

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 18 February 1981

The **SPEAKER (Hon. B. C. Eastick)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: HALLETT COVE RAILWAY

A petition signed by 547 residents of Morphett Vale and Reynella praying that the House urge the Government to reopen the Morphett Vale and Reynella to Hallett Cove railway was presented by Mr. Schmidt.

Petition received.

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTS

A petition signed by 197 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to introduce a fair and equitable system of rent payments for all Housing Trust tenants was presented by Mr. Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PETROL PRICE

A petition signed by 271 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the State Government to make representations to the Federal Government to stop the increase in the price of petrol was presented by Mr. Hamilton.

Petition received.

PETITION: PROSTITUTION

A petition signed by 42 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to strengthen existing laws against the prostitution trade, reject any proposal to legalise the trade, and request the Commonwealth Government to sign the United Nations Convention on Prostitution was presented by Mr. Schmidt.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MILAN TRADE FAIR

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I wish to announce that I have accepted an invitation from the President of the Milan Trade Fair (Dr. Franci), via the Italian Chamber of Commerce in Adelaide, to lead a delegation of South Australian business men to the Milan Trade Fair, which will be conducted from 14 to 23 April.

The business delegation travelling under the aegis of the Italian Chamber of Commerce will comprise representatives of such companies as: Albert Sommariva, Skil Metal, A. Taverna Products, Italia Ceramics, Minicozzi Cogan and Co., Advanced Pool Constructions, Jaffers Furniture, Thurgood Refrigeration, Litchfield Engineering, Australian Coffee Manufacturers, Rossi Smallgoods, T. & G. Insurance, and Gallery 45. Cav. Antonio Giordano will be the senior representative of the Italian Chamber of Commerce in Adelaide.

In addition, several other South Australian business

men, including Mr. Bob Footner, Chairman and Managing Director of Uniroyal, Mr. Joseph Busuttill, A.B.E. Data Systems, Mr. John Bakjac, Industrial Controls Limited, and several others who have not as yet finalised their arrangements, will be attending the Milan Trade Fair independently of the Italian Chamber of Commerce.

I shall be accompanied by Mr. Tiddy, Director of State Development, and Messrs. Loughlin and Stone of my personal staff. The Government considers that South Australian representation at the Milan fair, which is one of the principal exhibitions of its kind in the world, offers excellent prospects for further trade and development.

A South Australian business office will operate at the fair for the purposes of arranging discussions between Australian and Italian business houses and for the dissemination of South Australian promotional literature.

On 25 March, preceding the Milan Trade Fair, South Australia will host a Resources Investment Symposium, in London, in conjunction with the *Financial Times*.

At a time when the O.E.C.D. has placed Australia first out of all 23 member nations in terms of prospects for economic development in 1981, the Government considers it appropriate that special and continuing efforts should be made to present South Australia's case for resource and industrial development. Speakers at the symposium, which has attracted 150 prime investment advisers, include the following:

Mr. Jim Hardy, Chairman of Thomas Hardy and Sons Proprietary Limited, who will be Chairman.

Mr. Bruce Macklin, Chairman of SAGASCO and Robe River Limited and Director of Boral Limited, will speak on "Corporate Investment Experience in South Australia".

Mr. Ian Webber, Managing Director, Mitsubishi Australia Limited, "The Future of Manufacturing Industry in S.A."

Mr. P. L. Horrobin, Executive Director, Project Finance and Research Development for S. G. Warburg, one of London's major merchant banks. "Investment in South Australia".

Mr. I. G. Grant, Supervising Geologist, Department of Mines and Energy. "Mineral and Energy Resources and their Commercial Potential".

Mr. Matt Tiddy, Director of State Development. "Private and Public Sector Involvement in the Development of South Australia".

Hon. D. O. Tonkin, "South Australia's Development Opportunities".

Following this symposium, and while *en route* to Milan, I will have discussions with the French Minister for Trade, Monsieur Girond, and a group of French industrialists. Topics to be covered include technology transfer and joint venture development.

I shall also inspect and receive an up-to-date report from R.W.K. of the testing of South Australian brown coal at Niederaussem, and will visit Daimler-Benz to inspect the O'Bahn transportation system in Essen.

In Athens I shall be discussing South Australia's ethnic and multicultural policies with the Greek Government and discussing other matters of mutual interest with the Greek-Australia Society and the Australian Trade Commission. I shall also take the opportunity of visiting the earthquake area and of reporting back findings to the committee in charge of the appeal fund.

Before arriving in Europe I shall briefly visit Texas, which also celebrates its sesqui-centenary in 1986. Arrangements have been made for the Governor of Texas, William P. Clements, and me to discuss possible joint activities to celebrate the occasion, for other discussions to

take place regarding an improvement in South Australian exports to the U.S.A., and to promote tourism between the two States, especially during the celebration year.

The SPEAKER: I advise the House that in the absence of the honourable Minister of Education any questions relating to that portfolio will be taken by the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXES

Mr. BANNON: I ask the Premier whether he was correctly reported this morning in a radio news bulletin when he was quoted as saying words to this effect:

If charges do not go up, the taxpayer will have to meet the bill.

If the Premier confirms that he did make this comment, or something along those lines, will he explain how a dollar's worth of State charges is easier to bear than a dollar's worth of State taxes, and what is the difference?

Yesterday, this House learnt of unannounced Government plans to increase State charges. Members will recall the minute from the Premier himself that revealed how Cabinet had decided on an immediate review of all State charges, with a view to introducing appropriate increases, as soon as possible. The charges, according to the minute, include licences, registration fees, permit fees, etc. The minute specifically refers to items included under what is termed Part I, in estimates of revenue. A study of this shows clearly that Part I is classed by the Treasury as taxes, and not charges. I also remind the Premier that in September 1978, when he was Leader of the Opposition, he noted that an increase in electricity tariff was, in fact, a tax rise.

On 19 September of that year in this House he referred to a Government statement that there were to be no tax increases and he noted that water charges, car registrations and higher power bills were, in fact, hidden increases in State taxation. Finally, in July 1979 the Deputy Premier, the member for Kavel, then Deputy Leader of the Opposition, was reported in the press as having said:

Recent increases in land tax, water and sewerage, make a mockery of Government claims that taxes are not going up.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The fundamental difference is that in that case the State Labor Government was putting up both charges and State taxation.

On the other hand, we have an enviable record of having fulfilled our election promises and of having abolished succession and gift duties, land tax on the principal place of residence, of having made substantial pay-roll tax exemptions, and of having abolished stamp duty payable on the purchase of first houses. In fact, we have slashed taxation, quite contrary to the record of the previous Government, by \$28 000 000 in a full year, and that is the fundamental difference. Obviously, the Leader does not really understand the difference between his situation and the situation in which we find ourselves, and I am quite certain that the public of South Australia is much happier with the position that we have brought about. I sometimes wonder whether the Leader knows the difference between a State charge and State taxation. Now that the Leader has given me the opportunity, I want to refer briefly to one or two matters in relation to that so-called leaked document that the Leader took great pleasure in waving about yesterday.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The sensationalism that was

indulged in by the media disappointed me enormously. That document was the subject of a press release in January, when the same matters were put forward. Not all sections of the media attended that press conference: they were not interested then. What is more to the point, that document is circulated to every Public Service department, most statutory authorities, and I know for a fact that it has been in the hands of Mr. Bob Gregory, for instance, as a normal part of his duties as a member of the State Transport Authority. For the Leader to wave the document around yesterday and seek to make some political mileage out of it in regard to its being a leaked document is quite remarkable.

Mr. BANNON: Mr. Gregory respects confidentiality. I hope you are not implying otherwise.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Bannan: I rise on a point of order. As I understand the Premier's comment, he is impugning some one who is a member of an authority and I would like to place clearly on the record that that imputation is false.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a point of order, and I do not accept it as such.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As I said before, I made no such accusation, because basically Mr. Gregory made that point to me himself and volunteered the information last night. He said how ridiculous it was to call that document a secret and leaked document. It was the subject of a press statement, which made quite clear that I had asked Ministers, as a matter of good housekeeping, to examine the present charges applying and whether or not they should be increased. For the Leader's benefit, I make the point that, if charges do not increase to help finance the services that any Government provides, obviously taxes will have to be increased to find the money—it has to come from somewhere.

This Government does not, in any way, subscribe to the point of view that was made quite clear by the Opposition yesterday—that it wants to increase State taxation. We will not be in it. Members opposite can promote it all they want, but I hope that they are honest enough to go ahead and promote it before the next election. They have made quite clear that they want to see State taxes increased. The policy of this Government is not to increase State taxation; as I said, we have already cut it considerably. However, we do believe that charges for services provided by State Government departments should reflect the costs involved in providing those services, and (as I said and as I was correctly quoted) if charges do not increase, it would mean that taxation would have to be increased. We are not going to increase taxation, so charges will have to go up. If the Leader cannot work out that elementary piece of financial bookkeeping, there is a very little I can do about it.

POT SMOKING

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Chief Secretary seen recent allegations of pot smoking at Adelaide Gaol? On 10 February this year the *Advertiser* contained the following report under the heading "Warders walk out over 'pot'," as follows:

Prison officers went on strike for six hours at the Adelaide Gaol yesterday. A shift of 56 prison officers walked off the job at 8 a.m. after prisoners allegedly were found smoking marijuana in a dormitory area on Sunday night . . . The prison officers' shop steward at the gaol, Mr. C. Byron, said officers were concerned at security problems in the prison. Prisoners had been found smoking marijuana in a part of the prison known as "The Lane" . . . He said it was not known how the prisoners got the marijuana. A spokesman for the

Department of Correctional Services said no marijuana had been found in the gaol in a search on Sunday night.

A letter to the Editor in a later edition of the *Advertiser* expressed great concern about the incident. Yesterday, the member for Norwood also alleged that pot smoking had occurred in the Adelaide Gaol. Will the Minister enlighten the House about the details and charges made in the paper and by the member for Norwood?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I have seen the reports. I have also seen the letter, which I think came from a lady from Port Lincoln who was very concerned about this matter. On examination, the allegations made are false. The facts of the matter are that the staff at Adelaide Gaol after morning parade on Monday, 9 February 1981, advised the Keeper of the gaol that there was to be a stop-work meeting. The meeting continued until approximately 9.15 a.m. when the Keeper was approached by union officials from the A.G.W.A. demanding that the Director of Correctional Services, Alex Stewart, attend immediately at the gaol and discuss complaints from members. Prior to the morning parade and subsequent stop-work meeting, no approach had been made to the Keeper informing him of any complaints which they then sought to discuss with the Director.

The major complaint concerned the rostering of personnel nominated for recent promotional positions at Adelaide Gaol. This matter was readily rectified in discussions with the executive and the Director of Correctional Services during a visit to the gaol that day. The allegations of pot smoking followed information given to an officer at the gaol, and immediate action was taken to remove all inmates from the so-called lane section of the gaol. A thorough search was carried out by the Dog Squad from Yatala Gaol. No trace of drugs was found. However, following the allegations, the division was left empty so that a complete search could be carried out. This occurred on the following day, Tuesday 10 February.

The position of one officer in the lane has been standard practice since the division was opened 20 years ago. As a result of discussions on that day, the Keeper will introduce a security panel and selection process to allocate inmates to lane accommodation. This accommodation is very similar to the minimum security section at Yatala Labour Prison, where one officer is in charge of each dormitory, there being two dormitories in this division. To sum up, in the thorough search by the Dog Squad and the subsequent search no drugs were found, as alleged in the reports.

NEW JOBS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say what progress has been made by the State Government in its attempt to woo a major employer from New South Wales to South Australia, thus securing 450 jobs for this State? On 1 October 1980 a rather curious piece appeared in the *News* quoting the Minister of Industrial Affairs as saying that a New South Wales company had approached the State Government to establish what incentives South Australia could offer. The Minister said he expected the company to decide on its future in about three months, but he could not give any details, because he was worried that this would alert the New South Wales Government to the possibility of the company closing its operation and heading here. Why the Minister put out this story is beyond my understanding.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader not to comment when explaining the question.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Perhaps the Premier can inform us what the decision of the company was and provide us with more details about this venture.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Negotiations are proceeding in a most satisfactory way. It would not be proper in any way to give details of those negotiations. An announcement will be made in due course.

ANCILLARY STAFF

Mr. GLAZBROOK: My question is directed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs, acting for the Minister of Education. Can he explain the reason for the decision to make an apparent cut of 4 per cent to the staffing equalisation of school assistant resources throughout schools in South Australia? This matter was drawn to the attention of the member for Henley Beach and me yesterday during a meeting that we attended with a group of principals. Our attention was drawn to a letter sent by the Director-General of Education in January, part of which states:

The Government has decided to require reduced allocations in the level of ancillary staff in schools of approximately 4 per cent overall. The reduction will be implemented in accordance with clause 13 of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award, and this decision has been influenced by the continuing decline in enrolments.

I refer also to an advertisement in the *Advertiser* on Monday 16 February, which is headed "School Assistants" and which states in part:

Your job security is under attack. The Minister of Education, Mr. Allison, has announced a 4 per cent cut-back as part of a rationalisation plan. The Minister's plan means that many school assistants will have their hours of work reduced and that they can be compulsorily transferred from one school to another.

A large number of school assistants face the possibility of a reduction in pay, loss of their accumulated sick leave entitlements, loss of their right to belong to the superannuation scheme . . .

At the bottom, the advertisement highlighted the following:

In the meanwhile the P.S.A. advises all members of their right to refuse any cut-backs at this point of time.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, because there has been a very loose use of the term "cuts", I make clear to the House that the total amount of funds allocated in the 1980-81 Budget for ancillary staff, based on the number of teachers in the profession, is basically the same as it was in 1979-80.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Yes, but you've reduced the number of teachers, and that is the point.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I shall come to that shortly. There has been no cut in funds in terms of the ratio of ancillary staff to teaching staff. The next point that I want to make, and I take up the point that the honourable member has raised, is that there has been, as he knows, a reduction of 20 000 in the number of students in South Australian Government schools over the past three years.

It is appropriate that I outline some of the history of the ancillary staff issue. At the beginning of last year, because of the reduction in the number of students, and therefore the reduction in the number of teachers, and thus the need to reduce ancillary staff accordingly, but maintaining the same ratio, on a voluntary basis it was agreed by the Public Service Association and the South Australian Institute of Teachers to reduce (and I stress that it was on a voluntary basis) the number of ancillary staff during 1980. At the end of 1980, unfortunately those voluntary reductions had not been achieved. In fact, substantially less than half of the

voluntary reductions, which had been promised in the negotiations with the Minister of Education early last year, had been achieved.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: So the big stick—

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I would have thought that, if two industrial groups had given an undertaking to achieve something on a voluntary basis, they should uphold that promise. If they did not uphold the promise, it would be appropriate for the Government to take action, and that is what the Government has had to do. Let us be quite clear about this. An undertaking was given to achieve certain reductions, based on the reduction in teachers in the State, in ancillary staff. They were not achieved on a voluntary basis, and the Minister of Education has acted, quite rightly. I am putting forward the proposal. The Minister of Education has issued two phases to the reduction. I stress again that the Budget allocation for ancillary staff on an ancillary staff to teacher ratio is basically the same as that in the previous Budget. Because there are likely to be Budget over-runs in this financial year, the actual allocation on that ratio basis is likely to be greater this year than it was last year.

The Minister has introduced this reduction in two phases, the first phase being a voluntary reduction as far as possible by the end of February to try to achieve up to the 4 per cent reduction to maintain the existing ratio of ancillary staff to teachers across the State. I am pleased to say that the response from schools has been excellent and that about half of that overall proposed reduction has already been achieved on a voluntary basis. In other words, the ancillary staff involved have offered to reduce their hours, or have retired for some reason, but it is on a voluntary basis.

After February, it will be necessary for the schools to require appropriate reduction on an across-the-board *pro rata* basis. I must stress that individual hardship has been taken into account in determining this procedure, and schools have been asked, through their principals, to inform the Education Department of any individual ancillary staff member with an economic hardship problem that should be taken into account, such as a single-parent family, poor economic circumstances, or some similar matter. I can assure the House, on behalf of the Minister of Education, that those circumstances will be taken into account.

I also point out that members should read the industrial award for this class of ancillary staff. It is not a normal sort of industrial award but a very unique one. Clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award states:

Notwithstanding anything elsewhere in this award contained if at any time the entitlement of a school to ancillary staff or the employment hours of ancillary staff shall be varied by the employer the employer shall have the right unilaterally to vary the ordinary hours and salary of an employee upon giving to that employee not less than two clear weeks notice in writing of its intention to do so. If any such variation of entitlement shall have the effect of causing the position of an employee to become redundant the employer shall be entitled to dismiss the employee in accordance with subclause (2) (a) of this clause.

I can assure the House that the Minister of Education has given an instruction to his department that people are not to be retrenched under this proposal. It is simply an across-the-board *pro rata* reduction to take up what has not already been achieved on a voluntary basis during February, since the Minister made his announcement.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I cannot qualify what constitutes hardship, because that is a matter for the

Minister and his department. The details are to be supplied by the school to the Education Department, and it is up to the department to make the assessment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I can understand why Opposition members are trying to interject across the Chamber.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We didn't ask the question.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I know, but members opposite are interjecting, and I can understand that. They are delighted to see some possibility of industrial action proposed by two of the unions involved. I stress, and I am sure the former Minister of Education realises, that there was a ratio of ancillary staff to teachers in this State, and that is being upheld by the present Government.

The Budget allocations for this financial year are likely to exceed the amounts given on that ratio basis for 1979-80. It is unfair to talk of cuts because it is not a real cut when it is realised that the number of students has declined by 20 000 and therefore the number of teachers has also declined.

ALBATROSS AIR CHARTER

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Tourism apologise to a local air charter firm, Albatross Air Charter of Todd Street, Kingscote, Kangaroo Island, for causing it embarrassment and possible loss of revenue and custom? Albatross Air Charter, I imagine, would be known to the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Everyone in Kingscote is known to the local member; you ought to know better.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. Wright: For whatever reason.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Gilles will come back to his question.

Mr. SLATER: The firm was registered in 1978 and conducts an air service between Kangaroo Island and Adelaide and possibly to other places on the mainland. It is a family concern operated by Mr. Keith Stevens, his wife and son, and the two men are the pilots. They began two years ago with one Cherokee aircraft and they now have a second Cherokee, and a Piper Aztec and I understand they are looking for another 10-seater aeroplane. The symbol of the firm, naturally, is an albatross and it is known on the island and elsewhere by that symbol.

The Minister comes into the story by way of a promotion of Ansett Air Travel, which adopted an albatross as its logo. The Minister attended the opening of the Ansett International Travel Office in Adelaide at which the new logo was displayed. She referred to the need to expand tourism to Kangaroo Island and said that Ansett International would sell tours to Kangaroo Island as well as to Fiji. She expressed herself at that time as being a "Kangaroo Island fan". The consequence of this official association with Ansett and the newly adopted Ansett albatross logo have caused some embarrassment and nuisance to the small expanding local company. It appears that the Minister knew little of the island enterprise.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment.

Mr. SLATER: A photograph appeared in the *Advertiser* on 7 February of the Minister holding the Ansett albatross symbol. Since then some members of the public have been ringing Albatross Air Charter asking whether it had sold out to Ansett and whether they have refunds of fares, and making expressions of regret and confusion.

Albatross Air Charter has written to Ansett asking it to move out of its territory, but to this date I understand no reply has been received. Perhaps the Minister might declare her unqualified support for the local firm and apologise to it for causing further undue turbulence in the aircraft industry.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I feel sure that, if there has been any misunderstanding, it has certainly been set right as a result of the detailed explanation by the member for Gilles. As the honourable member would well know, when Ministers are invited to open premises they are usually invited to pose for photographs by the insignia of those premises. In order to be co-operative with my hosts on that occasion I happily agreed to do so. If my action has had an adverse effect on any firm, I would wish to see any misunderstanding corrected without qualification.

URANIUM

Mr. ASHENDEN: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy noted recent statements about nuclear power and uranium mining by the following persons: Mr. James Callaghan (former Leader of the Labour Party in Britain); Mr. Hudson (former member for Brighton and former Minister of Mines and Energy); Mr. Hawke (the next leader of the Federal A.L.P.); and the member for Mitchell?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd will cease commenting either in his question or in any subsequent explanation.

Mr. ASHENDEN: Can the Minister say whether he sees these statements as being consistent and in line with current A.L.P. policy?

The SPEAKER: I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy to take heed of the fact that he is not a spokesman for another organisation. I ask him to answer the question as posed by the honourable member for Todd, with that exception.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The question of policy and development of the resources of this State is of vital concern to the State and the attitude of members of this Parliament, including members of the A.L.P., bear heavily and significantly on the deliberations of this House and matters which will in due course come before the House.

It is with a great deal of interest that I read of the attitude within the Opposition to this serious question. The answer to the question is that indeed I have seen the comments of these gentlemen; they highlight to the extreme conflict that exists in coming to a coherent policy in relation to uranium matters. During Mr. Callaghan's recent visit to this country, he said:

We are totally self-sufficient in energy, oil, natural gas, coal, nuclear power—the only industrialised nation in Europe in that fortunate position.

Then, he went on to say some optimistic things about Britain, in view of the fact that Britain is self-sufficient in relation to energy. He made no bones about the fact that a significant contribution to this energy came from nuclear power.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That does not detract from the point I am making, that without that nuclear component, as acknowledged by Mr. Callaghan, the country would be in serious trouble. As I have pointed out earlier, this matter is not a union problem in Great Britain, where they have been living with nuclear power for 25 or 30 years, nor is it a political problem, in the sense

of giving rise to conflict between the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the Labour Party. There is an anti-uranium group, a conservation group, some people who are active in any country. It is not a political problem as such. So, that is peculiar to this country, and to the State branch of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr. Keneally: A socialist plot.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Labor Party in Britain has lurched to the left; whether that will modify it or not, I do not know. It has recently elected Mr. Michael Foote as Leader. Its plans to socialise a number of companies are well known, but they have not yet—

Mr. McRAE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In what way can what the honourable gentleman is saying be remotely relevant of the question put to him by the honourable member?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Whilst the Speaker is on his feet, he will take no interjections from either side of the House. There is no point of order. I have pointed out previously that the manner in which a Minister answers a question put to him is entirely of his own making. That matter is receiving some consideration by the Standing Orders Committee, but, as the Standing Orders read at the moment, the Minister, so long as he does not make imputations about another member, or in any other way act against Standing Orders, may answer the question as he sees fit.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Coming closer to home, I read some of the comments in a paper given towards the end of last year by the former member for Brighton, Mr. Hugh Hudson, one of the realists in the Labor Party, if I may proffer that opinion. His paper was prepared for the Australia-Japan Economic Relations Research Project, from which I quote:

The absence of nuclear power in Australia, the existence of plentiful coal reserves, and the absence (in the main) of oil-fired power stations, all combine to produce a lack of appreciation of the problems of countries such as Japan, France and Italy.

It is not appreciated that such countries see the replacement of oil-fired stations as fundamental to the solution of balance of payments problems and the avoidance of serious threats to existing living standards, or indeed, that coal-fired stations are seen to be associated with serious pollution problems.

Those comments are strongly supportive of a point of view that I put to the *Advertiser* by letter in answer to some stern criticisms by the President of the Conservation Council, who made a fairly direct attack on me. That energised the member for Mitchell to go into print in response to what I said. His current views are well known. Among other things, when I pointed out in my original response to the President of the Conservation Council that, in my view, we had a moral obligation to provide energy in an energy hungry world and that this was an accepted form of energy around the world, my remarks were described by the member for Mitchell as "that tired old fiction".

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It still is.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitchell is in direct conflict with his international colleague from Britain, Mr. Callaghan, and the former Minister of Mines and Energy, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, whose place it appears the honourable member would seek to inherit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier, and no other member, has the call.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member talked about and quoted in relation to the trip of the former Premier, Don Dunstan, and the conclusions that he had reached as a result of his overseas visit. I picked up pen and sought by way of another letter to the *Advertiser* to refute what Mr. Payne had said. The *Advertiser*, in its wisdom or lack thereof, did not see fit to publish my letter, which stated, in part:

If the A.L.P. believes that, in an energy hungry world, resource rich countries such as Australia should take it upon themselves to subject millions of people to lives of economic deprivation, then Mr. Payne should say so.

I believe that Mr. Hudson would have supported strongly my sentiments. It continued:

The choice is clear, and all Mr. Payne has demonstrated is that he resides in that faction of the A.L.P. which refuses to face reality on this matter. A number of his colleagues, including Mr. Bob Hawke, disagree with him.

He also clings to the myth that the overseas visit undertaken by Mr. Dunstan in 1979 was in the nature of a "fact-finder" when we all know it began as an attempt to rationalise Party policy, degenerated into a faction fight in his absence—

It is a pity that the member for Elizabeth is not here to hear this reply, because he was one of the chief protagonists in that internal division.

Mr. Keneally: He is—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Stuart.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It continued:

and ultimately had to be downgraded when the former Premier realised that the numbers for a change in policy were stacked against him.

It ill-behoves the member for Mitchell to talk about the conclusions from the Dunstan overseas trip when I know for a fact, from talking to the technical experts who accompanied Mr. Dunstan on his trip, that the report was changed when he came back and found that the numbers did not add up.

I have quoted to the House the statements made by Mr. Hawke, heir apparent to bigger and better things in Canberra. I have also quoted to this House former statements made by Mr. Hawke, who was recently elevated to membership of the Federal House and who, even more recently, was quoted in the *Sydney Morning Herald* as saying that recent events had shown that labour would be readily available to construct the necessary facilities, mine uranium and export it. This, I might say, brought forth a fairly heated response from Mr. Uren, who is not noted for his right-wing proclivities, who took Mr. Hawke to task publicly, so we had the brawl in the Federal scene for all to see. I have noted with some concern, because the welfare of the State is bound up in this question, this internecine strife in the Labor Party.

It is a source of further concern to me that the Opposition spokesman on Mines and Energy is not at one with the sensible element in the Party, such as former Premier Corcoran, one of the best men they have thrown up, and the former Minister of Mines and Energy. It is a source of some concern to me that we have the current shadow Minister lining himself up with the member for Elizabeth and others whose tendencies are well known.

VIOLENT CRIME

Mr. WHITTEN: Will the Chief Secretary say whether, in view of the horrifying rise in violent crime documented in the Police Commissioner's report, the Government will

immediately act to protect life and property by restoring the police dog squad to its previous level of 16 dogs after the reduction to 12 dogs during the year, by enabling more police to attend vital general training courses after the reduction from 490 to 428 during 1979-80, and by enabling more police to participate in driving instruction courses after the cutback from 669 to 525? I am asking this question because, during the 1979 election, South Australians were subjected to disgusting media advertisements—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting rather than dealing with a stated fact.

Mr. WHITTEN: South Australians were subjected to media advertisements depicting a masked criminal and blaming the Labor Government for the then relatively low levels of violent crime. Now, under the present Government, violent crime has risen to previously unthinkable levels.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I never cease to be amazed at the fall back position of members opposite, these people masquerading, which has been a fond topic of the honourable member for Playford. The honourable member is talking about the Police Force. Let me say to him, and to the Opposition as a whole, that the Government has the needs of the Police Force under review. That covers dogs, if that matter is worrying the honourable member for Price. It gives me great heart to know that he would be prepared to set the dogs on to some of the trouble makers around the streets, because they could certainly be extremely effective. I am grateful for his inspiration in this matter. To return to the question: the needs of the Police Force are being monitored. Putting a policeman on every corner will not break down or get on top of all the problems; it must be done in balance.

An honourable member: You mean the public's been sold a pup.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: A mouth full of teeth in the seat of the pants of the member opposite would be a most wonderful thing for the House. The matters raised by the honourable member have been noted, and I hope we will be able to balance it out fully in terms of the need for protection for this State.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

Mr. RANDALL: Is the Minister of Mines and Energy aware that in a recent press statement the Leader stated:

The Tonkin Government has already lost Redcliff.

Can the Minister say whether that is a statement of fact?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That statement is—how can I phrase it without being unparliamentary?—entirely fictitious: in fact, it is nonsense. If we go back to the early history of this matter, we know that in 1973 a Redcliff project was announced by former Premier Dunstan. That was the basis, if my memory serves me correctly, of the next election campaign—Redcliff was the big carrot which was dangled at that election campaign. It was described as a *fait accompli*—we had it in the bag!

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Letter of intent.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Oh, it was there! In my memory of political events there has not been a more announced and reannounced project, and I do not have to tell you, Sir, or members of the House that that is some record. The Redcliff project has been announced and reannounced over that 10-year period, and even when the present Government came into office it was confidently announced by the now Leader of the Opposition that the

project was to go ahead last April. He had inside information! I knew darn well it was nonsense, but he knew better than we did! This project has been their baby, and they have used and hammered hell out of it; they have used it at election after election. It is absolute nonsense to say that we lost it, because we never had it—they never had it. The Premier had the common sense to go over and talk to the Chairman of the board and other senior members of the Dow Chemical Company.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And finish it off.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: "Finish it off", the honourable member says. Mr. Speaker, do not be hard on the honourable member—it is a question of pity. The Premier went over there to find out what the score really was, and it was at that stage that the Dow Chemical Company informed him that, in view of markets, the company would delay the project for two years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Ascot Park.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government has not been a party to these premature announcements. We have tried to be realists in our dealings with companies. I will give another example: the Leader of the Opposition in recent times has been trumpeting to the world that we should become involved in biotechnology. The Leader knows perfectly well that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has been having talks for seven or eight months with this firm. The Leader's public trumpeting in order to get his name into the paper can only harm these negotiations. That sort of behaviour did nothing to enhance our deliberations with Dow, which may wonder what sort of hick State this is when the Leader of the Opposition makes public statements which the company knows, as did the Government, are nonsense. What does it achieve? The Leader of the Opposition gets his name in the paper; that is all. I suppose that if he ran naked down King William Street he would get his name in the paper—his actions are about as sensible as that.

An honourable member: We'd want something better than that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I agree entirely. The Dow Chemical Company is spending upwards of \$3 000 000 on continuing environmental studies in the Spencer Gulf region, which is important information. I might add that the 1973 announcement was made before any assessment, even a preliminary assessment, had been made in relation to the environmental constraints. Apparently that was a minor consideration. Also, as a result of the Premier's contact with the Dow board, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Orefice, has indicated that he intends to come to South Australia in August of this year for further discussions with the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I suppose how you pronounce his name depends where you were brought up. He will be here in August for further discussions with the Premier, and the company is spending \$3 000 000. In those circumstances, I think it is a bit premature (although the Opposition would quite obviously like to say so) to say that it has failed. In fact, it has not. The other thing of importance is that, now that Dow does not have exclusivity, the Asahi Company intends to establish an office in Adelaide. In fact, I think that two of the company's executives have taken up residence already. That company will spend upwards of \$1 000 000 in investigating the possibilities of a petro-chemical plant.

It ill-behoves the Leader of the Opposition, to see his name in print, to make statements on matters about which he is palpably ignorant, designed, if anything, to damage the State.

CYSTIC FIBROSIS

Mr. HAMILTON: Has the Minister of Health received complaints from the parents of cystic fibrosis sufferers about the contempt shown by the Premier towards questions I asked about the incidence of the disease, the drugs used in treating it, and their availability? Since the Premier's comments were reported, I have received many complaints, some of them very moving, about the Premier's ridiculing of my question. I think it ill-behoves—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HAMILTON:—members of the Government—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HAMILTON:—to joke about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come back to the explanation, without comment, or leave will be denied.

Mr. HAMILTON: The Minister will be aware that, in the past, cystic fibrosis has been fatal, but that new drugs offer hope of survival. This morning I received a letter from a constituent stating, in part:

Dear Mr. Hamilton,

I feel I must write and add my protest to yours, re Mr. Tonkin's statement about cystic fibrosis. I know Mr. Tonkin has a family and he should be very thankful that his family is free from this most severe sickness. I have a grandson, very clever, and would have been able to make a success of many things if it were not for cystic fibrosis. Last year, he had a lung collapse four times, and then a very big operation to stop it happening again. And the next thing to happen was that the lung had a broken blood vessel in it, and you can imagine what this young man went through.

The letter continues that it was "very sad that the head doctor of the cystic fibrosis clinic has had to go to Canada for two years research in cystic fibrosis as he could not get the money here for research." Has the Minister received similar letters? Has she complained to the Premier? Will she investigate the availability and adequacy of research funds in South Australia for this disease? And I would hope that we would not make a joke about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the honourable Minister of Health to answer the question, I draw once again to the attention of all honourable members that the proceedings of the House require that the question be asked, that a simple explanation be given, and that the question be not asked a second time. I ask all honourable members to refrain from rephrasing the question or from giving the exact question on a second occasion.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No, I have not seen or heard of any complaints directed to my office regarding the Premier's comment about the number of questions, some of which, I would say, were of an entirely frivolous nature. I am not suggesting that the question about cystic fibrosis comes into that category.

Mr. Hamilton: The Premier did.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: That was the question the honourable member put on the Notice Paper. The Premier did not in any way, when commenting on that question, indicate that it was a frivolous matter. He did indicate that some of the information sought could have been readily gained by the honourable member by simple reference to a medical dictionary. A number of questions which the honourable member put on the Notice Paper were indeed frivolous. Many others could have been answered by very little work on the part of the member for Albert Park. For example, had he chosen to go to the *South Australian Year Book* or the dictionary, or simple statistics which are easily available, he could have found the answers to some of his questions.

I should like to give the honourable member some kindly advice, as he appears to be vying with his colleague from Salisbury for the position of shadow Minister of Health. I suggest that, if he wants to take up the time of the Public Service in answering questions, he should direct to the Minister those questions which are of value and which are relevant to State Government responsibilities. If he has questions which have no relevance whatever to State Government responsibilities, which are of a general nature, and which could be answered by reference to readily available sources of information, he should go straight to those sources of information.

I have had no complaints at all in respect of cystic fibrosis. If the honourable member would like to forward any complaints to me I will, of course, deal with them.

WATER FILTRATION

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Water Resources give an assurance that the Happy Valley water filtration programme will still go ahead in the 1981-82 financial year? Last year I asked the Minister a similar question following complaints I had received from residents about the quality of water in that southern area, and the Minister gave the assurance at that time that the normal water filtration programme which was set up under the Steele Hall Government would go ahead in the 1981-82 financial year as programmed.

Unfortunately, in the last few weeks, due to publicity given to the unfortunate incidence of amoebic meningitis at Whyalla and the Government's action to look at the filtration of water for the city's water supply, many residents of the southern area have been concerned that perhaps, if this were to go ahead, the programme outlined for the Happy Valley filtration system would be in some way hampered or retarded in its progress. Some residents went to the trouble of ringing the Engineering and Water Supply Department to find out whether this would be so, only to receive the answer from some members of the Public Service that there may be a possibility that this water filtration programme would in some way be hampered should the Whyalla programme go ahead.

