath people are confronted by a stall in the street (in Brisbane, at any rate), and in Western Australia there is almost a whole alleyway in which the sale of lottery tickets appears to be the exclusive activity of the people in that area. Of course, when advertising is permitted, one agency endeavours to outdo or outshine his opponents a little farther up the street, and we have all sorts of claims about "lucky Fred" and all the rest of it, which are just too silly for words, and anyhow are degrading. I am glad the Bill proposes to exclude those possibilities from the operation of the lottery here. I draw attention, however, to one rather curious situation again that I see in subclause (8) of clause 19. We see here that:

> It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment—
>
> (*a*) for an agent of the commission or any person authorized by the Commission to sell tickets in a lottery conducted by the commission, to display within or outside premises at which he is so authorized to sell such tickets a notice or notices bearing the words "Lottery Tickets Sold Here" without the addition of any other words, symbols or characters.

I approve of that. It is obviously necessary for the public to know by a symbol or sign, such as is permitted under this subclause, that these premises do sell lottery tickets; but under paragraph (*b*) of subclause (8) it shall be lawful for the commission to issue, distribute, display or publish a list of the names and addresses (if any), and to do other things. Apparently the words "if any" are inserted because the subscriber to a ticket may or may not have given his address, but I do not know how he hopes to benefit if he has not given an address to which the prize money can be sent. He may have given a post office *nom de plume*, but that is not the kernel of the matter I am trying to elucidate. This provision states:

> for the commission to issue, distribute, display or publish—
>
> (i) a list of the names and addresses (if any) of prize winners or the numbers of prize winning tickets in any lottery conducted by the commission, whether or not the names of the agents or persons who sold any prize winning ticket are included in that list.

In other words, if Mrs. Jones is an authorized agent of the commission to sell lottery tickets, she is not allowed to put anything above her premises other than the words "Lottery tickets sold here"; but, if the commission desires (it is not obliged to) when it publishes the numbers of the winning tickets, to say, "Well, the first prize was sold by Mrs. Jones of such-and-such an address", it can do so, and that is perfectly legal; but she cannot advertise herself in that way. What will be the commission's policy on that matter? Will it be consistent and always publish the name of the agent and the names of the winners of a prize or prizes, or not? It will have to be careful lest it give undue publicity to some agents compared with others. The agent cannot advertise the fact that he or she has sold a winning ticket, but the commission can and apparently it may or it may not.

Of course, the commission is also legally entitled to publish a list of names and addresses of agents of the commission and other persons authorized by the commission to sell tickets.

Again, although the agent himself must not give any publicity to the fact that he is an agent of the commission, the commission, in its wisdom, may or may not, at its discretion, publish his name with a list of agents. I believe it would have been better if the Bill had clearly defined that these things should or should not be done. I should think it would have made it easier for the commission to have the policy clearly elucidated in the Bill because then it would have been in no doubt as to its requirements.

Clause 16 relates to the Hospitals Fund and deals with the establishment in the Treasury of a fund to be known as the Lotteries Fund. Of course, the Lotteries Fund is the fund from which the Hospitals Fund is to be derived. Clause 16 (4) provides:

The balance remaining in the Lotteries Fund from time to time, to the extent that it represents any surplus of income over expenditure, and any prize moneys that have not been claimed for over six months, shall be transferred by the commission, as required by the Treasurer, from the Lotteries Fund to an account in the Treasury known as the "Hospitals Fund."

The clause then provides for a few incidental matters to that main proviso. Until there are sufficient moneys in the Lotteries Fund to meet the expenses of administering the affairs of the commission, the Hospitals Fund will not get much benefit, if any, from it. I believe there is a widespread misunderstanding and misconception of the benefits that the hospitals of the State are likely to receive under the Bill and under another Bill before another place at this time. Much was said in leading up to the referendum on this matter and many people believed that the establishment of a lottery would mean the end of financial problems for the hospitals and of the badge days for charities, and that there would be so much money to disburse that the financial problems of charities generally would largely be solved. I know members of this House do not accept that view.

Mr. Shannon: Hospital auxiliaries will still be required.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, I know the honourable member has in mind the thought that immediately occurs to me. The hospital auxiliaries have taken a pleasure and pride over many years in working to meet the needs of their hospitals, and that applies to hospitals generally throughout the State. It is one of the pleasing features of the charitable spirit that exists in South Australia that so many people have devoted themselves unsparingly to working for such worthy objects as these. Like everybody else, these people sometimes get a little bit weary of well-doing and perhaps they are looking forward to a substantial measure of relief from this work which, although they enjoy it, no doubt sometimes becomes a little irksome. However, I do not believe this is likely to happen to any measurable extent.

