HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 29 October 1981

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

PETITIONS: PRE-SCHOOL OPERATING COSTS

Petitions signed by 223 concerned residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide sufficient funds to cover all pre-school operating costs were presented by the Hon. D. O. Tonkin and Mr Schmidt.

Petitions received.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on Questions, I advise that any questions to the honourable Minister of Environment and Planning will be taken by the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs.

MAGILL HOME

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier accompany me, at a mutually convenient time, to Magill Home so that he can hear for himself the pleas of the elderly and infirm people who want to continue to live in an integrated community at Magill? Today, there was a rally of Magill Home residents and staff on the front steps of Parliament House. I was told that the Minister of Health and the Minister of Community Welfare had been invited to attend, but did not appear. Those at the rally were told by the residents that the 60-year-old concept of an integrated aged care facility was vital to the well-being of the residents, and was being developed but, unfortunately, work had ceased.

Presently, elderly people who enter Magill to live in hostel accommodation are transferred to the infirmary if they become ill, unable to cope or need long-term nursing care; they are transferred to the infirmary at Magill Home itself. The Government now proposes to transfer such people across town to Windana Home. I was told by residents that this would mean a cruel upheaval for most of them and their friends. They want to stay at the Magill community, so that they can be close to friends and staff whom they have come to know and trust.

I am informed that such a move by the Government will mean a net loss of 72 beds, at a time when there is already a large waiting list for the 90 beds at Windana, which could be filled at any time without any patients from Magill being transferred there.

The residents I spoke with a few minutes ago believe that the State Government is putting the interests of those who are least able to fight back as its last priority. They believe that the ideology of small government is taking precedence over people. They are also extremely disappointed that their local member, the Minister of Health, has not fought to retain Magill's integrated structure and has not fought to preserve the interests of the residents there.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In answer to the Leader's basic question (Will I accompany him to Magill?), no, I will not accompany him to Magill, but I would certainly be pleased to renew my acquaintance with that establishment. I have known it intimately in the past in another profession and I do know some of the difficulties which have been associated with it. I have kept some interest in matters since that time.

It is, I believe, one of the areas of the care of the aged and elderly people that has not been the best effort of government for many years past. I would point out that this situation has applied there for well over 10 or 15 years, I suspect. The point I am making is that I do not think that this is a matter which ought to be politicked on as the Leader is doing now. I would be delighted to go out and to inspect the facilities.

I would like to correct an impression which has been given by the Leader of the Opposition that the member for Coles, the Minister of Health, has not thought to do the best she can for the patients in that area. That is totally and absolutely untrue. She has done the very best she can, given the circumstances which apply and, indeed, her statement to the House made only on Tuesday proves that. I hope that that statement is fully read and understood by those people who are so very properly concerned about this matter and I hope that the Leader reads it fully and properly, too, so that he understands it.

Mr Gunn: He would not understand it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can only think that he probably does not understand it because he obviously has not quite got the drift of it. It is not the last priority of this Government to help these people: quite the reverse, at a time when there are limited funds, largely, as everyone knows, because of the cut-back by the Federal Government in its funding to the States.

We are doing everything possible to make those days for those people comfortable, to make them as pleasant as possible and above all to maintain their dignity, because that is the most important thing to people in that situation, to maintain their dignity so that they—

Mr Abbott: You know nothing about it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I know nothing about it, the honourable member says. I beg to differ; I know a great deal about it and that is one of the reasons why this Government is doing so much to promote the concept of domiciliary care to keep such people in their own homes for as long as they possibly can. It is absolutely ridiculous for the honourable member to say such things. I am most sympathetic to the situation. A solution is being worked out properly by the Minister of Health. I know she is going to have detailed discussions with the people involved, and I would be pleased to be part of those discussions and to inspect the Magill Home with her when this can be arranged and when discussions can be arranged.

Mr BECKER: My question is to the Minister of Health.

Mr Bannon: You have just been given it.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: What are you talking about?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Hanson has been called to ask a question.

Mr BECKER: Thank you, Sir. I do not need any prompting from the petulant little boy who leads the Opposition. Can the Minister of Health say whether there will be any way, other than the way which is being proposed by the Government, to gain Commonwealth approval for nursing home beds to be established at Windana?

I have had a long involvement in obtaining Federal Government approval to establish nursing beds at Windana, as the Minister is aware, on behalf of various organisations. I refer also to the Minister's statement in the House on Tuesday in regard to proposals to transfer patients from the State nursing home at Magill. I understand that allegations were made this afternoon on the steps of Parliament House that the A.L.P. would upgrade Magill, and that the Government is irresponsible, and is using aids to bolster up financial mismanagement. I have only to refer the public

to the Public Accounts Committee's findings into the mismanagement of health services in this State during the socialist years of the 1970s. I am concerned, and I think everyone else is, that Windana be used to full effect.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I do not believe that there would be any way, other than the way the State Government is proposing, by which we could gain Commonwealth approval for the payment of benefits for nursing home beds at Windana. There seems to be some dispute about the pronunciation of that name, but I understand from senior officers in the Department for Community Welfare, since Windana was a custodial institution for delinquent boys, and based on the Aboriginal pronunciation, the name should be pronounced as I have pronounced it. Be that as it may, the Opposition should know (and, if it does not, the previous Minister should know) that negotiations were entered into to gain Commonwealth approval for payment of Commonwealth benefits for nursing home beds at Windana while the A.L.P. was in Government. The Opposition should therefore know how extremely difficult, if not impossible, it is to gain that approval; the reason being that the original purpose for which the beds were established (namely, to accommodate patients suffering from brain failure) was refused by the Commonwealth on the grounds that such patients should be classified as psycho-geriatric patients and that they therefore did not come within the guidelines of Commonwealth Government legislation for approval. The Commonwealth regarded that as an area of State responsibility.

As a result, the Health Commission made representations to see whether it could be accepted as a State nursing home, as a deficit-funded nursing home, but the answer to all those applications was 'No'. The Government believes that the only way that the beds at Windana can be put to use is by transferring to Windana beds that are already approved and which are in use at Magill. On that basis, we hope (we do not know—we hope—because negotiations have not commenced as yet) that the Commonwealth will give approval. If it does not approve the proposal that is being suggested, then frankly I see no way in which those superb facilities at Windana can be used for nursing home beds. It would be tragic if the money that has gone into upgrading those facilities was wasted. It would be equally tragic if the Government were to spend $2 000 000 of taxpayer's money on upgrading facilities which are now substandard when we already have excellent facilities which cannot be used. I submit that the only way we can provide accommodation, the much improved accommodation—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Would be to put more pressure on Fraser and McKellar.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: With the best will in the world the State Government cannot change Commonwealth law, and we stand no chance whatsoever of changing the Commonwealth guidelines for approval of nursing home beds, per head of population. The Opposition should realise, if it does not already, that the Adelaide metropolitan area by Commonwealth standards is already properly serviced with nursing home beds. There is not a deficiency of nursing home beds in Adelaide by Commonwealth standards. In fact the eastern suburbs, and also in the southern area where Windana is located, we are already above the Commonwealth guidelines.

Mr Hemmings interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I should also say that if this transfer were to be effected, instead of there being a decrease in the total of nursing home bed stock in the metropolitan area, there would be an increase of 18. Admittedly, 18 is not a large number, but it is significant when we look at people who need institutional care. Another point that should be made is that there have been allegations of a waiting list of 190 at Windana and that, if this proposal is pursued, those 190 people, minus presumably the 18 who could be covered by the increase, will be for nursing home beds.