From that point, residents came to see me. They are seeking an assurance from the Minister that, if the Government goes ahead with the system for Whyalla, it will in no way have an effect on the Happy Valley filtration programme.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I can appreciate the concern of the honourable member because of the problems that he has had in that area, particularly as a result of the phantom midge recently. Quite obviously, the Engineering and Water Supply Department is not in a position to answer the questions that residents have been asking it. When Cabinet decided recently to proceed with the water filtration of the northern towns, requiring two filtration plants, one on the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and one on the Swan Reach-Stockwell pipeline, at an estimated cost of \$35 000 000, the Premier indicated that there was a possibility, depending on the level of funding which would be made available from the Federal Government, that there would be some delay in the completion of the total metropolitan Adelaide water filtration programme.

The Hope Valley and Anstey Hill water filtration plants are already operative, the Barossa filtration plant will be operative this year, and the Little Para filtration plant is currently under construction. The next filtration plant to be constructed will be at Happy Valley, which is by far the largest of the filtration plants and which will cost an

estimated \$45 000 000. That programme is currently in the early stages of investigation and design prior to tenders being let for the detailed design works for the construction of the water filtration plant. In actual fact, early work on the Happy Valley water filtration plant scheme has already started, and it is expected that it will be in operation by late 1987 or early 1988.

The metropolitan Adelaide water filtration programme will not be stopped, but the total programme for the northern towns water filtration and the Adelaide metropolitan water filtration programme, depending on the degree and level of funding from the Federal Government, may be lengthened by 12 months or so. We were looking originally at a completion date of about 1989, but that completion date for the total water filtration for South Australia may be 1990 or 1991.

MURRAY RIVER WATER

Mr. PETERSON: Is the Minister of Water Resources aware of suggestions to divert water from the east coast rivers of Australia into the Darling and Murray Rivers? If so, what is this Government's attitude to the scheme, and what has the Minister done to express the Government's support or rejection of the scheme?

We are all aware of the dependence of our State on the Murray River and of the massive problems with the quality of the water from that river, problems that do not appear to be moving anywhere near a solution. This scheme may be the answer. A letter to the Editor in the *Advertiser* of 17 February written by a Mr. D. D. Harris of Kensington Park is as follows:

In November, 1980, a State water supply and resources conference in Sydney passed the following resolution:

Conference recommends to the Local Government and Shires Association that they seek a Federal Parliamentary Committee of Enquiry into the feasibility of the diversion of surplus Clarence River water into wester rivers.

The Clarence catchment is double that of the Snowy and its average rainfall 40 per cent greater.

Benefits would include flood control, hydro-electric power, more irrigation water and a greater flow to South Australia.

While this issue remains a live one in New South Wales, it is desirable that the South Australian Government should vigorously support the request for a feasibility study.

This matter must, I think, be seriously investigated by any Government in this State, because we seem to be getting nowhere with current negotiations and, with our dependence on the Murray River, we cannot let it go for much longer.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I am very conscious and well aware of the project to which the honourable member refers. The Clarence River diversion project has been raised many times during the last 20 or 30 years. It is a cost benefit situation. I believe that ultimately, in the long term, some of the swift flowing rivers on the Eastern coast of Australia will ultimately be diverted, or portions of their flow will be diverted, to the western side of the Dividing Range, but it is a cost benefit study and just when it will become an economically feasible proposition for that to proceed is anyone's guess.

However, the honourable member also mentioned the benefits to South Australia. At the moment there would be little benefit to South Australia, as the waters of the Clarence River under the sovereign State situation belong to New South Wales, and the likelihood of South Australia

deriving benefits from the diversion of the Clarence River into the upper reaches or tributaries of the Darling River are fairly remote when one considers the massive irrigation diversions that the New South Wales Government is currently considering.

The diversion of the Clarence River into the tributaries of the Darling would undoubtedly at this stage be totally utilised by New South Wales, and if that were to be the case all that South Australia would receive from such a works would be increased salinity and no more water. It is a complex situation, and unless there is an increase in South Australia's entitlement under the River Murray Waters Agreement, as was the situation when the Dartmouth storage was agreed to, naturally South Australia would not be interested in that project if there were no benefits to South Australia, only increased salinity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: Mr. GREGORY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It has been pointed out to me that an inference may have been taken that I have implied that Mr. Gregory in some way acted improperly in relation to a document used by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday. That is not at all true; it was certainly not my intention. I have far too high a respect for that gentleman to make any such suggestion. I was simply using the fact that the State Transport Authority was just one of the authorities which had considered the document and its implications as an example of the widespread circulation it had already had.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Meat Corporation Act, 1936-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to bring about a restructuring of the finances of the South Australian Meat Corporation. On 5 June 1980, I announced to this House the appointment of Mr. G. J. Inns, Director-General, Premier's Department, as Chairman of the South Australian Meat Corporation, to take effect from 1 July 1980. I told members that Mr. Inns would be seconded from his full-time position for an initial period of six months to undertake a special assignment in finalising a corporate plan and proposing a financial restructuring of the corporation. In particular, I said that the project would cover the following specific terms of reference:

- (a) effect a financial restructuring of the corporation;
- (b) develop and put into effect a corporate plan for the future role of Samcor, taking into account the recently enacted meat hygiene legislation;
- (c) arrange for the disposal of land surplus to the requirements of Samcor;
- (d) propose a new corporate structure for the corporation's future administration; and

(e) restructure the Port Lincoln works.

I went on to say:

I appreciate that this is a formidable task but it is one that we undertook to take on. I believe that I know what is required in order to achieve results and still bring the committed service to the consuming public and the producers of this State, and, at the same time, reduce the millstone this State has suffered for too many years from the losses surrounding this service works.

I am pleased to announce that the first three of these terms of reference have been completed, and work is progressing in the remaining two areas of the project.

Mr. Inns has formally reported to me on the proposed corporate plan for Samcor, on a proposal for a complete restructuring of the corporation's finances, including the disposal of surplus assets, and on a range of alternative options to determine the extent of the corporation's future role. I will outline the decisions which the Government has taken and, for the general information of members, I will table an overview of the corporate plan. It adequately covers the essential objectives for the operations of the corporation for the next three years, and I am aware of the interest shown by the member for Salisbury in relation to that particular overview plan.

The Government examined a number of options for the future of the Gepps Cross abattoir, which is operated by the South Australian Meat Corporation. It must now be acknowledged that by any commercial test Samcor cannot trade out of its present financial difficulties, and were it a privately owned abattoir it would undoubtedly be placed in a receiver's hands to be either closed down, sold, or otherwise dealt with. However, because it is believed that in this State there is a responsibility to maintain a significant service abattoir, it has been decided by the Government to continue Gepps Cross as a statutory authority, but in a restructured form.

The South Australian Meat Corporation was established by the previous Government just over eight years ago, and for most of that time the Gepps Cross works has operated at a loss. As at the end of the current financial year those losses have accumulated to just over \$20 000 000, taking into account the extraordinary write-down in the value of assets last year. This accumulated deficit, coupled with extensive capital borrowings for expansion and plant improvement with the assistance of substantial Government guarantees, now means that the corporation's debts amount to \$28 520 000. Its annual interest burden is just over \$2 700 000.

There are a number of reasons why this situation has occurred. Some reflect on the previous Government's handling of the problem. Sufficient for me to say now, however, that the high cost of debt servicing, coupled with high depreciation charges, a decline of Samcor's market share, and adverse trends in the industry brought about by drought and restocking all mean that in the foreseeable future and in the present circumstances the corporation will be unable to generate sufficient operating profits to overcome the effect of these factors.

However, it is some consolation to learn from the 1979-80 annual report of the corporation that it has been able that year to produce an operating profit of some \$1 100 000. That is, of course, before the payment of interest and depreciation, which change the profit situation into one of substantial loss. However, what this indicates is that, if some substantial relief is provided to Samcor from its interest and depreciation costs, net profits are achievable in times of reasonable seasonal conditions.

The Government has decided that some bold steps must be taken to place Samcor in a position which will give the corporation sufficient incentive (free from the debt

burden) to operate in the future as an efficient service abattoir and to compete on a reasonable, but not favoured, commercial basis with operators in the private sector. The meat hygiene legislation has laid the foundation for that to happen. As an additional part of the programme to achieve this objective, the Government has determined that Samcor should not be required to provide at its own cost an open-ended service. It will refer to this aspect further in a moment.

The corporate plan, which has been endorsed by the Government and a summary of which is tabled, underlines the new commercial approach that Samcor will be required to adopt. Objectives have been established for the key operational areas of the corporation's activities and, although there are a number of key external factors which are outside Samcor's control, operating profits, at least of the level experienced last year, have been determined as an achievable target.

A new approach to marketing, by assuming a more positive attitude to customer requirements, is already being developed at Gepps Cross, and a marketing consultant has been engaged for a short period to assist the development of this objective. A rationalisation of the production areas within the works is taking place, and proposals to improve personnel relations and control administrative overheads all form part of the detailed corporate plan.

But central to all of the corporate restructuring is the development of a sound financial base for Samcor, and the purpose of this Bill is to bring that about. As I commented earlier, the two single burdening factors that have militated against a profitable operation at Gepps Cross have been high interest and depreciation commitments.

In the corporation's 1978-79 annual report it was indicated that a decision had been taken by the board to write down the corporation's assets to appropriate values. That was done during the financial year just completed and, with the approval of the corporation's auditors, the 1979-80 financial accounts now reflect an agreed value of the assets at Gepps Cross that can be used. The full description and extent of that asset write-down is contained in the latest annual report.

It is the alleviation of the interest burden that necessitates the legislation currently before the House. In adopting a commercial role for Samcor, the Government believes that its financial accounts should be structured accordingly. If Samcor was a privately owned abattoir, its capital structure would reflect a reasonably high ratio of equity funding in relation to borrowings.

At present, Samcor's capital structure is made up entirely of borrowed funds. The purpose of this Bill is to relieve Samcor of the direct liability for servicing a substantial proportion of its accrued liabilities so as to reflect an appropriate ratio of debt to equity in the corporation's capital structure. The objectives are two-fold:

- (a) to give Samcor the incentive to perform without the burden of capital and interest being reflected in its accounts in the annual loss or profit; and
- (b) to enable that performance to be assessed without the need to make allowance for financial encumbrances incurred over a long period by previous boards.

Having regard to the capital structure of a number of private companies in the industry, the Government believes that a ratio of equity to borrowings for Samcor would be about 4 to 1.

It is intended to adopt this gearing ratio, which will require the Government to take direct responsibility for

approximately \$2 500 000 of Samcor's annual interest burden. Of course, the Government has always had indirect responsibility for this debt by virtue of the Treasurer's formal guarantee and the fact that Samcor is a statutory authority. Nevertheless, under this plan the cost to Government would be an additional direct payment of about \$950 000 per annum, because the \$1 550 000 being paid to the corporation for maintenance, depreciation and inspection charges for the northern works would be discontinued.

To effect these transactions, the Samcor Act Amendment Bill proposes to establish a Samcor Deficit Fund which, in addition to the functions already described, will receive amounts paid from the future profits of Samcor calculated according to a notional rate of company tax, and such further amounts agreed between the Minister and the corporation which would be related to a dividend it would pay on share capital if it were a commercial enterprise. From this fund payments will be made to Samcor for the continued maintenance of any slaughtering facility that the Government requires to be available to service excessive demands during peak seasonal conditions. The Government subscribes to the view that, if Samcor is to be given a commercial charter, it cannot be expected to provide an open-ended service by maintaining facilities sufficient to cater for abnormal peaks in supply of animals for slaughter.

At the same time, the Government believes it would be inadvisable at this time to contemplate demolishing or terminating the maintenance of a substantial portion of the facilities at Gepps Cross, and I refer to the northern works in particular. For the next three years, therefore, the Government will assume the responsibility for the cost of maintaining a significant portion of the facilities contained in the northern works by paying to the corporation, through the Samcor Deficit Fund, the sum of \$250 000 per annum for each of the next three years as a major share in that maintenance cost.

One further aspect of the restructuring proposal is the disposal of assets that are now surplus to Samcor's requirements. One such redundant asset that has been identified is 164 hectares of land situated to the east of Main North Road. The Government has accepted a proposal that the land be transferred to the Department of Lands to determine, with the approval of Cabinet, its future use and to supervise its subsequent disposal.

In return for the transfer of the land, the Government will pay to Samcor \$4 000 000 in working capital which, in the financial accounts of the corporation, will be regarded as consideration for sale of an existing asset. An appropriation of this amount was made from Loan Account to Deposit Account in June 1980. This payment, therefore, will have no effect on the 1980-81 Budget. It is intended that these new financial arrangements will be effective from the beginning of the current financial year.

The package means relief for Samcor and an opportunity for the corporation to prove itself in a competitive climate, operating on a proper commercial basis. The decision should have been taken long ago in a situation for which previous Governments must bear considerable criticism.

I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amending Act will be retrospective to 1 July 1980. Clause 3 places the

corporation under the control and direction of the Minister.

Clause 4 enacts new sections 54 and 55 of the principal Act. New Section 54 enables the Minister to assume liabilities of the corporation. New section 55 establishes a fund at the Treasury, to be administered by the Minister, and to be known as the Samcor Deficit Fund. The fund is to consist of moneys provided by Parliament and moneys paid into the fund by the corporation. These latter moneys are to consist of the amount by which the corporation benefits by reason of its exemption from company tax, and any remaining balance of profits. The Minister is required to pay out of the fund amounts required to satisfy liabilities assumed by him under new section 54, and amounts required to reimburse the corporation for costs incurred or to be incurred by it in maintaining plant and machinery, at the direction of the Minister, plant and equipment in excess of what would be required if the corporation functioned solely on a commercial basis. Any surplus in the fund is to be paid into general revenue.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOCCER FOOTBALL POOLS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 February. Page 2753.)

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): The Opposition believes that this is a very important Bill; it departs from the general principle that has existed in this State since 1965, that a private organisation be given the opportunity to conduct major fund raising competitions in relation to gambling that have not previously existed in this State. Because the Bill relates to gambling, the Opposition regards it as a conscience issue.

I will refer first to the various forms of gambling, which has become a very important aspect of State Government finances. I point out that any analysis of such revenue comparisons between the States is both complex and confusing; however, for the purpose of the comparison, I refer to a statistical table based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics publication, *Taxation Review on Gambling*, dealing with the major sources of revenue to the States in the past five years, and I seek leave to have this table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

	S.A.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Qld.	W.A.	Tas.	Total
1974-75							
Lottery Taxes	4.0	25.6	26.8	7.4	3.9	0.3	67.9
Poker Machines Tax	—	71.9	—	—	—	—	71.9
Racing Taxes	8.3	51.5	48.1	16.7	9.5	2.2	136.2
Other	—	—	1.5	—	—	1.8	3.3
1974-75 Total	12.3	149.0	76.3	24.1	13.4	4.3	279.4
1975-76							
Lottery Taxes	5.4	27.3	39.5	7.6	5.5	0.3	85.9
Poker Machines Tax	—	83.4	—	—	—	—	83.4
Racing Taxes	9.9	62.8	56.6	19.4	11.2	2.4	162.3
Other	—	5.2	1.0	0.2	—	1.9	8.3
1975-76 Total	15.3	178.8	97.1	27.3	16.7	4.7	339.9
1976-77							
Lottery Taxes	6.3	29.5	58.2	8.6	5.9	1.1	109.6
Poker Machine Tax	—	92.0	—	—	—	—	92.0
Racing Taxes	11.2	70.5	62.9	20.8	12.3	2.8	180.7
Other	—	5.8	1.5	2.4	—	2.5	12.3
1976-77 Total	17.5	197.9	122.6	31.9	18.2	6.4	394.5
1977-78							
Lottery Taxes	8.6	31.1	72.8	8.8	6.2	1.7	129.2
Poker Machines Tax	—	98.2	—	—	—	—	98.2
Racing Taxes	11.4	78.8	66.1	21.2	13.8	3.0	194.3
Other	—	6.4	1.8	1.9	—	2.3	12.5
1977-78 Total	20.0	214.6	140.7	31.8	20.0	7.0	434.1
1978-79							
Lottery Taxes	15.2	33.4	82.0	9.5	6.2	2.5	148.8
Poker Machines Tax	—	108.0	—	—	—	—	108.0
Racing Taxes	11.1	84.7	67.3	23.3	15.1	3.0	204.5
Other	—	8.5	2.7	3.2	—	2.9	17.3
1978-79 Total	26.2	234.5	152.0	36.1	21.3	8.5	478.6

Source: A.B.S. publication *Taxation Revenue, Australia, 1978-79* (Catalogue No. 5506.0). Table 8 "State and "

Mr. SLATER: The table shows that, in 1974-75, the total receipts to South Australia from this major source of revenue, gambling, was \$12 300 000; in 1978-79, the total revenue from gambling was \$26 200 000, an increase of about 100 per cent. A similar pattern has been shown in every other State. It may be significant to note that in 1974-75, lottery receipts in South Australia were \$4 000 000, and racing taxes amounted to \$8 300 000; in 1978-79, lottery taxes amounted to \$15 200 000 and racing taxes amounted to \$11 100 000. This indicates very clearly that the success of the South Australian Lotteries Commission, in increasing its activities and turnover, resulted in an increase of nearly 400 per cent to the revenue of the State. The South Australian Lotteries Commission has, therefore, become a very major contributor to State revenue from gambling activities.

It may be of interest to honourable members to recall the history of the Lotteries Commission and the public support that it has received since its inception in May 1967. Honourable members may recall that a referendum was held in South Australia in 1965, and the public of this State voted very decisively in favour of the introduction of a State lottery.

I point out that prior to that time the Party in Government, the Liberal Party, was strongly opposed to the introduction of a State lottery. It opposed it, and I can recall the then Premier, Sir Thomas Playford, indicating when the matter was raised, if I can recall his words, that it was like placing poison in the hands of children. He did not believe that lotteries were acceptable to the public of South Australia. However, in due course the Walsh Government conducted a referendum, and legislation was introduced into this House by the then Government and assented to on 3 November 1966. A commission of three was appointed to promote and conduct lotteries in the State of South Australia. Within six months of its appointment, the Lotteries Commission commenced business. The first 50c lottery was drawn on 29 May 1967. Since then the commission has been a success story in its methods, management and operation. I believe it still has the wholehearted support of the vast majority of South Australians.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It has the support of this House, too, of course, in the light of the Bill passed yesterday.

Mr. SLATER: That is correct. The Minister reminds me that we passed an amendment to the State Lotteries Act yesterday. I will be mentioning that during my remarks, as it has some significance. Lotteries activities have become an important aspect of Government revenue raising. Any activity which may detract from the commission's operations must, therefore, be carefully considered. This Bill for the introduction of soccer pools in South Australia must be given careful attention. If this Bill passes, there is no doubt that the licence will be afforded to Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd. I do not think there is any doubt that that will be the company to obtain the licence, as it is the operator of soccer pools in every other State except Western Australia.

I point out that that company is a subsidiary of the Vernon organisation of the United Kingdom, which I understand has the sole rights in relation to the United Kingdom soccer competition, which means, of course, that any other persons or organisations wanting to conduct soccer pools would have to find a different competition on which to organise their activities if they wish to obtain a large slice of the action (if I may use that term).

I think it is important for me to look at Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. The two major shareholders are, as

I have pointed out, the Vernon organisation, and News Limited. It is virtually impossible for any other organisation to run this pool if it is based on the United Kingdom operation. Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. was incorporated in Victoria in 1974. It registered in South Australia on 19 November 1980. The Attorney-General consented to its registration as a foreign company on 3 October 1980. Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. is represented by its agent in South Australia, Donald Gordon Bramwell. The company's office is situated at 45 Grenfell Street. Its accountants are Deloitte, Haskins and Sells. The directors of the company are John Randall Kennerley, of 24 Fletcher Street, Woollahra, New South Wales; Brian Patrick Morris, of 54a Collins Road, St. Ives, New South Wales, who is also a director of News Limited and United Telecasters (the 0-10 network); Anthony Simpson Furze, of 6 Canberra Grove, Brighton, Victoria; and Robert James Fenwick, of 5 Millers Road, Maraybya, New South Wales. The company has a nominal capital of \$1 000 000 in \$1 shares. At present, two shares have been issued—

Mr. Keneally: Fully paid up, I hope.

Mr. SLATER: Fully paid up—to F. L. Birch, one share, and H. J. Beitzel, one share, so it is, in South Australia, a \$2 company. There is no doubt that the assets of the major company would protect that situation. I think it is important that we look at the memorandum of association of Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd., as follows:

1. The name of the company is Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Limited
2. The objects for which the company is established are:
 - (a) To establish promote and carry on all lawful forms of pari-mutual and pool forecasts and competitions upon the results of soccer matches and other suitable forms of sport.
 - (b) To carry on business as capitalists, financiers, concessionaires, manufacturers and merchants and to undertake and carry on and execute all kinds of financial commercial manufacturing, trading and other operations and to carry on any other business which may seem to be capable of being conveniently carried on in connection with any of these objects or calculated directly or indirectly to enhance the value of or facilitate the realisation of or render profitable any of the company's property or rights.

It is expressly declared that each subclause of this clause shall be construed independently of the other subclauses hereof and that none of the objects mentioned in any subclause shall be deemed to be merely subsidiary.

3. The powers of the company shall include each of the powers set out in paragraphs 1 to 26 (inclusive) in the Third Schedule to the Companies Act, 1961.

The memorandum continues, later:

The capital of the company is \$1 000 000 divided into \$1 000 000 shares of \$1 each with power to increase or reduce such capital and to divide the shares in the capital or increased capital for the time being into several classes—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Is that the memorandum of the South Australian registered company?

Mr. SLATER: No, this is the memorandum of the company from 1961, I think when incorporated in Victoria. No doubt, it is still applicable to South Australia as well as being registered as a foreign company.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What is the paid up capital?

Mr. SLATER: I do not know what is the paid up capital for the company throughout Australia. The memorandum of association continues:

5. (a) The directors shall have power to refuse to register any transfer of shares and they shall in no case be bound to

assign any reason for so refusing and their decision shall be absolute.

(b) The number of members of the company is limited to not more than 50 (counting joint holders of shares as one person and not counting any person in the employment of the company or of its subsidiary or any person who while previously in the employment of the company or of its subsidiary was and thereafter has continued to be a member of the company).

(c) Any invitation to the public to subscribe for any shares in or debentures of the company is prohibited.

(d) Any invitation to the public to deposit money with the company for fixed periods or payable at call whether bearing or not bearing interest is prohibited.

I do not want to convey that I am suggesting that there is anything improper, anything unlawful, concerning Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited. However, it causes us some concern that a group of private individuals with far-reaching connections in the United Kingdom and throughout the world as stated in the articles of association of the company, should have the sole rights to operate an undertaking of this nature in South Australia when it could have been organised just as well, perhaps in a different form, by a recognised organisation of which I have spoken previously, that is, the South Australian Lotteries Commission. I appreciate that there would have been some difficulties in running only soccer pools, but the point I am making is that there were other opportunities to use the South Australian Lotteries Commission to obtain money for sport and recreation.

I believe that the Lotteries Commission approached the Government and asked for the opportunity to provide special conventional lotteries, the money from which would have reverted to a special sport and recreation fund. However, unfortunately that proposal was not accepted. Perhaps the Minister can tell us why the South Australian Lotteries Commission's offer was not accepted. Was it because the Australian Soccer Pools proposal was in vogue at that time and the Government was considering it? I do not want to draw any inferences from the fact that the company registered itself in South Australia only a short time after the present Government came into office. The Minister has said in his second reading explanation that the company had made approaches to the previous Government. That is true, but the proposals made to the previous Government were not acceptable, because we believed that the operation should have been under the control of the South Australian Lotteries Commission. We were not happy that a private organisation should have the option, more or less, to take over such an operation, which is supported basically by the people of South Australia.

We were concerned that it might have some effect on the operation of the Lotteries Commission. Legislation was passed in this House yesterday which indicates that that concern was also felt by the Government in introducing legislation to provide the Lotteries Commission the opportunity to pool its prize with other States to ensure that clientele were not lost when the soccer pools come into operation in this State. My personal view is perhaps based on the first experience that Australian Soccer Pools had in Australia when operations were introduced into Victoria. As a matter of fact, it got off to a fairly shaky start. There were a number of reasons for this. It was probably because there were other gambling operations in Victoria at that time and people were not adjusted to the scheme. It takes some time to promote any new form of operation.

I point out that, when soccer pools were introduced into New South Wales, Cross Lotto was not in operation, so the New South Wales soccer pools competition got away

to a fairly good start, and it was later that the New South Wales Government sanctioned the introduction of Cross Lotto operations. The reverse applies in this State. Cross Lotto has been doing exceptionally well. I am suggesting that if soccer pools start to operate in this State it might be found difficult during the first 12 months or two years to raise the expectation that Mr. Beitzel expressed in his proposal to the Government. I now refer to a report from Melbourne which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 14 January 1976 and which states, in part:

Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. has lost nearly \$900 000 up to 31 July 1975. The \$879 740 loss has wiped out the \$450 000 capital contributed by Vernons Pools of Britain and Y. V. (M.) Nominees.

The nominee company is operated by Yarwood Vane and Co., chartered accountants, and is believed to house News Limited's stake in Australian Soccer Pools. At 31 July, shareholders' funds stood in a \$429 740 deficit position.

One of the major reasons why the Victorian operation got off to a bad start was that it was the first time that Australian had any experience with these things, and it will also take time in South Australia for the public to adjust.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: There was also an Australian Rules football pool.

Mr. SLATER: Yes, there was.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: And they tried to do it through Tattersalls.

Mr. SLATER: That did not work effectively; it was a flop, because the success of any of these operations is in the promise and the opportunity to win a really large prize.

The Minister has referred to the fact that when the Labor Party was in Government it considered the introduction of soccer pools. We did have approaches, and perhaps that might be regarded as consideration. I want to refer to previous questions raised when the Dunstan Government was in power. I refer to *Hansard* of 16 August 1977, page 447, where the following Question on Notice, asked by the member for Hanson, was recorded:

Has the Government given further consideration to the establishment of football pools in South Australia and, if so—

(a) what were the findings;

(b) what action does the Government intend to take; and

(c) if the Government does not intend to take action, why not?

The reply from Premier Dunstan was "No". He went on to outline the soccer pools operations effective at that time. He mentioned the Victorian operation, which was not doing so well, and said that an operation had recently been introduced in Queensland. I do not need to read out all the information given in the answer, which basically was "No". The then Premier also said that there was no worthwhile advantage in introducing it into South Australia and impeding the steady growth of Cross Lotto. That was the opinion of the Government at that time concerning the introduction of soccer pools into South Australia. That view did not change greatly up until the time the present Government came into office. We firmly believed, and still believe, that it would be far better for the South Australian Lotteries Commission to conduct a conventional lottery for the benefit of sport and recreation in this State.

However, there is no doubt that the licence mentioned in the Bill will be afforded to Australian Soccer Pools, for the reasons I have already stated. I wish to put to the Minister a question regarding the Totalizator Agency Board agencies acting as agents for Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. The second reading explanation refers to

persons acting as agents, and I would like to know whether the T.A.B. will be receiving the 12½ per cent agent's commission and what will be the arrangements between the T.A.B. and Soccer Pools. It is important for us to know what are the arrangements.

Since the time in 1976 when the operation of soccer pools in Victoria got off to a shaky start, no doubt the position has been recovered significantly. There is no doubt about that from the revenue received by the various Governments since that time. A sum of \$9 000 000 accrued to the New South Wales Government last year from soccer pools taxation, because in that State the Government receives 30 per cent of the total turnover, a fairly significant contribution to State Government revenue.

When soccer pools were introduced into New South Wales, the legislation provided that 50 per cent of the 30 per cent to the Government went to Consolidated Revenue and 50 per cent to a sport and recreation fund. In 1976, the legislation in New South Wales was amended to provide for 75 per cent for the sport and recreation fund and 25 per cent to Consolidated Revenue, suggesting that, with the increasing operation of Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd., the New South Wales Government believed that more money should be provided from the fund for recreation and sport.

I understand that to promote the operation in South Australia, to get it off the ground, Australian Soccer Pools intends to spend more than \$2 000 000 in advertising and general promotional work to ensure that it captures the South Australian market to some degree. We are concerned that the South Australian Lotteries Commission might need to compete and to increase its advertising in order to offset any losses that may occur. Additional advertising on the part of the Lotteries Commission could detract from its overall result, and money that was available to the Hospital Fund from that result would decline.

There is a remarkable similarity between the operation of Cross Lotto and the operation of soccer pools, although some who follow soccer closely claim that there is some degree of skill in picking the draws and the winners. However, the entry forms are remarkably similar, with the crossing off of numbers. In the soccer pools form, the numbers go to 55, with 11 numbers to be crossed out, while the Cross Lotto form shows 40 numbers, with six to be crossed out. It may be that participation in the soccer operation will detract from the operations of the Lotteries Commission.

The selling point made by the Minister and the Government in the introduction of soccer pools has been that it will significantly benefit sport in South Australia. I am not opposed to that. Members on this side believe that sport and recreation should have been provided with resources greater than those being afforded it by the present Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I believe that all Governments should spend more money on sport and recreation.

Mr. SLATER: The previous Government introduced the Sport and Recreation Division. Ours was the Government that introduced funding for recreation and sport. Five or six years ago, we were regarded throughout Australia as the trendsetters in that direction.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I don't think we have ever criticised you for that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the honourable member needs any assistance from his colleagues.

Mr. SLATER: Unfortunately, that situation has been reversed. A perusal of the Budget allocations for 1980-81

shows that, of all the States, South Australia is lagging behind the others in direct funding for sport. Concern has been expressed, quite justifiably, by sporting bodies throughout South Australia. I believe that they are entitled to a greater priority from the Government in relation to funding, and I take it from the Minister's comments a few moments ago that he agrees. I take it, too, that he has run into some difficulties with his Cabinet colleagues in relation to Budget allocations for recreation and sport. I lay the blame not at the feet of the Minister but at the feet of the Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Where did the other States get their funds?

Mr. SLATER: From Budget allocations. I do not think that they got them out of a sport and recreation fund from soccer pools. We do not want to see this Government given an opportunity to get money from a source outside the normal budgetary allocation. We believe that the Budget allocation should be maintained; it should be increased. There should be no excuse for the Government to deny its obligation to recreation and sport. Comparing Budget allocations for 1980-81 directly for sport, South Australia allocated \$206 000, New South Wales \$659 000, Victoria \$625 000, Western Australia \$500 000, and Queensland \$1 750 000, of which \$1 200 000 was for junior coaching. The figures show quite conclusively that this State is lagging in the funding of recreation and sport.

We have had letters from various people associated with recreation and sport in South Australia asking us to support the Bill. I am supporting the Bill (it is a conscience vote), and I am asking my colleagues to do the same, but it is up to them. I believe that the operation, not necessarily the soccer pools operation but another form of lottery, could have been handled just as well by the South Australian Lotteries Commission. I do not want to appear over-parochial, but I am not happy about an international monopoly cartel which expresses itself, in its memorandum and articles, as a capitalist financier, operating soccer pools in this State, because the operation would not be for the benefit of sport and recreation. That organisation is in it for its own benefit, because it will make a quid out of it, and it will do pretty well.

Mr. Keneally: Holding out the carrot—

Mr. SLATER: It is a carrot held out to the sport and recreation people of South Australia. In the Committee stage, I will be asking questions about the distribution of the fund. It appears as though the Minister will have absolute discretion. The Bill provides for the distribution of funds to be made with the approval of the Minister. I would like to see an advisory committee of perhaps five people, some of whom are associated with recreation and sport, which could advise the Minister on the distribution of the fund, because I am afraid that some of the organisations may be disillusioned if their expectations are not fulfilled. I have received letters from organisations associated with sport, all of which are in some degree of financial need. I would not like to see those people disillusioned or deluded by being told by the Minister that there is no money for them from the fund until the next financial year. This happens now in the normal Budget allocations.

I think the Bill should provide for the setting up of an advisory committee comprising persons associated with recreation and sport. I think that would give a fairer and more equitable opportunity for the Minister to decide who will benefit from the fund. I would hate to think that the Government would follow the philosophy it has adopted in some cases of taxation, whereby the more affluent members of the society are the beneficiaries as opposed to those in greatest need. It is always difficult to determine

which is the area of greatest need. I do not want to cast an aspersion on the Minister; I believe he would act with discretion.

An honourable member: You're very kind.

Mr. SLATER: I am a kind bloke, as I think members should realise. I think I have been fairly kind to the promoters of Australian Soccer Pools, despite some antagonism I have towards its methods of operation. I support the Bill, not for its benefit but for the benefit of recreation and sport in South Australia. The Labor Party recognises quite sincerely the need for a substantial boost in funding. We do not want to see this method used as an excuse for the Government to avoid its responsibility for Budget allocation for recreation and sport. I do not think it should be used as an excuse; I think it should be additional to the Budget allocation, which needs to be increased anyway.

It is my understanding that the Lotteries Commission put forward a submission which was not accepted, and Australian Soccer Pools will obtain the licence. I hope that my decision to support this Bill will prove to be correct. The Bill is almost identical to the New South Wales Act and Acts in other States covering racing, gaming, and so on. I will reserve my judgment on its success and hope that it does not affect other forms of gambling activity in South Australia.

In the past eight or nine years, there have been opportunities for sport and recreation bodies to raise funds through minor lotteries. Many social, charitable and sporting bodies raise money through the minor lotteries legislation which is operated by the Division of Recreation and Sport. The amount of money raised in this way is fairly small when compared with the Cross Lotto operation or even soccer pools. I hope that the introduction of soccer pools will not affect this type of activity. I do not think it will, but there is always the thought that this could occur. I think many small sporting and charitable organisations have benefited greatly through the opportunity to run minor lotteries. I recall many years ago being associated in my youth with sporting clubs. At that time it was illegal to participate in a 20c raffle. Not many people were prosecuted for running a 20c raffle, even though it was illegal to do so. We saw the light, and we have moved with the times and legalised small lotteries. Sporting, social and charitable organisations also raise funds through bingo and other licensed operations, and I hope that soccer pools will not affect their operation.

With those remarks, I reserve my judgment on the success or otherwise of soccer pools. I hope it will provide the expected revenue that Mr. Beitzel suggested in his proposal. I think his expectations are a little high for the first two years.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I have assumed that, too.

Mr. SLATER: Yes, I accept that the Government revenue will not come up to the expectations in his proposal.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I think he was looking at \$2 000 000 at one stage.

Mr. SLATER: He mentioned a \$7 300 000 turnover, with \$2 000 000 for Government revenue. I would cut that by about one-third and suggest that in the first 12 months we would get \$600 000, which is a significant amount for recreation and sport.