I believe many people have been convinced in their thinking that if a lottery does not do much harm it may do some good, and this is the kind of good they have in mind when they think that. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said this afternoon that he did not believe this would be the end of problems in respect of financing hospitals. He suggested it would make a substantial contribution towards their benefit, but I doubt even that. I believe many people were perhaps persuaded to vote for a lottery at the referendum because they believed that it would substantially help our hospitals and charitable institutions. No doubt they were people who did not have strong views on the matter one way or another from an ethical point of view and were therefore disposed to support it because they thought it would assist our charities. Consequently, I believe possibly the overwhelming vote in favour of a lottery in this State should be viewed in the light of that observation. Nevertheless, I am not satisfied that the Government intends that the hospitals should benefit substantially from the proceeds (if any) of a lottery.

I was one who took the Premier at what I thought was his word when, on a number of occasions, he suggested that the proceeds (or a substantial part) of the lottery would go to the Hospitals Fund. I thought he intended to continue to provide Government funds for hospital purposes on the same basis as they had been supported for many years past in this State. I assumed from what he said that he meant that, in accordance with the expanding revenues of the State, an increased grant each year would be made from Government funds towards the maintenance and development of not only subsidized hospitals but practically all hospitals in the State. I was still in two minds about the matter when I heard the Premier and Treasurer make the following statement in his Budget speech this year:

Two Bills have recently been introduced into Parliament which it is expected will affect the revenues of the State. These are the Bills authorizing the operations of a Totalizator Agency Board and the institution of a State lottery. Both of these will ultimately bring significant revenues, probably eventually in excess of $1,000,000 each annually, and the revenues will be utilized to assist directly hospitals and comparable institutions.

That is all very well as far as it goes to that point. However, he continued:

The revenues so distributed will be in addition to the volume of funds hitherto—

I ask members to note that—

provided for hospitals from Consolidated Revenue Account, and they will not be used to reduce the existing—

members should also note that word—

rate of provisions from Revenue . . .

I took that at its face value and I thought the Treasurer intended to continue each year with his grants to hospitals; that he would continue naturally to expand his grants from Consolidated Revenue from time to time; and that the hospitals and similar charities would get over and above this sum an additional sum to be derived from a lottery and a totalizator agency board system of off-course betting. In making further examination and on having discussions on the matter with my colleagues, I concluded that I was wrong and that my hope would not materialize. When I looked at the concluding part of that sentence, I saw that my hopes were too high, as the Treasurer said:

. . . although they will of necessity help to relieve the pressures for increased provisions from Revenue for such purposes in the future.

I am afraid that I and many others will be sadly disillusioned in this matter. What the Treasurer intends (and the words are carefully chosen) is that although he may maintain grants to hospitals from Consolidated Revenue at the level that exists this year, future increases will depend upon the profits from a lottery. I think that is what the Treasurer means by these words and, if that is so, the people of this State have been sold short, because the Treasurer will not be called on in future to make greater grants from Consolidated Revenue than he is doing now and, to that extent, the profits from the lottery are of direct assistance to Consolidated Revenue. The last part of the sentence I have quoted cannot be interpreted in any other way. The Treasurer admits this, and he intends us to read the latter part of the sentence in that way.

I want this point to be clearly known to members of this House and to the public because I have no doubt that this is the intention of the Treasurer, and these carefully chosen words bear out my contention. All the talk we have heard and the affirmations we have been given by the Government on this matter are being interpreted by the public in a far more generous way than is correct. In actual fact, not in fancy, revenues from the lottery and T.A.B. will be taken into a special Treasury fund, known as the Lotteries Fund, and then into the Hospitals Fund, but will be offset against moneys that the Treasurer will not have to supply from Consolidated Revenue. To that extent, one cannot disguise the fact that these are revenues to the State.

Mr. Shannon: They could be as easily accessible to the Treasurer as are trust funds.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and we know that the Treasurer has found trust funds distressingly accessible. I am not clear about clause 17, which provides:

The commission shall offer as prizes in any lottery conducted under this Act not less than 60 per centum of the value of the tickets offered for sale in that lottery.

I understand that in respect of lotteries conducted in other States, it is the practice of the authority conducting it to announce the opening of a consultation that is to be drawn on a certain date. That is essential if the promoter is to draw the attention of would-be investors in the lottery.

Mr. Shannon: They cannot draw it until it is filled.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know how there can be any guarantee as to when it will be filled. Since the Second World War, a friend of mine with whom I served in New Guinea became the promoter of, I think, the ex-servicemen's lotteries in New South Wales. I do not know whether he was responsible or whether it was because my name was in the telephone book, but from time to time I received a large envelope containing tickets that I returned to that commission with my thanks. When I became tired of doing that, because of the cost of postage, I adopted the practice that was adopted by a very lovable character in this place of shoving them into a wastepaper basket. In those circumstances, the promoters of the consultation could not have known whether I sold the tickets: they would only have known that when they got them back.