I should point out to Opposition members that they really should do their homework a lot better when they start talking about waiting lists. It is standard practice in this State and in all other States for people to put their names on waiting lists for more than one institution. It would be quite erroneous to suppose that the people who have their name on a waiting list for Windana do not also have their name on waiting lists for other nursing homes, and that some of them may not have already been admitted to nursing homes.

Another point that should be made in relation to waiting lists for nursing homes is that, if the State Government pursues its correct and proper policy, which is endorsed by the Commonwealth and by the medical profession, of ensuring that admission to nursing homes is based on proper assessment carried out by qualified geriatric assessment teams, many people will have put their names on waiting lists who, it will be found, would be far more appropriately cared for by some other means—presumably, and most frequently, by improved community support services and by domiciliary care.

As the Premier has said, this State Government is second to none in the Commonwealth (and that has been confirmed recently) in the initiatives it has taken to provide domiciliary care. It is not only the most economical form of care but also the most appropriate and the most humane form of care for old people who wish to stay in their own homes to preserve their privacy, their dignity and their family contacts.

Mr Hemmings: They're just a head count to you.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It keeps families together. The people at Magill Home are not just a head count to me. They are my constituents, many of whom I know personally, whom I have visited from time to time regularly, and about whom I care a great deal.

There being a disturbance in the Strangers Gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is on that basis that I am extremely concerned that those people should be—

The Hon. Peter Duncan: To move them out to Windana.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Elizabeth will remain silent.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It is on the basis of that that I am determined that those people will be cared for in facilities of a high standard, and that is why the Minister of Community Welfare and I will be pursuing negotiations with the appropriate body in order to ensure that those people are properly looked after.

WINDANA NURSING HOME

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier say whether he will accompany me to a meeting with the staff of Windana, which is in my electorate, not in the electorate of Hanson?

Mr Becker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier accompany me to a meeting with the staff and relatives of patients who are seeking admission to Windana in order to discuss the statement made in another place on Tuesday 27 October by the Minister of Community Welfare that 'there is no effective waiting list at Windana', and also to discuss some of the statements just made by the Minister of Health in relation to the previous question?

At present Windana (and I will use that pronunciation as being the more popular one although not necessarily correct; it is a matter of on which syllable one puts the emphasis) day-care centre looks after 35 people each day. In addition, the nursing home section, which is waiting to be opened, contains 90 beds still in the original plastic wrapping after a two-year wait while the Health Commission has attempted in some way to negotiate with the Federal Government.

The current proposal for the transfer of bed allocations from Magill to Windana has not been clearly explained in terms of whether it involves 72 or 90 beds. Nevertheless, whatever the number is, it has been pointed out to me that Southern Cross Homes was not properly consulted about this, although for two years that body has been anticipating that it would be managing the nursing home. It is uncertain whether the day-care centre will remain. Furthermore, it has been put to me that it is an exercise to rob Peter to pay Paul, because, in the Minister's own words, even if the number of bed allocations transferred is 90 and not 72, that will create an extra bedstock in South Australia of only 18 beds, by her own macabre body count.

There are quite clearly 130 people waiting for admission, not 190. I have done some homework on this. Just a few minutes ago I received a telephone call from Southern Cross Homes, pointing out that it is its firm belief that there are 130 people on the waiting list for beds at the nursing home, it is that organisation's assessment that 97 of these are ready for nursing home care. This need for nursing care is not just applicable to Windana, but is a widespread phenomenon.

Southern Cross Homes also points out that there are a further 186 people on the waiting list for Southern Cross Nursing Home at North Plympton. In view of the individual tragedy that is involved in the cases of these people who are seeking admission to Windana, will the Premier face up to the real needs of real human beings and not try to fob them off on the excuse that they can be catered for at home?

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to answer the question, but not the comment.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is going to be very difficult indeed, but in deference to you I will do so, because the honourable member's record on this whole sorry business of Windana has certainly not been very good. I think the Minister of Health some considerable time ago outlined the matters on which the member for Ascot Park was able to frustrate the wishes of the State Government by interfering at a critical time when negotiations were taking place, so I think the honourable member for Ascot Park would do well to be quiet on this business. We do treat people as individuals and we are very concerned to get that approval for the people at Windana.

I must say that I also know that institution very well indeed from my former experience on the Social Welfare Advisory Council of this State. I know what the facilities are and what can be made of them. To say, as the member for Ascot Park has said, that we ought to be getting on with the job and negotiating with the Commonwealth more effectively—I simply ask him, although he has not been here very long, what was the Labor Government doing for 10 years.

Mr Bannon: We upgraded them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Labor Government did not. The Leader of the Opposition has the effrontery to say that the Labor Government upgraded the Magill Home. I would like to know exactly why the facilities are in the condition that they are in now. Let me just put this matter into perspective quite firmly. The Labor Party was in Government for nearly 10 years. It is only now that it has taken up this matter. I would say that, ever since we came to office just over two years ago, we have been trying to get the question of Windana sorted out. I repeat that we have got rather further along the track than the Labor Party ever did when it was in Government in recent years. Let us get this whole thing straight.

I may say that I rather resent the implied slur on the Southern Cross Homes organisation. What does the member mean by saying that it is uncertain and does not know what it is doing? I have the greatest respect and admiration for the Southern Cross Homes people, the Knights of the Southern Cross, who are behind that whole network of homes. It is a very fine organisation, indeed, and I think the member for Ascot Park should reconsider what he said and implied.

There is a waiting list. I am well aware of that. Southern Cross Homes is well aware that there is a waiting list, and is in constant touch with the Minister and me. The organisation had discussions with me and with the Minister. It is moving on, as are other organisations, to provide more nursing home beds in nursing home institutions throughout the metropolitan area and in country areas. It is a fact of life that those facilities are not yet adequate to deal with all of the people who need them. I repeat what the Minister and I have said, namely, that the emphasis on domiciliary care will be increased, and it has been increased quite dramatically since we have come to office, to make sure that people can stay in their own homes as long as possible (a very right and proper thing for them to do) and that, when they finally do need nursing home accommodation, that that nursing home accommodation will be made available for them as soon as possible, too.

I simply make the one point that everyone opposite seems determined to forget; that is, a great deal of progress has been made in the provision of nursing home beds during the last two years since we have come to office.

Mr EVANS: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the member for Fisher does not require the opportunity to ask a question, I will move on to the honourable member for Brighton.

Mr EVANS: Can the Minister of Health tell the House whether there is any precedent for the opposition to the move from the Magill Home to Windana, which has been currently demonstrated by the P.S.A. and the A.G.W.A.?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I can tell the House. Those of us who have quite recent memories may recall that these two unions expressed violent opposition when the Government proposed to move a group of intellectually handicapped people who were residents at Estcourt House to Mareeba. The reason for that move was that we wanted to take totally dependent children from Ru Rua, which was then located on Barton Terrace, North Adelaide, in a building which we recognised was not safe and which had been purchased by the previous Government for the purpose of housing totally dependent children.

As soon as we became aware it was not safe, I instructed the Health Commission to evacuate the children from that property. The only place to which we could safely take them at relatively short notice was Estcourt House, which had the accommodation available. There were, as I recall, 30 mildly intellectually handicapped people at Estcourt House. The A.G.W.A. and the P.S.A. at that stage expressed violent opposition. They said they would refuse to move those people to Mareeba and that Mareeba was not the appropriate place to put them. The Health Commission negotiated with the union and it patiently explained that the interests of these people were being cared for and, consequently, they were taken to Mareeba.