Even though I do not agree with some of the activities of the promoters, I support the Bill because I believe it will be a boost for recreation and sport in this State. I hope the House will pass the Bill, which will have a conscience vote by members on this side. We do have a conscience, despite the comment made in the press in relation to another matter. I hope we demonstrate conclusively on this

occasion that we do have a conscience. With those few remarks I give my tacit support to the Bill on behalf of recreation and sport.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I do not want to delay the passage of this Bill unnecessarily because I know that the press has played it up substantially and it is expected to be passed without undue delay. I think I ought to start where my colleague finished in relation to its being a conscience vote. We have been told on another matter that members on this side of the House do not have a conscience.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I don't think I said that, did I?

Mr. MAX BROWN: I know that is another matter, but nevertheless I think that it is worth reminding the Minister that it is a conscience Bill. The Opposition has given much consideration to this Bill. I am not particularly happy with it, even though it is well known on this side of the House that I do support gambling. I support lotteries, etc., but on this occasion I have some grave doubts about this aspect of gambling. The Minister smiles at me and I think he would know why I have these doubts.

One of my very grave concerns is that the soccer pools will be private-enterprise controlled. I do not believe that that should be so.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you think it is a dirty word, or are you just philosophically opposed to it?

Mr. MAX BROWN: In my earlier remarks, I pointed out that I had some reservations about the Bill, which I am trying to state. My major reservation is that it will be private-enterprise controlled. Sporting bodies are writing to all members of Parliament and saying that they want us to support this Bill. They might regret having done so. If the Bill is passed, it is possible that those people who are now jumping on the bandwagon might regret it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Why is that?

Mr. MAX BROWN: The major reason is that in the Bill there is no criteria setting out what funding these sporting bodies might get. I accept that the Minister could ask me how it could be put in the Bill; it would be difficult to do. Also, if the soccer pools are set up, they will be in direct opposition to the State lottery. I am not particularly happy about that, either. The State lottery and various gambling activities were set up by referendum. I suggest that this legislation has been brought in through the back door, and not through any reasonable democratic procedure.

I can remember well that, some years ago, when a private member introduced a Bill into this House for establishing a casino, which may have assisted the State, many, if not all, Government members voted against that. I will be very interested to see whether those Government members who voted against a casino being established, and who caused such a ruckus about it, will stand up and be counted in opposing this Bill.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: There is a difference between soccer pools and a casino.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, Murdoch and Sangster will get plenty out of this; they were not going to get plenty out of the other measure. In reality, there is not such a big difference. This is not a casino Bill, as the Minister rightly pointed out. He is baiting me on this. I will be interested to see which Government members vote for this Bill.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They are not comparable.

Mr. MAX BROWN: We will see. I have expressed my sincere concern about the legislation. The Government first brought it in by implying that it would afford a financial boost for the numerous small athletic organisations throughout the State.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I think you overstated that.

Mr. MAX BROWN: You suggested it, and brought it about by stealth.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I didn't say that.

Mr. MAX BROWN: You could have fooled me, considering all the letters I have had.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I did not write to them.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Of course not.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Keneally): Order! The honourable Minister is not helping the debate by continually interjecting. He should let the honourable member for Whyalla make his speech.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am pleased you are in the Chair, Sir, to protect me. The Minister has implied that that is what will happen. I sincerely question whether there will be any guarantee whether the funds will fully be made available from funds that the soccer pools have or do not have available. The Government might deliberately or otherwise sidetrack that money in from pools to another area.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MAX BROWN: Do not tell me that the member for Glenelg is going to sit there and suggest that this Government has not already done it.

Mr. Becker: Your Government did it—a bunch of thieves.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I heard the honourable member for Hanson say that the previous Government was a bunch of thieves. I ask him to withdraw that statement.

Mr. BECKER: I was making a statement in relation to the Hospitals Department—

The ACTING SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to withdraw unconditionally his statement that the previous Government was a bunch of thieves. It was definitely unparliamentary. I am not asking him to explain.

Mr. BECKER: If you wish, I shall withdraw. I still reckon they rigged the books.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! This is somewhat painful to the Chair. I should not have to continually remind the honourable member for Hanson that his further remark is also unparliamentary. He has further stated that the previous Government rigged the books. I ask him to withdraw that comment, unconditionally. If he wishes to make comments at all, he should make them under his breath, so that the Chair does not hear them. Once those comments are heard, the Chair is forced to take action.

Mr. BECKER: Can you advise me where in Standing Orders it says that this is unparliamentary?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is the ruling of the Chair that for any member of Parliament to impute to the previous Government an attitude or practice of that kind is unparliamentary. If the honourable member wishes, he can move dissent against the Chair's ruling, but I point out that it would be much easier for him to withdraw the implication against the previous Government, because it is clearly contrary to Standing Orders.

Mr. BECKER: If that is your instruction, Sir, yes, but I reserve the right to prove what I said.

Mr. MAX BROWN: To clarify what I said before the interruptions, I point out that it would be quite easy for the present Government or any other Government to use some of the money that would originate from these pools in another area. If members want any further proof of that, they have only to look at the policy of the present Government, which has spent less money on sport than the previous Labor Government or any other Government. Further, that situation spells out quite conclusively that what I am saying is correct. There is no criteria in this

Bill (and the member for Glenelg and other members opposite can laugh if they like) to provide that a certain sum will be made available to sport.

I go a little further by saying that, in my understanding, the Bill gives Robert Sangster and Rupert Murdoch the right to print money. That is what it is all about. We might question whether I use these gentlemen's names in vain, but if we look at the Bill and the statements that have been made in the press, we see reference to the Vernon Pools syndicate. We can trace all of the names that are to the forefront in this connection, but in the background is the name of Robert Sangster. The member for Glenelg could argue that I am jealous of Robert Sangster because he goes to the yearling sales and outbids me, but for the benefit of the honourable member, who argues about the question of the Vernon Pools, I point out the following definition in clause 2:

"approved representative", in relation to a licensee, means a person appointed pursuant to section 10 to be an approved representative of that licensee, being a person for the time being approved, or within a class for the time being approved, by the Minister under that section:

That means that the Bill provides a licence to Robert Sangster and Rupert Murdoch to print money. As I pointed out before I was rudely interrupted on several occasions, Cross Lotto was introduced into this State by referendum, and this Bill ignores that concept.

Mr. Evans: What about Instant Money?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is run by the Lotteries Commission. What are we talking about? The Lotteries Commission was set up as a public utility, and this Bill ignores that concept. Initially, the State agent in South Australia for soccer pools will be the T.A.B. I am very concerned whether we will be opening the door to arguments from sporting bodies as to their entitlement under this scheme. The question of control arises. Who is in the best position to manage the ordinary running of fund raising? I come back to the two faithfuls—Robert Sangster and Rupert Murdoch. Why?

Mr. Mathwin: That's what you are really getting at.

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is right.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member for Glenelg that he should cease interjecting. He will have his chance to speak in the second reading debate later.

Mr. Mathwin: I was trying to help, that's all.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have already told the honourable member for Glenelg that he should cease interjecting. He must not reply to rulings of the Chair.

Mr. MAX BROWN: This Bill provides a complete franchise for the Vernon Pools, which is operated by Robert Sangster and Rupert Murdoch: there is no question about that. If anyone wants to argue this point, they should look at the history of the Vernon Pools. Why are Vernon Pools involved? This is a conscience vote, and I wonder how to overcome this problem. The Minister pointed out, quite rightly, that Vernon Pools are in existence at present; they operate in New South Wales and Victoria, and will operate in South Australia in the future. If we go to the full capacity in regard to Vernon Pools and Robert Sangster, we see that he is involved in a worldwide organisation. Obviously, Vernon Pools is miles in front, as the Minister has suggested.

Because I cannot, for the life of me, see how the Minister expects the Bill to operate, I ask him who will obtain the funds that will be derived from running the pools. Are there any specific guidelines? I can see no real guidelines, but perhaps I am wrong. A number of organisations have written to me in regard to this Bill, such as the Olympic Council and the Amateur Association,

whose plight is quite genuine. I have no argument with that. Those organisations are worse off this year than they ever were under a Labor Government. They are in a somewhat false situation.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Where do you want the money to come from?

Mr. Mathwin: He wants to nationalise it so that there will be no profit.

Mr. MAX BROWN: All I am saying is that there is no criteria in this Bill that those people will get the money that they might be expecting to get. Perhaps the Minister, in the Committee stage, could spell out how the criteria are to be derived; if he can do that, I might owe him an apology. There is no such guarantee in the Bill.

I turn now to the State Lotteries Commission's attitude to this legislation. I am a little confused about it, because, as I understand from a press statement which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 12 February, the Lotteries Commission was suggesting that it did not want to have anything to do with this particular exercise. In fact, it had apparently given some careful consideration to it, although I cannot understand why, after giving consideration to it, it was not prepared to come to the party. I believe that this legislation will have some serious effects on the State lotteries. I suggest to the Minister and to the Government that, first, the South Australian Lotteries Commission will, initially at least, have to spend a considerable amount of money on promotion, money that it would not necessarily have had to spend if it had taken over the franchise for this exercise in this State.

I do not know offhand how much money would be needed for promotion, but I suggest to the Minister it would be considerable, particularly for an exercise like Cross Lotto. Let us be truthful about this: a soccer pool (and I may get into some difficulty about this with some of my constituents who were born and bred in the United Kingdom) is nothing more than Cross Lotto. Any other suggestion is pure fallacy, in my opinion. I suggest that soccer pools would be in direct opposition to South Australian lotteries and to Cross Lotto. There is no question about that. Bear in mind, of course, that South Australian lotteries and Cross Lotto could not possibly have the pool that this soccer pool will obviously have sooner or later.

I am suggesting that the Lotteries Commission is not as wise as it thought it was when it declined the opportunity to participate in this pool. I suggest to the House, rightly or wrongly, that the Vernon Pools operation could counter any extra publicity that the South Australian Lotteries Commission would have to enter into to be in opposition to soccer pools. Soccer pools will have the full weight of the Murdoch press behind it. I suggest that it will have Rupert Murdoch, Channel 9 and the *Adelaide News* behind it, which would not bill it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The Lotteries Commission will have had a good start, because it has got the block.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The Minister is baiting me, but his explanation is quite correct on this occasion. I am saying that, in the long run, this will force the South Australian Lotteries Commission to spend a considerable amount of money on promotion at the expense of the people in this State who play Cross Lotto and Instant Money. Soccer Pools, of course, has the whole force of Rupert Murdoch, who now owns the *Times*, behind it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I am doing exactly that, Sir. This Bill does everything but spell out that Rupert Murdoch and Robert Sangster have a complete franchise to print money. Any other suggestion is pure fallacy. I believe that

we have to deal with that situation, because that is the fact of the matter. I believe seriously that, if Robert Sangster and Rupert Murdoch want to use the T.A.B. facilities as an agency (I suppose we could call it), we will run foul, sooner or later, of the racing industry.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't race fowls.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Glenelg wants to have one of his dizzy spells at this stage. What I am saying is that the T.A.B. is a facility of the racing industry and of the Government, whether the member for Glenelg knows that or not. I am suggesting to him, and to anybody else who wants to argue the point about it, that that will be the position—that sooner or later somebody somewhere will suggest to the Minister that, in fact, they are not getting what they ought to get out of the situation because of these facts.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you mean we will drop off in racing turnover?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Not necessarily, but the Minister knows from a Bill that came into this place that the racing industry is screaming out for money, and that we had to do all sorts of things to assist that industry. It is feasible that, by using the T.A.B. facilities, sooner or later the racing game will ask why, as this money is going through its agencies, it does not get something out of it. I do not think that that is beyond the realms of possibility.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't mind the concept but you don't like the profits.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, I support the concept of soccer pools, but I have some grave doubts about whether this is the way we ought to be handling this matter. In fact, it might, in some shape or form, provide an avenue of opposition to South Australia's lottery and sports situation. On that basis, I will have two bob each way.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): There is no doubt in my mind, or in the mind of any South Australian, that Government spending on sport is not enough. The Minister asked, "Where do we get the money?" I have it from a reliable source that when the former Labor Government lost the last election there was a surplus in the Treasury of \$21 000 000, but this Government decided to do something else with that money, and it cut down on sport funding. There is not the amount of money for sport now which there was under the Labor Government, and which was handled by the Hon. Glen Broomhill. Money had to come from somewhere for this Government's plans, and it appears that the amateurs in all realms of sport in this State are in dire straits, as is shown in reports in the newspapers, which I will comment on later.

I hope the Minister can inform the House that we are once again going back to the right level to make sure that sports people in this State get a just deal from the Government. I do not think that soccer pools will be as great as it is said they will. I do not oppose the Bill; I think it is a good thing and, if handled properly, it will be of benefit to many people. However, I do not think it will benefit as many people as is thought. We can remember the days when these forms of gambling first started, and I can remember when clubs used to have refreshments and all types of raffles, etc., such as guessing the length of a piece of string to show skill. I can remember that in those days this was tolerated, although occasionally at fetes someone was raided, but never were such things properly policed. During those times there was no thought of soccer pools or anything like that.

I must admit that Sir Thomas Playford, who headed the Government of the day, was a very astute politician, for which I give him great credit. However, during that time a member moved that, in the opinion of this House, lotteries

should be introduced in South Australia, and lotteries were later introduced by the Walsh Government. It was decided to have a referendum. That indicates how far away the Government of the day was from allowing gambling of any type. I shall be interested to listen to what other honourable members have to say on this matter. When the vote was taken, over 70 per cent of people in this State were in favour of lotteries and the Government received money from those lotteries. We now have bingo tickets, beer tickets and other things, and the profits from these swell the coffers of the Department of Recreation and Sport. Also, we now have Cross Lotto. Things have completely changed. One can go into bowling clubs and similar places which now have licences for machines for cash tickets and beer tickets.

I do not say that this has improved sport, but it has definitely improved the situation, in that clubs now have more money and are able to keep fees down. Not every club can do this, especially those in the amateur field. However, money is channelled back for recreation and sport. I am not sure what levy is put on these tickets. I also do not know what the beer ticket levy is, because such tickets are sold through hotels. I do not know what amount of money is channeled back into recreation and sport, and am interested to find out. I might be told by the Premier that I am a lazy politician, and I do not want that kind of criticism levelled at me. The point is that it would be very awkward for me to go right through all the areas to find out what money is obtained from bingo tickets, beer tickets and other tickets. I hope the Minister can tell me how much money is involved. I will not put a Question on Notice, but I would like to know what money is channelled to the Government, what are the costs of administering these things, and whether the money goes back into sport. The Minister may say that the amount is only minimal. I do not think that soccer pools will make such a big difference. I hope that there is a chance that there will be an inflow of cash for sport.

Like the member for Whyalla, I am a little perturbed about the T.A.B. I do not know whether there will be a separate window for this. We have already gone through the matter concerning the 50c minimum bet for the races, which was increased to \$1. Sometimes it is busy at the T.A.B. and sometimes it is not. Can the Minister say how the operation will be carried out at the T.A.B.? Many people who go to the T.A.B. will not be sure whether they want a soccer pool bet or a racing bet, and I think that one or other of these two forms of betting will prove to be not as profitable as was thought.

As was mentioned by the member for Whyalla, to whom will the 12½ per cent, which amount I consider as running expenses, go? I think the sports people in this State will be up in arms if there is any amount over which does not go into sport, because we all know that sport needs money. I hope that will not be the case.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It is going into a sport fund.

Mr. LANGLEY: I know where the profits are going as this was spelt out by the Minister in the Bill, but I am not so sure about the 12½ per cent. I have another vital concern, as the Minister would know, namely, that during the course of allocating grants, usually the recommendation comes from the Minister and goes to the Sports Advisory Council. When I was on the Sports Advisory Council as a Government member (I think the member for Fisher now represents the Government), it was wonderful to see (and I think it is a credit to members of the Sports Advisory Council) that never at any stage did the members push their own interests, and I presume that it is the same now. I do not know who the members of the Sports Advisory Council are at present, but it was usually

comprised of administrative people and also coaches. I hope that there is a similar group of people on the Sports Advisory council now.

When this measure becomes law, and when the money is flowing, I am sure that similar opportunities will be given for these people to study the operations of recreation and sport areas. When I went to Clare to open a building, I was amazed to see what had been done with a nominal grant of \$2 000. The work was all done by voluntary labour, and I hope such opportunities will be given in future to people of all ages. In that case it was a basketball set-up, and the money the organisation received made everyone very happy. I am sure that this type of help is greatly appreciated, and I am sure that it is a real fillip to sport in the country. It applies to sport in the city as well. Recently, when a grant was given, a member of the then Opposition, now a member of the Government, said he did not know whether it was a good thing to give a grant to people in a certain country town, for the simple reason that it would cause jealousy.

I do not know how the honourable member will vote on this Bill, because that is what will happen. No Government can give money to everyone at once. It must be a gradual process, and the needs of the various bodies must be considered. I was surprised by that statement, and I hope the honourable member has changed his view. Bad conditions do not produce good sports people, but good conditions must improve their game.

I hope the operation of soccer pools will be a success. It is about time the Australian Government did something for sport, because we are at a low ebb in South Australia, and I am sure the other States could also use the money. The Australian Government put back into sport a measly \$13 000 000 for the whole of Australia, although it received almost three times that sum from taxes related to sport. The sporting fraternity must be made aware that, when they buy their sporting equipment, they pay a 15 per cent tax on the purchase. To my mind, that is shocking.

I am sure the Minister would be happy to get that money, and it would be a great fillip for sport throughout Australia, but the Australian Government is not willing to give back to sports people what it takes from them. This must be a political matter, because of the events at the time of the Olympic Games. The Government of the day should do something about it. I was on the Sports Council when Mr. Whitlam was Prime Minister, and we had good relations with the people from Canberra on the matter. We were making progress, but suddenly the position changed. I am sure the Minister does his best to get money for sport, but sport is the first thing to be hit these days.

We in Australia are noted for our excellent sports people who, in many cases, are of world class. I am sure the Minister will do his best in this situation. I believe that it should not be possible to take money from people in this way. I think a cricket bat costs about \$100, and many people have to pay subscriptions to play in the park lands. They have no buildings, they are out in the sun, and in many cases they have to hang their clothes on the fence. I would not like to see that happening in the football season.

Like the member for Whyalla, I am sure that someone will make money out of this operation, and there is no doubt about who that will be. Mr. Murdoch has never been a friend of mine, but he is probably the person concerned in this operation. I would have liked to see the Lotteries Commission running it. No doubt there have been conferences on the matter, and the Government has made its decision, but it worries me that there is a certain amount of money that the Government will not get. In the past, that money has been very helpful to the hospital.

One of the main points relates to the embargo on the use of English soccer games for soccer pools.

Mr. Slater: The franchise.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. That is one of the reasons. We have only to read the paper to know the results. Ever since soccer pools have been mooted, the *News* has used ways and means of promoting the operation, to the detriment of the Government of the day. An article written by Geoff Roach says that we are in a poor state. I thought it was "our State, mate", but he has gone to town on many aspects of the matter. We have received letters from many people in sport asking us to vote for the Bill, but that report sets out what is happening.

One of the problems facing the Minister is that the money is not available. Once this operation commences, hundreds of people will want a share of the money. Referring to grants to help sporting people, the sum of \$206 000 for South Australia was paltry.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: What was that for?

Mr. LANGLEY: For the sports coaching scheme, the allocation was \$98 000, for travel to nationals, \$78 000, and for the conduct of championships, \$30 000.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: And there are Loan funds to add on to that.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. No one is happy about the position. In Tasmania, the allocation was \$253 000, in New South Wales \$659 000, and in Victoria \$625 000. In Victoria I think a small percentage goes to recreation and sport out of daily doubles and trifectas, although I am not sure about that. I would hate the racing clubs to give half a per cent of something for sport! In Western Australia the allocation was \$500 000, and in Queensland it was \$1 750 000. Although we hope that our poor position will be improved, I do not think it will happen quickly.

Athletes who train for the Olympic Games put in many hours of work. The Commonwealth Government helps them with travel, and the State Government with interstate trips. They retain their amateur status, but they must have adequate equipment to support their efforts to become world champions. No-one can become a world champion without giving up time for training and, in many cases, losing employment. Sports people need benefactors if they are to continue on their way. Their supporters have barbecue evenings, social nights, and fancy dress evenings—anything to raise money to ensure that they are able to compete against world class competition.

I congratulate both Governments for helping people to travel interstate for competition. It is very difficult to reach world standard as an amateur who is not allowed to accept money. I do not think Australians will be able to reach world standard until we have a college with sports fields where students can undertake scholastic studies and can also be trained by excellent coaches. I hope this will come one day; it will be a great thing for the people of South Australia and Australia when it does. Just recently a young lady who works in the Education Department almost reached world class in her field. However, I believe that when she goes overseas she will not receive her salary, but I hope I am wrong. We have sporting talent in this country, and I believe this should be encouraged at any cost. Other countries are doing it, and we must have competition to improve our standards. It is a wonderful thing to see the under-age teams playing on Saturday mornings. I think competition brings out the best in people. The Government should do all it possibly can to help people to achieve the highest standard they can in their chosen sport.

I do not want to conclude on a sour note but the SURS scheme, which was introduced by the previous Government, did an excellent job in rehabilitating sporting fields,

but this has been abolished by the Government. I only hope that we do not abolish sport in this State; I do not think that that will be done. I hope the Government in future ensures that people in this State will be given every opportunity to play sport and participate in competitions, even though I know this will cost millions of dollars. I give credit to the people who give up their time voluntarily to help sport. I hope the Government of the day, whichever Party is in power, will ensure that money is made available, not only through this Bill but through other means, to encourage and support sport in this State. I believe the extra expenditure of \$1 000 000 or \$1 500 000 would do much for sport. This would help our sportsmen and sportswomen to reach international standards, and it would not take us long. We will never be able to make everyone happy but we should be able to make the people of this State better sportsmen.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I would like to compliment the three speakers on the Opposition side who have preceded me in this debate, and to point out to those who take the trouble to read *Hansard* that the member for Gilles recently represented Australia in the World Veteran Championships in New Zealand.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He threw the javelin.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, in the field games. I am not too sure whether he came back with medals, but the whole concept of veterans games is to compete and the honourable member certainly did that. He has a history of involvement with sporting bodies in the area in which he has lived all his life. He knows the problems that exist with small sporting groups trying to survive when a share of the dollar is hard to get.

The member for Whyalla, himself an official of sporting clubs in his town, also has had almost a lifetime in sport and we who live in the North know of his activities. The member for Unley is one of South Australia's sporting heroes, one of the greatest all-round sportsmen this State has provided. It is always with interest that I listen to his comments on sport and what is needed in sport to provide the champions, one of whom he was himself. He is a modest man, who will not thank me for saying this, but nevertheless I think it is a compliment that has been well earned. He is a notable South Australian and his views on sport should always be listened to.

When I decided to participate in this debate, I asked myself a few questions, as this is a free vote for members of the Opposition. The questions that I asked myself were as follows:

- (1) Whether sport and recreation should expect greater financial support from Government than it is currently receiving;
- (2) are soccer pools the appropriate mechanism to provide this additional funding;
- (3) will soccer pools have a deleterious effect on the Lotteries Commission and other fund-raising activities that are currently taken part in by small sporting organisations;
- (4) whether Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. is the most suitable promoter; and
- (5) whether I, as an individual, had any objection to this form of gambling?

To answer (5) first, I have no philosophical or moral objection to soccer pools; it is merely another numbers game. In South Australia, we have had Cross Lotto for some time (which has been a successful lotteries activity), and soccer pools are merely an extension of that. Those people who believe that somehow there is a skill involved in soccer pools and who wish to practice that skill will get very poor quickly because it is a game of chance. I do not

have any objection to soccer pools and, if soccer pools are run by the State Lotteries Commission, I would be much in support of them.

Having said where I stand on that issue, which traditionally is one that this Parliament recognises as being a conscience vote, I am anxious to see how the Government members vote. I have been told (it could be unreliable, as some of the information I get might be described in that way) that the members of the Government are going to vote as a bloc on this issue. If that is the case, it rather surprises me because in the 10 years I have been here I have been told many times that members of the Liberal Party are free to vote as they please and never is the Party whip imposed on them, even when the matter is of great importance to the State. I am waiting to see how those democrats on the Government benches vote when the whips crack and the divisions, if any, are taken. I suspect that they have been told to vote with their Minister. Unfortunately, of course, they did not vote with their Minister on another issue which was of so much greater importance to a small group of people in South Australia, not that this present issue is not important—it is.

The answer to my first question of whether sport and recreation should receive greater financial support from the Government than they are currently receiving is quite apparent—they ought to. It has been a continual theme of mine since I have been a member of Parliament that the Government ought to involve itself in a much greater way in financing the various sport and recreation pursuits of the people in South Australia. The only time in the past 10 years that any effort has been made to provide anywhere near adequate finance for sport and recreation was during the time of the Whitlam Government and the Frank Stewart Ministry of Sport and Recreation.

The first Sport and Recreation Department was set up by the then Federal Labor Government, which was soon followed by the South Australian Government, with the Hon. Glen Broomhill, the first Sport and Recreation Minister in South Australia. While we had a Federal Labor Government and State Labor Government, funds flowed to South Australia at a rate not seen before that time, nor since, unfortunately. We had some magnificent sporting complexes constructed throughout South Australia as a result of that co-operation between local, State and Federal Governments.

The member for Rocky River smiles. I think he was the Mayor of Kadina when that town got its handsome complex, which was much needed. It seems strange that with a Labor Government in power Kadina and Loxton, not traditionally strong A.L.P. areas, although at times they have been A.L.P. areas, should have benefited. Whyalla also benefited. I could go on and recount the sporting complexes built in South Australia as a result of this co-operation through the various tiers of Government.

The initiative began with the Federal Government, and in any massive financing of sport in Australia the initiative should remain with the Federal Government, because that is where the money is and where major decisions can be made. I have no criticism of the Recreation and Sport Division in South Australia, nor of the Ministers of that division, because they have been starved of funds. They have had the extremely difficult task of trying to select, from applications running into millions of dollars, to whom should go their paltry \$200 000. The total money available to the division last year for allocation to various sporting bodies could have been spent in my electorate alone, without going to the other 46 electorates in South Australia, and it would hardly have been noticed. The demand is extreme. This is why we have had this carrot

thrust before the sporting organisations here, because they are so desperate for funds. They are anxious to support any activity that will guarantee the funds they need.

This is why the sporting organisations in South Australia are so enthusiastically supporting the soccer pools concept, not necessarily because they think it is good, and not because they want to see Rupert Murdoch and Robert Sangster profit from contributions that the ordinary South Australian makes, but because they know that this present Government will not give them the funds that they need out of Consolidated Revenue. The only way they can get funds is to support a private entrepreneur, no matter who that might be.

Secondly, I asked myself whether the soccer pools were the appropriate mechanism to provide the additional funding. The excuse the Minister uses to justify South Australia participating in the pools is that currently \$30 000 leaves the State every week. That is probably a guess, but it would not surprise me. That \$30 000 would be 60 000 tickets, which is not a great number of tickets to leave South Australia, particularly when the prize money is \$300 000 or \$400 000. That is certainly a lottery in which a lot of soccer supporters in South Australia would participate. They have been going into soccer pools all their lives. We have large ethnic communities in areas such as Elizabeth and Whyalla where people have become accustomed to that. It is an everyday thing to take a ticket in a soccer pool.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: And they enjoy doing it.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. The question is whether that is the appropriate way to raise the funds. I do not believe that it necessarily is, nor that the Minister's argument of \$30 000 a week leaving the State is an adequate reason to participate in soccer pools. Many thousands of dollars leave South Australia every week for Victorian Tatts Lotto and other Victorian lotteries. I have no doubt that thousands of dollars leave South Australia because of higher prize money available elsewhere. Money will leave the State anyway.

If, of course, \$1 500 000 leaves the State every year in soccer pools, and we expect to get about \$600 000 back after the first year, that is a net loss of \$900 000. But, I suppose, that is not an argument I can strongly promote. I do not necessarily believe that soccer pools are the best method of raising the moneys for sports organisations here. It is a Government responsibility to ensure that a certain percentage of the State Budget is directed towards sport and recreation.

I said earlier, in another forum, that it is thought by some that, if the Lotteries Commission were to run a special sports lottery, that would take money away from hospitals. Adequate funding in sport and recreation is preventive medicine and cannot be divorced from money for hospitals. If we have a fit and healthy community participating in sporting and recreational activities, there is a very good chance that we will have less need for hospitalisation, as people get older. Of course, if we are playing teams such as that which the Minister supports, obviously we will have to have casualty sections, and some sportsmen will be injured.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I am glad my officers have left the Chamber.

Mr. KENEALLY: I take the point. There will be casualties, of course, but the long-term effect is a healthier community and less need for hospitals. There is a *quid pro quo*. I am not prepared to accept the argument that the hospitals funding will necessarily be affected dramatically by the Lotteries Commission running a special fund. That brings me to my third query whether or not soccer pools have a deleterious effect on the Lotteries Commission and

other fund-raising activities. They will have an effect, but it is the extent of that effect that is questionable.

I believe that people go into lotteries not because they want to support hospitals, sport and recreation, the racing industry, lacrosse, or any of those associations with no fund-raising capacity, but because they want to win first prize. That is the motivating force. This is the case now, so if the Lotteries Commission was able to provide a million dollar lottery, people would subscribe to it, and that lottery would be completed in addition to the lotteries that the commission is running now, not in place of an existing lottery. The sum of \$1 000 000 a year could be provided to sport and recreation. The Government ought to look at that suggestion.

One thing about this argument that distresses me considerably is whether Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. is the most suitable promoter. Much has already been said about Rupert Murdoch and Robert Sangster. As a Labor Party, we know what conditions Rupert Murdoch places on supporting political Parties, because we know that in 1972, when he went to the Prime Minister, whom he was partly responsible for electing (there is no doubt that the Murdoch press then played a vital part in the election, after so many years, of a Labor Government), he asked for a special favour. The Prime Minister was stunned that that favour should be asked of him. Of course, he said "Not on your Nelly."

Members interjecting:

Mr. KENEALLY: I will tell the honourable member, outside this Chamber what that favour was. It was rejected, and Rupert Murdoch's attitude towards the Labor Party has been pretty consistent since the refusal.

I make a very harsh suggestion in relation to the soccer pools in South Australia, and the Minister should stay while I do so, because I do not want to make the suggestion in his absence: I have a suspicion that Rupert Murdoch is having his *quid pro quo* here. This Bill represents payment for the support he has given the Liberal Party in South Australia: it is the pay-off. That is the way in which Rupert Murdoch acts, and it is not only we in South Australia who know what Rupert Murdoch is looking for. That is the one aspect of the Bill about which I am vitally concerned.

Of course, I expect members of the Government to say that my suggestion is total rubbish. There is no way in the world that they will come out and say, "Yes, the member for Stuart is correct in what he says." We know how that gentleman operates and what he asks in return for his support. The suspicion remains that this is the *quid pro quo*. As I said earlier, sporting organisations have had a carrot placed in front of them: because they are so starved for funds, they have absolutely no option in this question but to support soccer pools because they need the money. If the Government was to approach each of those sporting organisations that have indicated support and say, "The Government is prepared to give a guaranteed percentage of the Budget to sport and recreation" (and I know that it is difficult to tie down Treasurers to things like that, but an undertaking could be given without inclusion in the Bill that support will not fall below a certain figure), I believe that the organisations would not be so enthusiastic about soccer pools.

Let us not forget that the present Government's Budget allocation for sport and recreation last year was a disgrace. Of all Government departments in South Australia, that which suffered the greatest cut in last year's Budget was the Recreation and Sport Division. That is unquestioned. It was in that area that the Government believed that it could make the greatest cuts in expenditure, and this shows the high priority that this Government places on

sport and recreation. It is that division that is most expendable. No wonder the Government is anxious to tie itself in with the soccer pools, because this action will let the Government off the hook from fulfilling its responsibility, which it does not wish to do. The Government's record is there for all to see: it would prefer an outside organisation, a private entrepreneur, to make excessive profits at the expense of South Australians, because in doing so the South Australian community can profit in some way.

I say that the sum required adequately to fund sport and recreation in South Australia will never be met, and can never be met, by the percentage that the State hopes to obtain from soccer pools. I believe that soccer pools will be very successful, because those people who run the pools have the capacity to promote them at the expense of other lotteries, which they will do. The exercise will be very successful. A substantial percentage will come to the State, but it will be insignificant compared to the needs that exist, and that is what we should be concerned about. I believe that the Government will vote *en bloc* on this issue. Once the Bill is passed here, and if, perchance, it passes in the other place, the Government will withdraw its Budget allocation for sport and recreation and let the sporting organisations depend on soccer pools for their funds.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: You're a doubting Thomas.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am a realist. I am a member of Parliament who has been trying to obtain support for a number of organisations in my district for some years, largely without success. There have been some notable successes. When I speak so vehemently in favour of support for sporting organisations, I could not give two hoots about providing financial support for the racing industry, the South Australian Football League or even the South Australian Cricket Association, because those bodies are able to raise funds for their own needs, and quite often they raise the funds at the expense of smaller organisations which, in a world sense, provide South Australia with sporting talent in such fields as athletics. Over the years, South Australia has produced outstanding athletes who have achieved success at the expense of their job, and, as the member for Unley pointed out, their domestic lifestyle, with very little support. While a few sporting organisations grab the cream, the overwhelming majority of sporting people are denied the support that they should receive.

I do not really care about providing a percentage to those professional organisations whose ability to raise funds is beyond doubt, because they can and do raise funds and they do not need Government support. However, organisations such as the South Australian athletics organisation, the lacrosse organisation, the hockey organisation, and perhaps even the tennis organisation, are not flush with funds, although the tennis organisation does better than others I have mentioned.

Dr. Billard: What about table-tennis?

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, there are a number of organisations. South Australia has produced some notable table-tennis exponents, and some of our juniors are extremely competent. Given the right coaching and opportunity, they would be able to reach the very pinnacle of world-class table-tennis.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: Some members of this Parliament are not without ability.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am sure that some members of this Parliament are not without ability in a number of sporting pursuits. The honourable member is, of course, one of those. The question is whether sport and recreation deserves greater assistance and the answer to that question

is, "Yes". The second question that I raised was whether soccer pools are the appropriate mechanism to provide funds, and that is questionable. Will soccer pools have a deleterious effect on the Lotteries Commission? The answer to that question is, "Yes", but it may be marginal and a risk that we ought to take. Is Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited the most suitable promoter? The answer to that question is, "No, it is not." It is unfortunate that we are tied in with these people and, as I have no doubt that the Parliament will pass this Bill, that distresses me, because a lot of money will leave this State and will provide profit to those who have no need of it, people who are extending their empire into areas that I do not support.