Mr. Shannon: They know what they get back. They're the only ones that count.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I join issue with my colleague on this point. Supposing I sent back half the stubs with the names of the customers shown, how would they know that I was still selling the tickets. I am in doubt about this matter, although there may be machinery that covers this point. If all tickets are not sold, the commission is obliged to offer, as prizes, 60 per cent of the value not of the tickets sold but of those offered, so that the hospital is being cheated all the

time, whereas the investor is not. If the commission is obliged to offer as prizes 60 per cent of the value of the tickets offered for sale regardless of how many are sold, prize-winners will get 60 per cent and hospitals will come off second-best. Clause 19 (9), dealing with malpractice, is a curious provision, and I do not know how it will work. The member for Gumeracha referred to it this afternoon, and I want clarification of it, as it states:

A person who carries out or has carried out any duties or functions in relation to or in connection with the promotion or conduct of a lottery under this Act shall not fail or refuse to answer truthfully, to the best of his knowledge, information and belief, any questions asked of him by the Auditor-General or a person acting under his authority notwithstanding that such answer would or might tend to incriminate him . . .

I think I know what this clause means to do: it is intended to keep the commission and its servants strictly honest, and in that respect it is commendable. However, what will be the position of a servant of the commission who, on the information of someone (maybe a friend or maybe an enemy), causes the agent to be arraigned before the Auditor-General to answer questions about the conduct of his agency or on some aspect of his work as an officer of the commission? As far as I know, from my meagre knowledge of the law, this is unusual. A person arraigned before a court has the option either to answer or not to answer a question put to him. However, under the Bill, a person will not go before a court or be interrogated by a police officer; he will be interrogated by the Auditor-General, who may say, "Did you or did you not do certain things? You must answer truthfully." Mr. Brown may say, "I do not wish to answer; it may incriminate me," to which the Auditor-General replies, "Oh, yes, but under clause 19 (9) you must answer truthfully, even though it may incriminate you." Therefore, Mr. Brown is obliged under this clause to say, "Yes, I embezzled some of the commission's funds."

Even if the Auditor-General is not permitted to use this confession in a charge subsequently laid against Mr. Brown in a court, other recourse is open to him, for he can ask Mr. Brown, "What did you do with the money?" Mr. Brown may say, "I bought some furniture," whereupon the Auditor-General may ask, "From whom?" If Mr. Brown says, "I bought it from a certain firm in Hindley Street," the authority may approach that firm to inquire whether Mr. Brown, in fact, bought furniture on a certain date and, if the records reveal that he did, then, without even using Mr. Brown's confession to the Auditor-General, a *prima facie* case exists against Mr. Brown. A discrepancy exists in the commission's funds; Mr. Brown bought some furniture for which his normal income would not have permitted him to pay cash. He is immediately suspect and can be taken to court where such circumstantial evidence may be used against him. Such a provision should not exist.

I agree it is desirable (in fact, essential) that the commission in all its activities should be above reproach and that all possible and reasonable steps should be taken to ensure that it functions in a manner that will result in the public's confidence in it being maintained; that will convince the public that its investments are being properly safeguarded; and that it is receiving a fair deal in qualifying for a prize when the marbles are drawn from the barrel. However, it is not necessary to go to such an extent to ensure that the commission's functions are honest and above board. Although it is a summary method of dealing with a problem that obviously exists, I point out that under every enactment responsibilities are placed on the shoulders of public servants and on members of the public generally, and that ordinary processes of law ensure that servants remain honest and are not subjected to undue temptations, and so on.

Those processes of law, quite apart from a provision of this sort, ought to be (and, I believe, are) sufficient to ensure the honesty of the commission's activities. Although I believe the Bill will achieve its purpose, it will need to be improved in Committee. Amendments on the file relate to the financing of the scheme and to the appropriation of money. Apart from the criticism I have made of the Bill, I believe that it will fulfil its function and that the lottery will function in due course. I am not quite so sure that the lottery's financial results will be attractive in the early stages; I think we shall be subjected to strong competition from well established lotteries in both the Eastern States and Western Australia, more particularly in the Eastern States. The public, being discriminating investors in this and other matters, may prefer to do what it has done for many years, namely, send money, say, to Tattersalls in Victoria rather than support its own State lottery. Some people, however, may do what they consider to be the patriotic thing and support a lottery in this State, but that support may not amount to much.

Unless people can obtain as good a deal from an organization in this State as they can from one in another State, they will continue to do what they have done in the past. A lottery here will meet with strong competition from lotteries in the Eastern States. I remind the House that not so many years ago Melbourne was successful in a bid to transfer Tattersalls from Tasmania where it had originated. Of course, Tattersalls has been a money-spinner for the Victorian Treasurer.

Mr. Coumbe: It was filched.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although I do not know the circumstances of the deal, Tattersalls transferred to Victoria, and the Victorian Treasurer thought all his financial problems had been solved. However, the loudest voice in the recent clamour to obtain Commonwealth assistance has been that of the Victorian Treasurer.