What has happened is that, when the Health Commission tried to locate those very same people in community housing in accordance with current policy on the concept of normalisation, we purchased a property at Drapers Hall, at Crafers. Again, the unions made furious outcries and said, 'No, we do not want them to move.' One cannot help but wonder whether these people are concerned with those in their care or whether they are concerned with the convenient location for themselves, because the fact of the matter is—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's outrageous.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The record speaks for itself and the record says that the Health Commission, in its efforts to find appropriate accommodation for these people, has been exemplary in ensuring that their place of residence is as comfortable, as convenient, and as near to normal living as possible. I can only say that the threat of insecurity and the worries that may be incurred by any proposed move are immeasurably increased by the actions of the unions in these matters. That applies to the intellectually handicapped at Estcourt House and Mareeba and it applies equally to the residents and the patients at Magill Home. I condemn in the strongest possible terms the kind of activity that is being deliberately generated by these unions to create a sense of fear and insecurity amongst these people.

Mr Trainer: You're outrageous.

The SPEAKER: Order!

GAS SUPPLIES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy now assure gas consumers in metropolitan Adelaide that they do not face the likelihood of any shortage of supply from the year 1987, contrary to several alarmist statements he has made to that effect? Members will recall that the Minister has, on a number of occasions in recent times, repeated the allegation that the Dunstan Government, in the very early 1970s, failed to safeguard our future gas supplies by signing up Sydney ahead of Adelaide. He has blamed the Labor Government for arrangements made for the future disposal of Cooper Basin gas.

The General Manager of the South Australian Gas Company apparently does not agree with or believe the statements that are being bruted abroad by the Minister. I refer to a letter supplied to every employee of the South Australian Gas Company and also to a press release a few days ago, as follows:

Gas employees assured no shortage of gas

Employees of the South Australian Gas Company have been assured that the State has ample supplies of natural gas, and that other options for gas supplies are being investigated. This assurance has been given in a letter issued to employees by the General Manager of the Gas Company (Mr J. P. Burnside). The letter says that recent media statements about future gas supplies for South Australia could be disturbing to employees of the company and cause concern to gas consumers. Contrary to implications in the articles, the end of 1987 does not spell the end of Cooper Basin gas to Adelaide, says Mr Burnside in his message.

That is the date on which our present contract for gas supply will be renegotiated, and provisions for this are already laid down in our contract with the Pipelines Authority of South Australia.

The letter points out that since the Gas Company started to take natural gas in 1969, exploration in the Cooper Basin since that date has discovered more gas than has been used.

There is no reason to doubt that this will continue and adequate reserves will be available in 1987 to renew our contract well after the year 2000, says Mr Burnside.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The first thing I should point out to the House and to the member is that the South Australian Gas Company is not the major user of gas in this State. In fact, the Electricity Trust of South Australia is by far the largest user. I am well aware that Mr Burnside and the Gas Company have been negotiating for back-up supplies of gas, in their case, from Bass Strait.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is all right. All will be revealed to the member if he cares to listen. Negotiations have taken place to see that gas that flows to New South Wales via a link to Bass Strait could be paid back from the A.G.L. contract to ensure that the Gas Company has adequate supplies when the current contracts run out. These are the plain facts.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you say Mr Burnside isn't telling the truth?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can understand why Mr Burnside sent that out. The reserves of gas now available are less than the reserves indicated in 1972-73, when the Labor Party wrote the contracts. It is also a fact—

Mr Payne: He has made the statement now.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: People make optimistic statements. I, too, agree that there will be other supplies available, and we certainly hope—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That is the first time that you have admitted that.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It will be no thanks to the Labor Party; it will be as a result of the initiatives of this Government.

Mr Bannon: —Of business men, by talking.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The business men of this State—

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The business men of this State are well aware of contracts written by the Labor Party. They can also be assured that this Government has assiduously set about ensuring our future gas supplies and seeing that our electricity grid will be properly serviced after 1987.

I have outlined the fact that there was still a shortage of about 600 to 700 billion cubic feet to satisfy the A.G.L. contract when we came to Government. I pointed out earlier this week that the then Labor Government was warned, even by the producers. I was asked to name the man and I did. The Hon. Don Dunstan certainly put the kibosh on that. I have read the appropriate *Hansard* extract in which he took full credit for the gas contracts written. The fact is that the Labor Party pledged quantities of gas to New South Wales well into the next century and it contracted—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why don't you stop playing politics? Tell us how much gas we've got.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the Deputy Leader had listened, he would have heard me say that between 600 and 700 billion cubic feet still have to be discovered to satisfy the A.G.L. contracts.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Don't you think it's there?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: When the Hon. Don Dunstan was warned that the State's interests were not being preserved, he gave one of those airy fairy waves of his hand and said, 'We will find plenty of gas.' We have been hearing that since 1973. It is this Government that has sought to rationalise those contracts. Legally, we have not a great deal going for us.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Or morally.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I always know I am being effective when members opposite go in for buffoonery. When they behave like buffoons, I know that they are not liking what I am saying. The plain fact is that when we came into office we realised that we had to get some certainty in relation to our gas supplies. I was talking about this today to Mr Carmichael, of Santos, again.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: How much gas have we got?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have told the honourable member there are 2.3 t.c.f. in reserves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Minister of Mines and Energy to please resume his seat. The Chair is tolerant of a little addition to the debate, but it is going to be intolerant of unnecessary interjections from both sides of the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I have mentioned to members of the Opposition that we have had discussions with Queensland. We have had several discussions with the Northern Territory in relation to the Mereenie gas field. I was up there about six weeks ago, and we have had discussions with the Bass Strait producers. The gas in the Cooper Basin has not yet been found. We are doing all we can, in co-operation with the Cooper Basin producers, to try to increase the level of exploration. I can understand the pressing necessity which is there. This is a top priority of this Government. There is precious little evidence of anything being done by our predecessors to come to terms with this problem.

If the member for Mitchell had cared to talk to the producers or to anyone else in relation to reserves, he would know the situation. This Government has made this a top priority and that is why I have been to several States and I am in constant dialogue with the producers to ensure that we do have gas available in 1987: no thanks to the Labor Party. It ill behoves the honourable members opposite—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: And the Gas Company.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: As I say, let him go and talk to the Electricity Trust and to the major users.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I have.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Go again. He did not have his ears open. I certainly did. There is a great deal of gas yet to be discovered in the Cooper Basin.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who said?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, no-one knows. The fact is that, if they do not drill holes, they will not find it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what members of the Opposition find so amusing. They do not think this is a serious problem. We inherited the problem and we are bending over backwards to solve it, but members opposite are not worried about it.We still have to find gas to satisfy the A.G.L. contract but, because Mr Burnside sent out a letter stating that his company was making arrangements to see that the Gas Company gets gas, the Opposition thinks all is rosy in the garden. How absurd! It is about as absurd as the contracts that the Labor Government wrote.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Premier give an assurance that the Parks Community Centre will not be sold and that there will be no reductions in the services provided by the centre? In recent weeks there have been persistent reports that the Government is going to sell all, or part, of the facilities at Parks to private enterprise. It is my understanding that the Minister of Local Government, Mr Hill, has assured the management of Parks that this is not the case. However, the possibility of the Government selling all, or part, of the centre was again raised at a public meeting at the centre last night. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he can given an assurance that it is not the Government's intention to reduce standards at the Parks Community Centre.