As the member for Gilles stated, this Parliament is placed in a situation where it must either support additional funding for sport and recreation or be prepared to take the risk that the Government will face its responsibilities in this area. Obviously, we cannot afford to gamble on the second option, because I do not believe that the Government will face its responsibilities. I believe that the Minister who is responsible for sport and recreation will fight for an adequate share of the Budget cake. I have no doubt about that, and I have no doubt that he fought valiantly for a share of the last Budget cake, but he was unsuccessful on that occasion, and I have no reason to believe that he will be any more successful the next time, because his colleagues do not place the importance on this area of Government activity that they should.

That is the pity of it. Acknowledging that the State Government is not going to face its responsibility, I am faced, as a private member making a private decision as to whether or not I ought to overlook my very serious reservations about the people who will be running the soccer pools, with deciding whether to give my support to the measure. I do not propose to oppose the measure at the second reading, but there are a lot of comments that I will be making in Committee and there will be attitudes and opinions that I will be trying to extract from the Minister and his Government during the Committee stage. I have severe reservations about how we are going about providing the money that is so drastically needed. I have no reservations at all about the need that exists within our sporting organisations. I trust that, whatever the measure that we within this Parliament use now or in the future, we will be encouraged to move away from the niggardly attitude adopted, particularly in the past 18 months, and the niggardly attitude that traditionally has been adopted by Governments in Australia towards sports. As to my vote, I am reserving that for the more critical stages of Committee.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I do not like this Bill very much. I share with my colleague, the member for Stuart, many of the reservations that he has. I seek to go a little further than my colleague has done and oppose the legislation. I want to make clear that I believe that there will be other members of the House who will be opposing this legislation, certainly others on the Opposition side and, I would have thought, if they were consistent, possibly a sprinkling of Government members as well.

The Opposition has taken the decision that the vote on the second reading should be determined by the individual member rather than by the Party's attitude—what is sometimes mistakenly called a "conscience vote". I say "mistakenly", because I believe it is an act of conscience that a person votes with a Party along the lines of the philosophy of that Party. I see no loss of conscience on that, so long as one is open and not hypocritical about it. It has been a tradition of my Party that, on matters where the

element of personal morality rather than what one might call collective morality it is to the forefront, the Party itself should not adopt a Party attitude.

I think that it is one of the less attractive aspects of modern democracy that the great national Parties in democracies have sought to take Party positions on practically every conceivable public issue that comes up. I think that that is quite wrong. The Party of which I am a part evolved during the 1890's for a fairly specific role in society and, by and large, that role has not changed over the years, because the problems that beset the capitalist society in which we operate have also, in large part, not changed, despite the enormous development in technology, our way of life and so on; the problems are still there, and our philosophy has remained largely unchanged.

However, there are many public issues of the day which are quite separate from that matter of philosophy. The fact that a person is a Social Democrat does not, I believe, dictate any particular policy on a question such as abortion in the form in which it is a problem, a public question or issue currently. The fact that one is a Social Democrat does not necessarily dictate a particular policy in relation to liquor and the marketing of liquor. The fact that a person is a Social Democrat, or for that matter a Liberal Democrat or a way out Conservative, does not, I believe, dictate any particular policy in relation to gambling, although there may be some carry-over in these particular fields. So, where we are consistent and not hypocritical in our attitude to these particular matters, we often have to draw on our heritage in other than the Party sphere in coming to these sorts of decisions.

I still do that in part, because part of my heritage is the non-conformist conscience, which formed a good deal of social thinking of this State of South Australia from its very beginning. In fact, if one reads Douglas Pike's book *Paradise of Dissent* (and here, of course, I am glossing over the technical distinction between non-conformists and dissenters, which, of course, is a real distinction), one would have to say that the central theme is the working out of that non-conformist and dissenting conscience in the old fashioned sense of dissent in the history of this State, or province as it was at least for the 19th and into the early 20th century.

Because my upbringing was very much in that tradition, I begin with somewhat of a bias against any particular form of gambling. I cannot claim purity in this matter. I have never bet on a racehorse. I have never been into the T.A.B. I have never entered Cross Lotto. I have, however, from time to time (and I do not see how one could be a politician and avoid this) invested in the minor raffles that seem to be a burden on our lives as public people. In fact, I have to say that I have probably modified my stand on the traditional non-conformist conscience as the years have gone by.

I, personally, do not see all that much difference between the investment that the working class person makes in the speculative matter of gambling and the more wildcat sort of investment which occurs in certain areas of the Stock Exchange, the highest reaches of our capitalist economy. It may be that the element of speculation is very much greater in one case than the other. It is also true that the return for the investment is very much greater. It is true, of course, that speculative investment in the latter sense produces employment, although the latter stage of the mining boom largely produced bits of paper that simply went round in ever decreasing circles. However, it is also true that the conventional gambling industry produces employment for jockeys, trainers, bookmakers and all those sorts of people.

Dr. Billard: It depends on the motivation, doesn't it?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Certainly, motivation is very much part of the matter. However, if the member for Newland is suggesting to us that people who invest for the most part do it because they want to carry out a public function rather than because they want to make a quid, then I think he is being more innocent than I give him credit for being.

Dr. Billard: There's a difference between entertainment and compulsive gambling.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If one wants to enter that field of debate, one can do so. I do not know that it is particularly productive for the matter before us. All one can say is that there are plenty of gamblers around who are not compulsive gamblers, but people who occupy my stand-point in the debate would still see certain aspects of their behaviour as somewhat deplorable.

Be that as it may, the point I am working towards is that my present perhaps muted stand against gambling, muted in terms, perhaps, of a position I once occupied, is formed these days as much by my Social Democratic background as it is by my wanting to identify with certain elements of the non-conformist conscience. Before I move to that, and so that I can make absolutely clear the basis on which I am opposing the measure, I simply say that the outline I gave a few minutes ago of the concept of the non-party vote, and the uses to which it should continue to be put in modern democracies, would seem to be something with which a member of the Liberal Party could have no quarrel whatsoever.

In fact, if one were to sit down and listen to the rhetoric of that Party, which, perforce, I have had to do for the past 10 years, the only criticism one would make of my position from that standpoint is that it does not go far enough, that people such as the member for Goyder might well say to me, "We still feel that your Party occupies too wide an area on Party questions and should leave a wider area of ambit for the exercise of individual judgment rather than the collective Party judgment".

That is the sort of thing I would have assumed from the rhetoric which has come forth from members of the Liberal Party over the time that I have been in this Chamber. One would have been forgiven for thinking in 1972-73 that perhaps the Liberal Party did not caucus at all, that in fact members were able to make up their own minds on practically everything that came before the House, and that it was purely an act of providence for the most part that they happened to vote together. The first dents that occurred in that armoury occurred with the actions that were taken in the Party structure against the members of the Liberal Movement, and the threats that were made and the actions taken at that time. Apart from what happened outside the Parliament, all I can say is that inside the Parliament we noted that the very high moral tone that had been adopted on these matters was considerably toned down after that time.

The next stage in development occurred towards the end of 1979, when suddenly the Liberal Party won an election. Since that time we have seen almost the complete disappearance of the concept of the exercise of individual judgment on the part of Liberal Party members, and we have seen Liberal Party members voting *en bloc*. I believe that considerable Party pressure was exercised on individual members of the Liberal Party—

Mr. Ashenden: Absolute rubbish.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The member for Todd does me too much credit—he does not even know what I am about to say. I believe that considerable individual pressure was placed on members of the Liberal Party in relation to the way they should vote on a private member's Bill that was disposed of in this place only a week ago. I

know that occurred, because I have been told by Liberal Party back-benchers that that occurred. It is certainly true that, after various opinions were expressed in debate, only the Minister of Transport, who after all was a member of the Select Committee, voted against his Party on that matter. We find now that, in areas where in the past there was a considerable exercise of non-conformist conscience within the Liberal Party, particularly in the days of Sir Thomas Playford, suddenly Government members are apparently to vote *en bloc*. I would be interested to hear later in the debate, and I hope that members of the Government will be prepared to get up and address themselves to this matter, any justification as to how this matter can be treated as a Party rather than as an individual matter, given all the rhetoric that we have heard from Liberal Party members throughout the years. All that this really proves is that the Liberal Party is now in Government and therefore the tactics are different; one can afford the luxury of going all over the place when in Opposition, but one does not have that luxury when in Government, particularly if the numbers are fairly close. I charge Government members with hypocrisy in this matter over the years. I guess I must exempt those who are new in this place; maybe they came here with a burning desire for caucus control on all matters that would come before the House. In any event, that seems to be their track record thus far.

Returning to the gravamen of the Bill; how are collective activities and services funded in our society? They can be funded in various ways. First, individuals who have entered into this activity can undertake their own fund raising activities. For the most part this is not a very successful way of doing things, particularly if the organisation is limited in numbers of members and those members may be limited in relation to the financial resources available to them. It is possible for organisations to obtain some sort of commercial sponsorship. Often this is a matter of luck—having somebody in a large firm who has an interest in a particular activity. For example, I remember Mr. Ronald Aitken, of the Brewing Company, and his many years of association with the Amateur Athletics Association of South Australia Inc., and the number of athletes, for example, who found employment with the Brewing Company. I certainly offer no criticism of that, but I point out that it may be just a matter of luck that that individual was keen on a particular form of sporting activity. No doubt there are other ways in which support can be obtained from private sources, but in this day and age, to use an outmoded cliché, it usually gets down to some sort of Government sponsorship, or some form of control of activity which enables funds to flow into an activity.

What is envisaged in this measure is that by legislation Government will allow a voluntary tax to be levied. That is what it really amounts to, unless one wants to say that taxes are by definition compulsory, and therefore I must use some other term for it. However, portion of the funds will go into the delivery of the service via an arm of Government. It is therefore a tax, albeit voluntary. This can be achieved by charges or compulsory taxation. As a Social Democrat, I very much favour Government support for these sorts of activities through progressive taxation, because by that means the people who are most able to afford to support these activities will be doing so. It is progressive rather than regressive in effect. The only real difference between this debate and the other debate which has been going on in a sporadic way between the Government and the Opposition as to the difference between a tax and a charge is that in this case the charge or tax, or whatever one wants to call it, is voluntary in nature.

Nonetheless, it offends against the principle that I have as a Social Democrat, which is "from each according to his means". Therefore, we are embarking on a course which is repugnant to my philosophy so far as the funding of sporting activities is concerned.

It saddens me that so many people of goodwill in our local sporting organisations are either so desperate for funds or else are so innocent in their attitude towards public questions that they have had recourse to writing to members of Parliament pleading for our support on this matter. Perhaps I should read one of these letters. It is from a body for which I have immense respect, namely, the Amateur Athletic Association of South Australia Inc. Mr. Brian Chapman, who has done so much for that organisation during the time he has been with them, in a letter addressed "Dear Member of Parliament", which I presume means that all members have received it, writes:

This association urges you to give favourable consideration to the soccer pools legislation now before the House.

Passage of the Bill would ensure that athletics and other sports would have greater funds (or would be able to find funds) for:

1. Facility development (for community as well as elite athlete use.)
2. Coaching programmes.
3. Elite athlete support.
4. Salary of administrative/development officer.

Without such support, this Association faces the bleak prospect of having only one athlete, Bruce Frayne, in the Commonwealth Games at Brisbane.

Hoping for your favourable consideration,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Brian Chapman

I return to the final paragraph of the letter, referring to the bleak prospect of having only one athlete, Bruce Frayne, in the Commonwealth Games at Brisbane. What an indictment of public funding of athletics in this country.

Mr. Becker: They might not be of a good enough standard.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not know how much the member for Hanson knows or how close an attention he pays to athletics in this State, but I pay very close attention.

Mr. Becker: You're not the greatest know-all in this place, but keep going.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I do not claim omniscience, either. I read the newspapers in relation to athletics performances in this State, and occasionally I go along to a performance at Kensington. I know enough to know that more athletes than Bruce Frayne have the ability to compete at the Commonwealth Games. It is not Mr. Chapman's claim that only Bruce Frayne has the ability. His claim is, in effect, that so poor is public support, Government support, for athletics in this State that we are forced into having to plead with Parliamentarians to introduce this monstrous system so that some crumbs will drop from the table. That is in effect what is being said. I am not quite sure whether that is what Mr. Chapman intended, but they are the facts of the matter.

Public sector support is so poor that this system which the Minister wants to foist upon us is what is going to be necessary in order to get the funds. I am sad about that. It saddens me to think that such things have come to this pass. Many other organisations have written in similar fashion. I will not read it out, but I had a letter from the South Australian Volleyball Association, and members have had pleas from various other groups for similar consideration. There are, of course, the traditional objections to the extension of gambling facilities in this State. It is rare that we have to vote on legislation in

relation to gambling. In the past, much has been done by administrative action, and I do not defend that at all. It is good that the House is given an opportunity to express its opinion on these initiatives. We are being asked to extend gambling facilities in this State in order to do something that the public sector should be doing, at least in part.

This, I believe, is quite out of court and something that we should not be prepared to support. Many years ago, there was a proposition from a Government of which I was a part in this Chamber for the setting up of a casino in South Australia. Along with various Government members at that time, I crossed the floor to defeat the measure. I do not recall whether any Liberal Party members at that time crossed the floor and voted with the Government on the matter; whether that resented a unanimous collective decision of the non-conformist conscience, or whether the Liberal Party, for political reasons, voted *en bloc*, I do not know. If it was a voting in a block on that occasion, that further gives the lie to the other sort of rhetoric we have heard from them down the years. On the other hand, if it genuinely was opposed to the extension of gambling facilities in this State, what we are being asked to do now is quite inconsistent with the stance taken by the Liberal Party on that occasion.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That's not fair. The two are not comparable really.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I have enormous respect for the Minister and his ability, and I agree that technically they are not 100 per cent comparable, but there is sufficient overlap in principle for me to decide that I should vote in this place consistently with the way I voted on that occasion.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes. Obviously, a football pool and a casino are different things, but they are manifestations of the same thing and my objections to the one are akin to my objections to the other. I would hope that from what I have said there will be members on the Government side who, recalling their vote on that occasion, will be prepared to cross the floor in this matter consistent with the way in which they voted on that occasion.

Various of my colleagues have drawn attention to certain matters that they may raise in Committee, and I believe that an amendment has been circulated. I will not refer to the contents of it, because I am not allowed to. I do not want to get into any great detail, except to place on record the fact that I join with my colleagues in their objections to certain specifics of this legislation. With me, it gets back to the basic fundamental principle of whether activities which attract enormous interest from Australians—in the vernacular, we are sports mad—really should be funded in this way. One wonders why sport, which attracts enormous interest in this country, should have been, down the years, so poorly funded by the Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Hospitals used to be funded in the same way.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes indeed; I accept that. Is it that we were too successful too early in the matter? Is it that we like to preserve the myth of amateurism and people not having to work very hard, believing that people have it born in them and having enough of them in our society to carry the day? Is it that we are not a competitive people? That would not upset me, but perhaps it would be more upsetting to honourable members opposite who carry that sort of ethos into their general public attitudes. I am not sure. I think it relates largely to the fact that, for most of my lifetime, most of the States of Australia and

the Commonwealth have been governed by right-of-centre Parties which do not want to spend money, despite the enormous enthusiasm for the sort of activities on which it would be spent.

I do not think we can say, except in very recent years, that they have been let off the hook by industry and commerce, because, except in recent years, industry and commerce were not in too great a hurry to open their purses. Largely, it gets back to political philosophy. It is part of my philosophy that Governments should support sport, and I am fully in agreement with the member for Stuart when he says that the support should go to those areas of sport that need it most, rather than to those run very much on business lines.

I believe also that the way in which the money should be raised should be in line with social democratic principles and progressive taxation. One can never have a sure 100 per cent system in these matters, and I accept that, as a practical politician. I do not believe that in my lifetime we will see the complete elimination of fares on public transport, which the Minister would be quick to point out would be one of the logical consequences of the line of argument I am putting up.

I do not believe that in my lifetime we will see the abolition of water charges, excess water rates, which would be a logical extension of the line of thinking I am putting up. I accept the Minister's criticism that this is consistent with my viewpoint that lotteries should never have been used to raise money for hospitals, but it is in, and there is not much we can do about it.

Part of the reason why I am speaking as I am now is that, in four or five years time, I and the honourable member and others will have to say the same thing in relation to this matter: pools are in, they are off and running, they have been going for four or five years, and there is nothing we can do about it. Another sphere of proper Government activity and funding has been removed from the taxation area, the area where the principle of "from each according to his means" applies, and has been moved into the area of regressive taxation and funding.

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

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I never cease to be amazed at the contributions that we hear periodically from members opposite, and I think the member for Baudin, when he reads his speech, will be amazed at some of the contradictory statements that he made.

Mr. Slater: You didn't understand him. It was a bit too heavy.

Mr. BECKER: I know when someone is contradicting himself, as I believe anyone else would. The honourable member could have covered the points that he made in five minutes. Whether we like it or not, the natural progression of this Bill was predicted. It is regrettable that sufficient funds are not available to finance all of the sport and recreation programmes in this State.

Mr. Slater: That will never happen.

Mr. BECKER: That is correct. The member for Unley paid tribute to those who have dedicated their lives to their respective sports. The contribution that they make is extremely expensive personally and to the sporting body. We should do all we can to encourage the sporting talent of this State and this nation. Victoria, New South Wales, and Queensland of late, have certainly proved that they want to do all they can to assist. There is no more competitive State in Australia than Victoria, which was the first to introduce soccer pools in October 1974.

At that time, in my position of shadow Minister of Sport, Recreation and Youth, I had discussions with Sir

Arthur George, the shadow Minister of Sport in New South Wales, and the Victorian Minister, Mr. Brian Dixon. It was suggested that we in South Australia should encourage the Government to consider soccer pools as a means of funding sport and recreation. Since then, I have been able to follow through that suggestion, but to no avail. Members opposite will be pleased to remember that the member for Playford first raised this issue when he was a member of the Government. He asked whether his Party would introduce soccer pools. On 7 November 1978 (page 1779 of *Hansard*), I asked the following Question on Notice:

1. Has further consideration been given to establishing football pools in South Australia and, if not, why not?
2. Could the proceeds of such pools, if established, be made available to amateur sporting organisations?
3. What is the current estimated amount of money sent out of this State to other football pools?

The then Premier, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, replied as follows:

1. The Government has followed carefully the progress of football pools in the Eastern States. The broad pattern has been that, after a brief initial period of interest, turnover has declined markedly and then levelled off at a rate somewhat below the peak. The revenue generated by football pools has not been such as to suggest that there is a large untapped demand for this form of gambling and the Government has, therefore, given no further consideration to the establishment of football pools in South Australia.

2. The proceeds of pools, if established, could be used for any purpose, but the practice in South Australia has been for revenue generated by lotteries of this nature to be credited to the Hospitals Fund.

3. The Government knows of no method of deriving a reliable estimate of this figure and sees little value in speculation.

Henry Beitzel, who was the main administrative officer in relation to the football pools in the Eastern States, informed me in 1975, and I followed it up subsequently, that about \$50 000 to \$60 000 a week was leaving South Australia and going to soccer pools in the Eastern States and that, if we established a soccer pools system in South Australia, we could anticipate about \$100 000 in entries a week. Therefore, it never became a proposition for South Australia to conduct its own soccer pools.

I have had discussions with the Lotteries Commission, which is very keen to protect its corner of the market. Some members of the Opposition may be inclined to support it, but the problem is that it would be far more beneficial to those who are prepared to support soccer pools to be part and parcel of a national fund. That is why I believe that the Minister has taken the right step in accepting the opportunity to become part of that national fund. The Minister's estimate that we may receive about \$1 000 000 a year for our percentage of soccer pools is probably conservative; the figure could be between \$1 000 000 and \$1 500 000. It is important that we trace back some of the statements that have been made, particularly the contribution of the member for Whyalla, because I share the same opinion. The honourable member referred to clause 17 of the Bill, which relates to the recreation and sport fund, and which states:

(1) There shall be established at the Treasury a fund to be called the "recreation and sport fund".

(2) There shall be paid to the credit of the recreation and sport fund—

(a) the amount of the duty and additional duty paid to the Minister under this Act;

and

(b) any moneys paid to the Minister by the appropriate

Minister or other appropriate authority pursuant to an agreement referred to in section 14 (3).

(3) The moneys paid to the recreation and sport fund pursuant to subsection (2) shall be used to support and develop such recreational and sporting facilities and services within the State as are approved by the Minister.

I now want to refer to the Hospitals Fund, and I refer again to the Auditor-General's Report. We should go back a little in history and look at the Auditor-General's Report for the year ending 30 June 1974. It is stated:

The Hospitals Fund is a deposit account maintained at the Treasury to which are credited moneys received pursuant to the following legislation:—

- (a) Lottery and Gaming Act . . .
- (b) State Lotteries Act . . .
- (c) Stamp Duties Act.

The Acts further provide that moneys transferred to the fund shall be used for the provision, maintenance, development and improvement of public hospitals and equipment for public hospitals as approved by Parliament in the Estimates of Expenditure.

In 1973-74, the total income of the Hospitals Fund was \$7 098 000. Under the item "Payments for the year, public hospitals—Non-government—As appropriated under Part XVI; details are shown in an Appendix to the Treasurer's Statement A herein", the sum of \$6 750 000 appears. All of the money that was collected in 1973-74 was not paid to the hospitals in this State.

There was a carry-over figure of \$1 315 000. The point I was making was that the people in this State believe, and have firmly believed ever since the establishment of the Lotteries Commission, that all profits and proceeds of the State Lotteries are paid to the hospitals in this State. Until the 1973-74 financial year, the money was paid to the Hospitals Fund and then it was transferred into a special part of the Treasurer's statement for the benefit of public hospitals, but not all the money was paid. That is the first point.

The second point is that the Hospital Fund, being an account of the Treasury, was never credited with any interest and still has not been credited with any interest, so that the general revenue account benefits from that. If you establish a trust fund or any fund to hold moneys, whether it be a hospital or recreation and sport fund, I have always said that the moneys in that account must receive interest. I see no reason why it should go into the general revenue of the State. If we are going to do something, then let us do it properly.

In 1975, there was a change in the Budget. In 1976, we find the following statement in the Auditor-General's Report on page 43:

Grants to hospitals were previously paid directly from the Hospitals Fund. In 1975-76, following a change in accounting procedures, the sum of \$11 500 000 was transferred from the Hospitals Fund to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution towards public hospital cost, met from Consolidated Revenue.

In the 1975-76 financial year, there was a carry-forward balance of \$2 171 000. The receipts from T.A.B., the Lotteries Commission and the profits at that stage had declined to \$5 100 000, and stamp duty on motor vehicles brought total income to \$12 400 000. The amount available, including the carry-forward figure, was \$14 500 000, and yet \$11 500 000 was transferred to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution towards public hospital costs. That left a carry forward balance of \$3 000 000.

Let us now look at the Auditor-General's Report for the year ending 30 June 1978. The carry-forward figure for the financial year 1977-78 was nearly \$4 000 000. The profits

from the Lotteries Commission had climbed to \$6 900 000. The total income was \$15 000 000, and the amount available was \$19 000 000. Payments for the year transferred to Consolidated Revenue amounted to \$15 000 000. An amount of \$4 000 000 was retained in the fund. The situation gets even worse for the year ended 30 June 1979. The carry-forward balance for that financial year was \$4 000 000. Total receipts were \$22 000 000. The profits of the Lotteries Commission had climbed to \$14 000 000, making a total amount available of \$26 000 000. Yet only \$18 000 000 was transferred to Consolidated Revenue as a contribution towards public hospitals. That left a carry-forward balance of \$8 000 000. For the financial year ended 30 June 1980, under my Government—

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member connect with the Bill, the facts that he is now reading?

Mr. BECKER: I am dealing with clause 17, which sets up the establishment of the recreation and sports fund and the handling and dispersment of the moneys. I am pointing out to members that, when you establish a fund such as this, each and everyone of us wants to be absolutely positive that the moneys going into that account will go to purposes designated in the legislation. On page 29 of the Auditor-General's Report for the year ended 30 June 1980, the carry-forward balance was \$8 000 000. The Lotteries Commission profit had climbed to \$16 000 000. Total receipts were \$25 300 000 and the total amount available was \$33 400 000. Yet \$27 000 000 was transferred as a contribution towards public hospital costs. In the last three financial years, the profits of the Lotteries Commission had gone from \$6 900 000 to \$14 100 000 to \$16 300 000, and that is the impact of the instant cash tickets. The contribution to Consolidated Revenue has been \$15 000 000, \$18 000 000 and \$27 000 000, respectively.

The member for Whyalla, as I said, was quite correct in raising that point and seeking the assurance of the Government that any profits made from the soccer pools will be for the benefit stated in the legislation. I can assure the member for Whyalla and other members of the House that it is the intention of the Minister, and no doubt the Government, that this will happen. However, there is nothing in the legislation to say that the fund will receive any interest from the Treasury, and I do not see why the Treasury should keep that interest nor why general revenue should get that benefit. If we are going to do something, we should do it properly.

The Hospital Fund, as far as I have been concerned, has not given the people of South Australia the true indication of what really has happened to the profits of the Lotteries Commission. That fund has never, as far as I can see, carried out the full and proper intent for which it was established. Anyone in this State who buys tickets in South Australian lotteries, when asked where the profits go, will reply, "To our hospitals". If one tells them it goes to general revenue they will not believe you. That is the situation.

I do not want to see that situation occur in relation to soccer pools, because, as far as the sporting people in this State are concerned, and particularly the amateur sporting people, we want the whole of this money to be for their benefit. It is a pity, as I said earlier, that this is the only way in which we can fund sporting organisations. The only other alternative is to increase taxes and that is simply not on.

Comment was made on the letters members have received from various amateur sporting organisations and how hypocritical that is. I do not think it is. I give full marks to the South Australian Olympic Council, the

Amateur Athletic Association of South Australia, the South Australian Volleyball Association, and the South Australian Amateur Fencing Association for having the courage to contact us promptly and advise us of their attitude in this case. The South Australian Amateur Fencing Association is a small group dependent on raising moneys whenever and wherever it can. Volleyball is a fast growing sport which really has come into prominence only in the past few years. The Olympic Council has always been at the forefront of promoting amateur athletics in this State and has battled, whenever there has been a Commonwealth Games or Olympic Games, to obtain sufficient funds. Regarding the Amateur Athletics Association, the best thing that ever happened was when Brian Chapman stepped in and broke the cartel operating in that organisation.

At long last it is now doing something for the athletes of this State, but it needs a lot of money. It does not need a few thousand dollars: it needs hundreds of thousands of dollars to put us back on the map and to give encouragement and back-up support to the young people. As the member for Unley can confirm, for those who are fortunate enough to represent their State or their country, even though their air fares to a venue are supported by the either the State or Federal Government, it costs on the average for a young person under 20 years of age, if they are in a State team, about \$500 or \$600 to attend sporting championships. For those fortunate enough to be selected in an international team or Olympic team, the cost can vary from \$2 000 to \$3 000 upwards, even though 50 per cent or more of their overall costs are raised through voluntary subscriptions and various fund raising functions.

Why should athletes in this State, and in this country, have to beg and be part of fund-raising schemes, while training to represent their State? Regrettably, the only way, other than increased taxation, to provide money to continue the encouragement of the sporting prowess of our young people is through the soccer pools. I urge all members to give this legislation serious consideration and to support it, because what we are doing today is for the benefit of the youth of tomorrow. Let us keep following this line of exhibiting pride in the sporting ability of people in our State and our nation as a whole. I support the Bill.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I do not support this measure as submitted, because Robert Sangster and Mr. Murdoch will rake in most of the money that comes into the pools. I have received three letters from sporting bodies asking that all members support the soccer pools. I sympathise with the amateur sporting bodies. I had the experience when my family was younger of one of my daughters being an amateur swimmer. The only way a parent in that situation can keep a child in a sport is to spend a tremendous amount of money, not only for the participant's fare and accommodation but also because the parents are required to go with their children to places throughout Australia, wherever those children are competing. If an athlete does not have that sort of support from his or her parents as an amateur, he or she is virtually unwanted because of the money that has to be found to enable amateur sportspersons to participate.

I listened with concern to the member for Glenelg, who asked whether we wanted to nationalise the pools when it was suggested that they be run by the State. If soccer pools were run by the State, I would support them wholeheartedly. I think that, if it was suggested that Murdoch and Sangster run our lotteries and rake off close enough to 70 per cent of the profit, most members on both sides would not be very happy about that.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I don't see how you arrive at that figure.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am going on the 30 per cent and then the 37 per cent, as mentioned in the Bill. I do not think many members have given enough thought to the amount of money available for this form of gambling. Unlike my colleague, the member for Baudin, I like to have a lottery ticket and to go to the races. I was a member of the racing board, something I think is well known in this place.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Betting control.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Betting Control Board. I know the problems that racing was facing, and is still facing. One thing that these associations are expecting to help pull them out of their financial troubles is the trifecta. Only last week we voted on a Bill to increase the T.A.B. ticket price to \$1. I have just seen a sample ticket that will be associated with the pools, and it was a 50c ticket. I know that over the years there has been plenty of publicity when somebody in Australia has won the pools involving enormous amounts, such as \$500 000. That attracts a lot of interest. Once the pools commence operation and are serviced through the T.A.B., I think members will find that that will be at the expense of the punter who goes to the T.A.B. to have a few units on a horse, dog, trotter or a trifecta.

The trifecta is the thing on which racing is heavily dependent. Anyone who attends race meetings, as I do, would have seen the new T.A.B. system that is operating at racecourses. The people who spend money on lotteries, or the pools, or dabble on the races have only a certain amount of money to spend. Only a certain number of people participate in gambling. If another form of gambling is introduced, I think we will find that it will take money out of one pocket and put it into another. If the soccer pools were run by the State, I would possibly go along with it wholeheartedly but, because of the Sangster and Murdoch association with the pools, and because I trust neither of them, I will not do so. Murdoch does not support our type of people, and I do not think Mr. Sangster does, either. While watching television I have seen an ad flash on every now and again which states, "It's our State mate". If members on the other side are supporting a Bill to introduce soccer pools, over which Murdoch and Sangster will have control, they are giving another part of our State away, mate. Members opposite are saying that 37½ per cent of the amount involved is going to be the be all and end all of things. That is not the case. All that members opposite are going to do is pay back Murdoch's debt for winning the last election, as I see it.

Mr. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in this debate a member was asked to withdraw a statement which imputed to a political Party a motive that was improper. I believe that the honourable member has made a similar imputation, and I ask that he be asked to withdraw that imputation.

The SPEAKER: Has the imputation caused stress to the honourable member?

Mr. EVANS: It has caused as much stress to me as the imputation made earlier by a member of this House could have caused another person.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order to the point that I previously indicated, that where such a statement is made I will ask the honourable member who made that statement whether he wishes to withdraw it.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am prepared to withdraw it, but I cannot accept that it was the same situation.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member not to qualify his statement.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I withdraw the remark. It is not my habit to accuse people of being thieves or rogues—I will not elaborate any further than that. I have just returned from the bowling in Tasmania—

Mr. Oswald: Oh, yes!

Mr. PLUNKETT: There were a few Liberal Party members there, and I am aware that they encourage people to join these sorts of things, so I do not think the member for Morphett should be so sarcastic. He is quite entitled to go if he wants to. Tasmania has its casino, and there is no way in the world that Liberal Party members in Tasmania would support a situation where the State received only 30 per cent or 37 per cent of the profits from the casino. They make certain that the State gets the whole amount, and rightly so.

I am very concerned that Liberal Party members are prepared to allow this Sangster-Murdoch situation to exist, and to allow those people to take all the profits out of the State. Also, what about the situation where no South Australian is allowed to have any opportunity to join with Sangster and Murdoch? There is no way that shares would ever become available to enable any South Australian to participate. I think it is fair to have lotteries to support sportsmen and women, and I think that a Government, Labor or Liberal, must supply a certain amount of money to enable them to go away and participate without having to live on a shoestring budget; they should have their fares and accommodation and other expenses paid, the same as is done in most other countries. Australia has been very lacking in supporting sportsmen and women to this extent. However, I do not think this measure is the answer. I cannot see that the answer is to allow two people to control a new type of gambling in South Australia and to reap the benefits.

I agree with the comments of the member for Hanson; I have not seen anything in this Bill that indicates that all this money will go to sportsmen. I have no doubt that this Bill will go through, because of the numbers. As one of my colleagues has said, the numbers will be used.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's a conscience vote.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The conscience vote can be used in a variety of ways, but I am certain that all members will be instructed as to their vote. A conscience vote was taken last week, and only one member opposite, the Minister, who was on the committee, used his vote. A few other members intended to support that Bill, but they backed down. I have no doubt that members opposite will vote as a block—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is unwise for any member to contemplate a vote.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I apologise, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to delay the House to any extent. My colleagues who have spoken previously have covered many of the points that I intended to raise. I do not want to see the State being ripped off. I consider that, in having Murdoch and Sangster in control, there is a rip-off straight away. I am not against soccer pools, and I fully support the sportsmen of South Australia. I think they should be given a much better deal whether it comes from the running of pools or from other sources. However, I do not think the answer is to have soccer pools run by Murdoch and Sangster.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you going to oppose it?

Mr. PLUNKETT: I will leave that in abeyance. My colleague has an amendment, and when that comes up I will make my decision. However, I can guarantee that I will not be supporting the Bill in its present form, which provides for a Murdoch and Sangster situation. There is no way in the world that I would ever support those two people. I will not repeat what one of the Minister's colleagues said earlier, but that is what I think of them.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): I want to make my position very clear—I shall be voting against the second reading. Whilst the idea of soccer pools is not repugnant to me, the way this Bill has been accepted and introduced by the Government is against everything that I stand for. Much has been said this afternoon and this evening about the Murdoch-Sangster connection. I do not want to bore the House by repeating some of the things my colleagues have said, but we consider it serious that the Government, which opposed every form of lottery introduced by the previous Administration, is now presenting in this House a means of making money which will be strictly limited to the Murdoch-Sangster organisation. We have heard much talk about how there are people in this State who want to support a form of soccer pools. The Minister made a point in his second reading explanation that approximately \$30 000 is leaving this State each week. The member for Hanson stated that that figure could quite conceivably be \$50 000 a week.

As one who comes from a country where soccer pools are big business, I can assure members that the kind of presentation that is given by the existing Victorian soccer pools in no way reflects a situation which in any way would attract people who are interested in filling out one of these coupons. All one is given are the numbers 1 to 55 and one must make a cross in each square—eight squares, or whatever.

Mr. Millhouse: Why 55?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will not answer that interjection. I will wait for the member for Mitcham to speak.

Mr. Millhouse: Why should there be not 55?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS: If the member for Mitcham would have a look at the ticket on my desk he will see that there are numbers from 1 to 55. Each week 55 games of soccer are played, and I am sure the member for Mitcham, with his legal background, will be able to understand that simple explanation. The argument that people of British, Italian, or Greek backgrounds, who come from countries where soccer is one of the main national sports, will wish to take part in this competition is really ludicrous.