Mr. Lawn: I thought South Australia was the only State in financial difficulties.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Victorian Treasurer has not always been wise in his responsibility, either. To that extent, he must perhaps share the blame with the Treasurer of this State for some unwise financial indulgences. But I shall not debate that matter here. I hope that the points I have raised will be considered in Committee.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the Bill, as previously indicated. The people of this State overwhelmingly supported a referendum to introduce a lottery. I am afraid I did not give it my whole support because I did not intend to be bulldozed into voting for a lottery. However, a referendum was carried in favour of the scheme, and here is a Bill legislating for the provision of a lottery. So far, so good! I am not opposed to lotteries. The member for Flinders has just said that we shall meet with strong competition from other States. Indeed, every other State has a lottery, and the many thousands of people who today invest in those lotteries will not necessarily be weaned away from those States by the fact that South Australia has a lottery. To meet this strong competition successfully, I wonder whether "bigger and better" is the answer! Perhaps if a smaller prize for a much smaller contribution were offered, we would achieve some success, although the flamboyancy of the $20,000 and $50,000 prizes—

Mr. Clark: They take a while to fill, though.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes. I have always thought that lotteries in between, offering a much smaller prize, would fill more quickly and would not be such a drain on funds. For instance, a ticket for 10c could be sold in a lottery, first prize in which was $1,000. Probably about 17,000 or 18,000 tickets would have to be sold in order to enable a prize of about $1,000 to be given. A person would be able to buy five tickets at 10 cents each in such a lottery for the same amount as we used to spend when we said, "Five bob for Tatts." In that way, a person could have an interest in five successive lotteries if he wished or, if he wanted to spend only 10 cents, he could buy only one ticket.

A prize of $1,000 for 10c is good odds and I think such a lottery would be worth trying. Everybody is not attracted by the idea of paying 50c or 60c to buy a ticket in a lottery in which 100,000 or 200,000 tickets are sold. Members may know whether such small lotteries have been conducted, but I have no recollection of their having been tried. I suppose a lottery must pay its way and, if people were able to choose between two types of ticket, one in an extended lottery and one in the smaller lottery of the type I have suggested the wishes of all investors would be catered for. It would be necessary to conduct an extended lottery in addition to the smaller one.

It seems that this measure has been drawn up by Puritans who have fallen by the wayside and are hiding under the puritanical blanket and peeping out. Colossal penalties are provided for offences and, although no-one can disagree in regard to such offences as forgery, clause 19 (6) provides:

A person shall not by any means advertise that he will accept money for a share in a ticket to be purchased by him or any other person in a lottery conducted or to be conducted by the commission and no person shall print or publish any such advertisement.

What does "advertise" mean? Can a lottery be advertised orally? At present people say openly in many offices and groups of people, "Whose turn is it to buy the ticket?" Each member of the group may subscribe 10c and the person whose turn it is says that he will buy the ticket. Does such a person break the law? That is stretching things a little, but we have such funny things in our Lottery and Gaming Act that a person may be penalized if he buys a ticket with the money contributed by people in such groups. The penalty in the Bill is only $200! This provision should be

examined in Committee. We should see whether such a person as I have mentioned breaks the law.

I am pleased that this measure has come before the House. We do not want to be the odd State out all the time. However, I do not think hospitals will benefit greatly from the lotteries for a long time. That does not mean that the intention to give the money to hospitals is not a good one, and I have no doubt that the money will go to them. However, I have never believed that we can get solvency in hospital administration by conducting lotteries. That has not been proved anywhere yet. However, this money will be an addition to the funds.

The schedule to the Bill sets out the types of hospital that may benefit, and that schedule requires close examination. I should want all hospitals to benefit, but such an arrangement would decrease the amount of money available to each. It may be necessary to allocate the money on a roster basis, either to each hospital in turn or to different groups in turn. I should not want subsidized hospitals in country districts to be too far down the list.

The many such subsidized hospitals do magnificent work under tremendous difficulties. Indeed, few of them could continue to function were it not for the unswerving devotion of the women on the hospital auxiliaries. The work of these women deserves encouragement by way of a donation from the Lottery Fund. Of course, they would continue to do this work, but anything given would help them. Many of these women are doing a magnificent job voluntarily and under difficulties.

Donations on a roster basis such as I have suggested would give effect in fuller measure to the purpose for which a hospital fund is set up. I would not want one particular type of hospital, especially the main Government-controlled hospitals, to be the only type to benefit so that the Government could keep down its expenditure. These hospitals should not be helped to the exclusion of the voluntarily conducted hospitals that give such vital service in country districts.

If these country hospitals are not assisted, members will have ample opportunity to seek to help them later. I do not think a large sum will result from the lotteries for some years, but the Government will have to decide before very long how the proceeds are to be distributed, and I hope that it sets about doing that. I should like the Government to consider my suggestion about the smaller type of lottery in which fewer tickets are sold, giving shorter odds. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): This Bill was introduced by the Government following the holding of a referendum at which the people of South Australia, in their wisdom, recorded a very strong vote in favour of the introduction of lotteries. I had no doubt that the referendum would be carried, but I was surprised that it was carried by such a big majority.