Mr Bannon: Can the Minister's assurance be relied on?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I know the Leader of the Opposition has been promoting the rumours that Parks is to be sold off, and obviously he does not want the assurance. It is absolutely disgraceful that the Opposition and one of its candidates should be so unnecessarily causing concern to people associated with Parks.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can understand why the Leader wants to stop me answering the question, but he will not stop me from doing so. Let me say here and now that the Government will not sell the Parks Community Centre, and it will not in any way reduce the standard of service at the centre. There has been no indication, no statement and certainly no intention that Parks would be sold, and there has never been any such indication. I repeat that it is a matter of very grave concern that the Opposition and, as I say, one of its candidates seems to have embarked on a campaign of blatant politicking in an attempt to whip up totally unwarranted fears that the Government intends selling off the Parks Community Centre.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In response to the interjection from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which I know is totally out of order, the trouble is that the Deputy Leader and his colleagues have not had the guts to play politics in Parliament House, but they have gone outside into the community and stimulated these unnecessary and unwarranted fears and concerns of the people of that community. That is the difference.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Tell us whether you will lease any projects down there.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am telling the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition that I do not wish to hear from him again this afternoon unless he has received the call. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As is the case with other institutions, the Government is investigating whether or not savings can be achieved in the running of the Parks Community Centre without adversely affecting the service and facilities available. The Minister is consulting with the management, and the management's suggestions have been sought in this matter. But he has also made it perfectly clear that the centre will not be sold. That is a ridiculous suggestion, yet the rumours continue to be circulated. Speakers at the public meeting held last night again raised the same doubts about the future which have already been raised unnecessarily in their minds and which have caused unnecessary alarm and concern. Whilst they held those doubts and fears sincerely because of what they had been told, it is significant that the Chairman of the meeting was the endorsed A.L.P. candidate for Semaphore.

Once again, the Minister has been able to give a reassurance that the Parks will not be sold, and I hope that that finally puts those very cruel rumours to rest once and for all. The standard of services at Parks will not be lowered. The Government has (and this is clear evidence of its degree of support for the Parks Community Centre) just produced a promotional film outlining the services it provides. The Government has made a separate appropriation (as anyone who had taken the trouble to look at the Budget documents would have seen) of $40 000 this year for the very purpose of promoting the Parks and publicising its services within the local community. The Government has allocated $1 480 000 towards the running of Parks and, the Parks Board expects to receive at least $428 000 in fees. The total running costs for the 1981-82 financial year which are covered by the Government grants and the expected revenue will be more than $1 900 000, compared with $1 850 000 spent last year.

The Government is committed to the continuing support of the Parks centre. To say that it is going to be handed over to private enterprise in any way is ridiculous, malicious and mischievous. Further, I must say that the Government appreciates the work being done by the staff and the very many dedicated volunteers at the Parks centre, and it is determined to ensure that this work is continued. I greatly regret and resent the efforts being made by the Opposition to create unnecessary fears about the future of the centre.

ELIZABETH WEST HIGH SCHOOL

Mr HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Education say why the Education Department has deleted the Elizabeth West High School from the short list of schools to take part in the special vocational programme next year, and whether it is a coincidence that the five high schools selected are in areas contained in or adjacent to Liberal Party marginal electorates? In a press release dated 23 October, the Minister of Education announced that high schools in Mawson, Thorndon, Goodwood, Strathmont, and Thebarton were to be the schools taking part in special vocational programmes in 1982, and that those schools had been selected from many schools, the reasons for their selection being available facilities, staff, accessibility, and geographical location. I understand that the Elizabeth West High School, which was on the short list, and which was given to understand that funding was available, meets these requirements admirably and, more importantly, it is in an area with the highest percentage of youth unemployment in Australia.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member has been grinning rather vacuously for quite some time while other questions have been answered. It seems that, to assess Thebarton as a marginal Liberal seat and Goodwood—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The honourable member will be judged by his own kind; it needs no further comment from me. Suffice to say that the decisions arrived at were arrived at by an independent committee comprising departmental representatives of the Departments of Further Education, Education, and Labour and Industry—men who have been involved, I would suggest, in this programme even during the lifetime of the former Labor Government. That is how long the Link course and transition education programmes have been going on. Those people were not transferred from their important role when the new Government came in.

Mr Hemmings: Why was it taken off the list?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not know that Elizabeth West was specifically taken off the list, because I was not consulted in the first place as to the number of schools included on any list longer than the present six schools, and that has always been the number of schools I have referred to: six schools which did not include Elizabeth West.

Decisions have been arrived at from within the committee, and the reasons given in the announcements made were the reasons provided to the various Ministers by members of that committee who consulted with Federal members and with different school and regional organisations. It is unfortunate that the $2 500 000 allowed by the Federal Government, even when coupled with about $4 000 000 for education and $2 000 000 for further education, which this State provides, is not sufficient for us to expand the programme as widely as we would like. Surely, honourable members would realise that these are developments from former experimental schemes, such as SURS, CITY, E.P.U.Y., the NEAT scheme, and all the others which have been put forward by State and Federal Governments in an attempt to keep young people at school a little longer so that they would be trained—

Mr Hemmings: That's the point—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member will just bear with me, we are trying to retain students in schools so that they will be better trained for the jobs that are unquestionably available.

There is an assumption in what the honourable member says that nothing is being done outside those six schools. In fact, there are another four schools in rural areas, again, which were decided upon by the committee. The South-East is one area and Whyalla in the Iron Triangle is another one. In fact, every school contacted in the northern region of Adelaide, on a quick assessment by the Director-General of Education so that we could advise the Federal Government of our State input into this scheme, said, 'We are already of our own accord initiating school-to-work transition programmes.' I suggest that if the honourable member waits a little longer—

Mr Hemmings: You might live to regret saying that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This is what I was told. On a quick survey, the schools which were questioned responded and said that they had some staff involved in school-to-work transition. Of course, you only have to look at the work that student counsellors do—and they are surely present in almost every large school in South Australia—advising youngsters as to the work available and the type of training which might be appropriate for the jobs that are on the market. They have been in schools for the last 10 years in increasing numbers. So it does not take much perception to see that that has been going on for quite a long time, and I am not taking the credit for it. I am simply pointing out that it is an ongoing thing; things which are not working with regard to transition training are being rejected, that is, annually or termly, and other projects are being brought on.

The schools that have applied for assistance to the Education Department have been notified that the whole scheme is constantly under review. The schools such as the one which the honourable member mentions and in which he has a special interest have, I have no doubt, been informed by the department that they would be considered for expansionary programmes later on in the next financial year. That is obviously something that has to be done. Meanwhile, we have done a considerable amount over the last two years, with both State and Federal funds, towards getting these youngsters trained, whether it be in simple English and number communications skills or in the more complex areas of manipulative and, even more advanced, macro and micro electronics, boilermaking, sheet metal, welding and all that sort of thing which is there.

Why choose those five or six schools specifically? I would say that it is partly a wheel coming full circle. You may recall that the previous Government in its wisdom decided almost a decade ago that the then technical high schools would be phased out and education would in general be rubber-stamped with a general purpose high school. It has not worked to parent and employer (and, I suggest, more recently to student and teacher) satisfaction. There are certainly strong cases for perpetuating technical high schools. The schools which we already have seized upon, such as Thebarton, Goodwood, Mawson and others in the metropolitan area, have for a long time had under-utilised technical equipment, which we believe should attract students from a wider area than merely the adjacent population. So, 325 youngsters will be accommodated in these six schools in the initial programmes. I think that it is singularly the most exciting development in education in South Australia for the last decade. Yet, it has not received that sort of publicity and comment, because we have gone about it

quietly, as we have done with so many of the projects in education over the last few years. I repeat that this is singularly the most exciting new development in education in the last decade, one that has been heralded by employers, parents and students who are motivated towards getting some technical vocational training and being prepared to move out to the jobs which are certainly available now in a whole range of occupations.

In case the House has any doubt at all about what the Minister of Industrial Affairs has been saying, let me point out that people like earthmovers are currently crying out for skilled drivers to take over the heavy equipment to deal with all the demolition, grading and all that sort of work which is ready waiting for the building industry. The building industry itself has not had any apprenticeships for such a long time that it is crying out for them. Boilermaking, sheetmetal, macro and micro electronics, simple business practices, accounting, shorthand-typing, and all that range of industries are now saying, 'Give us the people'. That is really what the Education Department is currently about in this slow and steady transition towards making sure that youngsters are better equipped for the work force.