If one wants to put forward that argument, then the soccer pools people in this country should produce a coupon similar to that issued in the United Kingdom. It is not, so the idea of soccer pools is to make it a game of chance. No skill is involved, and there is no incentive for people to look at the number and to see what game is involved. The Minister is shaking his head. Within 24 hours I can produce a soccer coupon from the United Kingdom which does give that interest. Perhaps the Minister has one, and if he shows it to me I may shed a little tear of nostalgia.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Is this from one of your constituents who sends his money back to the United Kingdom?

Mr. HEMMINGS: I do not know of any who do that. The only way in which they send money back to the United Kingdom is in the form of food parcels because of the situation Mrs. Thatcher is creating there.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister did provoke me, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has been here long enough to know that he should not be provoked.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I have a lot of time for the Minister. I do not especially oppose the concept of soccer pools. Let us strip away the hypocrisy of what people have been saying, that people want to indulge in a lottery based on the game of soccer. It is another extension of Cross Lotto. I am opposed to this Government's being prepared to sell

out the rights of any South Australian in having anything to do with this soccer pool. Previous speakers have said what has happened. The Government has given *carte blanche* to the Murdoch-Sangster connection. The Minister looked very shocked when the member for Stuart said that this was a pay-off for support in the previous election. The member for Morphett shakes his head, but we can be forgiven for believing that that is the case.

Other organisations run soccer pools quite efficiently, and did so long before the Vernon organisation entered the field. Those organisations could have been consulted by this Government, or the Government could have let them come in, but it was the Vernon and News Limited or the Sangster-Murdoch connection that was offered it. It has not been put out for tender, but simply given to that organisation. No-one from South Australia has any say, and no-one from this State can take part and become a shareholder in the organisation.

The Minister talks about certain sums of money coming to the Government and being relayed to sporting bodies. From personal experience, I know that football pools become very big business. At the moment, there is the situation of the long shot, of being able to pick eight draws and get in 24 points, but that is not what soccer pools are about. That is the big lure of the big money prizes, but more and more business emanates from soccer pools. This Government and its members must realise that at the moment we are just talking about \$1 500 000 going out of the State or being spent in that area. If soccer pools take hold in this State, as in the United Kingdom and Europe, eventually they will outstrip Cross Lotto and all the other promotions put out by the State Lotteries Commission, and we will end up with a situation where perhaps the prize money coming into the Government coffers might increase, but the profits going out to Mr. Murdoch and Mr. Sangster will increase, too.

It seems to me that the basis of the second reading explanation was that, because sporting bodies in this State were not receiving sufficient sums of money, that was justification for supporting the introduction of soccer pools. Everyone who has spoken tonight has agreed that sporting bodies receive very little. They received little enough when my Party was in Government, and they receive far less from the present Government. I did not expect to be speaking so early, but I would like to refer to letters I have received periodically from the Minister in relation to grants to sporting bodies or organisations in my district. The situation is laughable. The letters usually go in this vein:

Dear Mr. Hemmings,

I am pleased to inform you that (so-and-so) sporting organisation has received a grant of \$68 to cover the replacement of tennis balls.

That is the kind of grant this Government has been giving out: \$68. I notice the member for Flinders nodding his head. He must have received similar letters. The member for Stuart made the point that the whole of the \$200 000 allocated in the previous Budget could be spent in the district of Stuart, and no-one would know that it had been spent. Let us not kid ourselves that this is a move by the Government to relieve the financial problems of sporting bodies. It had the incentive to do that in the Budget, but we all know what happened then. The area of recreation and sport received the greatest number of cuts.

What is the Minister saying—that if we support the Bill, the worries of all the organisations are over? I agree with my colleague who said that a real snow job has been carried out by the Minister or the officers of his department on all the local sporting organisations. We have seen, especially in the *News* and the *Advertiser*,

almost daily, a series of letters from administrators of different sporting organisations, congratulating the Government on introducing the Bill for soccer pools so that they can get some hard-earned money from it.

Since 1977, I have been a little cynical about Governments, and this one has made me even more cynical. We have had an orchestrated series of letters coming through to us about why we should support the Bill. I have never seen one letter in the *News* or the *Advertiser*, nor has one come to me as a member of Parliament, criticising this Government for not giving any money to sport and recreation. They never congratulated the Labor Government when it was in office for the money it gave them. They are not worried about where the money comes from as long as they get their percentage.

There will be problems, and I think the Minister appreciates that. There is not a unlimited pool of cash. The Minister must make his decision about where he allocates the money, and I hope that the first recipient will not be the Walkerville Bowling Club. If I can digress—

The SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will not digress any further than he has already.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I thought what I was saying was very closely allied to the Bill. This is a new form of gambling. Much has been said about the report to the United Kingdom Commission into Gambling in regard to the fact that football pools are a family affair and do not involve the problems inherent in horse racing or casinos. I accept that. A recent survey indicated that more and more unemployed people are spending their unemployment benefit on forms of gambling.

Mr. Randall: By choice.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I would be the first to admit that. I believe that the Premier understands the point I am making—that the unemployment benefit that people receive is so pitiful that they can see a chance, by the outlay of \$2 or \$3, to possibly make a great windfall. This Bill makes it easier for people to indulge in some form of gambling.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They are more likely to use the Instant Money Game or something like that.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The Minister seems to be more aware of the problems: I hope he has seen that survey. I was shocked and surprised at the number of people who use their unemployment benefits for gambling. Obviously, the member for Henley Beach does not understand the trauma that people go through in trying to make a small sum into a large sum. I understand this, and obviously the Premier does. Problems occur when unemployed people find another opening in which to spend their money.

If the Minister is listening, I will ask him a question about a problem that is being experienced in the United Kingdom, the birth place of football pools. A football pool was set up in that country basically to provide money to charities, and one could argue, if one was a supporter of Murdoch and Sangster, that that is the object in this case. Real problems were experienced in the United Kingdom. With all the legal and Parliamentary expertise available in the United Kingdom, the problem is yet to be resolved. This matter is relevant because a sizable percentage of the money from soccer pools will, in effect, go to charities—that is, sporting bodies. The Westminster *Hansard* of 25 June 1971 (page 1824) deals with the Pools Competitions Bill. The problem was that an organisation was running soccer pools in which a fair majority of the prize money went to charity, but it found that it was in breach of the law. I hope that the Minister and his officers are listening to what I say very intently so that, when we go into the Committee stage, the Minister will be able to

answer questions about this matter. In the second reading debate on the Bill, a gentleman stated:

The intention of this Bill is to ensure that, while that review takes place and until permanent legislation can be introduced into this extremely complicated area, the position of those charities will be safeguarded.

The point was that, if any organisation received money from the soccer pools, which were available to the public as a means of winning vast sums, it would be in jeopardy. It is quite possible that the United Kingdom laws, which we all know are also relevant to South Australia, may still prevail in this regard. It was further stated:

At the moment, we are dealing with a piece of expediency legislation—

note the words “expediency legislation”—

which enables them to continue drawing income from this form of football pool competition, but which prevents any other body which was not in the field prior to the date of the Singette and Martin decision to start a similar scheme.

There are real problems in this area, and I hope the Minister will be able to satisfy members on this side that a similar situation will not occur here in two or three years time. The football pools organisation was operating in the United Kingdom for about 15 years before it realised that it was carrying out an unlawful competition.

It seems that there is a little more to be considered in this area. Again, I say I oppose the Bill, not on the grounds that soccer pools are against the interests of the people of this State. I believe that increased means of gambling can create problems. I am mainly opposed to the provisions for administration. We will be giving something to an organisation that is not South Australian; there will be no Government control or participation, and no Lotteries Commission participation in the administration of sport. This seems to be another example of the Establishment of this State agreeing with the Murdoch organisation, and if it is proved that we are right, that this is a typical example of this Government—

Members interjecting:

Mr. HEMMINGS V.C.: I could talk about other things for another nine minutes, such as Alsatian dogs—

The SPEAKER: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he no longer has nine minutes left. Comments in this debate in relation to Alsatian dogs will not be allowed by the Chair.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Now that you are being so hard on me, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude. I oppose the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! There should not be even facetious remarks against the authority of the Chair.

Mr. RUSSACK (Goyder): The debate so far has concentrated on the importance of sport and the money that is needed to support it. I agree that this State and this Government should be interested in the welfare of people of all ages in regard to sport and, where possible, support financially sporting organisations and fixtures.

Secondly, I believe there has been an emphasis in this debate on the system that is to be adopted, the method by which such a soccer pool will be established, and that has been one of the concerns of those who have spoken in this debate about the establishment of such a pool. As far as I am concerned, I am sure that members and the constituents in my electorate would know my attitude to life, my background and my conviction in matters such as this, and I speak in particular of gambling. I do not personally approve nor do I participate, but I suppose that over the past 20 years many of us, because of the type of life we now find in society, find ourselves involved in things that previously we were able to avoid. I must confess that when, on occasion, I am at a function and am

asked to draw the winning ticket from a raffle I oblige.

I would also like to say, that I am not ignorant of the sports associated with gambling. I recall vividly and have pleasant memories of a gentleman who owned some very good race horses who used to have a cup of coffee with me after a council meeting once a fortnight. I enjoyed very much talking about his horses, and I say here and now that he assured me that he did not bet a shilling on a horse. I have had discussions about horses and I have visited horse studs and feel that I am conversant with and appreciate the friendship and personalities of those who are involved in this type of sport. Yet, I find it difficult to come to the point where I would support such a measure as this.

It is not necessary for me to explain the, shall I say, disadvantages of gambling. Naturally, for those who are successful there are obvious advantages but, when we consider the disadvantages and the misfortunes of people and to what that can lead, I am sure that there should be concern. I assure the House that I have given this matter considerable thought. As a matter of fact, I was reading again the second reading explanation at quarter to one this morning, in an earnest endeavour to come to a firm decision and be able to decide what I should do in this matter.

Often a person who participates in lotteries and in other forms of gambling is the person who can least afford it. I suppose we can accept that there are different degrees of gambling, or different methods, some of which are not as detrimental as others. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

With regard to the introduction of another form of gambling, I would point out that when the Council of Churches made its submission to the last Royal Commission into Gambling in the U.K., it agreed that playing pools could not be classified as serious gambling, but rather as a minor form of family or group activity.

I guess that is so, and I would agree that there are forms of gambling which are far worse than others in their detrimental effect. One such from that has been introduced into this State is the Instant Money Game. I would never, in my present thinking, support poker machines. I have, as other members know, voted in this place against a casino being established in this State. I took the trouble of travelling to Tasmania to have discussions with the Premier, the Under Treasurer, the Chief of the C.I.B. and others concerning that form of gambling in Tasmania. From what I was told I am certain that South Australia is better off without a casino and the same, as far as I am concerned, applies to poker machines. I would like to turn to the South Australian Year Book for 1980.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. RUSSACK: I do not want to weary the House, but I feel that some of this information is relevant. I want to bring out the point that, irrespective of the method or the system, there is always an escalation in the use of that form of gambling. The Year Book states:

Originally only one lottery, a 50 cent series, was conducted but in July 1967 a Jackpot series with tickets at \$1 each, was introduced. In addition special lotteries have been conducted with tickets sold at \$2, \$3, \$4, \$5, \$10 or \$20 each. The last of the 50 cent lotteries was drawn on 2 July 1974 and on 3 July 1974 a 60 cent lottery was introduced. However, its popularity gradually declined and the 60 cent lottery was discontinued on 6 August 1976.

In April 1973, a new type of lottery called “X Lotto” (Cross Lotto) was introduced in October 1975, the percentage of prize money was increased from 60 per cent to 61 per cent. For the year ending 31 December 1979, \$16 087 915 was invested. On 4 December 1978, the

commission introduced yet another type of lottery called "Instant Money Game".

I would like the House to know the amount of money brought in in this particular game, which I consider to be impulse gambling. In the commercial world there were merchants who—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked members previously to lower the level of audible conversation. Not only is it a discourtesy to the House but also it is a discourtesy to the speaker on his feet.

Mr. RUSSACK: Commercial houses, retail houses, would place before the customer an intrusion so that the customer had to go around the fixtures and thus was attracted to make a purchase. This was called impulse buying. To me, the Instant Money Game is similar to that. A person is tempted to go on and on and I consider that it is a most undesirable form of gambling game as far as the society is concerned.

I see the soccer pools as a different form of gambling altogether, not nearly as disastrous as the Instant Money Game. The Year Book continues:

As its name indicates, the subscriber knows immediately whether he has won a prize. This lottery originated in America in 1974 and has spread to England, Europe, Africa. The instant prizes in this lottery range from \$2 to \$10 000, amounts of \$2 and \$5 are paid immediately at the point of sale; higher prizes are paid by cheque from Head Office immediately after verification on presentation of the ticket. Tickets are in Lots of 500 000 with a face value of \$1 each, 60 per cent of which is allocated to prize money. Sales for the year ending 31 December 1979 were \$27 000 000.

At 31 December 1979 there were 227 Lotteries Commission Agents appointed in South Australia. Of these, 150 were in Adelaide and suburban areas; 56 in country areas and 21 were subscriber (non-ticket selling) agents.

I suggest that over the years since the Lotteries Commission was established there has been a definite and steep increase in the amount of money invested in this form of lotteries and gambling in South Australia.

This afternoon, the member for Baudin philosophised about his approach to this subject. He gave what I would say is his political philosophy, and said that his acceptance of that philosophy led him to oppose this Bill. Moreover, he did not agree with the way the money was raised for the use of sporting bodies. I find myself in a position of having strong beliefs concerning gambling, yet I know that the mere fact of my opposing the Bill for the sake of opposing it will not alter the situation. The Minister has stated that it is estimated that \$30 000 a week is going from this State to other States, and perhaps overseas, from people who play soccer pools. Therefore, if this Bill is passed, one would assume that the bulk of that money will be retained in this State. I suppose that that is debatable. The point is, as I have endeavoured to demonstrate in what I have read about State lotteries, I would say that if and when a soccer pool is established in this State it will expand rapidly. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

Successful pools are those which offer the potential to win very large prizes for a small outlay. Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. is able to provide such a large pool of funds to enable very large prizes to be paid. Typical winners sometimes receive as much as \$400 000 and scoop prizes made up of jackpots can bring wins of over \$500 000. This level of funding would, I venture to say, be impossible to achieve in a State-run soccer pools scheme.

There is the intention that the prize money will be very large. I realise that if this Bill is passed and pools established, money could be retained in South Australia, but the disadvantage could be that there will be an escalation of that type of pool or lottery. I realise, also,

that when a person has some restricted views on social questions and endeavours during a vote to block a measure such as this, that person can give the impression that he is trying to force his ideas and convictions on to everyone in the community. I realise that there must be a balance when one comes to a decision on a question such as this.

I also know that in my electorate there are many sporting bodies, such as bowls clubs, cricket clubs, football clubs, and I suppose every type of sporting club. In country electorates, there seems to be a greater demand for money for sporting clubs. In my electorate there is not just one football league. I can think of three full leagues and portions of a couple of others that have teams from my district, so there is a responsibility on me to those sporting bodies in my district, that I make it possible for them to receive assistance.

I realise that, if this soccer pool is established, perhaps those teams will benefit from the proceeds. That is what I understand will happen to the money from the soccer pools.

Only the member for Baudin and myself have looked at this subject on moral grounds. Other members have approached the Bill from a different point of view altogether. I have received letters about this matter from sporting bodies, such as the Amateur Athletics Association of South Australia Incorporated, the South Australian Volleyball Association, and the South Australian Olympic Council. I noted in the letter from the Olympic Council that 30 sporting bodies are involved with that council. I appreciate that those sporting bodies are undoubtedly in need of assistance.

For the reasons that I have outlined, I am not in support of this Bill. It is no good being opposed to something which would be of benefit, and in this case of monetary benefit, to many people in this State, unless one can suggest what should be put in its place. I am reminded of a letter which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of 21 December 1980, and which was written by the member for Fisher. It is as follows:

Many Australians were born gamblers—bet on two millepedes crawling up a wall, they would. Settling and developing this country probably was the first gamble. Legally, \$388 000 000 was bet on races or lotteries in South Australia alone last financial year.

That is more than the capital of 30 small mineral and gas explorers. That is the paid-up capital of the A.N.Z. Bank, C.S.R., and North Broken Hill combined.

With a fortune like that, just imagine the projects which could be financed. We wouldn't need to lose our gambling habit, just change its direction. Fortunately for us, some do bet their all on an industrial or mining venture.

These are the people who developed and marketed clothes hoists or plastic lenses, found overseas markets or searched for oil in remote areas. Putting your money on a losing horse, or sinking it down a mine doesn't look much different the day you do it. But five, 10 or 20 years later that mine might pay dividends.

Real jobs are created, minerals found and marketed and foreign currency earned or saved. Instead of the toss of a coin or the fall of the dice, why don't we gamble on our natural resources and our people's inventions?

Let us challenge the foreign investors by investing in what is ours—not complaining because they are prepared to risk the capital. If governments should ever become involved in promoting gambling, this is the area for them. Bet you double or nothing on our next oil strike, mate.

I believe that, if we develop our resources and endeavour to develop the State, we will get returns from those enterprises and in this way we can assist in a very real way

those people who need money and for whom it is said this Bill provides.

When a person invests money in a lottery or horse racing or any other form of gambling that person then discharges any control over that investment. The result is absolutely in the hands of some other person, some other system or some other animal. However, if money is invested in resources, it will be found, through work, that eventually we can help others financially.

People have often said that life itself is a gamble, and I suspect that is the case. People do their best. For example, a person enters business or a person might go on the land and, because of seasonal conditions, there is a failure. Such a person has the ability to introduce into that gamble, into that venture, some hard work and has a certain control over that very factor.

Apart from lotteries, last year T.A.B. betting in the mainland States amounted to \$2 186 000 000 and in some States, for example in Queensland, punters placed almost double the amount of bets with bookmakers that they placed with the T.A.B. Last year, South Australians invested \$112 000 000 with the T.A.B. At present, in South Australia each family has only a certain amount of money to be used. I believe that available gambling facilities are sufficient, and that consideration must be given to some other means of assistance to sporting organisations other than a soccer pools lottery.

In summary, I want to emphasise that this is a conscience vote. I have endeavoured to explain to the House what my conscience dictates. Also, I realise that there could be advantages in simply disregarding one's conscience. There could be advantages in this legislation in regard to keeping money within this State that now goes outside the State. A decision to support this Bill would mean that it would be to allow the transfer of a practice now taking place from outside the State to within the State. A matter that does give me concern is that within this system there will still be a lot of money going outside this State, and that would be necessary to establish a pool that would return a profit to this State, and that would be necessary to establish a pool that would return to this State the money that the Government is looking for to assist sporting bodies.

I emphasise that I am not opposed to sport. In fact, our country would be much healthier if people of all ages participated in a sport appropriate to their age to keep them fit, instead of just being spectators. The Government is obliged to support those sporting bodies financially, but because of personal convictions and because I feel that money should be made available in another way, the way I have suggested, namely in the development of resources, and then provided to organisations in need. After serious consideration and long deliberation, I feel that on balance I must oppose the measure.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): I do not intend to take too much of the time of the House in speaking to the Bill. Being a late speaker, I find that many of the points I wish to make have been covered. I was interested to hear the comments of the previous speaker on gambling. I do not think I have any personal feelings on gambling. It does not bother me; it is not a problem. I have a bet a year and a Cross Lotto a week, and I am hardly a mad punter. I cannot comprehend the feelings of some people on gambling, but I respect their point of view, and I was

pleased to hear it. It has presented a different facet of the situation for me.

However, I see an anomaly in some of the attitudes. Only yesterday we voted to extend our Cross Lotto link-up, which I assume will end up with a three-State or a four-State link. We have already accepted that in principle for Cross Lotto, but we are somewhat reluctant to take it up with soccer pools. It has been said today and in the publications on this Bill that \$30 000 a week is going out of the State, largely for soccer pools. We need to keep in the State as much money as possible that has come from the State. If we get it back, what better use for it than for sport?

The member for Goyder quoted the 30 sports named in the South Australian Olympic Council. I wonder how many members support those truly amateur sports, the ones that keep up the Olympic ideal. They are also basically the sports that have made Australia famous. Most of our sporting prowess has come from amateur sport, particularly in the Olympic sphere. I wonder how many people supported those sports, individually or collectively.

I have had a very happy and long association with amateur sport, as a participant and an administrator, and I am very conscious of the massive difficulties of those clubs in keeping their heads above water. We have already, in my opinion, forced them into selling alcohol as a means of survival. For most clubs it is the major income item, the only way they can survive and keep the club viable and operating, and provide a venue for people to play sport.

It worries me that we seem to be processing this Bill very quickly. I notice from correspondence I have received from different sporting bodies that those people support it, and it has been said earlier that it is probably as much out of anxiety as anything else, and a wish to get access to funds that they have not got at the moment. I do not think they really understand and are not aware of how it will work, and see it as a source of ready funds. I would have liked to see a little longer for it to have been considered by those groups.

The administration of amateur clubs in the main is, I would say, without exception, because they keep surviving, done by extremely dedicated and hard-working people. Without that core of people to run these clubs, we would not have the sport we have. They are working all the time under extreme duress to keep their heads above water.

Comments were made earlier about the clarification of the Bill and the allocation of the funds. That worries me a little, because it leaves the interpretation wide open for the Minister. As much as I respect the present Minister, he might not be there tomorrow or the week after or next year. Governments can change—who knows? The Democrats might win Government one day. The administration angle worries me. It is possible that certain people may allocate funds for political reasons—not necessarily on a needs basis.

Obviously, we have problems in certain sports at the moment—football, for instance. The Government has an alternative project for the lighting of Football Park, and there are major league clubs with huge deficits. It worries me that money that should not go there might go there.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It is not envisaged that this money would be used for that purpose.

Mr. PETERSON: It is not envisaged but, with respect to the Minister, who knows what tomorrow brings? It is not really an area of need. There are two obvious projects on the drawing board which would seem to me to benefit greatly from the scheme. One is the recently announced Aquatic Park, for which we have to find \$3 750 000, and

the other is the 1986 Australian Games which we hope to hold on the 150th anniversary of the State. If I were a little more cynical, it would seem odd to me that this Bill has come to light in line with those two projects, as it offers a source of funds for those projects.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The Bill was in the drafting stage well before those things came to light, but there is no doubt that some of the funds would go to those projects.

Mr. PETERSON: We are talking of only \$1 000 000 a year. With all the sports we have, it does not take much to knock a hole in \$1 000 000 these days for sport. I am interested in the Minister's attitude towards granting any of these funds for the administration and upkeep of professional sports bodies. I am a devout amateur sportsman, and I know that this is a needy area where these funds must be applied. These are the areas that usually feed into the professional sports. Most amateur sportsmen eventually go on to become professional sportsmen. Not many start out as professionals, and they must start somewhere. Earlier today, comments were made about professional associations and their ability to raise funds, and I support those comments. I would be absolutely against money out of these funds going to professional sport.

Much has been made of the suitability of soccer pools for raising funds. If this source of revenue is denied, we will be doing two things: we will be putting amateur sport in this State at risk, because there are real difficulties in this area, and we will be saying to many people who do not know who Murdoch and Sangster are that, because they exist, there can be no funds for amateur sport. That is wrong. One cannot use these names to deny funds for the development of sport at all levels.

It has been said in the House today that the level of funds for sport will be inadequate even with the assistance of soccer pools money. If that is true, and I hope it is not, heaven help sport in this State. There are difficulties now and, if sporting organisations receive another \$1 000 000 and are still short, I do not know where they will end up. We are all aware that the recreation and sport budget has been reduced by the Government quite severely, and I do not believe that anyone in this House considers that it will be increased again, so the only source of additional funds will be the pools. The future of many sports is at risk, and this can be seen from the comments made in letters that I have received. I wonder how many members belong to a club, participate in clubs, have been involved in decisions made at club meetings, and are aware of the difficulties that currently exist in making ends meet.

We have read of the nebulous object called the gambling dollar, and I believe that there is also a sports dollar, which is stretching pretty thin. By "sports dollar" I mean that, when one is a member of a club, one always finds a drag on his money. There are tickets in raffles to be bought and club fees and fees for equipment to be paid. It seems that the sports dollar is getting pretty thin.

Some members have objected to the fact that the pools will be run by Vernons and the News. I am concerned that money will go out of the State, but I do not know of any way to keep it here. Money will leave the State whatever we do. It has been suggested that we run a special sports lottery, but that would take funds from the pool already here. The organisation of another lottery will involve the same gambling dollar and will reduce the lottery income.

The member for Stuart suggested that the increase in the sports allocation would be constituted as preventive medicine, and that is a valid point. It is certainly an original thought. A possible decrease in the lottery pool has been suggested; this could occur, but I do not believe that anyone in the House or in the State can predict the

effect. A letter from the South Australian Olympic Council really puts it all together. It states:

We believe that all Parliamentarians, irrespective of their political philosophies, would agree that there is a specific need for greater assistance. The introduction of a soccer football pools system will provide such assistance outside the existing Government revenue system.

I believe that that is the only way in which sport will receive more money. I support the Bill, because I consider it to be a source of funds for sport and because I am aware of the difficulties that sport is facing. We must take a broad view of the future of sports people and offer them some hope.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I oppose the Bill, and I do so for reasons analogous to my opinion to the casino Bill that was introduced by my Government some four years ago. This Bill involves a conscience vote for members of the A.L.P. and, therefore, it is necessary that I set forward the basis on which I use that conscience. I very much respected the analysis of the situation of his own conscience by the member for Goyder, and it is quite obvious that, when we are confronted with situations of this kind, we must take into account our backgrounds and religious beliefs.

I do not believe that gambling is an evil in the same way that I would say that prostitution or things of that kind are evil. I acknowledge that there are certain people who, if exposed to gambling, can become addicted to it and whose families can suffer great evil. Therefore, my general line of thinking has been that one should draw a line between gambling in a reasonably controlled form and gambling that is blatantly merchandised (to use the word that was used by the member for Goyder). Therefore, I oppose the casino form of gambling or Instant Money gambling to a greater extent than I oppose betting on racehorses, trotting horses or dogs. Certainly, I take no exception to a punt on the State lotteries. I am not setting myself up as a moral judge of my fellow man: I am merely indicating that I do not find gambling to be evil in itself, although some forms of gambling are evil to some people.

My second objection in regard to the casino Bill was that the proposition was wrong because the casino would not be handled by the State Government and, what is more, it would be handled by Federal Hotels, of which organisation I had a very low opinion. On that mixture of grounds, I opposed the legislation and crossed the floor.

My real reason for opposing and condemning this measure is that this Government, just as an A.L.P. Government in New South Wales did, is playing into the manipulative hands of Mr. Murdoch. I believe that Murdoch's behaviour in this country and overseas has been an absolute disgrace. This Government stands no more to be condemned than does our colleague A.L.P. Government in New South Wales—they both stand to be condemned. They are trafficking with the devil. We must live with the situation in which a Labor Government was trafficking with the devil, and now a Liberal Government is proposing to traffic with the devil. There are great evils in this. The public comprehension, rightly or wrongly, will be that trade-offs are involved. The Liberal Party in New South Wales has been very quick to point out that, in its view, the news representation by Mr. Murdoch's papers of the State Labor Premier since that deal has been outstandingly good.

Whether he would agree with that, I do not know. What I am saying is that, as soon as one deals with a manipulator like Murdoch, one exposes oneself to that sort of criticism and to the suggestion that cash is passing hands. I do not suggest for a moment that the present Minister, whom I

greatly respect, would have any part in that sort of nonsense, but the difficulty is that, when one is dealing with a person like Murdoch or any of his representatives, one is dealing with a person who is basically without any form of conscience and is prepared to manipulate people to his own ends. In no way is Murdoch in this venture for anyone's good but his own, and his own financial gain at that.

Mr. Becker: That's why you practise law.

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member who has just taken his seat has not heard any of the remarks that I made previously, and I will not repeat them for his benefit.

Mr. Becker: I've been listening to you.

Mr. McRAE: If the honourable member has been listening, he obviously has not understood, so I will ignore the interjection.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is completely out of order in interjecting.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, totally out of order. I say, therefore, that there are great dangers in all of this. I accept the argument that, because this organisation has the franchise rights or licence rights (whatever is the word that has been used today), therefore, in a sense, if you are going to go into soccer pools, it may be a practical necessity to deal with them. But if these people are manipulative, and if they are evil, as I suggest they are (and as all the evidence suggests they are right around the world), I do not really see that as an excuse for dealing with them. If you are dealing with a drug trafficker, it is no excuse for your own conduct to say that there are others in other States dealing with drug traffickers. The analogy that I draw (and it may be tough on Mr. Murdoch) is that he is a person who throughout the world has been manipulating others and behaving badly—a scandalously bad person. For that reason alone, apart from anything else said, I would not want to see our State Government or the people of this State aligned with him in any way, let alone with the endorsement of a Statute of this Parliament. For those reasons, I oppose the measure.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I rise to express a point of view in this debate more to explain the quandary in which I find myself than for any other reason. Traditionally, I have voted in this House against measures of a gambling nature, and on the face of it I feel that I must do so again. On the other hand, I find myself wanting to be able to support to the strongest degree possible amateur sports and other forms of sporting activities in whatever way I can, so I am in a real quandary. For that reason, I feel I must speak to express a protest that we as members of the House should be asked to make a judgment, not on an issue in which there is a moral component but on the basis that that moral judgment is to be—I was going to say tarnished—influenced by a need, and a very great need, for sporting activities.

This measure has had very little publicity, and I think it would be safe to say that probably three-quarters of the population does not know that it is before the House. One could ask why that would be the case, and it is hard to find a real reason. The measure came in last week and there were a couple of articles in the metropolitan media, though practically nothing was circulated in the country media. We could look a little further than that and ask why that is the case. It may be that one of the principal persons involved in the running of Soccer Pools Australia is involved in one newspaper and not involved in another newspaper, so naturally enough the other newspaper is not likely to run something that is going to benefit its opponent. Maybe I am jumping to conclusions, and

unnecessary conclusions, but it does cross one's mind that that may well be the case.

Some members of the Opposition have opposed this Bill not because of their attitude towards gambling but more because of their opposition to the person or persons who may be assisting in this operation. One therefore questions the actual motives of that. I guess we could say that free enterprise itself is a gamble. Farming is in many cases a gamble: I have heard it said many times that the greatest gamblers in Australia are farmers. As the member for Gilles had said, life itself is a gamble, and maybe that is the case.

Amateur sport is very dear to me, so much so that a number of people in my own electorate who have hit international fame have done so the hard way through the amateur system. I firmly believe that, if additional funds were available for amateur sport, we may have more people in that category. I would like to take this opportunity to name at least four of those young athletes who have come into that category. The most recent, of course, is John Fitzgerald, a young lad from Cockaleeche who has just made the Davis Cup team. He is well ranked in the world tennis ratings and has a certain berth now for Wimbledon. He has qualified for the last two years, and holds the Western Australian Open, and he has done it the hard way, with very little, if any, outside support. His own family were his principal backers.

Two other lads, Dean and David Lukin, are world rankers in weight lifting; for their age group, they are the best in the western world for weight lifting, and they are ranked No. 4 for the whole of the world in their weight-lifting exploits. Once again, they have been brought up the hard way. Who knows—if they had been given the training and experience of international competition they, in turn, may have been better ranked than they are at the present moment.

A young lass, Caroline Byles, in track and field events is making her mark not only on the State scene but also on the Australian scene, and is tipped to be an international runner. They are just four young athletes who, during this present year, are making their mark on the scene. No doubt other members could cite similar examples from their respective electorates. These young people are all known to me personally, and that probably brings home to me the very urgent and dire need for sporting activities. The problem that confronts me is why we should have to use a form of gambling as a revenue-raising measure for young athletes. I quote from Estimates of Resources Allocation, a booklet that was provided for members' use during the hearing of the last Estimates Committees. Under "Functions" in relation to the Recreation and Sport Division, point No. 1 is as follows:

To identify the recreational and sporting needs of all sectors of the community and provide resources for these as appropriate.

Under that is the charter of the Government, and I would say a self-appointed charter of the Government, that those needs are there, and there is an undertaking that those resources will be provided as appropriate. Unfortunately, it is deemed appropriate by the Government that we should look to soccer pools as a means of raising funds. The idea has taken off, particularly amongst amateur athletic sports and their respective associations, and, as has been mentioned in the House, we have received a number of letters saying, "Please support this Bill; it may give us some extra money." One cannot blame sporting associations for wanting this Bill to go through, because it may just give them some extra funding. Mr. John Rodda, Secretary of the South Australian Olympic Council, wrote as follows:

We believe that all Parliamentarians, irrespective of their political philosophies, will agree that there is a specific need for greater assistance.

There is absolutely no suggestion of challenging that remark. We all agree that there is a drastic need, but is it necessary, is it essential, that we have to resort to this type of fund raising to help in this case?

The member for Stuart summarised his speech by asking, I think, four or five questions. I believe that the questions he raised should be asked by every member of the Chamber. We could probably add to that list of questions. One of the questions was, "Should sport and recreation be financed by this means?" Unfortunately, I think we would have to admit that it would be far better if it were financed through other means than a form of gambling. He also asked, "Are soccer pools the appropriate means of funding?" I think that question needs to be asked. He also asked, "Will soccer pools have a deleterious effect on lotteries?" Nobody can really answer that question. There is only a certain amount of money to go around, so we have the situation where the lotteries may lose to some extent to the benefit of sporting groups.

We, therefore, have two charitable fund raising instrumentalities, one raising money in the interests of hospitals and the other in the interests of sport—again, competing against one another. The good thing is that whatever funds are raised are going to worthwhile causes, and I think that that is admitted.

Mr. Becker: True.

Mr. BLACKER: It is true, as the member for Hanson has said. I cannot think of two more worthy causes than those. The other point that appears to be the biggest problem for the Opposition is whether Australian Soccer Pools is the most suitable company to administer this project. I do not know the people involved personally. I know them, perhaps, by reputation. I think that the success of soccer pools can only be guaranteed if the overall intake on a weekly basis is of a sufficiently large size to provide the large prizemoney which will attract the small-time participant. To that extent, I can understand the need for a large organisation to be able to step into the field and operate that soccer pool.

I believe I would be inconsistent if I did not express a protest against this means of fund raising. I recognise the urgent need for funds for sport. It is unfortunate that the Government should see it as necessary or desirable to have to use this means of fund raising for sport. I feel that in this instance I must vote against the Bill to show a protest at the means by which the funds are raised, not at the use to which those funds are put.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I rise to indicate that I will be opposing the Bill at this second reading stage. If it does, in fact, pass from the second reading stage, I will be moving an amendment in the Committee stage in the hope of improving the Bill as it may then be. There are quite a few problems with the legislation before us at the moment. In saying that, I indicate that I am not opposed to more financial assistance for sporting organisations in this State. I think it would be completely wrong of anybody to infer that any one who opposes this Bill is, in fact, trying to deprive sporting organisations of assistance. I think that there are other means of assistance being provided. I think that the previous Government indicated the support it was prepared to give to sporting organisations, creating a lead within Australia.