Mr. McKee: Particularly in Gumeracha.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not have the figures for the various districts. However, I take it that, notwithstanding the views they may have held before, members of Parliament representing the people who supported the introduction of lotteries now have a duty and an obligation to support this Bill. I have investigated the question of prizes in the other States. In the Victorian *Year Book* for 1966 (page 629) the following appears:

With the object of providing additional finance for hospitals and other charitable institutions, the trustees of the will and estate of the late George Adams, founder of Tattersall's Consultations, were granted a licence to promote and conduct sweepstakes in Victoria in accordance with the provisions of the Tattersall Consultations Act, 1953. The Act provides that, within seven days after the drawing of each consultation, duty equivalent to 31 per cent of the total amount of subscriptions to the consultation shall be paid to Consolidated Revenue. Each year, an equivalent amount is paid out of Consolidated Revenue, in such proportions as the Treasurer determines, into the Hospitals and Charities Fund, and the Mental Hospitals Fund.

Then follows a table setting out the amounts subscribed to consultations, the duty paid to Consolidated Revenue, and the allocations of this revenue to the funds mentioned. In 1960. the subscriptions to consultations amounted to $19,270,000; the duty paid to Consolidated Revenue was $5,932,000; and the amounts allocated to the Hospitals and Charities Fund and the Mental Hospitals Fund were $5,078,000 and $854,000 respectively. In 1961 the subscriptions totalled $21,544,000, the duty paid was $6,514,000, and the amounts allocated to the funds previously mentioned were $6,268,000 and $246,000. In 1964 (the last year quoted) subscriptions to consultations totalled $21,340,000, the duty paid to Consolidated Revenue was $6,609,000, and the amounts allocated to the funds were $6,309,000 and $300,000.

Clause 17 provides that the commission shall offer as prizes in any lottery conducted under this legislation not less than 60 per cent of the value of the tickets offered for sale in that lottery. I think the percentage in Western Australia is somewhere about the same. The New South Wales official *Year Book* for 1964 (page 238) states:

Each lottery comprises 100,000 tickets. The price of a ticket is 5s. 6d. in the ordinary lotteries, 10s. in the special lotteries, £1 in the jackpot lotteries, and £3 in Opera House lotteries.

A table in that publication shows that, in 1953, subscriptions totalled $20,660,000, cash prizes amounted to $13,161,000, the excess of subscriptions over cash prizes was $7,499,000, and the administrative expenses were $634,256. In 1962, which is the last year quoted in this book, the subscriptions increased to $39,195,000, cash prizes totalled $24,494,500, the excess of subscriptions over cash prizes was $14,700,500, and administrative expenses totalled $1,282,794. From that comparison with other States, it seems that 60 per cent is a pretty fair average: therefore, this provision seems to be in line.

The various lotteries contain some good features and some bad features, and it seems to me that the Government in its wisdom has picked out the best parts and left out some of the bad parts to which people object, such as the selling of tickets on street corners. In this State the Minister will have control over that aspect. I think the idea of a lottery is all right. I believe that as much money as possible should be paid to hospitals. Like the honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) I should like to see part of the prize money allocated to some of the private hospitals that are run on a voluntary basis. Everything possible should be done to encourage people to support these hospitals. The Chief Secretary has already gone on record as saying that any Government would be in serious straits if it did not have the support of the community and the auxiliary committees, particularly ladies' committees, that help these hospitals, and I know that is true. In the district I represent the ladies' committees give wonderful help to their local hospitals; they work extremely hard, yet they seem to take a delight in helping to support these hospitals.

My wife is on an auxiliary committee of the hospital in the area in which I live. The work these women do is outstanding. They go to a great deal of trouble and get up to all sorts of little dodges to raise money to keep their local hospitals going. Of course, the Government subsidy is an incentive for these people to put their best foot forward and to do as much as they can to increase the money that their hospital can get, not only for capital funds but for administrative purposes.

The holding of a lottery in South Australia has been illegal. However, that has not prevented people from obtaining lottery tickets, for all they have to do is send a subscription over to one of the other States and purchase a lottery ticket. Therefore, to say that South Australia should not introduce legislation for a lottery was just dodging the issue. This Bill will bring South Australia into line with all the other States. The money will go to the hospitals in our own State, and this will give country people an added incentive to do more for their hospitals. I should like to hear the clauses debated to get them clarified. I support the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (29).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Dunstan, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Shannon, Stott, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (5).—Messrs. Brookman, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 24 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"The Commission."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "but no such direction shall be inconsistent with this Act".