PORTER BAY PROPOSAL

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Water Resources obtain a report on the stage of development of the Porter Bay sewerage proposal and could he advise the House when it would be expected that work will commence? The Minister has had considerable correspondence from citizens of Kirton Point, particularly those directly involved in the area of the Porter Bay proposal. In response to that correspondence the Minister advised that the proposal was subject to funding arrangements and approval by the PWC. The Minister and the department would be aware of the inconvenience caused to many residents who have to pump their soakage pits at three-weekly intervals. This, together with the associated health risks, is of considerable concern to residents in the area.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Government is certainly well aware of the problem to which the member for Flinders has referred; in fact, there are two particular areas of concern: certainly, the Porter Bay problem and also the problem existing in the Happy Valley area. The Government has given approval to proceed in part, and it has made a start in one area, that is, the Happy Valley area, at an estimated cost of $405 000. Some $237 000 was allocated in this present Budget for expenditure during this financial year. The proposal for Porter Bay is estimated to cost some $670 000, and every consideration will be given to making some funds available during the next financial year, but I will certainly obtain for the honourable member a progress report on the design and the development of that proposal for the Porter Bay area.

NURSING HOMES

Mr PETERSON: My question is directed to the Minister of Health. With all the discussion on and disruption of nursing home arrangements in this State and the upset caused to the patients concerned, which really must be a very serious consideration to any Minister of Health, what action will be taken to calm their fears and allow them to continue in a settled way of life? Elderly people obviously are very upset by any threat to a closed environment in which they feel comfortable and happy. This current issue must be causing them a lot of problems, and I think some action should be taken to allay the fears of the people and comfort them.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I thank the member for Semaphore for his very thoughtful question and for his consideration in the way in which it was framed. Like the member for Semaphore, I am very concerned indeed because I know how easy it is to arouse feeling of insecurity amongst elderly people. That is one of the reasons why I condemn out of hand the actions that I believe are politically motivated which have been taken and which have had that effect. To answer the question in practical terms: the Minister of Community Welfare, who is the Minister responsible for the Magill Home and who is very sensitive to this particular issue, has made certain that senior officers of his department have been in constant contact with the residents at Magill Home to keep them informed and to reassure them. Obviously, one of the key reassurances is to the hostel residents to make it clear to them that there is no intention whatever to transfer them anywhere.

In terms of what Cabinet approved on Monday, namely, the negotiations to proceed with the Commonwealth Department for Health and the Southern Cross Homes, I understand that the residents have been informed by officers of the Department for Community Welfare of what is proposed, and a copy of the Minister's statement (which was somewhat longer and more detailed than the one I gave in this House) has been sent to the residents at the Magill Home.

Unfortunately, at this stage no absolute assurances can be given. The very fact that negotiations are taking place means that we cannot tell these people that they will certainly be moved to Windana. That really depends on the Commonwealth. The best we can do is to assure them, which assurance I have given in the House and I give it again, that whatever happens they will be housed in the best facilities we can provide, that before any move is made there will be assessments of individual patient needs, and that families will be taken into consideration in the consultation process.

The record of the staff of both the Health Commission and the Department for Community Welfare in matters like this, where they know that their clients can easily be confused and feel concerned about the future, is very good. I have every confidence that that good record will be maintained. On Tuesday, I intend to accept an invitation from the residents to address a meeting arranged at Magill, and I believe that the reassurances I give there will be helpful to them. As the local member, I will also take the usual course of keeping in touch with constituents to inform them about what is happening and to let them know that the Government has their best interests at heart, and that their needs will be taken into account.

KINDERGARTEN MOBILE UNITS

Mr RANDALL: Can the Minister of Education say how many mobile kindergarten units the Kindergarten Union operates, what is the cost, and what is the future planning regarding these units? When I was in Rundle Mall the other day I saw a brand new mobile kindergarten unit on display. It suddenly occurred to me that with all the negative type of publicity being promulgated throughout the community—that the Kindergarten Union is being cut, closed down, and so on—the Minister should indicate to the House some of the positive things that the Kindergarten Union is doing, and that this may well do the community some good.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this area. He has, of course, asked a number of questions.

Mr Trainer: He's been Dorothy Dixing.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member stayed awake long enough during the course of a session, he would realise that the member for Henley Beach has repeatedly taken an interest in kindergartens in his area.

Mr Langley: How many questions has he asked?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I assure members that I have a constant stream of questions, asked in both correspondence form and in the House, from members on this side of the Chamber. The obvious interest of the member for Henley Beach in his electorate does not have to be explained away on the floor of the House. He has the confidence of the people he sees on a regular basis. I can assure members of that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It may be irrelevant, but I do enjoy the nature of this repartee from the other side. I remind members that I have seen several Premiers off from that side, all of whom said that I would not be back within three or four months time. So, I think my judgment would stand the test of time, which is a little more than the judgment on that side.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Unley has done me more service than any other single member by his repeated door-knocking in my electorate at crucial times.

Mr Langley: I've only been up there once.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He has been invited back. The answer to the question is that there are four mobile kindergartens in South Australia. I am not certain of the basic cost of equipping one of them with the bus, the chassis, and then the equipment inside; it could be between $40 000 and $50 000. However, the recurrent costs, which include the staffing of two full-time professional teachers in each kindergarten, would be about $114 000. They serve not only the remoter areas of South Australia but also those rapidly expanding new suburbs where it has not yet been possible to establish the necessary kindergarten services. Their mobility is a very desirable feature where children are under-privileged.

Apart from that, there are 11 mobile resource centres staffed by a single resource assistant which also travel around the State with toy, book and material libraries, costing about $132 000 for staffing alone each year. That represents a considerable additional service to South Australia and helps those children presently under-privileged. The honourable member asked to what extent the service would be expanded. The Kindergarten Union has advised me that it has no immediate plans to expand the service, but that this matter will be kept under regular review.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: In Question Time today, in answer to a question from the member for Brighton concerning the Parks Community Centre, the Premier made two allegations personally, which I would like to refute. First, he said that I and other members of the Opposition were raising matters outside the Parliament and were not game to raise them within Parliament, but were fermenting groups within the community.

In relation to the Parks Community Centre, I point out to the House and the Premier that this matter was first raised by me at some length in the Estimates Committees debate and that the answers given by the Minister in charge of that centre formed the basis for the subsequent community activity and publicity surrounding it, and nothing else. It was raised in the Parliament. Secondly, the Premier suggested that, in relation to the Parks Community Centre, I have been spreading false rumours about the Government's intentions to sell or lease that centre. My remarks were based on the specific answer given by the Minister in Estimates question time, and I quote his words:

> We have endeavoured to interest the General Manager in looking into the possibility of some private or other public institutions taking over sections of the Parks, because we thought it might be more economical for that to be considered.

There was also the letter sent by the director of the department, on the Minister's behalf, to the Parks, in which he said that an assessment was being made of the practicability of phasing out those services by transferring some or all of them to the private sector to operate, thereby minimising the impact on State Government assistance. They are not rumours but, in fact, the words of the Minister and of his Director. Secondly, in answering the question, the Premier, while scotching the rumour by making an affirmation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has sought leave to make a personal explanation, not to proceed with debating any other material.

Mr BANNON: I make the final point in relation to spreading rumours, which I utterly reject, by saying that the information disseminated was based on the answers given by the Minister and the memo from his Director, and the Premier's answer dealt with only one aspect of that, the sale of facilities. He did not answer the question about the lease of facilities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SOUTHERN CROSS HOMES

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make two personal explanations.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can seek leave for a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: I will attempt to combine the two into one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park will resume his seat. He should appreciate that he may seek leave for one at a time. That was the instruction given.