I think that members on this side strongly believe that funding should be available. What I am questioning is the mode of its being made available in the way that this

particular Bill provides. What we are being asked to support is soccer pools being introduced into this State that are being controlled by a company not named in the Bill but certainly named by the Minister as being Australian Soccer Pools. I think it quite unusual that we should have this situation whereby the Bill anticipates any number of applications. It does not refer to one only: it refers to "applicants", yet the Minister, in his explanation, has presumed the will of Parliament by talking about Australian Soccer Pools.

One can ask the question why, indeed, the Bill did not specifically refer to that company? Why did we have to go through this charade of saying "an applicant", anticipating that there may, in fact, be other applicants? The interesting thing is, as I understand it, that when the initial proposal came before the New South Wales Parliament some years ago there was another consortium interested. An Australian consortium entirely owned by people in this country did have a proposal for sports pools, and at the time that was being considered, so it is not as though there were not alternatives at that time. I refer to the interesting feature that the Bill and the Minister's second reading explanations do not necessarily tie up in their formalities.

One of the things that worries me is the question of the form of the company that is likely to receive the concession. It is a proprietary company. The memorandum of association is in complete accord with the provisions for proprietary companies as listed under, I think, section 15 of the Companies Act. What worries me a great deal is that some of the features that apply to proprietary companies should concern us, when they are applying to something that is nothing more than a State monopoly of one type of sporting lottery within this State. I would like to outline some of the features of proprietary companies. For a start, proprietary companies—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As long as the honourable member links his remarks with the Bill. I cannot allow him to make a speech on the merits of the Companies Act. He must link his comments with the Bill.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you for your ruling, Sir. The point I am making is that the very company form we should be using is not a proprietary company but something that I know in Canada is embodied in constrained share companies or special Act corporations. I am going to suggest to the House that, if we are going to have such an organisation as a private company having a monopoly right to soccer pools in this State, the form should be not the proprietary company form, but either, I suggest, of those two forms or another alternative. That is the reason for introducing this matter.

Mr. BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Can the honourable member explain which clause of the Bill he is referring to in relation to companies? I think it has nothing to do with the legislation at all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. I have already suggested to the honourable member that any remarks he makes in relation to this matter must be linked to the Bill and I am listening carefully to what he has to say. The honourable member for Salisbury.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I do not wish to quote from *Hansard*, because I know that I am not allowed to do that, but the Minister, in his second reading explanation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member may refer to the second reading explanation.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said that it was apparent that such a scheme would have to be operated by either the South Australian Lotteries Commission or the Australian Soccer

Pools Pty. Ltd. He then went on to exclude the Lotteries Commission. Therefore, we are left with an analysis of the remainder of the two entrants. That is what I am now proceeding to do and I am endeavouring to continue along that line.

Proprietary companies can have a minimum directorate of two people, among other things. There is no obligation on them to hold statutory meetings or forward statutory reports. There is no entrenched statutory right of the shareholders of such a company to remove a director of that company. Indeed, a quorum for a general meeting of a proprietary company can be as small as two. It does not seem to me appropriate that an applicant who is going to have monopoly rights on this particular type of fund-raising activity in this State should be able to operate under those particular features.

I would have liked to see embodied in the legislation that the conditions that the Minister can apply to an applicant should cover some of the hazards, some of the dangers that will arise from those particular points. The sorts of doubts that I have in my mind are that, while the Minister has provided in the Bill for controls of audit on the operation of any successful applicant, that does not necessarily tie in with the fact that proprietary companies do not have to give statutory reports.

The auditors, doubtless, will have the power to go into any applicant's books, but surely it would have been much easier if the company had been obliged to furnish annual reports much along the lines of any other company. That is the point that I am making, that it should be established in the legislation that annual reports should be issued. In other words, that particular feature of proprietary company tradition or law should not apply in this particular instance. One other feature I would mention that worries me a little is that Australian Soccer Pools will, for the purposes of South Australian legislation, be regarded as what is known as a "foreign company", foreign inasmuch as it is not from this State. I now read from *Australian Proprietary Companies Management Finance and Taxation*, as follows:

A "foreign", company need not keep a share register in the State of "foreign" company registration, but it may do so if it deems it desirable or necessary to do so.

Given the company that we know is likely to receive the application if the Bill succeeds, and given the proprietary company rights in this matter, I would have thought that the Minister would see fit to embody in the conditions in the Bill some requirement that a register of the shareholders be kept in this State, so that it could be open for perusal and inspection by the public of this State. The tradition is that a company can have a share register if it so chooses in this State, but it is not obliged to. If it chooses not to, then the difficulty for the South Australian public is that we have to go interstate to find that particular share register.

If one believes that that may be an unreasonable doubt to have expressed I believe that already we have some evidence of that. The Opposition has sought from the Parliamentary Library information on the memorandum of association of the company, and a photocopy of a document was provided headed "Memorandum of Association of Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd.". It is dated 14 June 1974 and indicates that there are two shareholders, one Frank Lewis Birch, owning one share and one Henry John Beitzel, owning another share, making a total of two shares.

As I understand the situation, that is not correct. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I understand that the present state of affairs is that Vernons in the United Kingdom owns two-thirds of the company and

various Australian businessmen own one-third. The point is that, when approached, the Parliamentary Library in seeking that information, with the very best resources and high level of skills that it has, could only come up with this document showing two people owning two shares, a situation which is obviously no longer correct.

If the company was required by legislation to have a share register within South Australia, it would have been that much easier for South Australians to be assured about who actually owns the company. I hope the Minister will give serious consideration to that situation, because we are not just dealing with one company in competition with others: we are dealing with a company that will be given a monopoly right. Also, we are dealing with a company that will be part of the Government's fund raising structure. It will be part of the fund raising structure for sport and recreation; in other words, it will be an arm of the sport and recreation budget in its attempt to meet all its expenses and commitments.

One other feature that I know has concerned others who have read the memorandum of association is the very broad nature of purposes as set out. Indeed, they sound rather Draconian in their wording. For example, they suggest that the directors shall have power to refuse to register any transfer of shares and shall in no case be bound to assign any reason for so refusing, and their decision shall be absolute. It then deals with various other aspects about limiting numbers to no more than 50 shareholders, and so on. It sounds dramatic and forceful but, in fact, it is nothing more than just the provisions of the Companies Act in this regard.

I know that one judge has ruled that the memorandums of association of proprietary companies are indeed not in the best form, and that a lot of criticism could be given about the way in which they are worded. I wonder whether the Minister and his staff have looked at this question to see whether the present memorandum of association of this company is correctly worded and is entirely legal. I refer to the statement by Lord Wrenbury in the case *Colman v. Brougham*, when he stated:

There has grown up a pernicious practice of registering memoranda of association which under the clause relating to objects, contain paragraph after paragraph, not specifying or delimiting—

that is the particularly important word here—

the proposed trade or purpose, but confusing power with purpose, and indicating every class of act which the corporation is to have power to do. Such a memorandum is not, I think a compliance with the Act.

Here we have a doubt cast on the validity of the wording of the memorandum of association. That issue needs to be clarified, if nothing more, by the Minister. For reasons of pressure of other business on the day, most of the Minister's explanation was inserted in *Hansard* without reading. Certainly, the Opposition understands why that was necessary on the day, and I am not arguing against that. I have taken, as I am sure all members have, the trouble to read the entire explanation, but I still find that it does not touch on many of the serious problems that should have been touched on.

Can the Minister provide this House with information on the financial operations of Australian Soccer Pools since it became established in this country in other States? For example, can we be told to what extent the prize money needed to be subsidised by the promoters? Can we be told to what extent the margin given over to the promoters is meeting their administration costs? Can we be told what return those promoters are making on the money that they have invested?

None of that information could I find in the Minister's

second reading explanation. I have no doubt that his officers will have looked into that information and will be able to provide those figures. I ask that at the appropriate time the Minister take the opportunity to provide those figures, because they are particularly important. It is not just a matter of our saying that here is a whole pile of money that we are going to receive. We have to look closely at the economics of the whole procedure and at the accounts of the particular organisation.

I repeat that under proprietary company laws there are very limited obligations by Australian Soccer Pools with regard to providing financial information. Indeed, I would like to know just how much information the Auditors-General in each State have been able to elicit from Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited. Since this company will be operating in South Australia, or is proposed to be operating in South Australia, and since it is proposed that it have a monopoly on this particular type of game, we need to look at how South Australia's interests will be protected. It is at this point that I would like to tackle the question of whether a monopoly should be granted and then look at the ways in which company structure can be modified to take account of situations where monopolies have been granted.

It has been suggested that there is in Australia room for only one such operation and that, therefore, it is quite reasonable that there be a monopoly granted to Australian Soccer Pools, an effective subsidiary of Vernons in the United Kingdom. I understand that there are at least 13 companies in the United Kingdom (five major ones and about eight smaller ones) operating sports pools of one form or another. The retort to that will be that the English population is much larger than ours but still, on a proportionate basis, that is a large number. A more relevant comparison would be with the Kingdom of Belgium, which has a population roughly that of Australia but where there are five pools in operation.

Apparently they are able to compete quite sufficiently against each other; they are able to provide sufficient pool money which deters substantial drifts of funds out of the country to other countries in search of high pool prizes. If that country can do it I wonder why the decision has been made in this country that we cannot do it. We have a great many fund raising ventures of one sort or another with very large prize pools. Why has the Government felt that we could not have more than one soccer pool? I know that the Minister would have looked at this matter and that he will refer to this in due course. I want to mention two possible options for consideration of members and, of course, doubtless there would be many others. The first is what is known as the constrained share companies in Canada. It has been determined by the Canadian Parliament that if a company is given access or rights of privilege to certain licence conditions under Act of Parliament then there should, by contravise, be requirements or responsibilities on that company to protect Canadian interest. The Canadian Act reads as follows:

The letters patent or supplementary letters patent of a public company may declare the company to be a constrained share company when the company is one in respect of which any class or description of persons may not have a significant or controlling interest, directly or indirectly in its shares, or any class or classes thereof, if:—

There are two categories mentioned, but only one is relevant to my comments, which is as follows:

the company is to qualify under any other Act of Parliament of Canada or any regulations thereunder for any licence or permit to carry on or continue its undertaking or any part thereof in Canada.

The essence of that is that to have access to, to have the right to participate as a monopoly, or as a duopoly, or whatever, by virtue of any Act of Parliament, the Government has the right to prescribe certain conditions on that company. The most significant one in Canada's case is what is called the "gross prescribed percentage", which limits the number of shares that may be held in that company by non-Canadians, by non-residents. That is a very wise piece of legislation, because if a company is to immediately benefit, by the will of Parliament, then it is only fair and just that that same Parliament should be able to require of that company responsibilities and responsiveness to the will of the people who elected that Parliament. That is the primary vehicle that the Canadians use and I would have thought that in this country we could have had a similar situation, namely, that if a company is to benefit, and it will benefit by a monopoly situation, then it must surely accept these obligations.

The other system in Canada is of a slightly different nature, but is still a model which should be of interest. It applies to what is called "Special Act Corporations" which largely are non-profit corporations. I was interested to note that the purposes embodied by the Special Act Corporations extend to, and I quote: "national, patriotic, religious, philanthropic, charitable, scientific, artistic, social, professional, or sporting character organisations"—the last mentioned being the operative words applying to this legislation. In the case of those corporations it is required that a majority of the directors shall be persons resident within Canada—a significant feature.

In drawing up legislation around this country it should have been most important to ensure that participation by South Australians was possible at the share ownership level, and also that participation by South Australians at the board level was also possible. By virtue of the fact that the Parliament may propose, if it passes this Bill, that this applicant, if successful, will be a feature of fund raising by the Government, then it is only natural and responsible that the Government should have some participation at the board level as well. To leave an avenue of effective tax (and that is what it is—it is an effective source of revenue for the Government) without immediate Government participation I think is open to the strongest criticism.

I will introduce amendments to cover the features that are raised in that regard. Ideally, I would have liked to see amendments which incorporate a new type of company structure, along the same lines as the Canadian legislation, but I do not believe that this Bill is the vehicle for that. There will be other occasions when such a major overhaul of Companies Act legislation should be attended to. The best that can be achieved on this occasion is some amendments to the Bill in an effort to achieve some of the effects that that might have achieved. I shall be moving in the Committee stage that clause 8 be amended.

I want to elaborate on a point that I mentioned earlier, that is, the question of support for sporting bodies. It has been said how important this will be for sporting bodies in this country. However, I refer to some comments that were made when very similar legislation came before the New South Wales Parliament in 1975. The point was made there that sporting groups would benefit from the amounts of money raised. The then member for Liverpool (he may still be the member for Liverpool) quoted the following report which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* and which was as follows:

State Sporting Organisations deserve a better deal than the handout they will get when soccer pools are introduced into New South Wales later this year. It is time the Government realised that \$3 000 000 each year from Vernons Pools just

won't meet the needs of the thousands of sporting groups in New South Wales.

I think the same comment can be made again, and indeed it was made this afternoon by various speakers on this side. I fear that this legislation, if passed, will not be the cash bonanza for sporting bodies that was anticipated. In fact, it may be one means of the Government's denying its own financial responsibilities in that area. Also, it may not provide the cornucopia of wealth initially hoped for. Also, the Minister should give us some indication of the type of sports or the level of sport that it is anticipated will be funded by the revenue from this form of game.

It is highly likely that the money could be lost (if I can use that word) in prestige sports, because if it is all spent in relatively high cost prestige sports of the big league nature then the mass of the public of South Australia will not receive any considerable benefit at all beyond the possibility of watching these prestige big league games on television or from the grandstand. Essentially, sporting assistance in this State should focus on sports which most people are able to participate in at the local level. I would appreciate the Minister's comments as to where he considers the major emphasis should be on funding for sporting organisations.

Comments have been made this evening about these letters that the Minister sends out, that we receive copies of, stating that somebody has been given \$68 for more tennis balls or tennis racquets or something of that nature, but which miss the real needs of local sporting organisations in question.

I refer also to the auditing of soccer pool returns. The form of company that looks like being successful is not very rigid in relation to its financial accounting. The Bill has had to comprise provisions relating to the Auditor-General's having access to the accounts. As I recall, the H. G. Palmer group, which collapsed in the 1960's and which was a subsidiary of a major insurance company in this country, was a proprietary company. I understand also that the major scandal that grew up from that collapse was that the accounts, such as they were (they turned out to be poor accounts indeed), were being hidden in all sorts of strange places to keep them out of the sight of the auditors. There was even a substantiated report that one set of accounts was being held in the head office toilet in order to keep it out of sight of the auditor, presuming that the auditor did not have a call of nature.

My fear is that the proprietary form of company will not be the company that has the financial rigidity of oversight that we will want for a company which will deal with large sums of money, which will be one of the fund-raising arms of the Government in relation to recreation and sport, and which will deal with large sums of money coming from the South Australian public.

I regret that the Minister has not seen fit to deal with this matter somewhat more slowly, so that his department could examine other forms that could have been adopted. I refer to the examples which already exist and which would have great relevance for us in South Australia. This aspect should have been given more consideration. To allow a company that can be so limited to only two directors, and to need a quorum of only two persons at general meetings—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): Had it been possible, I should have liked the honourable member who has just resumed his seat to continue a little further with his contribution, which has been the significant one from the

Opposition benches and which has given members certain things to consider in relation to this Bill. I have listened with interest to the debate and, like you, Sir, and the member for Baudin, I have taken some time to think through my position. As this is a conscience vote situation, where the vote is free and not a Party vote, one must weigh up the pros and cons of the matter and make a decision.

It is ironic that within a few days I have to speak to a group of students on this matter of decision making and how one goes about it. So, I have before me an example of what one must go through. Having researched some facts and thought through my position, I owe it to my constituents to explain my personal viewpoint and where, as a Parliamentarian representing an area, I stand on the matter.

The honourable member who has just resumed his seat has left me a little confused because, although he has made a valuable contribution, and perhaps has some valuable amendments to move, he says he cannot support the second reading. From my understanding of his speech, the honourable member did not clearly indicate that he was against the concept of soccer pools. I should therefore have thought he would support the second reading to enable the Bill to proceed, and so that amendments could be moved if he saw fit to move them, as a result of which we might have had a better Bill. However, that did not happen, and if the honourable member was unhappy with the Bill he could have voted against it later. That is where he left me in a bit of a dilemma.

The other points that the honourable member raised were valid and needed to be asked. The honourable member obviously has not had an opportunity to contact the Minister regarding certain areas of concern. However, he has asked valid questions and rightly deserves replies thereto.

The member for Baudin made a valuable contribution to the debate. He obviously had thought through his position, clearly came up with a personal point of view, and, as a matter of conscience, is prepared to vote accordingly. Some other members (not all Opposition or Government members have spoken) seem to me to be launching a vendetta against the people who will be backing this operation, just because those people run a newspaper and supposedly because during the last election campaign they ran advertisements which apparently upset those honourable members. This strong motivation is causing those members not to support this company in any way.

Mr. Becker: It's not a vendetta: it's paranoia.

Mr. RANDALL: Perhaps it is. It is interesting to watch the same members gather their daily information from the local newspapers in order to participate in other areas of activity that one would question because of their paranoia in relation to multi-national companies. I challenge some of those members to think the matter through. If they are prepared to challenge a multi-national company, why should they continue smoking, which habit continues to support multi-national companies financially?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: If you tried to grow your own, it would be against the law.

Mr. RANDALL: The best way is for one to give it up. I suppose that I am digressing from the subject matter, which I do not want to do. I do not want to waste the time of the House. If members are to carry out these vendettas and to have this paranoia, at least they should be consistent and work it through.

As other members have indicated tonight in relation to their areas, amateur sporting bodies in my area need financial support. This is a common thing which we see

throughout this House and which is expressed time and time again. We all recognise that amateur sporting bodies need financial support and that over the years they have been sadly lacking it. These bodies have obviously tried to raise money in various ways, and this is the dilemma at which we must look.

I have over the years examined my concern regarding the way in which amateur sporting bodies are forced, unfortunately, to raise money. However, this occurs because of the society in which we live. Some of these money-raising ventures involve bar sales. An increasing number of sporting bodies are obtaining limited licences or whatever.

Mr. Slater: Are you against that, too?

Mr. RANDALL: I am saying that one must weigh it up; I am not saying that I am against it. I will come to my personal stand on the matter in a moment. Money is raised by having bars, bar sales and providing liquor outlets. Some hotels see these establishments as competition. Some of the licensed clubs have facilities and avenues that are not open to the local hotels. I refer, for instance, to trading hours, dining facilities, and so on. However, I will not enter into debate on this aspect, which needs to be examined later. I accept that these community and amateur sporting clubs have seen this as a way of raising revenue. They need this revenue, and have taken their decision in this respect.

I refer also to the support that cigarette companies give to sporting companies. This causes me concern. Just as members opposite are concerned about uranium mining, I am concerned about cigarette smoking. A large number of people participate in a practice regarding which it has been established there are a number of dangers health-wise. One therefore shows a concern in that area. I acknowledge that amateur sporting clubs need finance and that this income is necessary.

We have moved into a new era this evening with the introduction of this legislation. Members opposite, by way of interjection, are wondering what I am leading up to and whether I support or oppose the Bill.

Mr. Slater: So we are. We don't have a clue.

Mr. RANDALL: That is good. This evening we have seen the introduction of new legislation, a new method which will help amateur clubs to raise more money. If we categorise them, we see that sporting clubs must raise money through bar sales, cigarette company support, or soccer pools, and we begin to rank the lesser evil. On that basis, I find it easier to support soccer pools as a revenue-raising source for amateur sporting clubs. The basis of the problem is how the clubs raise the money. Our sporting facilities in South Australia seem to have been neglected over the years and I suspect strongly that that is because the money has not been in the State to be spent on what some people might regard as luxuries.

I believe that encouragement in sport is preventive medicine. The member for Stuart expressed that opinion, and I support it. We should be encouraging the population to become involved in sport at any age. I do not involve myself in competitive sport, but I am happy to have a social game of tennis or whatever, as time permits. We all acknowledge that we lack sporting facilities in this State. Recently, I looked interstate at some of the great sporting stadiums.

An honourable member: On your gold pass?

Mr. RANDALL: Not on my gold pass. I was able to travel interstate on a Select Committee, and while I was there I took the opportunity to do further research. I saw a State which is getting millions of dollars in royalties from the development of its resources. It is not taxpayers' money, and no lottery is necessary. People have invested

money and have got results. They have taken the risk, and the Government has benefited, as have the people. Millions of dollars are available for the Government to use as necessary.

One area in which the Government can put money is into our sporting complexes, and I support the aim of developing an aquatic centre. We have a desperate need on the western side of town for a major running track, because the area on the other side at Kensington is overtaxed. I think there are enough small groups on the western side to warrant the development of a major complex. We need money and resources, and I do not believe that we need to tax the people of South Australia any further to achieve that. We need to raise it from other sources, from soccer pools, from the development of resources where royalties come in in large amounts and can be rechannelled, and finally things are achieved for the State.

I must now move on to my personal opinion. One must choose whether one wants to participate in smoking cigarettes, and one weighs the factors, the dangers, and the health risks.

An honourable member: I gave it up—did you?

Mr. RANDALL: I never started. Another area relates to alcohol consumption and the level of consumption of alcohol or coke, which might be just as dangerous. Again, a choice is involved. In the area of soccer pools and Instant Money, a choice is also involved, and I would encourage people to think through whether the dollar they invest is a sound investment with some possible chance of return, or whether they invest in some other area, as the member for Goyder indicated, such as mining development, where, although there is a risk involved, there is a greater likelihood of return.

Some would argue that the risk is higher, but one must think it through personally and come to a decision. My personal decision is that I do not buy Cross Lotto tickets, because I think it is a waste of money, but I do not deny anyone else the chance to do it; it is their choice.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Which ones do you buy?

Mr. RANDALL: I would invest perhaps in raffles, not aiming to win, but to contribute to a local charity. I believe that one needs to state one's position clearly. I am quite happy to support the legislation which will establish for our amateur sporting bodies in this State another source of revenue.

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I have no moral objection to gambling. We are all gamblers in this place, or we would not be here. We are gambling on the amount of support we will get in the electorate, but I found out—

Mr. Becker interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: What was that old saying about empty vessels making most noise? I found out at a tender age that, if you gamble, you cannot win if you do it over any length of time. When I worked in the mines in Broken Hill, I had a registered bookmaker as an offsider. I worked with him for 2½ years and then left. He stayed there, but in that 2½ years he had had only one losing day. If I learned nothing else in Broken Hill I learned that you cannot beat the bookie.

I have a large number of amateur sporting clubs in my district, some of which are reasonably big. Especially since September 1979, they have been hit by a drought. As someone on this side said earlier, they have been getting grants of \$65 or \$100, or perhaps a little more (there are some of reasonable size), but they are under pressure. It is a pity that they have been had a lend of by the Government, as they have in respect of this Bill. The Minister raises his eyebrows, but I must compliment the

Government on the job it has done in spreading the word that this proposition is the panacea for all the ills of amateur sporting bodies; in fact, it is not. The Government has made an absolute mess of its financial position, as has been outlined earlier this week, and, as always with conservative Governments, it is screwing the little person. It is not going to make the money available and it is trying to come up with some scheme that will allow it to say, "There is a great deal of money there, and you can have it." The Government itself will not be providing the money. It will find a way of ripping it off someone else.

I tend to go along with some of the comments of the previous speaker. I agree that smoking is not good for one's health but, as my colleague said, it is a matter of personal choice. One can weigh up the risks, and that is fair enough. I was a heavy smoker in the 1950's, but I have not had a cigarette since 1961. I do not believe in saying that I have given it up, because, as surely as I say that, I will start again. I have not had a cigarette since 1961, and I feel a lot better for it.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You wouldn't really know; it's so long since you had one.

Mr. O'NEILL: I still remember how I used to feel in the morning. The thing that concerns me is the way in which people have been misled in respect of this matter. It has, not been made clear to me, by the supporters of the Bill, whether there will be any money in addition to what the Government is already providing or whether the money from the pools will be in addition to, or in lieu of, the money already provided. If it is in addition to the moneys already provided, maybe that is an argument in its favour. If it is in lieu of that money, it makes the trickery all the worse because it is just a matter of pie in the sky. The Minister referred to the possibility of \$30 000 in the first year and somebody else escalated that to \$50 000 tonight. Goodness knows what it will be by the end of next week. This is just hypothesising and plucking things from the air.

I have been told that an educated guess is that the scheme will not provide anything in the way of returns for the first two years, and then it is supposed to take off. If this is the case, and it is not in addition to the money already provided by the Government (little as it is), the sporting clubs will be worse off than they are at the moment, and they are not in good shape. We have a situation in which the little sporting clubs have been appealed to and prevailed upon to write letters to their members of Parliament asking them to support this Bill because it is a great thing and they will get a little bit of money out of it. What is the cost of that little bit of money?

The member for Henley Beach made a few remarks about the fact that there was some acrimony on this side of the House just because some elements of the consortium ran a newspaper. If he believes that that is the only interest of one of the groups involved, he does not know very much at all. One of the terrible things about the situation in Australia today is that the whole Australian way of life as we knew it is under threat, because we have a brilliant entrepreneur who is concerned with elevating himself to the highest possible eminence. To achieve what he has, he has shown he has to be absolutely ruthless. He has been involved in politics in Australia (from outside), the United States of America and the United Kingdom. Yet we are supposed to be concerned just because he runs a newspaper.

I think the member for Henley Beach also said that it was because the Opposition did not like the advertisements for the last election. One would not have to be an Einstein to know that. One would only have to look at

Hansard and see the remarks made and acquaint oneself with the fact that there was proven libel and opinions from legal advisers that there were worse libels cleverly perpetrated in advertisements, under top legal advice. *In toto*, they constituted a libel but independently it would be very difficult to make it stick. That is a matter of history. Let us have no talk about just running a newspaper.

Members interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: The word "paranoia" coming from the source from which it came is amusing because, if ever we have seen anybody paranoid about anything, we have seen it in the member who made the remark in respect of his attitude to the trade union movement. I did not mean to be drawn off the track by the interjections. Nevertheless, the group we are concerned with already in Australia exercises a great influence in the press and in the electronic media. If members do not believe me, they can look at what is going on in Victoria; a Liberal Government is getting windy about what is happening. This group is involved in the proposition which is being put up tonight. It is also heavily involved in the transport industry. If it is not already involved, it is proposed to be involved in the new big communication satellite group being set up to try to take away control of all the business transmissions.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker. Although the debate has been wide-ranging (and I have no objection to that), I cannot see that the involvement in a communication satellite has anything to do with the clauses in the Bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): I uphold the point of order. I point out to the honourable member that a certain amount of latitude has been given. I realise that the honourable member is referring to personalities who have been mentioned tonight in the debate, but he is now moving far away from the association of those personalities with this Bill. I ask him to come back to the Bill.

Mr. O'NEILL: I find the remarks of the Minister frightening because when we talk about drifting away I am afraid that the Government is drifting away from reality if it thinks that we can take matters in isolation in the complicated society in which we live today. Indeed, it is a multi-national society because of the very things to which I have referred—the high speed transport, high speed communication and so on, as well as the interlocking political machinations that go on around the globe.

This group is involved in soccer pools in the other States. One of my colleagues referred to the dangers of monopolisation or oligopolisation that exists. Let us not kid ourselves. We should not take any of these matters in isolation, because they are not interested in running a soccer pool as something for the benefit of the community or sporting clubs. They are interested in running a newspaper only to make money out of classified advertisements. They are not interested in running television stations to bring knowledge to the multitudes. They are in it to make money and to maximise the profit. That is the ethic of the members of the Government.

Mr. Mathwin: "Profit" is a dirty word.

Mr. O'NEILL: Remember that you said it. It has been said by people on your side that "profit" is a dirty word and they have to come up with a new term to try to legitimise it.

Mr. Olsen interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: Here is the brilliant boy of the Liberal Party—the boy whose rise was so meteoric that he went straight through the top of his hair.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to the Bill.

Mr. O'NEILL: There is evidence in other countries to support all that I have said. Also, the piper must be paid.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

Mr. O'NEILL: The country from which the last interjector came is paying the piper right now. One of the people involved is collecting because he did a job, as he did here, in Britain for Margaret Thatcher.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to resume his seat. I point out to him that I have already upheld a point of order put by the Minister. The honourable member is getting too far away from the Bill before us. I ask him to come back to the debate on the Bill relating to soccer pools in South Australia.

Mr. O'NEILL: With due respect, if you want me to get up and talk about the soccer pools as such, then I am wasting my time. I am trying to point out some of the dangers that exist for the Government. There is one other important matter I must refer to because it concerns the Government and its integrity, and some of the conclusions which may be drawn as to the Government's intentions, if it proceeds with this legislation. I would very much like to see the Government come up with a proposition which will benefit amateur sporting clubs.

I find it very hard to believe that it has any concern, given the terrible charade that went on last year when it attacked the epitome of the amateur sportsman—the Olympic Games. For what reason? The great argument that it put up still exists, but it is not mentioned now—the presence of the Soviet troops in Afghanistan. I hope that members opposite will stop interjecting and distracting me.

The Liberal Party is now in a position in which an organisation that greatly assisted it to win the last election (and this is a matter of record), the first election that it could win in almost a decade, is being helped to obtain monopolistic control of a gambling system in this State. I cast no aspersions on the Minister, and I make that clear, but I am talking about conclusions that can be drawn from the actions of the Government. One of the conclusions that can be reached is that this Bill is a pay-off for past services rendered. However, there is a worse implication, because, if this Bill is passed, the Liberal Party cannot go to the next election with a clear conscience. If the Murdoch press or the Murdoch television supports the Liberals at the next election, particularly in the way in which it did last time—and let us remember that when it was proven—

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. The member for Florey has said in this House that this Bill represents a pay-off to the Murdoch press, and suggests that the pay-off is being made because the Murdoch press is alleged to have assisted the Liberal Party at the last election. On behalf of the Government, I absolutely resent the suggestion that this is a pay-off, and I submit that the honourable member should withdraw that remark.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The remarks made by the member for Florey are not strictly unparliamentary. I ask the honourable member whether he cares to withdraw the implications which he made and to which the Minister has taken exception.

Mr. O'NEILL: I would be happy to withdraw anything to which the Minister took exception, but I do not believe that I said what the Minister said I said. I said that this Bill could be taken as a pay-off for services rendered at the last election; I am not saying that it was.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the honourable member willing to withdraw the words to which the Minister has taken exception?

Mr. O'Neill: What are they?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member was insinuating that this Bill is a pay-off. As I am the Minister in charge of this Bill and the Minister who undertook all negotiations to bring the Bill to this point—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He said he cast no personal aspersions.

Mr. Mathwin: What about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is not assisting the proceedings by continuing to interject.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is no other interpretation of the honourable member's remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the member for Florey whether he is prepared to withdraw the words to which the Minister has taken exception?

Mr. O'NEILL: If the Minister checks *Hansard*, he will find that I did not say what he said I said. I will withdraw what he said I said, but I did not say it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has now withdrawn: he may proceed.

Mr. O'NEILL: If the record is checked, I am sure that it will be found that I cast no aspersions on the integrity of the Minister. I made no charges. I suggested it may be that this Bill could be construed in a certain way (and I will not use the obviously offending words again); I was coming to the more dangerous position for the Government, because what is past is past, and the Government must live with that, whether or not it was right. The danger that exists for the Government is that, in any future election as a result of this measure, any assistance that the Government obtains from the Murdoch empire can be construed as *quid pro quo*. Members opposite should weigh this issue very carefully, because they will be walking into a trap: once they step through the gate, there is no way back. The question mark will be there.

Regarding an alternative, my understanding is that the South Australian Lotteries Commission can run an operation that will benefit the small sporting bodies in South Australia. One of the arguments used against that was that it would draw money from the existing pool. I suppose that a pool from which money can be drawn for anything exists in South Australia, and the money that will go to Australian Soccer Pools will come from that pool. Once it leaves the State, there is no guarantee that any of it, other than that which comes back to the Government and which may be disbursed to sporting clubs, will return. For instance, there is no guarantee that the major prize will return to South Australia, and I doubt very much whether, over a number of years given this State's percentage of population, it will ever return here. As I understand from psychologists who have studied this form of amusement, it is not so much the odds that are considered in this type of operation but the size of the first prize.

One of the phenomena that we see in so-called Western democracy is that, whenever the people are suffering under conservative Governments that are taxing them into the ground and stripping every cent they can from the working people, there is an increase in gambling. Hope springs eternal in the human breast. The cruel trick that has been perpetrated in this place is in some ways analagous to drug trafficking, because people are being conned to believe that the panacea for all of their problems is to win a couple of million dollars in a pool. The reality is, of course, that they put in their money and over a period they lose their hard-earned cash but receive no big prize. Occasionally, they receive a little kick to keep them hooked on the habit. One has only to study the operations—

Mr. Mathwin: Have you ever been behind the curtain and seen the lotteries there?

Mr. O'NEILL: If the member for Glenelg is interjecting, I cannot understand the language he is speaking. I am not deliberately ignoring him: it is just that I do not know what he is talking about. The lotteries operation has been very smooth until now. We have seen some very interesting reactions from members opposite. I interjected on the member for Goyder, but I must say that I congratulate him on his courage. He is a man with a conscience. I have learnt quite a bit since being elected about conscience and the lack of a caucus in the Liberal Party. I have been amazed at the disciplinary action and the arm twisting that I have seen since coming here. I congratulate the heavies in the Liberal Party, because they have lined up their members on a few votes, and I guess they have been working pretty hard here.

I do not want to end on a note of acrimony. I ask members of the Government to be careful about what they are doing, because, if they vote for this Bill, in two years (if they wait that long for an election), when they go to the press, every little bit of support can be sheered home to this action. The Government will have every right to call on the Murdoch press to support it to even greater lengths than it did in 1979.

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): I was rather interested to hear the line of argument adopted this afternoon and this evening. We have heard a range of spurious arguments from the member for Stuart, who implied that a secret pay-off had occurred between a certain person and Mr. Whitlam when he was Prime Minister. He said that he would tell us what was involved outside the House, but we have not heard from him yet.

He also said that, if we passed this Bill, we would be allowing money from this State to go into someone else's coffers; in other words, someone would be making a profit out of people's pleasure, or whatever one likes to call it. If the honourable member is completely honest with himself, he would know that that is happening now.