This subclause takes away from the Minister any responsibility for the carrying on of the affairs of the commission. The people of South Australia voted for a lottery to be run under the control and authority of the Government. If these words are allowed to remain, the Government will have no authority over the lottery as long as the commission can say that it is not doing anything inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. For example, there is nothing in the Act that says that a lottery cannot be established next door to a church, which is obviously undesirable. There is no reason why we should not have some Parliamentary control and a Minister in the House whom we can question about this, because a big point in the referendum placed before the

people was that the lottery should be controlled by and under the authority of the Government. But here the Minister is expressly excluded from giving any directions for the administration of the lottery. The lottery would be better run if we had a Minister to answer questions about its administration.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I cannot understand how the position referred to by the honourable member could arise. Under the clause, the Minister is in charge but he is being given a further direction. I cannot see that it will make any difference whether the words are taken out or remain, because the Government will have in charge a Minister who will be responsible to Parliament. We do not want the Minister to make a direction inconsistent with the Bill. I ask the Committee to accept the clause as it is.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I refer the Committee to the provisions relating to directions to the Minister in clause 13. If the words in this clause are struck out and clause 13 is left as it stands, what will be the position?

Mr. SHANNON: These words imply that we will make certain the Minister will not break the law, because anything inconsistent with the Bill would be unlawful. This amendment does not strengthen or weaken the position of the Minister. I do not agree with the point made by the member for Gumeracha. Nevertheless, the clause as drafted merely instructs the Minister to keep his actions within the Bill, which a responsible Minister would do.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But it is not doing any harm.

Mr. SHANNON: I agree, but does it do any good?

The Hon. Frank Walsh: We are keeping the Minister on the straight and narrow.

Mr. SHANNON: That is what I do not like; there should not be a suggestion that the Minister would do anything outside the Bill. Surely a responsible Minister can be trusted to act only within the provision of the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Premier for the construction he has placed on the words, but another construction can be placed on them. I should like the Attorney-General to consider the construction of clause 19 where many offences are created, one of which is the offence of advertising by an agent. There is provision for a person to advertise in a big way, subject to the approval of the commission. Is it legal for the Government to stop him advertising distastefully if he obtains his authority from the commission?

Mr. Shannon: The clause the honourable member wishes to amend leaves power with the Minister, and that is the overriding authority.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The power is with the commission to give permission for advertising, but the type of advertising should be seriously considered, as I have seen what takes place in other States. If the Attorney-General could say that the Minister would be responsible for all advertising that the commission approved, that would put the matter where I should like it to be. However if he cannot say that, some amendment is necessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): Under clause 4 (3) the Government is responsible for the exercise of the functions of the commission, and the Minister is the person through whom the Government may issue directives. Although the administration is in the hands of the commission, that is subject to the direction of the Minister. No such directions shall be inconsistent with the Act, but that does not limit the powers of the Minister to act in accordance with the Act. Subclause (3) provides that the Minister may issue directives to the commission in the excercise of its powers and function that are given specifically to it. Powers and functions of the commission as to advertising are set out, and the Minister may direct the commission as to what it shall do with respect to advertising.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It could veto a decision of the commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Advertising is not being done by the commission.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may authorize agents, but that authorization is an exercise of the powers and functions of the commission that may be subject to direction by the Minister. The commission is subject to policy direction by the Minister. Basically, it comes back to Ministerial responsibility.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On the assurance of the Attorney-General that the Minister is in charge of the legal function of the commission, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Clause 4 (8) in its present form is wide and sweeping. A member of Parliament, as a member of the Public Works Committee would hold an appointment under the Government, as does the Governor himself. The Auditor-General could be appointed, although he has special duties under the legislation. Have the full implications of this provision been considered?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Its purpose is not unusual. I point out that we are often pleased to appoint public servants to various positions for which Parliament provides the necessary remuneration. The provision will not lead to the duplication of a full-time appointment within the Public Service. A public servant who is not due to retire for another 5 years, or even 10 years, may prove to be a valuable officer in the administration of the lottery. Did the Government ask the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department to resign recently so that he could be appointed as Chairman of the Housing Trust? The appointee under this legislation will be responsible for ensuring consistency in the commission's activities; and the Government desires to obtain the most capable person available.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have never been one to criticize the appointment of a public servant to a responsible position that may benefit the State's welfare. Indeed, I personally informed the Premier that I believed the recent appointment to the Housing Trust was a good one. I should not object if the provision specifically related to public servants or former public servants. However, even a Minister of the Crown could be appointed to the commission on the advice that I have obtained, although I am not suggesting that that would occur.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Powers and functions of the commission."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This clause applies to advertising, subclause (2) providing:

The commission may, or, if so required by the Minister, shall, at any time, revoke any delegation made pursuant to paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1) of this section.

If the commission is to be completely under the Minister's control, as the Attorney-General has stated, why is it necessary to include this provision?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although earlier clauses have provided that, in the exercise of its powers and functions, the commission is subject to the direction of the Minister on all policy matters, it is wise to include here a clear provision as to the delegation of power. There have been many cases concerning the delegation of powers and arguments in relation to them, and it is better to be specific than to allow people to go into court to argue about it. It may be held that this, in addition to the other powers, is surplusage but, on the other hand, it does not do any harm to set the matter forth perfectly clearly. The delegation of powers is subject to the direction of the Minister as to revocation at any time. This provision simply obviates argument.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Is there something special there about delegation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There may be. Earlier in this debate there was argument about what happened when the commission delegated its powers and whether that was subject to the direction of the Minister. We say in this clause clearly that it is subject to that direction, so there cannot be any argument about it. It is a useful exercise in drafting to make the provision perfectly clear.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16—"The Lotteries Fund and Hospitals Fund."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In subclause (7) to strike out "from moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose" and to insert "not exceeding in the aggregate two hundred thousand dollars which sum is hereby appropriated for the purpose".