Mr TRAINER: In the course of a reply to my question, the Premier implied that I cast a slur on Southern Cross Homes, and implied that, in contrast to him, I held that organisation in low esteem. That accusation is completely incorrect. What I said in the course of my question was that Southern Cross Homes was rather confused by the recent decision that had been made by the Government in respect of Magill Home and Windana. Indeed, when that particular announcement was made on Tuesday, I contacted Mr Peter Taylor, the Chairman of the Southern Cross Homes board, at about 5 p.m., following the Ministerial statement on that decision. At that time he knew very little about the decision, other than the fact that someone from the Health Commission had mentioned the previous week that it was being considered. The majority of the information that he has gained since then has been by way of *Hansard* extracts which I sent to him from the Legislative Council on Tuesday and which contained statements made by the Minister of Community Welfare. Some of the claims

in that extract surprised Mr Taylor. He was startled at the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to permit the honourable member to continue by way of introducing thoughts that are attributable to Mr Taylor. The honourable member sought leave to make a personal explanation, and that is all that he has been granted permission for.

Mr TRAINER: Mr Taylor informed me that he was surprised at some of the statements in that extract and that he felt there had not been sufficient consultation with Southern Cross Homes. That is the point I was making in the course of my explanation of my question, which the Premier has apparently misinterpreted. I made no effort whatever to cast a slur on Southern Cross Homes. I hold that organisation in high esteem. I have relatives and friends who are associated with that particular body. I think, and I can only assume this, based on statements that have been made by personnel connected with Southern Cross Homes, that the esteem is reciprocated and that organisation has expressed appreciation of my endeavours to try to have Windana opened for the benefit of my constituents and those people who are on the waiting list of Southern Cross Homes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WINDANA

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: During the Premier's reply to a question earlier today, he referred, as my colleague the member for Ascot Park has already indicated, to Southern Cross Homes and left the House with the clear impression, I think, that it was as a result of the actions of this current Government that Southern Cross Homes was in fact—

Mr Gunn: Is this a personal explanation?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes, it is, as you will see in a moment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has given leave to the honourable member for Elizabeth. The House should hear the explanation in silence, except as interrupted by the Chair.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Premier left the House with the distinct impression that the Government had been responsible in some way for involving Southern Cross in this project. I want it known to members and the public of South Australia that Southern Cross Homes was invited into the Windana project when I was the Minister of Health. It was an initiative of the former Government, not of the current Government, and it indicates the high regard in which I and other members on this side hold Southern Cross Homes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WINDANA

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: Mr Speaker, in the course of my personal explanation am I permitted to use the word 'outrageous' to describe a claim made by the Premier against me in regard to my personal reputation?

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is seeking an instruction, it is not a word which, stated in the way it was just used, is recognised as being unparliamentary. If he uses it with venom, it may be.

Mr TRAINER: In the course of that same reply to my question concerning the waiting list at Windana, the Premier made the outrageous implication that I in some way had sabotaged the negotiations at State and Federal level for the opening of Windana and that I was somehow responsible for the plight of those people upon the waiting list for admission to the 90 beds at Windana.

In so doing, the Premier was repeating allegations which the Minister of Health made on 3 June and 4 June and which I had believed I had satisfactorily refuted in my personal explanations on those days. The issue of the allegations centres around the Federal Government's refusing to fund Windana by categorising people who are brain failure cases as being mental health cases. It was implied by the Minister of Health, and it has now apparently been subsequently taken up by the Premier, that my use in a certain context of the word 'psychogeriatric' was the determining factor in Windana's remaining closed. That is not correct, as I have previously shown, but if the allegation was correct (and I am saying this in order to prove that it was not correct) that I was inadvertently, in a public forum or elsewhere, using phrases that would somehow interfere with the negotiations at State and Federal level, surely a responsible Minister would have approached me regarding such action. The Minister could have said something to me along the lines—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park sought leave for a personal explanation and is now developing a debate. I accepted his assurance that he was making certain assertions to set the scene, but he is going far beyond that at the moment.

Mr TRAINER: If I may continue my thread, Sir, you will see that I am attempting to not diverge from what is required, because I was merely going to show that the Minister did not take that action because it would have been based on a false premise that I actually had conducted myself in such a way as to sabotage those negotiations at State and Federal level. Indeed, such sabotage as did take place—perhaps sabotage is the wrong word: such interference with negotiations as led to the breakdown that did take place was carried out by the Health Commission—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is obvious from the honourable member's discussion that he is setting the scene to lay the blame on some person other than himself, whereas he has sought leave to make a personal explanation to explain only his own position. I ask him not to further transgress, or I will have to withdraw leave.

Mr TRAINER: I take your point, Mr Speaker, and your guidance. You have pointed out that I am not allowed to say that it was any—

Mr TRAINER:—person or organisation other than myself who used that term in negotiations with the Federal Government against the advice of Southern Cross Homes, in order to absolve myself of the charge that has been made, so I will not attempt to do so. I set out clearly and publicly, on 3 June in a personal explanation those public statements where I had used phrases regarding the patients, as I will demonstrate by quoting. I referred to them as 'persons with failing mental faculties' and as being 'mentally impaired'. Only on one major occasion, on 12 March, in a press release, did I use the term 'psychogeriatric' patients, and in doing so I was quoting from a Ministerial press release that had appeared as an article in the *Advertiser*.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 10 November at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 3.19 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Savings Bank of South Australia Act, 1929-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its objects are to up-date many of the provisions of the Act which have become unworkable or inapplicable due to progress made in the operations of The Savings Bank of South Australia since their original inclusion in the Act, to provide for a deputy Chairman of Trustees, to instigate changes to the method of appointment of officers of the bank to classified and prescribed positions within the bank and to expand the bank's power in the lending and investment field to allow the bank to compete in the market place for funds.

The up-dating amendments include the revision of the definitions of 'efficiency' and 'officer', the inclusion of definitions of 'accounts', 'accounting records', 'depositor', 'securities' and 'the union' and the repeal of the definitions of 'prescribed officer', 'the Association' and 'the State'. Subsequent amendments are made to the principal Act as a result of such changes. A cut-off date which has been long established is inserted in section 20 of the Act which relates to the provision of retiring allowances by the bank and retirement after 40 years' service with the bank is allowed without the loss of benefits accrued by the particular officer pursuant to this section. Section 20a of the principal Act relating to superannuation is amended by repealing the portion thereof which has become inoperative. The provisions of section 22 are amended to give the trustees of the bank extended power to make payments in lieu of long service leave to dependants being powers equivalent to those applicable to retirement allowances. Section 24 of the Act is repealed as being an inappropriate provision to apply to the rights of officers to leave and retiring allowances.

Reference to the Homes Act, 1941, is removed from section 31 of the Act. Amendments are made to sections 47, 48, 51 and 60 of the Act to allow the trustees of the bank power to regulate the deposit of moneys, the repayment of deposits and to up-date provisions which relate to the supply of the bank's rules to depositors and to unused accounts as the existing provisions have become inappropriate in light of banking advances and procedural changes. Amendment is made to section 59 of the Act relating to accounts of deceased depositors to make the operation of the section more easily understood and to up-date the same to deal with changing circumstances. The monetary limits referred to in the section are left within the discretion of the trustees. The balance sheet provisions (Part IX) are revised whereby the part is renamed 'Accounts and Audit' and the existing sections 61 and 62 are replaced by provisions in line with those contained in the Companies Act and modern accounting and auditing practice.