In my own electorate, and I am sure in the electorates of the members for Baudin, Salisbury and Elizabeth, where there are very large English populations, many people are already subscribing to English soccer pools. Of course, some of those people would be only too happy if they could win. Their money is already in circulation, and it is not questioned whether they are enabling a private organisation or a Government operated body to make a profit. They are doing this for pleasure, for monetary gain, or to become rich overnight. We are not here to question people's motives and ask why they want to subscribe to such a gaming system; they are, and that is a reality of life.

With that sort of attitude prevailing in the community, we as a Government can say "We acknowledge that that is what the people are doing. We are not going to prevent it, so let us provide it in this State so that the revenue that can be derived from it can benefit organisations in this State." Members opposite have made no bones about the fact that amateur sporting organisations need some form of assistance. When we look back over the years, amateur sporting organisations have been deprived of funds for quite some time.

In *Hansard* of 7 November 1978, at page 1779 Mr. Becker asked former Premier Dunstan whether or not his Government was looking at introducing football pools. Mr. Dunstan answered that his Government was not going to do so. That Government had the opportunity to allow such a system to be introduced. It also had the opportunity, through this system, to allow more revenue to be diverted to amateur sporting organisations. The very

same people who were in Government at that time are now saying, "No, we cannot do that; the Government should be giving more money to sporting organisations." Did the former Government do that when it was in power? Of course it did not. However, members opposite now get up in their high and mighty arrogance and imply that this Government is not giving money to sporting organisations.

In my own area, one of the first grants to which the Minister agreed when this Government came to power was a recreation complex costing some \$66 000 in the Happy Valley area. The Government gave the Meadows council a grant to establish a community centre from which the community at large has received great benefit, and sporting bodies are making great use of it. We also heard other arguments from the members opposite and were subjected to a history of social democracy, or should I say a history of the Australian Labor Party. All this led to the idea that some form of taxation should be introduced.

It was argued that allowing members of the community to participate in such a numbers exercise amounted to what was termed "a voluntary taxing system". The honourable member's argument was that we should be looking not at a voluntary taxing system but at a system by which each person paid according to his own means. Surely that is exactly what the member for Baudin was asking for; something where people can subscribe according to their own means. That is what they are doing through this Bill. Those who wish to spend their money on such a numbers game can do so according to what they think they can afford.

The honourable member who preceded me referred to what the member for Baudin called the non-conformist conscience". A conscience vote allows members to say what they think on a particular matter. During the Prostitution Bill debate members opposite said that we should not question personal morality. All of a sudden the Opposition seems to be contradicting itself, because it is questioning public morality and questioning whether people should subscribe to a numbers game or not. We should keep out of this area: if people wish to subscribe to this game, well and good; it is for them to determine themselves, and it is for them to determine how much they can spend.

Taking the argument back a step further: the previous Government should be indicted because it gave no encouragement to sport as such in this State. I notice the Opposition spokesman for sport and recreation raise his eyebrow. I made that statement because sport is something that is generated within one's being. We can supplement that either through additional funds or by giving encouragement. The former Government cut out any form of competition within our whole school system. I taught swimming during school holidays, and at the end of the course the children received a small certificate indicating what they had accomplished during their course. That system was abolished by the previous Government, and in the next year there was no incentive for the children to learn to swim. All they wanted to do was go to the beach and play games in the water, because there was nothing to encourage them to strive for a goal.

The Opposition is suddenly saying that the Government should change the taxing system to provide a goal for amateur sport. That supports amateur sport on the one hand, but it goes further than that. We need to encourage people to be aware of sport and to want to participate in it. That can be done only through proper encouragement.

People are already spending their money on numbers games. The Opposition has not said that such things as Instant Money, Cross Lotto or any of the other numbers games or "gambling" is wrong. The Opposition was quite

happy to go along with those systems, and it is quite happy to have the revenue derived from those systems used to build hospitals. In fact, Mr. Dunstan, in the reply to which I referred earlier, said that his Government used the lottery system to support health. The Government could turn that very same argument back at the Opposition and say it is wrong because it was screwing the little people and deriving a benefit from them because they love to indulge in some form of gambling. That is screwing those people to fund hospitals. Surely it is more to the point that the Government is looking after hospital schemes rather than, as the member for Florey put it, screwing the little person because he delights in participating in a numbers game. That is quite a contradiction in view of the Opposition's argument.

I know people in my area are quite happy to participate in a soccer pool. They are already doing that and I do not believe we can stop them. However, we can make use of that system for this State by using the revenue it earns to supplement what is already being done by the Government in the sport and recreation area.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I wish to contribute to this debate because it is a subject on which I have had a strong point of view for many years. It is a subject that I have studied in relation to gambling in many countries of the world, more particularly in relation to casinos than soccer pools. I support the Bill because I believe it is not impulse action gambling. All of my objections over the years have been against establishing in this State what I term impulse action gambling. Of course, the Instant Money Game runs very close to impulse action gambling. Throughout the world, impulse action gambling has proven to be one of the most damaging matters within society. More particularly, it is an area where people who wish to launder money can do so, whether it be money that has been obtained by theft, fraud or through tax avoidance.

I want to make it quite clear that my main objection in the area of gambling casinos is the impulse gambling area. Some people would argue that we fall far behind other countries in sporting facilities. In the main they are right when we compare our facilities with those of countries which have vast money resources or which have been operating for many more centuries than we have, and have had the opportunity to develop their facilities and economic base. When we compare our State with other States, as the member for Henley Beach pointed out when referring to mineral and petroleum products royalties, if we compare the two extremes South Australia gets \$5 300 000 a year from that area whilst Victoria gets \$133 000 000. There is a vast difference between the two figures, and that difference allows Victoria to move money into different areas. If we had another \$10 000 000 or \$15 000 000 a year from that area, it would be a great advantage to us.

I think that money from soccer pools would be a benefit to the sporting community. However, I think that there is an inherent danger that we need to be conscious of. If Governments, by whatever means, gradually make more money available to sporting groups, we will find that there is a tendency to pay more coaches and more administrators, and to offer greater incentive to competitors, eventually destroying the voluntary effort that prevails today in many sporting and athletic groups.

There is no doubt that we would all recognise that that is one of the inherent dangers we face as we move towards making large sums of money (if we reach that point) available to sporting groups. What we need to do is always have the balancing effect of saying that the Government will, either from general revenue or from the money from

soccer pools, make money available if a certain amount of effort is forthcoming from a sporting group toward raising some of the moneys towards a particular goal. Likewise, we need to be conscious that those people who sponsor some areas of sport will have an opportunity to say that, if a body is getting a substantial amount of money from a particular area, it may wish to back off and contribute to another area. If that occurs, I do not mind, so long as the money then goes towards research in the medical field or the development of new resources such as energy resources within the university, a practice that existed many years ago.

That money has now been withdrawn from the universities in many cases because business houses saw the benefit of television channels flashing their names across the screen at sporting events and giving the publicity that goes with that. If they gave a grant to a university, it carried little publicity in the news media and was not regularly before the public eye as an advertisement. There will be a benefit if that comes back and we get enough money from soccer pools to carry sporting and athletic communities and their major needs. We know that that day is a long way off. We know that soccer pools cannot overnight create that sort of money.

I think each of us recognises that, if we vote for this Bill, there is nothing to stop a future Government, of whatever philosophy (and maybe public pressure will force this upon it), from saying that it will now take over the operation. If the group that is promoting and operating soccer pools with the approval of the Government and this Parliament makes huge amounts of money (and that can be proven), there is no doubt that, as the years go by, there will be some public pressure, not only from sporting groups but from the general public, to make a change. There is a warning there, I think, to those in the field to keep returns in moderation and not to try to bleed the system or they will find that somebody will move them out of that area of operation. I do not think that anyone here doubts that that will occur if a company tends to take more than what one might think is a reasonable return from that operation.

There is no doubt that we need more money for the sport and recreation fields. When we talk about the Olympic Games, there is no doubt that some time in the not too distant future, if the world is going to see the best athletes in action at the Olympic Games, the Commonwealth Games or other games of significance, the "amateur" status will have to go. Those athletes who develop in countries that have greater control over the community, where discipline is forced upon the individual who has the potential to be a good athlete through the school system and the whole social structure to develop sporting or athletic skills for the benefit of a country's promotion, will always have an advantage over athletes from countries such as ours where it is left to the individual to devote himself to a sport.

We will eventually have to accept that athletes from those countries are professionals, whether they are in Pakistan in a hockey side (and most are commissioned officers of the Police Force who, if they do not win, will no longer be commissioned officers or will have no right of promotion) or in any country where sporting prowess gives an opportunity through the public sector to gain a better job, better conditions, or better facilities. In those countries those people are really professionals. The same thing applies in America with university and school scholarships and maybe, too, to a degree in this country. I believe that the Olympic Council has to say that it will accept any person who is an athlete to compete regardless of any amateur status. The sooner it does this the sooner we will have the top athletes of the world competing

against each other rather than the sham amateurism of the moment. That will give some of our people the chance to move through the world, to be sponsored and to receive payments, and to develop greater skills than they can at the moment in this vast nation with a small number of people.

I support the Bill. I believe it has some advantages for the State and the sporting and recreation community. Parliament should support this Bill so that it becomes operational at the earliest possible date.

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): There is no doubt in my mind that, if funding of sport and recreation was left solely to the Government funding system and, because of the constraints placed on Governments and the moneys that they can make available for sport, it would remain static. There is a great need to find a method of funding and financing the ever-increasing amount of sport being played by our youth and Australians in general. I think that in one junior school in my district there are 10 soccer teams, four football teams, five basketball teams, and so on, so there is a mass of people being led into the activities of sports throughout South Australia.

The problem that arises is that up to now most sports have relied on raising money from various sources such as sponsors. We have seen the larger sports being able to attract the larger sponsors, but when we come down to the smaller organisational sports we find that they have great difficulty in arranging sponsors so as to raise finances. This may apply to a local church group with a tennis club trying to buy equipment so that its members may play recreational sport on the weekends. It may apply to a swimming club, and the member for Mawson tonight mentioned the activities of schools, in relation to swimming competitions. An interesting aspect to that is that under the previous Administration a strange ruling was made because it did not like competition. So, when swimming pools were built the Government made sure that the swimming pools were three inches shorter than was permitted for competitive sport. This meant that swimming clubs were unable to avail themselves of those pools for competition use. Therefore, they are now looking for new areas to finance their sport to gain pool facilities.

There are other stories concerning smaller sports—probably some are unknown sports. For instance, if I asked the member for Gilles whether he would support an allocation of money to a game of "Pelota" he probably would not know what I was talking about. There are other games which are struggling for survival. I now refer to the member for Stuart's comment about a rush or surge of money being made available for sport during the Whitlam era. That was a once-only hit, simply because that Government could not maintain or sustain that level of finance available over any period of time. What is necessary is that action which the Minister has brought in today. What he is proposing is that we need to secure a method of raising finance which can go back into sporting activities and which is proven. The member for Napier was brought up in the same country as I. We were raised on the soccer pools, Vernons and Littlewoods, and we both know that there was a certain amount of skill attached to the selection of the best eight. We did not necessarily win. The concept was the same, and it did not hurt the society of that country. People lived with it and they appreciated it. I also refer to a point that the member for Napier mentioned about there being nobody in his electorate who sent money to England.

Mr. Hemmings: I did not say that.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I know many people in your area

some of whom joined with me in a syndicate for sending money over there for the pools. If the honourable member looks at the situation he will find that people today are doing the pools; they are sending them interstate, and there are still some that send them to the United Kingdom.

We all agree that sport needs some uplift and more finance. There is no debate about that. Both Parties agree, but the Opposition's argument is simply based on what seems to be a paranoid approach concerning one or two individual people. That is the difference in thinking between the Parties. There needs to be an organisation which has a proven track record in Australia and overseas and which can attract and produce the goods we are looking for. We have selected the one before us. If sport in this State is to get an uplift, what it needs is a consistency of funds. I believe that the organisation chosen to do the job will be able, through its advertising techniques and by its entrepreneurship to raise the necessary funds.

Mr. Hemmings: How were they chosen?

Mr. GLAZBROOK: I am not particularly looking at that argument. I am concerning myself with the argument before us about what it will do for this State. I think the money raised can do nothing but good for sport.

Members interjecting:

Mr. GLAZBROOK: It is not Question Time. I am expressing my views on what is necessary.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the House via the Chair and not argue directly across the Chamber.

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the honourable member was trying to provoke me by some sort of questioning. A constant form of raising money which can benefit sport in general is most essential and most desirable. I know many people in my constituency, and there are probably others throughout South Australia, would not like the idea of promoting further gambling, but the playing of the pools, as I see it, is no different from what already exists with horse-racing, dog-racing, trotting, and so forth. Entries on soccer pools are made on a form. People can look at the performance of teams and so forth, the same as with racing. What we are providing is an organisation that will provide employment and taxes. The latter, quite rightly, can be used towards sports needing support. In regard to comments made from members opposite, I have yet to hear a member of the Opposition stand up and support the Bill in its total concept, bearing in mind the fact that they have criticised the fact that no member on this side of the House spoke against the Bill. Although they say it is a conscience vote, no member opposite had the courage to speak for the Bill. Obviously members are sticking together on that as well. I support the Bill. It makes a great deal of sense and will do a great deal for sport in South Australia. I think it will provide a basis to work on, and sport will benefit and be able to produce a healthier youthful group of people.

The SPEAKER: I call on the honourable member for Glenelg.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have called the member for Glenelg, and I trust that he will be heard with the necessary silence.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Thank you, Sir. I rise to speak briefly in the debate, as I do not wish to keep the House any longer than necessary. However, I want to make clear my position on the Bill, which I support. I hope that my reasons for doing so are obvious to most members.

Sporting clubs and organisations need finance. There is a great need for more money to go into sport, because we all know the effects of it. Those who have been involved in

sport, either personally or by encouraging their children to participate, will know of the colossal advantages that exist. I certainly found this out in my recent study tour. The imperative involvement of young people in sport is of paramount importance. There is no doubt at all that, in the area in which I was studying, sport plays a large part in keeping young people on the right track. Any young person who is involved in a sport has little chance of wandering on to the wrong side of life.

Mr. Hemmings: You've got no proof of that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I certainly have got proof.

Mr. Hemmings: You never gave it in your report, though.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all very well for the honourable member to talk about my report. All he has read is its title. I should be more than surprised if the honourable member has looked over one of the 133 pages of my report. A great many other countries spend enormous sums of money on sport.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: When ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise. The greatest number of these countries derive their finance from either lotteries or some other method of raising money in that way. Canada would probably be one of the best countries in the Western world in relation to the stadiums that it has supplied for sport. All the Canadian provinces of which I am aware have raised a great deal of money for sport through lotteries and this sort of method. That is quite sufficient for me.

Manitoba and British Columbia, as well as another province that I visited in Canada, place enormous stress on the effects of sport on young people. They use sport to advantage by trying to keep young people out of trouble, out of institutions and away from crime. They have floated enormous sums of money into sport for this specific purpose. The need exists in Australia, particularly in South Australia. I say that because South Australia is my State and more money must go into sport.

Mr. Langley: It's our State.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is our State, and I have a sticker stating "It's our State, mate" on my car. This State must spend much more money on sport, and this is a very good way of raising that money.

Mr. Langley: Can you give us an idea of how much Germany, the U.S.S.R. and those countries spend on sport?

Mr. MATHWIN: I can. The U.S.S.R., Romania, Poland, and India raise money for sport by way of a lottery.

Mr. Langley: How do they spend it?

Mr. MATHWIN: If I told the honourable member how much they spent on lotteries in Poland, he would not know what it meant, anyway. More emphasis must be placed on the lesser known sports in this State. This will allow more young people to become involved.

In sports such as cricket, football, basketball, and so on, only a select few young people ever get to the top. The wider the sphere, involving more sports, the better chance young people will have of getting into the top bracket, as a result of which they will have the benefit of travelling to other States and places. More emphasis should therefore be placed on the lesser known sports.

Mr. Langley: Tell us the score with the Australian Government: how much they get for sport and don't spend.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Unley was heard in silence.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. I am disappointed with the member for Unley. I listened intently to his speech, which was one of the better

speeches that he has made in the 10 years that I have been a member in this place. The honourable member has practically got me on side, and is now doing his best to upset me, and that hurts me.

The Government should be concentrating on the lesser known sports. Indeed, the Recreation and Sport Division and the Education Department ought to get closer together in relation to assembly halls and gymnasiums that the Education Department builds. The specifications for these halls and gymnasiums in primary schools are far too small. The Education Department makes the excuse that, if a large hall is provided, it overcomes the young people, and that this is a problem for young children in primary schools. I suggest that the department examine how easy it is to divide up a large hall at a very low cost. If needed, larger halls can be provided and used by the youth of the community, particularly in new neighbourhoods. I refer to a recent visit that I paid to Munno Para, where they have nothing. They should have larger halls in order to keep young people involved and off the streets.

Mr. Langley: They can't afford it.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the honourable member supports this Bill, these people will get more money for sport. It is the responsibility of the two departments (namely, the Minister's department and the Education Department) to get together amicably and come to some arrangement regarding the size of halls and the provision of assembly halls and stadiums for different districts.

I was most disappointed when the member for Napier said that his people do not do the pools. Indeed, the honourable member said that his people were too poor to participate in the pools; they were his words. The honourable gentleman, who hails from the same country as I do (of course, he comes from the southern end, and that explains his problem), would know that a vast number of his constituents who come from the United Kingdom do the soccer pools and have done so for years. For the honourable gentleman to say that his people do not do the pools because they are too poor is absolutely ridiculous, and I hope that the honourable member will withdraw that part of his speech.

A number of Opposition members have talked about Vernons or Sangster, their mouths watering when they think of the sum of money that the Vernon Pools make. The Sangster family comes from Liverpool, in which I spent some time before I came to this country and which houses the two biggest soccer pools in the world, namely, Vernons and Littlewoods. The Sangster family has poured millions of dollars into sport. Indeed, the father of the current Sangster family was Chairman of one of the best soccer clubs in the world.

Mr. Langley: Which one was that?

Mr. MATHWIN: The one that I used to support when I was in the United Kingdom, namely, Everton. Sangsters were involved with that team in supplying it with a vast amount of finance, and that firm has done this for many smaller clubs, particularly throughout Lancashire. Some members opposite have spoken about profit. The member for Florey spent a long time apportioning blame for the loss of the election, and all those sorts of things. He blamed everyone but his own Party. He was upset because he had to say that horrible word that is taboo as far as he is concerned, namely, the terrible word "profit".

Mr. Langley: What about the match between Lancashire and Yorkshire? They won't sit alongside one another at the cricket ground.

Mr. MATHWIN: You are talking about the Wars of the Roses. It has been going on for hundreds of years, as the member ought to know.

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of the member for

Glenelg to the fact that the second reading debates do not allow the answering of questions or interjections across the Chamber, which are out of order anyway.

Mr. MATHWIN: I apologise for being naughty.

Mr. Hemmings: You need to, as well.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MATHWIN: The fact that Vernons are involved should have nothing to do with this matter. It should not put some members opposite off voting for the Bill, because it is a firm with vast experience in this matter. It has been dealing in soccer pools for more years than I can remember. That is a long time, and it gets longer every year. I believe that this is a good Bill and that it deserves the support of the House. I hope that all members, when they consider the situation honestly as a conscience situation, will realise that nothing but good can come out of it. As the member for Fisher has said, any Government has the ability, if it feels that far too much profit is being made by an organisation in this matter, to change the situation.

Mr. Keneally: It can nationalise them.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, indeed, if any Government feels that it can do better by nationalising the industry, but heaven forbid the thought, because we know what has happened to the nationalised industries in the United Kingdom. I do not want to get away from the Bill but I point that out for the sincere consideration of members. I support the measure and ask members opposite to do likewise.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): This has been a very interesting debate. It has gone on for a considerable time, and I ask why this always happens to Bills of which I have charge. It is a very important issue for the future of sport in this State. I appreciate that there will be a conscience vote on both sides. I also really appreciate the contributions that have been made by the members for Baudin, Goyder, Flinders, and one more.

Mr. Hemmings: Me?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, it was not the member for Napier. I apologise, but I cannot recall which member it was.

Mr. Keneally: The member for Torrens?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The speeches in this place by the member for Torrens are variable. I also pay a tribute to the member for Gilles, who, once again, on a Bill that I am in charge of, has done his homework extremely well. He obviously has spent a lot of time in researching the subject and I believe that he made a significant contribution to the debate.

However, that praise does not necessarily go to all members who have spoken. I want to refer particularly to those members opposite who, to quote the member for Brighton, seemed to show a paranoia about Australian Soccer Pools Pty. Ltd. because one of the shareholders in that organisation, a minority shareholder at that, holding approximately 30 per cent of the shares, happens to be News Limited.

I want to make very plain that there is no other organisation that can run soccer pools in this country or in this State at this time. If we were debating this Bill several years ago, certainly it could have been possible for the Lotteries Commission in this State to join with Lotteries Commissions in other States and run a type of soccer pool. I am not sure of the provisions of the patent rights that Vernons own on British soccer, but I believe that what I have said would have been possible. Now the horse has bolted. That is no longer an argument. There is no way in

which the State Lotteries Commission can run soccer pools in this State alone.

Yesterday, this House passed a Bill to allow the State Lotteries Commission to join with two other States in boxing the lotto, and the reason why they have done that is to increase the size of the prize pool. In the second reading explanation I referred to Australian Soccer Pools Ltd., because that is the only organisation that can run soccer pools at this stage in this State.

Otherwise, we would not have a significant prize pool and the money coming to recreation and sport in this State would be minimal. I am saying that after having the benefit of investigating this matter at great length. The introduction of the Bill has been delayed because of investigations by officers and me on this point. A lot of consideration was given to the matter.

Let us consider the point made by the member for Stuart and others. It was said that the State Lotteries Commission could run a State sports lottery. I agree. It could run a special \$1 000 000 lottery, as I think the member for Stuart said, say, once a year, and the proceeds could go to recreation and sport. However, I tell the House that, if that was the case, it would certainly affect the revenue accruing to this State from lotteries. It would affect the small lotteries and ticket sales and functions held by amateur sporting bodies to raise money. That is one reason why the Government turned its back on that particular matter.

I now want to deal with one other point that the member for Stuart made. He said (and I hope I am quoting him correctly but I probably have not got the exact words) that he had suspicions that this deal, as he called it, with Murdoch (I think he mentioned) was *quid pro quo*. I resent that implication. As I said when I took a point of order against the member for Florey, I absolutely resent those imputations about my integrity, but I conducted the negotiations on the Bill. No-one else in the Government did. The only other time other members of the Government saw the proposal was when it went to Cabinet. In fact, I picked up the negotiations because there had been some informal contact with the previous Government. I say no more than that, and I am not saying what the previous Government intended to do.

Mr. Langley: It was very informal, wasn't it?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I said there was some informal contact, and I continued that contact when I became Minister. I processed the matter right through, and there has been no *quid pro quo* to Rupert Murdoch. I suggest that the member for Stuart should not reflect on my integrity or the integrity of this Government. The member for Salisbury raised the matter of company control, and I would like to deal with that in Committee, perhaps on the clause he proposes to amend. The member for Whyalla asked what arrangements were being made with the T.A.B. The T.A.B. has not been instructed to become an agent. It was asked whether it wished to become an agent, and it said that it did. It did not believe that becoming an agent for soccer pools would affect racing investment turnover. That is the considered opinion of the T.A.B. as it is, I believe, the considered opinion of most of the codes.

The member for Gilles raised the matter of advisory committees, and I suggested that that aspect be left until the Committee stage for discussion in more detail. The member for Whyalla and the member for Baudin mentioned a comparison between soccer pools and a casino. There is no comparison between a casino and the introduction of an Australian soccer pools system. The World Council of Churches would not have said that a casino was a harmless enterprise in relation to the family,

but it did say that about soccer pools. Admittedly, it was a British committee, but the committee of World Council of Churches said that the effects on the family were minimal, and it would not have said that about a casino.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I did not hear the interjection, and it is probably just as well. I want to mention a point made by a couple of members about funding for recreation and sport in South Australia compared to New South Wales. The member for Unley quoted from an article in the *News* by Geoff Roach. I refer the honourable member to Geoff Roach's article on the Olympic Games, because I think it was one of the most courageous pieces of sporting journalism that I have seen. But that is another matter, and it is not dealing with the Bill. The member for Unley quoted from the article, comparing South Australian expenditure and New South Wales expenditure. I shall deal with only one of the items. We are talking about sports development. I have here a report from the New South Wales Department of Sport and Recreation. For some reason, the department deals in calendar years, so this is a report for the period ending 31 January 1979, a strange date on which to end a calendar year. The approved expenditure for that year on sports development, not talking about other things, was \$179 400, of which they had expended \$49 350. The expenditure in this State on sports development was \$200 000, and we have only a quarter of the population of New South Wales. Members opposite did not mention—

Mr. Slater interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the figure for Western Australia was \$500 000 but I do not have the figures for the other expenditure. In the figures the honourable member quoted from the *News* there was nothing about capital assistance grants or anything of the sort. They mentioned three specific categories.

Mr. Langley: Didn't I say that in my speech?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If that is so, I apologise. Members opposite did not mention the difference in population between South Australia and New South Wales. They were pleased to talk about New South Wales, because it has a Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will please resume his seat. I have been more than tolerant about the degree of interjection whilst the Minister has been replying. I inform all members that the only person who has the call is the Minister, and any interjections will be treated by warning, in the first instance, and naming thereafter.

Mr. Langley: Right.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Unley.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The funding for recreation and sport in the department (I hope the member for Stuart will note this), except, I think, for the salaries line, is entirely out of proceeds from the New South Wales soccer pools; what is more, unlike the provisions of this legislation, only two-thirds of the accrued profits to the Government go to recreation and sport in New South Wales. In this proposed legislation, the entire accrued profits to the Government will go to recreation and sport. I think this is a very telling point, and I am disappointed that members opposite did not use it in their arguments. I have no criticism of members in this House who argued on an absolutely conscientious basis.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: The member for Gilles pointed out—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I believe I have

acknowledged the contribution made by the member for Gilles. The member for Glenelg mentioned the duplication of resources in having the Education Department build facilities, with the Department of Recreation and Sport and other Government departments building facilities.

Dr. Billard: Councils.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: And indeed local government. I agree with the member for Glenelg: this is a serious matter, and we cannot afford to duplicate resources. I am happy to say that negotiations have been going on between my department and the Education Department to try to get some joint approach and joint use of facilities. I am sure that the member for Baudin would support that philosophy and that when he was Minister he would have supported it. We are cognisant of the problem, and we are working on it.

In summing up, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe there are enough funds for recreation and sport. I have never hidden that; I have said it publicly. I believe that in future, and we could be looking many years ahead, expenditure by Governments on recreation and sport will be one of the biggest facets of Government spending. We have only to look at the situation in relation to early retirement and shorter working hours to realise the increased amount of leisure time that people will have and the vast use of recreation and sporting facilities that will be required by members of the public. I do not believe that any Government in Australia has paid more than lip service to this matter, but I believe that it is coming, and I am committed to it.

The debate has been a useful one, and it has been interesting to note the differing views of members. I was impressed by the contribution of the member for Brighton, and I took on board the warning given by the member for Hanson regarding the use of money from the recreation and sports fund. We can deal with more detail in Committee, and I commend the Bill to the House.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Promoting soccer football pools not unlawful in certain circumstances."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I understand from comments made by the member for Napier earlier that in 1971 that there was some problem in the United Kingdom with regard to the right of one operator or promoter to claim monopoly rights. Legislation was passed at that time in the United Kingdom Parliament to give that right for 10 years, whereupon, since, it has been extended on an annual basis while the matter was investigated. As I understand it, where we do not have our own legislation, we are subject to British legislation. Does the Minister know whether the findings in that case in 1971 have any implications for us and, if so, what are those implications?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, I do not. I believe they do not have any implications for us. I cannot answer the question in detail for the honourable member, as I do not know, and I would not try to convince the Committee that I did know. I do not believe that it has any implications for us. However, before the Bill passes out of this Parliament, I undertake to get a complete answer for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Minors not to take part in soccer football pools."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: As I understand it, this is almost an exact copy of the New South Wales legislation. Indeed, since the New South Wales legislation was passed in 1975,

I was interested to note that there has been no upgrading of the penalty which appears in subclause (3), referring to a penalty not exceeding \$100. This is six years ago. Did the Minister or his department give any consideration to increasing that penalty to take account of the 1981 dollar value as compared to that of 1975? Secondly, at the time in New South Wales, questions were raised about the policing on this. There is always a problem with age cut-off points. I support them, but nevertheless it is a problem as to how effective policing will be—whether it will just be tokenism or whether it will be real. Will the Minister comment on the level of the penalty and also the effectiveness of policing this provision.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I believe the penalty is adequate at this stage. Obviously, it is subject to review. We gave this clause a lot of thought when drafting the Bill, because Victoria does not have an age limit, and I understand that in Queensland it is not policed, whereas it certainly is in New South Wales. I believe that we should have an age limit and that that viewpoint would be shared by most members of the Committee. If the penalty is not adequate, I will come back to the House with an amendment to the Act, assuming that the Bill passes the Parliament. On the question of the age limit, I insisted that it be put in the Bill, and I believe that that was the correct thing to do.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister has certainly answered one part of the question. However, I am not sure that he has fully answered the other part. I accept his determination to have this clause in the Bill, and I accept that all of us would support its inclusion. Is it in fact just a gesture to salve our combined consciences, or will it be a policed section of the Act? Is there any undertaking that the Minister can give us in this regard?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It will certainly be policed. I believe that there is no age limit on State lotteries. This is somewhat of a departure for this State. It is an important distinction, and the provision will be policed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I was somewhat surprised to hear the Minister say that he was keen to see the age limit put in when he earlier told the House that the World Council of Churches thought that this was a fairly harmless form of family activity. The Minister used that point to bolster the argument for the introduction of soccer pools in South Australia. I am somewhat surprised as to why the Minister is now apparently suggesting that there is something iniquitous in it or something from which minors need to be protected. What are his reasons for introducing the age requirement?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The World Council of Churches Committee on Gambling would not have considered this matter in detail. It was considering gambling as a whole. The World Council of Churches would not have been considering a particular soccer pools Bill in detail. It made its judgment on the question of soccer pools generally. This Government, as the honourable member knows, deals with family impact statements when it goes to Cabinet with a submission. It was in the preparation of a family impact statement that it became obvious to me that there should be an age limit here. I am not entranced with some forms of gambling. I am certainly not a wowsler. I have gambled moderately in the past. I have even played the Instant Money Game because I had so many complaints from my constituents about the effects it was having on families, and I do not like the effect that it has.

If I was going to bring in another form of gambling, I believed that it was necessary to have certain safeguards. For that reason and with the best intentions in the world, I

thought it was important to have this clause in the Bill, and that was supported by my colleagues.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: In view of the opinions just expressed and the fact that the Government has been in power since September 1979, why has it not taken or recommended to Cabinet similar action in regard to the very game to which the Minister has just referred?

The CHAIRMAN: I rule the question out of order, as it is not relevant to the matter we are discussing.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, it would seem to be a valid point to raise. Where an age limit is introduced in a gambling activity and the reasons given are that the Minister has certain feelings (to which he is entitled), it would seem to be not entirely unreasonable to ask the Minister why he has not the same feelings about other forms of gambling over which he has some control.

The CHAIRMAN: I will allow the Minister to reply. However, I point out that clause 5 deals with minors not being permitted to take part in soccer pools. I cannot allow the debate to be broadened to deal with other forms of gambling.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I will be brief in deference to your ruling, Mr. Chairman. As a member of the Government, I have a responsibility, although I am not responsible for other forms of lotteries, other than minor lotteries—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Have you made a submission?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, I have not made a submission, but I understand that it is under consideration by the Government.

Mr. PETERSON: If a person under 18 years bought a ticket and won the pools, can he keep the money for paying the fine of \$100? If not, where would the money go—back into the pool or to the State whence it came?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Another clause, to which I cannot refer now, relates to the Unclaimed Moneys Act. The money would go to general revenue.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I recognise that the Minister has said that a family impact statement has been prepared, but I point out that clause 5 (2) gives a blanket cover to any person selling a ticket to a person under the age of 18 years. In effect, this clause provides that any person who sells a ticket can state that he did not realise that the buyer was under 18. In the selling of cigarettes to minors, the same protection applies. However, it does not work, as the police have said. They say that they do not intend to prosecute in this regard. Does the Minister believe that the same attitude will be taken by the police in regard to this clause?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. I have said that the police will police the Act. They are in the same position as regards under-age people who enter restricted films, or things of that nature. From what I have heard (and this is not my portfolio), the proprietors are coping quite well in regard to that law, and I do not see why that cannot happen in this case. I realise that problems are involved, and I do not pretend that they will not arise. I also realise that it will be hard to police the Act, but we will try.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—“Licence to promote soccer football pools.”

Mr. KENEALLY: Under this clause, the Minister has the power to grant or refuse licences, to take licences away from a successful licensee, and so on. In the second reading explanation, the Minister stated that only two organisations in Australia have the capacity to run the soccer pools: one is the South Australian Lotteries Commission, and the Minister told us that the commission did not wish to be involved, and the other is Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited. If only Australian Soccer Pools is interested, and it will have a monopoly, it

appears that almost every part of clause 6 is window dressing and does not mean a great deal. How will the Minister refuse a licence to the very organisation that this legislation is designed to support?

The Minister has no freedom under this clause. If the Bill passes, the franchise will be given to Australian Soccer Pools. One would not understand that from the clause. One would believe that an option is available to a number of organisations and that the Minister will make a free choice from those organisations as to which is the best able to run soccer pools in the interests of this State. If the organisation does not comply with what the Minister lays down, he will threaten it with withdrawing the licence. That is a lot of bally-hoo. This clause is a mockery because Australian Soccer Pools will obtain the licence and the Minister will not be able to take it away. What sort of offence would the organisation have to commit to encourage the Minister to take away its licence? No-one else can do the job. I would be interested to know why we are faced with these fine sounding words that mean nothing.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I hope that the member for Stuart does not suggest that these safeguards should not be included in the Bill. If one follows the train of his thought to the logical conclusion, he is saying that the inclusion of these safeguards is of no use. The member for Salisbury referred to the constraints that should be placed on companies. The member for Stuart pursued that line previously. The Government has made no secret of the fact that the franchise will go to Australian Soccer Pools. This information was included in the second reading explanation so that there would be no doubts in the minds of members of the Committee. I could refer to the fines and sanctions provided in this clause. First, a bond of \$100 000 is provided.

Mr. Keneally: Subclause (2) (b) provides "that he is not prepared to grant the application".

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The clause covers numerous facets of application and licensing. I informed the Committee that the sanctions must be included to maintain adequate control of the company, which is, in this case, Australian Soccer Pools, or any other company. The member for Stuart stated that no other company has appeared on the horizon, but I indicate that I will take action against this company if it breaks the terms of its agreement with the Government.