The amendment seeks Parliamentary approval for the Treasurer to advance to the commission such amounts not exceeding in the aggregate $200,000 to enable the commission to start functioning. There is on honourable members' files an amendment in the name of the member for Gumeracha (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) that would have the effect of compelling the Government to introduce a Bill expressly authorizing the making of advances to the commission. If the honourable member's amendment were agreed to, it would only unnecessarily delay the setting up of the commission and the commencement of its operations. The Government, therefore, seeks Parliamentary approval in this Bill to enable the Treasurer to advance to the commission sums not exceeding in the aggregate $200,000 in order to avoid the unnecessary delays and expense that would be caused if the honourable member's amendment were agreed to.

I do not want to be personal about this matter, but the honourable member moved an amendment to provide that the lotteries must be under Government administration and founded by the Government. I accepted that in good faith. I know now (and I do not hold this against the honourable member) that he is totally opposed to the Bill. I point out respectfully to the honourable member that the Government has to have finance with which to get this commission functioning.

The Bill as originally drafted contained the words "from moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose", and that could have meant anything. A firm suggestion has now been made and the Government seeks $200,000 with which to commence the work of establishing the lotteries. There will be unforeseen expenses. I know, as do all other honourable members, that there must be a return at some time after the lotteries commence to function. The Government asks the Committee to approve the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The amendment appears to have materially improved the clause. The clause as drafted, in my opinion, appropriates an unspecified amount of money at an unspecified time. If that were agreed to, the Treasurer would be authorized under the Public Finance Act to make such advances as he considered necessary for the purposes of the legislation. We have many demands on our money at present and I do not think a blank cheque should be given in this matter.

I do not consider that this commission can be put into operation for $200,000. That is a much lower amount than the estimates I have seen of the cost of establishing lotteries. I ask the Attorney-General what is the significance of the words "not exceeding in the aggregate". I point out that the Public Finance Act provides that where there is no Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work or there is an Act appropriating money for an authorized Loan work but the amount appropriated is insufficient for the complete carrying out of the work, the Governor may, by warrant, authorize the Treasurer to advance any public moneys not exceeding the amount stated in the warrant. We first considered this Bill with no money voted at all, and obviously that meant that the Treasurer could advance as much as he liked in the matter. The words now proposed are a complete contradiction of the provision in the Public Finance Act which authorizes the Governor by warrant to make moneys available. Can the Treasurer or the Attorney-General clarify this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Only a short time ago the Attorney-General pointed out that we had to be consistent throughout this measure. My information from the Parliamentary Draftsman discloses—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Treasurer would not be in order in referring to information from the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I withdraw those words, Mr. Chairman. I have information that $200,000 may not be required. However, after careful consideration it was thought better to be on the safe side in the matter. We are trying to be consistent. I do not dispute the words referred to in the Public Finance Act, as quoted by the member for Gumeracha. However, we considered it necessary to be more deliberate about the matter. I ask the Committee to agree to the amendment so that we can get this project under way. We do not want to be involved in expenditure beyond that mentioned. If it is necessary to seek further assistance, we will come back to Parliament for it, but I hope that will not be necessary because it should be a returning proposition to repay that sum and, irrespective of what else may occur, it will be repaid. I ask the Committee to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

Clauses 19—"Offences."

Mr. QUIRKE: Subclause (6) provides:

A person shall not by any means advertise that he will accept money for a share in a ticket to be purchased by him or any other person in a lottery conducted or to be conducted by the commission and no person shall print or publish any such advertisement.

Can a person advertise orally? If he is forbidden to inform people that he is prepared to do certain things, he is precluded from buying a ticket on behalf of three or four other people, which is a common practice now. I would prefer to see the following wording:

A person shall not print or publish any advertisement saying that he will accept money for a share in a ticket to be purchased by him or any other person in a lottery conducted or to be conducted by the commission.

That is exactly the same thing, except that it removes the liability to pay a $200 fine if the words "by any means advertise" mean "oral advertising".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I understand it, a person will not be permitted to advertise that he is prepared to buy a share

in a ticket that may have been issued to another person. A person is not prevented from having a share in a ticket. However, I cannot agree to allowing advertising that a person is prepared to buy a share in a ticket.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If you got up and spruiked about it, you would be in trouble.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If one goes up to a person in the street and says, "Two or three of us ought to have a ticket in the lottery", that is permissible; it is provided for here.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This clause causes me concern and I have a suggestion to make. Subclause (7) provides:

A person shall not distribute, display or publish or cause to be distributed, displayed or published, by any means, any notice or advertisement which states or from which it could reasonably be inferred,

and so on. Then subclause (8) provides:

It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment . . . for any person, who is requested or authorized by the commission to do so, to print, exhibit or publish, or cause to be printed, exhibited or published any notice, placard, handbill, card, writing, sign or advertisement of any lottery, or of any proposal for any lottery.