Provision is made for the appointment of a deputy Chairman of Trustees to act on behalf of the Chairman during his absence. Section 15 is amended to this purpose.

Amendments are made to provisions relating to the appointment of officers to classified or prescribed positions whereby the approval of the Governor is not required for such appointment thereby relieving Treasury of unnecessary administrative work. The approval of the Governor is still required for those offices in the bank which are so designated by the Treasurer after consultation with the trustees of the bank.

The bank's powers are expanded in the field of lending whereby the existing sections 31 and 31a are repealed and replaced by a single section regulating the bank's lending. The trustees are given the power to lend the bank's funds with the restriction that at least half of the funds so lent shall be for residential purposes and further that unsecured loans shall be limited to a prescribed amount at present $5 000. The terms and conditions relating to such loans are left to the discretion of the trustees of the bank. Section 32 of the Act is amended by the deletion of the reference to lending thereunder thereby specifying those areas in which the bank may make investment. The power to invest in shares or debentures of bodies corporate operating in the banking field with the Treasurer's concurrence is added to that section. In addition, the bank is given power to invest in and deal in bills of exchange or promissory notes and to issue convertible certificates of deposit by amendments to section 42 of the Act. The expansion of the bank's powers in this area allow the bank to compete on more favourable terms than are at present imposed by the existing provisions of its Act in the very competitive finance market. In particular, the powers to lend upon an expanded range of securities and to deal in the Bill market are important to the bank's operations. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the headings to Parts VIII and IX of the Act. Clause 4 amends definitions of existing items in minor ways and adds definitions related to amendments to the substantive sections of the Act.

Clause 5 repeals section 15 and substitutes a section providing for the appointment of a Deputy Chairman of Trustees. Clause 6 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 19. Clause 7 amends section 19a to remove the necessity for the Governor's approval for the salaries of prescribed offices.

Clause 8 amends section 20 by deleting the words 'clerks or servants' and inserts a provision for retirement after 40 years' of service and inserting the cut-off date for entitlements under section 20 as being 1 July 1959 (being the date of the appointment of such officers). Clause 9 repeals section 20a (2) and (3) of the Act relating to the bank's superannuation arrangements. Clause 10 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 20b. Clause 11 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 21. Clause 12 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 22, repeals subsection 3 and substitutes fresh provisions relating to payments in lieu of long service leave.

Clause 13 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 23. Clause 14 repeals section 24. Clause 15 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 26. Clause 16 repeals section 26a and substitutes a redrafted section with

identical intent. Clause 17 deletes the words 'with the approval of the Governor' from section 26b.

Clause 18 deletes the words 'with the approval of the Governor' from section 26e. Clause 19 replaces the words 'the Association' with 'the Union' in section 26g. Clause 20 replaces the words 'the Association' with 'the Union' in section 26h. Clause 21 deletes the words 'with the approval of the Governor' from section 26i. Clause 22 is a formal amendment correcting section 26q.

Clause 23 replaces the words 'the Association' with 'the Union' in section 26s. Clause 24 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 27. Clause 25: section 31 and section 31a are repealed and replaced by section 31 relating to all loans made by the Bank. Clause 27: section 32 is amended by adding an additional area of investment namely certain shares or debentures in bodies corporate related to banking. The words 'invest funds of the bank' are substituted for 'invest and lend funds of the bank in or upon'.

Clause 28 deletes the words 'clerks or servants' from section 35. Clause 29 deletes the words 'clerk or servant' from section 36. Clause 30 amends the heading to Part VIII. Clause 31 amends section 42 by adding the powers to issue certain securities and to deal in Bills of Exchange or promissory notes. Clause 32 amends section 46 by omitting reference to section 31a and replacing it with reference to section 31.

Clause 33 repeals section 47 and substitutes new provisions for the deposit of money. Clause 34 repeals section 48 and substitutes new provisions for the availability of the bank's rules to depositors. Clause 35 repeals section 51 and substitutes new provisions for the repayment of deposits. Clause 36 repeals section 59 and substitutes new provisions for the payment of claims for the funds of deceased depositors. Clause 37 deletes reference to passbooks in section 60. Clause 38 amends the heading to Part IX. Clause 39 repeals sections 61 and 62 and substitutes sections 61, 62 and 62a providing for the preparation of the bank's accounts and the audit thereof.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) 1981

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It grants an additional entitlement to private sector employees generally in South Australia apart from those employees covered by Federal awards over whose working conditions this Parliament has no jurisdiction. Under the Bill, a full-time employee who is ill for a period of at least three consecutive days (excluding weekends and public holidays) whilst on annual leave becomes entitled to sick leave (up to the limit of his sick leave credits) in respect of the period of illness. The period of sick leave will not then count as annual leave. This new entitlement applies the principle which has applied to State public sector employees for some years.

The introduction of this Bill follows a decision of the Full Court of the South Australian Industrial Court and a request by the major employer representative organisations for appropriate remedial legislation. Earlier this year an application was made to vary the Clerks (S.A.) Award. It sought a provision to the effect that an employee who became ill while on annual leave could claim sick leave against his sick leave credits and be entitled to a further period of annual leave in lieu of the period of sickness.

In view of the current wording of section 80 of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the section dealing with sick leave, the matter was referred to the Full Bench of the Industrial Court. The Full Court found that under section 80 an employee is only entitled to a grant of sick leave if he is 'unable to attend or remain at his place of employment' and that hence an employee is not entitled to sick leave while on annual leave.

The application was subsequently amended so that what is, in effect, presently sought is an extension of annual leave by a period of sickness up to a maximum of 10 days per year. If the application is granted, employees entitled to the benefit of the award would have an additional 10 days paid leave per year on account of sickness because the additional leave could not be debited against sick leave credits.

Such a provision while clearly directed at overcoming the problems raised by the Full Court would, in the opinion of the Government, create an undesirable anomaly. It would create a burden upon industry in this State that exists nowhere else in Australia.

It is clear that the present situation has developed out of what is, in essence, a statutory technicality or anomaly. The logical response to this situation is to remove the anomaly by amending the legislation. In fact, a member of the Full Commission currently hearing the matter has suggested statutory amendments as the appropriate means of resolving the current difficulties.

There have been discussions between the major employer representative organisations and the trade unions concerned on the question of sick leave on annual leave. Discussions have been held with both employer organisations and unions as to the general nature of the amendments proposed. Both employer organisations and unions are aware of the general nature of the amendments proposed. However, the amendments are, in the opinion of the Government, so eminently fair and reasonable that there is no point in delaying the introduction of the present measure. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides for the grant of sick leave while on annual leave if the illness is such as would have incapacitated the employee for work for days or more, any such sick leave will not count as annual leave. New subsection (5a) provides that paid sick leave granted either under section 80 or under an award or industrial agreement is to be debited against the sick leave credit of the employee. This provision is intended to prevent the creation of new species of sick leave that are not subject to the rules of the Act or the relevant award or agreement dealing with the acquisition of sick leave credits.

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

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 October. Page 1702.)

Mr SLATER (Gilles): When we were debating this matter last evening, I expressed support for the principle of after-

race pay-outs, but I also expressed concern about the fears of the night codes, greyhounds and trotting racing, and about what might happen with the introduction of after-race pay-outs. In my view, the turn-over of T.A.B. will increase, although the extent of that increase is purely a matter of conjecture. I think it will be between 7 per cent and 10 per cent, and, if that is so, and if that percentage is all on the horse-racing code, a consequent reduction in the percentage of the other codes may occur.