[Midnight]

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I have been trying to translate to a possible situation what seems to have been put by the Minister as a hypothetical situation. If, when applications are opened, another enterprise or promoter applies to the Government with a proposal to operate soccer pools, will the Minister give to the House an undertaking that he will seriously consider such application to the extent that it may be successful over and above an application made by Australian Soccer Pools?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If there are any other applications, they will be seriously considered, but I doubt that that will occur.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Regarding applicants for a licence being proprietary companies, will the Minister give an undertaking that he will make it a condition of application that an exempt proprietary company cannot apply and maintain its exempt status? I am concerned that there are very few obligations on proprietary companies in regard to their reporting to other people. In the category covering proprietary companies, there are two groups—exempt and non-exempt. The exempt companies have

even fewer obligations to report to anyone. I can cite some of the advantages to the operators of exempt proprietary companies from a book entitled *Company Law* by Mr. Ford, which states:

In addition to the advantages of secrecy of financial affairs which is available in certain circumstances, there are the following advantages:

1. It is not prohibited from making loans to directors;
2. When appointing an auditor, the members, unlike members of other companies, are not prohibited from appointing an officer of the company, a partner, employer or employee of an officer of the company, or a partner or employee of an employee of an officer of the company, provided he is a registered company auditor.

3. When the Companies Auditors Board considers it impractical for the company to obtain the services of a registered company auditor, the board, because of the location of the companies business, may sanction another appointment . . . Certain items normally required in the annual directors' report may be omitted.

I have omitted some of the advantages because they are not relevant. I raise that point because the memorandum of association forwarded to me for Australian Soccer Pools, as the company was in 1974, indicated that at that stage it would have been an exempt proprietary company. By virtue of the News Ltd. shareholding it is now no longer exempt. But, by virtue of share transfer, it could become exempt again. The Minister should consider making it a condition that, if an exempt proprietary company wants to apply for a licence, it will not enjoy the advantages of secrecy of financial affairs, as mentioned in the passage I have just quoted.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Over the past few days, the member for Salisbury has done a lot of work on company law and the law relating to proprietary companies. I do not pretend to know as much as he does about that subject. I will not give him an undertaking that I will put that in the conditions. The member for Salisbury has pointed out that the Minister will decide the conditions of the licence. That is very much an argument against some of the things that he suggested earlier, because the Minister can make licence conditions. All of the things mentioned by the member for Salisbury will be given due consideration when the conditions are drawn up, because obviously I will have to take Crown Law advice. There is no question about that, and that is why I am not prepared to give the honourable member an undertaking that I will put those things in the conditions, without first obtaining that advice. I am sure the member for Salisbury would regard that approach as reasonable.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Minister tended to lecture me a little when I raised the first query in relation to this clause. I note that he has just informed the member for Salisbury that the Minister will be setting the conditions applying to any licence. The clause states that the licence will be in force for a period of 10 years. I am still interested to hear from the Minister, who will take Crown Law opinion before he enters into a contract with Australian Soccer Pools Ltd., whether or not the whole idea of South Australia's participating in soccer pools is still questionable.

Is it still a matter of the Minister and the Crown Law Office of South Australia being able to come to agreeable terms with the company to which we are going to give this monopoly? That brings me to ask a question relating to clause 6 (2) (b). What circumstances would prevent the Minister from granting an application? I believe it is a *fait accompli*. There is already an understanding with this company that, should this Bill pass, this company will be the promoter.

I do not know why we should be faced with the responsibility of debating clauses such as this, and hearing the Minister saying that he will be establishing the rules that the contractor will have to abide by. Is the agreement still flexible? Will it go ahead if there are circumstances that would prevent him from agreeing to it? Does the Minister foresee those circumstances becoming apparent and, if he does, what are those circumstances likely to be?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If this Bill is passed by this Parliament, given vice Regal assent and proclaimed I will enter into negotiations with Australian Soccer Pools. There is no question about that and I would not want the Committee to be under any misapprehension. However, if during the negotiations I believe that the State will be disadvantaged I will, of course, not proceed, or I will certainly recommend to the Government that it does not proceed, because that decision will have to be taken by the Government. In fact, if I do negotiate an agreement with Australian Soccer Pools that will also have to be agreed to by Cabinet, and there is no question about that, either. I hope that answers that part of the honourable member's question. I am not trying to hide anything. There is no commitment or deal with Australian Soccer Pools. I will be prepared to enter into negotiations with that company if and when the Act is proclaimed. I cannot answer the question in relation to the circumstances that would be unsatisfactory and, once again, I would need legal advice about that.

Mr. LEWIS: Even though I have not participated in the earlier debate on this Bill, I have a nagging doubt about this aspect of the legislation. I am not a lawyer, and I do not understand where the legislation precludes a political Party from ever being a shareholder in the company, either directly or as a nominee, and deriving benefits from the operation of the pool and the profits that accrue to it. We all know that the present Minister would never allow that to happen. If members opposite wanted an assurance about that, I am sure that I could give them that assurance on his behalf. However, in 10 or 11 years time another Minister may have the responsibility for deciding who will be the successful applicant for the licence at that time.

I do not know of any other type of commercial animal like the one we are about to create. Will the Minister say whether we have precluded political Parties from deriving benefits from the profits obtained in this way? It would concern me if we have not.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I can give the honourable member an assurance that, if the honourable member for Mitcham came to me and said that the Australian Democrats wanted to run soccer pools, I would not agree, nor would the Government. I cannot give the honourable member a cast iron guarantee about this. If a political Party was incorporated, I suppose it could apply. If members opposite want to apply, I can assure them of the same reaction. I will get advice on this matter and let the honourable member have that information at a later stage.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Under this clause, clearly there is an assignation by the State of a peculiar right to an individual. Even though specifications are spelt out for the issuance of a licence, the Minister has already informed the Committee who the recipient is going to be. From my reading of Erskine May in relation to the description of a public Bill, a private Bill and a hybrid Bill, it seems to me a possibility that the Bill before us, particularly because the Minister has made that pre-assignation in his second reading speech of the State's peculiar right in this matter, is a once-off guarantee. Was advice taken from the Crown Law about this matter?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes. As honourable members have pointed out, the Bill does not mention any

other specific organisation. This was the case in the other States. I understand, from advice I received; that the Bills did not go to a Select Committee. I do not believe, from advice given to me, that there was any need for that in this case. If there was, we would have done that. The mentioning of an organisation in the second reading speech was just stark realism; it was no good hiding it, and I would have been criticised by honourable members if I had.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I do not suppose we could have criticised if we had not known who it was going to be.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am sure honourable members would have found a way about it. On my advice, there is no need for this Bill to go through the Select Committee process.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I asked earlier whether, if another group or promoter made an application, it would be given serious consideration, and the Minister said, "Yes". He was asked later about discussions with Australian Soccer Pools, and he told us that the moment this Bill has passed he would enter into negotiations with that company. It seems to me that the second answer does not comply with the first. I would have thought, in all fairness, that the Minister should open applications for the licence and then, upon receipt of applications, enter into negotiations. Can the Minister say that the scenario I suggest is the one that will be followed?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Applications will be called before negotiations are commenced. The honourable member is quite right.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Conditions of licence."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I move:

Page 4, after line 29—Insert subsection as follows:

(2) The conditions of a licence shall include—

(a) where the licensee is a natural person, a condition that he shall be resident in South Australia for the term of the licence;

(b) where the licensee is a corporation—

(i) a condition that at all times during the term of the licence not less than 20 per centum of the issued shares of the corporation shall be held by residents of South Australia and not less than 20 per centum of the voting rights that can be exercised at a general meeting of the corporation shall be exercisable by residents of South Australia; and

(ii) a condition that a person nominated by the Minister shall be a director of the corporation at all times during the term of the licence.

I spoke during the second reading debate about the need to have controls over any licensee who operates in this State with regard to soccer pools. I suggested various ways of this being achieved by altering the company structure. I also cited the example of two company structures available under Canadian law.

Indeed, one of them is available particularly for the sorts of groups that operate in exactly the same circumstances as this soccer pool will operate, namely, if a company is to benefit by being able to operate under an Act of Parliament by licence or other such instrument, certain obligations fall upon that company. The legislation there requires participation by Canadian citizens, both in share ownership and in the board level representation of those companies.

In due course, we will need to have a broader structure incorporated in the Companies Act for all these situations

which occur in this State. However, since we have this legislation before us we need somehow to embody the spirit of those provisions as conveniently as possible; hence the amendment that I move.

The applicant who is granted the licence will be in a very powerful position, because it will be a monopoly situation. Such an applicant will be guaranteed that there will be no competition of a like nature. Also, in effect, the applicant will be part of the fund raising of the Government, because a certain portion of the profits will go to the Government. It has been stated that part of the fund will go to the Department of Recreation and Sport. However, the Bill does not provide for any input of a South Australian nature directly into such a company. This amendment seeks to do that, on the first level by having an appointee of the Minister as a director of the corporation.

That becomes significant when one looks at the rights of proprietary companies and the rights that directors have in deciding what will appear in the financial accounts of proprietary companies. If one of those directors is not a Government appointee, there will be no control over the definition of what accounts will be used or developed by the company in question.

It is not unreasonable to expect share ownership by South Australians. The question concerning the percentage would obviously be a matter of some debate. The figure of 20 per cent is a useful figure, firstly because of the number of other states involved in Australian Soccer Pools already, and it would be unreasonable to expect a higher proportion on that basis alone. I think that 20 per cent would not be an unrealistic level to achieve. The share ownership part is not in any way trying to predispose who the share owners would be. Even though I may feel that the most appropriate share owners should be none other than perhaps the Lotteries Commission, the amendment is not seeking to do that.

Mr. Keneally: The Minister will have Rupert Murdoch as his nominee on the board. He's a good South Australian.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am not sure that he is a South Australian any more. One wonders what citizenship he presently holds.

The CHAIRMAN: That comment is out of order.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I accept your ruling on that, Sir. We acknowledge that the first part of the amendment concerning the natural born person is not really relevant to this situation, but it must be included to take account of a situation that might conceivably occur in the future. We are considering bodies corporate, and hence the second part of my amendment. I strongly believe that, if we are to give to any body corporate such financial privileges (and this question was raised in the New South Wales Parliament when similar legislation was discussed); is it appropriate for one company to be granted a monopoly or should this be left to the competition of various agencies offering such games, if it is to be turned over to private enterprise at all? If we make a decision that a monopoly will exist, one company obviously will benefit to a very great extent.

The pay-off for that is that such a company will be obliged to make a contribution to the Government coffers. That is fine. In an amendment that will be moved later, some reference will be made to the percentage that will be paid out in prize pools. What better means of communication control than having an appointee of the Minister on the board of directors so that those consultations can take place in the board of the company?

If we have given a company these rights and privileges, as indeed they are, surely we are not expecting too much when stating that they should have some commitment to

South Australia. The very statement "It's our State, mate," of which we have heard so much, should surely apply here. We have accepted in this State the logic of having lotteries controlled, by and large, by the Lotteries Commission, because it services the entire South Australian community. Surely we want this to be serving the South Australian community as well and to embody that principle, so that it is simply not an out-of-town, out-of-State organisation coming in here and, for some financial pay-off, proceeding to rip profits out of the system as fast as it can go.

I hope that the Minister sees his way clear to accept these amendments, as they will have undoubted advantages in the years to come in protecting the interests of this State. It will not be beyond the realms of possibility that even the favoured son, who seems to be in the front running in relation to this application, could accept these requirements. Already, there are Australian shareholders in the structure of the company, which means that it would be possible that they could adopt into their Memorandum of Association a certain per centage in South Australia. Every State Government that is participating in this scheme should be demanding rights of access to the board of directors so that it can be a party to the way in which this proposal develops.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I oppose the amendments, mainly because of the honourable member's statement that every State Government may well do this. I look forward, when this legislation passes, to joining the other States in negotiations with the company. That is the nub of the matter. South Australia is virtually last in the field. I do not know whether Western Australia will come in, although I understand that it is considering the matter seriously. South Australia is fifth in the field. The legislation has been drawn up by all other States, which will act in concert in negotiations with the company. As I have said, I look forward to joining in those negotiations. The honourable member said that we will be discussing percentages in a later clause. That is one of the reasons why I wish to become involved in negotiations.

The amendments cannot be taken unilaterally by one State. It may well be that there is a strong case in what the honourable member says. I do not deny that. However, if there is, it must be taken in concert with the other States. There is no way in which this State could appoint a director to Australian Soccer Pools Limited, a company originally registered in Victoria and now registered here, without the other States also taking the same steps. I would not be prepared to take those steps unilaterally, although it may perhaps be done in negotiation with the other States.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Inasmuch as the Minister laid much import on my last statement, I will lay much import on his last statement. He said that there should be representation on boards; I cannot remember his exact words. I hope that that is an undertaking by the Minister that, whatever the fate of this amendment, he, in concert with his interstate colleagues, will try to work for representation on the board of the participating State Governments.

The Minister anticipates what surely is the flow of events. We seem to be so fogged with the assurance that Australian Soccer Pools Limited will be the winner of the application. We ought to go back to the actual things that will happen: first, this amendment will be carried, putting into the Act requirements that an applicant should meet these conditions.

Applicants will then decide how they would have to alter their own memoranda of association to meet these conditions. It would not be a case of the Minister's going

to a company and saying, "You shall do this," because it is that company's decision to change the memoranda of association. The Minister cannot direct that. All he can say is, "If you have not got them in there, I cannot accept your application," but it is not in the Minister's power to direct.

We suggest that the Minister should put that as a condition of application and the company will decide whether it will do it. I believe it would do it. I believe that the fact that Australian Soccer Pools has Australian equity participation indicates a willingness to allow local share ownership. It could have had 100 per cent ownership by Vernons of the United Kingdom, and it has not got that. I believe that this is a realistic possibility that we could pose to the company.

On the other hand, why should we be criticised for wanting to take a lead in this issue? New South Wales took a lead in the issue some years ago on various points and I would criticise it on one of them. That is the low level of percentage paid out in prizes. I do not agree with the figure that New South Wales chose and I am pleased to think that there is a possibility that that figure will be raised. I cannot see what is wrong with this State wanting to take a lead in this regard, which is far more honourable than the other type of lead.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I cannot add to what I have said. The conditions of licence are important. The member will realise that I saw this amendment only tonight and have had little time to get legal opinion on it but I am advised that the memorandum or articles of association of any particular company are not all that important. The conditions that we place on the licence are the important things, and I think the member for Salisbury would realise that if he thought about it.

There are in this Bill other safeguards that we will be discussing on the later clause. I gave the member for Salisbury an indication that the points he raised would be taken into account when we were drawing up the conditions of licence but, for the reasons I have given, I am unable to accept this amendment. I am also advised that it may be unworkable but, once again, I am not pretending to be an expert in the law.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am not referring to the amendment. The conditions of licence in clause 8 allow for the conditions relating to the maximum amount a person may subscribe in respect of one entry in a soccer football pool promoted, etc. Does the Minister intended that it will be a 50c entry? The T.A.B. has put forward an argument that the 50c amount associated with one transaction is no longer a viable unit and it has gone on 16 February, on to the \$1 unit. Does the Minister intended that the amount may be \$1?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: There is a parallel—

Mr. Keneally: A paradox.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No, a parallel, not a paradox. I would not want to be accused of lecturing the member for Stuart. The important thing about the T.A.B. is that it is a minimum investment.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Yes, I understand. I visit them more than you do. I know exactly how they work. I could lecture you on it, if you like.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I gave an assurance in this place at another time that I would not agree to an application for a minimum bet of \$1.

I would say that 50c is the amount that we should insist on and should begin the conditions of the licence, and I understand that the average investment in soccer pools is about \$1.50. People play three games on the one ticket. In some respects it could be called multiple betting. If the minimum bet were to be raised to \$1, and if a person bet on the treble, that would mean a minimum investment of

\$3. We will not agree to that, and it is still \$1.50. The same thing applies here.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the honourable member for Mitchell should allow us to complete our consideration of the amendment, after which he is at liberty to refer to the clause as it stands or as amended. He is at liberty then to refer back to the clause.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The matter is so trifling I think we will dismiss it straight away. It appears to be a minor error in the printing.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not wish to appear difficult, but I suggest that we should adhere to the Standing Orders.

Mr. BECKER: I support the Minister in opposing the amendment, which is one of the most restrictive measures I have seen in 11 years in Parliament. Whilst I can understand it coming forward from the honourable member and the Opposition, I believe that the terms of the legislation before us and the controls and the power of the Minister are more than adequate for any type of legislation, including this.

It is unfortunate that there is only one company in Australia that has experience in operating soccer pools. Whether we like it or not, to some degree that company has to be considered as the front runner. There could be another consortium formed to apply for the licence, but it would have to come up with guarantees to convince me, anyway, that it could compete in relation to prize money, and would get the support that would outstrip the other football pool, and it cannot be done. I think it has been explained by the Minister that the best method is to accept what is offering and to be part of the national soccer pools plan. It must also be considered that, with an operation on such a scale, the administration would be much cheaper than setting up an administration in each State for five different soccer pools.

Let us see what is behind the honourable member's thinking. He said that such legislation is in force in Canada. Canada has restrictive company legislation and at present is losing millions if not billions of dollars of potential investment. Within seven or eight days, \$85 000 000 will arrive in this State from that area, because of the restrictive company legislation there. Canada is missing out on very valuable investment dollars. We do not mind, because Australia is one of the few countries left in the free world that is considered stable for investment.

Members interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: Canada is heading for economic problems, and I will be able to inform honourable members in a couple of months what is happening. Anyone with money in Canada is pulling it out because of the restrictive company legislation. I could say that it is a socialist plot, but it would be the beginning of the end if the honourable member gets his way, because he would start to do this to every company in South Australia, and there are many companies involved with legislation. Will he start on the banks and the insurance companies, on General Motors-Holden's or Mitsubishi? What nonsense. What is he trying to do, coming here with a restriction that a person should be a resident of South Australia or should have 20 per cent of the shares in South Australia? Let us get right down to the guts of the issue. What are members opposite trying to do?

Mr. O'Neill interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: Listen, you have to wake up to the facts, mister. First, somebody has to bring the money in to invest in this country. This is not a socialist State yet, and I will fight the Opposition's proposal.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I was going to rise on a point of order, as I did not believe that "mister" was a

Parliamentary term. However, the member for Hanson has sat down so I will answer a few comments. The Canadian legislation has been in operation since 1970 and it does not seem to have done the dire things for Canada that the honourable member suggests. If that was the case, surely it would have done so back in 1970, but in fact Canada has had the same fluctuations and economic circumstances throughout the 1970's as have the major Western industrial countries. So, the honourable member's point loses quite a lot in that area. One of the points that I made before was that the legislation there was not prescriptive by nominating a percentage of shares that should be held by local residents. It provides that it could be varied, depending on circumstances. Obviously, for some companies that may be affected by special Acts of Parliament it would be unreasonable to have a high percentage or any percentage. That legislation quite allows that flexibility.

When I spoke on a generalised change to company law, I believed we could do the same here. For the sake of our discussion tonight, regarding one example, a figure of 20 per cent has been suggested. However, I come back to the point before the House that we, as representatives of the people of South Australia, will, if we pass this Bill, be granting to the successful applicant (in all probability Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited) extensive rights and privileges in this State. We will be giving them a monopoly and a ticket to money and to earn profit. The Government will be receiving some money back in the form of revenue for tourism and recreation but a company will have rights and privileges granted by this Parliament. It is not unreasonable in any circumstances to consider what obligations we should require in return. My amendment is attempting to ensure protection for the interests of the South Australian community, the principle of which I believe the Minister has accepted. I do not believe that it is unreasonable to put this amendment to try to embody that principle at this stage.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member does not know very much about economics, let alone world economics, and I am not going to give him a lesson on it. He talks about rights and privileges—

Mr. O'Neill interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: Go back to sleep, comrade. The honourable member talked about rights and privileges for companies in this State. He can refer to the Mining Act and mining legislation—that is what it is all about. I am opposed to the principle of this and I hope that every member of the Committee is also opposed to it. It is the beginning of the end.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold (teller), Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Allison.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 9—"Revocation of licence."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I referred in the second reading debate to foreign companies, and in regard to proprietary companies I said that foreign companies (albeit that "foreign" does not necessarily apply internationally; it

may merely apply interstate) are not obliged to keep share registries in the State where they are foreign companies. Will the Minister give consideration to this being one of the things upon which a licence will depend, that is, that a share register be maintained, so that the Minister can give effect to subclause (2), which relates to dealings with shares?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 10—"Approved representatives."

Mr. SLATER: In relation to subclause (1) will the Minister approve of a person or newsagent, who at the present time may be an agent for the South Australian Lotteries Commission, becoming an authorised soccer pools agent? Further, will he say how agencies for soccer pools will be set up in South Australia?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I assure the member for Gilles that I would certainly want to negotiate with the Lotteries Commission before I took a step such as that. I would not be surprised if the Lotteries Act prohibited Lotteries Commission agents from being agents for other types of competition.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Audits for certain purposes."

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: What accounts does the Minister anticipate that the Auditor-General will be seeking to inspect, and will it be a regular feature or will the inspection be at random? Will the accounts be expected to be public accounts, which could be made available to members of the House or, indeed, to members of the community at large?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I expect that the Auditor-General would inspect the accounts regularly rather than at random. Whether they would be made public is something that I cannot say at this stage, and I am not prepared to give a commitment on this. I understand that under an earlier clause the Minister can specify the books and documents to be inspected. I will be taking advice on this, but if this clause is used properly by the Government, it answers many of the objections raised by the honourable member.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: One of the things that worries me about the questions and answers we have had tonight is that we seem to be largely in the realm of conjecture. On quite a few occasions, the Minister has said that he cannot give a definite answer to a certain question and would need to take advice. That, I would understand fully if we were the first State passing such legislation—if we were the leaders—and Australian Soccer Pools were going to operate in South Australia ahead of any other State, but that is not the situation. In fact, quite a few States have preceded us, and the Minister himself has said that. I would have thought that the Minister or his department would do a lot of homework on this matter and investigated the way in which Ministers in other States and their departments have policed the accounts of Australian Soccer Pools.

I would have thought that that information would be available to this House, because it was a fairly logical line of questioning for us to consider at this time. We need to know this information. We need to be satisfied in our own minds that the group in question is in fact capable of providing open accounts or sufficient accounting to satisfy the Ministers in other States. I hope that the Minister can at least say what consultations his department has had with interstate departments with particular regard to this clause.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: My officers have been back and forward several times, especially to New South Wales,

because we are modelling our legislation on theirs. I was not prepared to go into detailed negotiations on conditions, because I was a little unsure whether this legislation would pass this House. When that happens, detailed investigations of the licence conditions and the type of reporting that will be required under this clause will be necessary and will be carried out. In fact, I myself will undertake negotiations with my fellow Ministers in those States where Australian Soccer Pools is the licensee. I am advised that we are likely to be asking for weekly financial reports.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: At last we are getting some definite information based on interstate experience. That is precisely what we should have had right through the debate on this Bill, some indication of what each of the States does. I am not saying that the Minister should anticipate the situation here, although some information would be useful. It would not have been prejudicing him or the Bill to state exactly what New South Wales does, for example, with regard to what accounts are required to be shown on a weekly basis, if that is the State that does it on a weekly basis, or what accounts other States require. That, as information, would have been most useful to the House. It would have helped us satisfy ourselves as to whether this clause was going to be effective and workable. We have one part of the answer there. Any further information the Minister can give on what his officers have found out about what particular sorts of accounts are required to be shown would also be most useful.

Clause passed.

Clause 14—"Application of subscriptions".

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

Page 71—

Line 17—Leave out "thirty per centum" and insert "the prescribed percentage".

After line 23—Insert subsection as follows:

(2a) The reference in subsection (1) (b) to the prescribed percentage of subscriptions is a reference—

(a) except as provided in paragraph (b), to thirty per centum;

or

(b) where a greater percentage is prescribed, to that greater percentage.

This is an important amendment, which refers particularly to the question, if this Bill passes this place, of my being able to enter into negotiations with the other States and with this particular company if it becomes the licensee.

The reason for this is that, under the Bill as it stands, there is no provision for altering the percentage paid to the State. There is provision to alter by regulation the percentage paid to the prize pool, but not the percentage paid to the State. I can inform the Committee that, quite frankly, there is some dissatisfaction with the profits being made by the company referred to in this debate in the other States, and negotiations are taking place for an additional prize percentage to be paid in and also for an alteration to all the other percentages that go with that. I support that fully. I think the prize percentage should be increased above 37 per cent, although I understand it has been around 40 per cent. For that reason we need to be able to prescribe an altered percentage for the State as well.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 15 and 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Recreation and Sport Fund."

Mr. SLATER: I move:

Page 9, line 22—

After "Minister" insert "after consultation with the

Recreation and Sport Fund Advisory Committee established under subsection (4)'"

After line 22—Insert subsections as follows:

(4) For the purposes of this section, a committee shall be established entitled the "Recreation and Sport Fund Advisory Committee" with the function of advising the Minister in respect of the application of the moneys standing to the credit of that fund.

(5) The Recreation and Sport Fund Advisory Committee shall consist of five members appointed by the Governor each of whom shall have wide knowledge and experience relevant to the administration and development of recreational and sporting facilities and services within the State.

The reason for the amendment is that we seek to provide the opportunity for the Minister to have available to him, and to obtain advice from, persons with a wide range of knowledge and expertise in regard to the provision of sporting and recreation facilities. One of the most important aspects of the Bill concerns the distribution of the prize fund. I am sure that sporting bodies need to be reassured that the distribution of the fund will be regarded by all as fair and equitable. The amendment provides a way for the Minister to obtain advice in regard to the distribution of the fund from recreational bodies themselves. In the other States where recreation and sport funds have been established, I am not aware of what formula is involved in the distribution of the funds.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I understand completely the reasons why the honourable member has moved this amendment, which was worthy of much consideration. Unfortunately, however, I must oppose the amendment. To my knowledge, this type of committee does not exist in the other States where this type of scheme is being used. Also, I have already been advised on this Bill by my Recreation Advisory Council and my Sports Advisory Council. I will also receive advice on some priorities from the 1986 sesqui-centenary sporting committee.

To set up another committee would be to cut across the already considerable work that has been done by the recreation and sports advisory councils, which have considered what should happen to money should this Bill be passed. Those committees have considered how the money should be allocated, and I would not like to cut across the work that they have done. Therefore, to set up another committee, with its necessary administrative structure, would be unnecessary. It is essential that I be advised, and I want to be advised. I therefore assure the honourable member that I will be advised. However, I do not think it is necessary to incorporate this in the legislation.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I am indeed disappointed with the Minister's response to what he agreed was not an unfair Opposition amendment. Having agreed that he welcomed, needed and would use advice, the Minister said that the amendment would cut across an advice system that was already being used. I should have thought that the proper response in the circumstances of a *bona fide* amendment moved by the Opposition would be for the Minister to move a counter amendment putting in the legislation the advice bodies to which he has referred. That may have been acceptable to the Opposition in the circumstances.

Instead, we are told that, even though much consideration has been given to the matter, it is too awkward administratively for the Minister to accept the amendment. That is really all that has been said. There is no quarrel with the spirit of the amendment, and the Minister agreed that he had a need to obtain advice. I am

disappointed with the Minister's response, and would be willing, as I am sure other Opposition members would be, to accept the rejection of this amendment if the Minister was willing to give an assurance that he would remedy the situation along the lines that I have suggested through the Minister in another place if the Bill passes in this House.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Perhaps I should clarify the situation. The Recreation Advisory Council advises me on recreation matters, and I make my officers available to it. The Sports Advisory Council advises me on sporting matters and priorities, and I make one of my officers available to it also. In this respect, much work is involved for my officers. I also make an officer available to the sesqui-centenary sports committee. Much of my officers' time is taken up with these committees, all of which feed advice to me. For that reason, I did not want to try to amend the amendment, as it would have complicated the issue unduly.

Mr. SLATER: While I appreciate that the Minister has some competent advice available to him regarding advisory councils, the situation is slightly different regarding this fund, because I would like it to be seen that the people involved in recreation and sport feel quite sure, as I have said, that the fund is distributed fairly and equitably.

The expectations of those people have been raised somewhat by the fact that the legislation will provide a special fund to make available facilities and services to recreation and sport. I cannot agree with the Minister when he says that these situations are taken care of already by advisory councils. I think it important for the multiplicity of sporting organisations in South Australia to feel assured and certain they are not being prejudiced in any way by funds going to one section of sport and other sections possibly being denied access to this fund.

I realise that the provision states "with the approval of, the Minister". I ask the Minister to consider the matter again carefully. It is important for recreation and sporting bodies to feel some degree of comfort and to be happy in the fact that the fund will be distributed as fairly as possible, and the Minister is able to seek as much advice as possible to ensure that that occurs.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: One thing that I had in my notes but did not mention is that enough—I will not say trouble—perhaps dissension amongst sporting and recreation bodies because each particular body—

Mr. Slater: Wants representation on the advisory council.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It does not have representation on the advisory council, and I think one of the most common approaches from recreation and sporting bodies is that they have been passed over for years and have not had representation. As the member for Gilles and certainly the member for Unley would know, all sporting or recreation bodies are invited to send in nominations. My officers go through them and make recommendations to me for my approval, but it is a very difficult job and the idea is to try to balance it out. Even that causes a lot of criticism.

To restrict the advice to the Minister to five people would, I believe, cause even more dissension. The amendment provides for five people who are pre-eminent in the field of recreation and sport, or words of that kind, but to find those people, with five people advising the Minister how to distribute the funds, would cause more dissension and trouble than it would solve.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Those may well be the considered remarks of the Minister, particularly in relation to finding the people and cutting down the dissension. I can only give the Minister the benefit of some experience

that I had as Minister of Community Welfare. On one occasion a fund in excess of \$1 000 000 had to be apportioned in relation to requests for something like \$2 800 000 or \$2 900 000.

The way in which that fund was administered because of the Statute was very wise. The wording was very similar to the wording appearing here. The Community Welfare Grants Fund Committee, under the chairmanship of Judge Kingsley Newman, did a magnificent job in trying to meet the needs of the whole spectrum of welfare, covering all ages, a task not dissimilar to that confronting the Minister, because of the range of people involved. Over a period of three or four years, the number of complaints received about disbursements made on the recommendation of the committee was very limited, and I am sure that was because the matter was removed from the arena of the Minister giving it out here or there.

It seems that the same situation is faced here. This is setting up a new fund and, when some money gets into it, the Minister will be faced with the task. I ask the Minister to consider how carefully we in the Opposition ranks constructed this amendment. It says that the Governor can appoint five people, but the reality is that the Minister will be appointing the people. We have placed no limitation other than that they should have wide experience in the field concerned. I do not think it can be argued that the Opposition has set out to make it difficult for the Minister, that it is trying to do something that has some meaning other than that clearly expressed by the words in the amendment. For my part, I am sorry that the Minister is not prepared to accept a *bona fide* attempt by the Opposition to amend the Bill for the good of all.

President Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat, you should get out of the kitchen." The Minister knows that, as well as the perks, there are the responsibilities. The member for Gilles has very fluently pointed out that there is more than one task for the fund: to give out money and to be seen to be giving out money as fairly as possible in a scene of need where there will never be enough to go around in any one year.

I question the Minister's wisdom. He has to make the final decision, and I will not push this further, but I am surprised that, when the Opposition has put forward a sensible and logical amendment, the only real reason the Minister finds to reject it is that it might cut across some bodies. The remedy would be for the Minister to make it fit the scene he has.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: At no stage have I reflected on the amendment and what it is intended to do. Under the new scheme, if it comes about, there will be one set of money in the recreation and sport fund and I am being asked to legislate to set up a five-person committee to advise me on that, and the Sports Advisory Council and the Recreation Advisory Council will still be there to advise me on the moneys now distributed by the department. There must be a good deal of overlap between the funds. There is no thought that the soccer pools money will replace the allocation to the department. A great deal of work is done by the advisory council.

It might be necessary to provide a headquarters for a sport which would be part of the guidelines that we were thinking about for the recreation and sport fund, but which has in fact been paid for through the general Loan funds of the Recreation and Sport Department. It means bringing in another body to deal with one set of money, and the other two bodies to deal with another set of money. They are both dealing with the same amount, and to me that means administrative problems.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold,

Bannon, M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (23)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson (teller), and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Allison.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I make an appeal that emphasis be placed on recreation as well as sport. Much of the debate has tended to concentrate on sport, without any reference to recreation. A large segment of the community is not active in sport of any form, yet it has a need and a desire for improved recreational facilities. The pursuits of this group are sometimes of a passive nature. It is very important that the money from this fund be spent in somewhat equal proportions between those two areas; otherwise, a very large section of the community will receive little or no benefit from the funds that have been raised. I hope that the predisposition of many members to refer constantly to sport without reference to recreation will not be reflected by the way in which the fund is operated.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I entirely agree. I have always made a point of talking about recreation and sport, and, when the Leader of the Opposition was the Minister responsible, sport and recreation received equal prominence. In fact, it is argued by half of the officers in my department that sport is part of recreation: the other half thinks the other way. I can assure honourable members that due emphasis will be given to recreation.

However, I make one proviso: the capital assistance for major facilities that will be paid when the final arrangements are made for the recreation and sport fund will go mainly to sporting facilities at the start, because we have to catch up a backlog. I have been informed by my officers that most of the major recreation centres have been completed, although one or two have not. I know of a large initiative that will be taken this year in regard to a recreation centre, funds for which may not be paid from the recreation and sport fund. I also point out that I do not intend to earmark the whole recreation and sport fund for capital facilities, and the sort of thing in which the member for Salisbury would be interested is assistance to local government to provide recreation officers for councils. That is just one facet that I bring to his attention.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 23) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER AND SEWERAGE RATING) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ELECTION OF SENATORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It brings the Election of Senators Act into somewhat closer conformity with the corresponding (but more modern) legislation of the other States. The present Act is a rather antiquated document and is possibly defective in some respects, e.g., it does not provide for the fixing of a date for the return of the writ. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 2 of the principal Act and enacts two new sections. Under new section 2 (1) the Governor is empowered to fix, by proclamation, the date for issue of a writ for a Senate election, the place at which nominations are to be made and the day on or before which nominations must be made, the date for taking the poll, and the date on or before which the writ must be returned. Subsection (2) provides that nominations must be made after the issue of the writ and before 12 noon on the day of nomination. Subsection (3) provides for polling to take place at the polling places appointed under the relevant law of the Commonwealth. New section 3 provides that within twenty days before or after the date fixed for polling, the Governor may, by proclamation, extend the time for holding the election, extend the time for returning the writ, or provide for meeting any difficulty that might otherwise interfere with the due course of the election.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RECREATION GROUNDS RATES AND TAXES EXEMPTION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PORT PIRIE RACECOURSE LAND REVESTMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATE LOTTERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.27 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 19 February at 2 p.m.