So we start by making it an offence to advertise and then we say, "It shall not be an offence if the advertisement has been inserted with the authority of the commission." But there is no provision in this clause enabling the authority to be withdrawn upon the veto of the Minister.

Supposing the commission gives authority for a programme of television advertisements for a lottery and, a person having got the commission's permission for that programme, the Minister then intervenes and says, "No; I don't like this. It offends many people. This must stop": there is no authority in the Act for the commission or the Minister to interfere and withdraw the approval given, because the advertising is being done by a person who is not responsible to the Minister and who, in the first place, got his authority from the commission, in which circumstances the Minister has no power to interfere. Will the Minister explain this?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: In the first place, a person is authorized by the commission to do certain things. If he wanted to advertise on television or in some other way and the Minister, after Cabinet's decision had been given, said, "I don't like this type of advertising. It is not in harmony with the provisions of this Act", he would then make representations to the commission and say, "This has to be stopped."

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: But how does the commission stop it, having given approval?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister stops it. He has authority over the commission. The Minister has the authority over the commission all through the Bill. Powers are given to the commission to operate under a Minister, and the Minister is responsible to the Government and to Parliament. Therefore, if the Minister objects, the commission has no other course than to abide by the decision of the Minister in this matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Subclause (8) provides:

It shall not be an offence under subsection (7) of this section or under any other enactment . . . (*b*) for the commission to issue, distribute, display or publish (i) a list of the names and addresses (if any) of prize winners or the numbers of prize winning tickets in any lottery conducted by the commission—

It is all right down to that point; but it further provides:

whether or not the names of the agents or persons who sold any prize winning ticket are included in that list.

It is improper that the commission should do the advertising for a successful agent. This is the crux of all objectionable advertising that goes on in the other States.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Most undesirable advertising.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We prohibit an agent advertising as "Lucky Fred" but we do not prohibit the commission advertising for him. What is the purpose of this provision? Surely it is unnecessary and dangerous. I see no reason why it should be there. I should like some explanation from the Premier because unless he can satisfy me I will move that this part of the subparagraph be struck out.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is a common practice for a commission to be permitted, if it so desires, to publish the name of the agent who sold the winning ticket.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Why?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know that this will make much difference to the sale of tickets.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Will the names of all agents who sell prize winning tickets, or only some of them, be published?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not know whose names will be published but those are the names that will be published if the commission desires to do it. If the commission does not desire to publish names then it will not be compelled to do so. I see no real stumbling block associated with these words.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Then take them out.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: We tried to do our best to provide a reasonable foundation on which the lottery should be introduced. I want to have this provision included.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I don't think you are very convincing about it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Then I will not waste any more time; I ask the Committee to accept the provision as it stands.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

In subclause (8) (*b*) (i) to strike out "whether or not the names of the agents or persons who sold any prize winning ticket is included in that list."

From his explanation I can see that the Premier is not very convinced that these words are necessary. The commission has a list of prize winners every time a lottery is drawn. Will the commission publish the names of the agents who sell all the prize-winning tickets, will it do it on every occasion, or will it print only the names of the agents who sell the tickets for the first prize? If an agent is not allowed to advertise the success of his client, why should the commission be able to advertise this fact? These words do not affect the operation of the Bill and do not take away any necessary power from anybody.

Mr. CASEY: With all due respect to the honourable member, I think he is trying to split hairs in this case. The whole idea behind the provisions of the Bill dealing with advertising is to stop the hoarding of signs such as takes place in other States, particularly in Queensland where these signs are erected outside places where tickets are sold saying that a particular shop has sold the winning ticket. People like to know who sold the winning ticket because they are curious. That is the reason for this provision and I do not think it is advertising to any great extent; all it does is pass on minor information.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it improves the Bill in any way, and so that it can be taken through its stages, I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not at all satisfied with the explanation the Premier gave, aided and abetted by the Attorney-General. Subclause (6) does not do what I say it should do, and I am sure that sooner or later a decision will have to be made on this point. We have surrounded these provisions with so many prohibitions that we are trying to make the Bill as unworkable as we can.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Advertising should be subject to strict control, because other people will be prosecuted for the same type of advertising as the commission will authorize certain agents to do. Will it be possible to withdraw an authorization?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This is a protective clause without which we could find ourselves in a most undesirable position. People will know when the lottery is operating and the Minister should have authority (which he has) so that, if exception is taken to what the commission has approved, he can withdraw the approval.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 20, schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.29 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 5, at 2 p.m.