An argument can be put forward that, if overall turn-over increases, even though the percentage for each code may decrease, an increase could occur in the monetary amounts returned to the individual codes. That may be so if all things are equal, but all things will not be equal, because people who are able to collect their investments will reinvest them on horse-racing rather than on the night codes, as T.A.B. offices are closed in the early evening. I believe that the T.A.B. should take suitable precautions. It is difficult for agencies to be open after 8 p.m., first, because it will probably be uneconomic, in that any increase would be an added cost, and, secondly, because of the safety factor. There must be some element of concern about safety if agencies are open in the evening.

The fears expressed can be best conveyed by reading to the House a letter written to all members of Parliament (I think all members received a copy) by the South Australian Trotting Control Board. The letter states:

> I write for and on behalf of the following bodies, namely, the—
> Dog Racing Control Board,
> Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club,
> South Australian Trotting Control Board,
> South Australian Trotting Club,
> Country Trotting Clubs Association of South Australia, and
> Breeders', Owners', Trainers' and Reinsmen's Association of South Australia,
>
> to inform you of their deep concern for the future financial well-being of the trotting and greyhound racing industries in this State following the proposed introduction of after-race payout of T.A.B. dividends.
>
> You are no doubt aware that the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, which was established in November 1979, made certain recommendations to the State Government . . . The great majority of the recommendations meet with the full agreement and appreciation of the industry, but I must bring to your attention matters evidently overlooked by the committee of inquiry which have the potential to prove disastrous financially to the trotting and greyhound codes, thereby negating any benefits to be derived from all other issues dealt with by the committee of inquiry.
>
> The matter to which I refer is the method of distribution of T.A.B. surplus funds amongst the three racing codes. Currently, the surplus funds of T.A.B. are disbursed in the same proportion as the market holdings of each code i.e., if trotting's turnover constitutes 21 per cent of turn-over then it is entitled to 21 per cent of the surplus funds of T.A.B. The amounts disbursed amongst the codes are paid to the controlling bodies for each code, which subsequently disburse those funds in a manner approved by the Minister.
>
> The State Government has accepted the recommendation of the committee of inquiry to introduce after-race payout of T.A.B. dividends, an issue with which we agree provided the interests of the night racing codes are protected. This measure will favourably affect T.A.B. profitability whilst producing no adverse effect to on-course attendances and activity, but provide no benefit to the trotting and greyhound codes, as every indication, including T.A.B. reaction and the views of the committee of inquiry itself, is that T.A.B. agencies will not extend hours of operation on night meetings.
>
> Therefore, trotting and greyhound meetings, being almost entirely night fixtures, are in no position to attract any extra turn-over through T.A.B., as agencies will not be open to accept any reinvestments. The galloping code, however, will be in a position to capitalise on the introduction of the after-race payout of T.A.B. dividends as T.A.B. agencies will be open for business for the duration of those meetings. The market holdings of the galloping code will rise as a result, and those of the night codes decline, with the same proportional effect on T.A.B. profits distribution. Precedent exists for these contentions in both New South Wales and Queensland, where the respective State Governments have found it necessary to take action to amend the method of distribution of T.A.B. surplus funds amongst the racing codes.

The letter continues:

> The night racing codes are extemely concerned with the present method of distribution of funds to the controlling bodies from T.A.B.

They are concerned at what is going to happen with the introduction of after-race pay-outs, which they think will have a substantial effect on their codes in relation to the percentage of T.A.B. turn-over. The letter concludes:

> The night racing codes made extensive submissions upon this matter, and this would have appeared to them to have been disregarded as the committee of inquiry made no reference to this particular question in its report. The night racing codes feel that if after-race payouts are to be introduced they could be significantly disadvantaged and would seek change to the present method of distribution which would protect their financial well-being. There can be a number of ways in which the method of distribution could be amended, the most simple being the adoption of a fixed percentage of T.A.B. surplus to be distributed to each of the three codes, namely, dogs 13 per cent, trotting 22 per cent and galloping 65 per cent.

The letter is signed by K. W. Porter, Secretary of the South Australian Trotting Control Board. The concern shared by the night codes about the introduction of after-race pay-outs is obvious. Experience in other States has indicated that where this facility exists there is strong evidence that the night racing codes are placed at a disadvantage unless the T.A.B. operates during the running of the meeting, or a more equitable formula for distribution of T.A.B. profits is established. It should be noted that in all other States where after-race pay-outs of dividends have been introduced, the disadvantage to night racing codes has been recognised and the formula for distribution of the profits between the codes has been amended accordingly.

In Western Australia, although there is no greyhound racing, on a fixed formula the profits arising from T.A.B. operation are distributed to the horse-racing codes, with 60 per cent to racing and 40 per cent to trotting. New South Wales and Queensland distribute profits according to formulae which recognise the adverse circumstances in which the night codes are placed. In New South Wales, after-race pay-outs have produced the most unfavourable reaction to the night codes turn-over. I want to quote some figures. In the year ended 30 June 1975, racing received $317 000 000, or 59.77 per cent; trotting received $101 000 000, or 19.05 per cent; and greyhounds received $112 000 000, which was 21.18 per cent. In the year ended 30 June 1980, racing increased its proportion to 73.79 per cent, trotting declined to 13.12 per cent, and greyhounds declined quite dramatically to 13.09 per cent.

The New South Wales Government has now acted to protect the interests of the night-racing codes, and in 1980 limited the racing to receiving 70 per cent of the profits available from the industry. I had information only in the last few weeks that here again a new formula needs to be devised, because this has not had sufficient impact on the two night codes to improve their position in New South Wales.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Even though they had a formula?

Mr SLATER: Even though they had a particular formula, it did not prove sufficiently flexible for the night codes to achieve what they desired. It seems to me that the same situation would apply in South Australia if the Minister did not consider a flexible formula for the night codes. I do not think that a fixed percentage would actually provide what we are looking for. It needs to be a renewable situation, possibly every six to 12 months—preferably every 12 months—to enable the matter to be determined and to give justice to all the codes concerned. As I say, it seems fairly obvious that, if the T.A.B. is open during the day and the galloping code will have the opportunity for people to invest and reinvest during the day, it is certainly reasonable to

assume that the night codes (trotting and dog-racing held mostly in the evening) will be disadvantaged. I put to the Minister on behalf of all the clubs—all of the night codes, the country trotting clubs and the country racing clubs and for the benefit of the three codes actually, because it is an industry that is important to this State—that we ought to be looking to some formula which can be established so that all codes will benefit, and so that the recommendations of the racing inquiry, which we are debating at present, are not negated through the Minister's not coming to the party on behalf of the night codes.

The member for Flinders last night mentioned the country racing clubs. They are in a difficult situation financially, I understand. I have had representations made to me by members of the country racing clubs, and it would appear that they are also looking for a fixed percentage of the South Australian Jockey Club distribution to assist the viability of country racing. I am pleased to learn—the Minister may confirm this or otherwise—that a decision has been made, and I understand that the South Australian Jockey Club has indicated that it is prepared to provide to the country racing clubs 11½ per cent of the T.A.B.

The country clubs were looking for 12½ per cent of the South Australian Jockey Club distribution, and they were also concerned with the availability of that money at a particular time. Some of them claimed that it was not being paid to them at a time when it was needed and that, as a consequence, they had to go into some debt to maintain the viability of their clubs. So I am pleased to know that some decision has been made. I do not know whether or not the agreement is formalised as yet; the Minister, as I said, may confirm this or otherwise. I understand he has a letter of intent from the South Australian Jockey Club offering this 11½ per cent of the T.A.B. distribution and a first charge fixed at $460 000, indexed to the c.p.i., with the agreement applying for two years.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I was hoping to make that big announcement.

Mr SLATER: The Minister has confirmed it by way of interjection, and I am pleased that that is the case. I need to say no more about that because, as I said, country racing is important to the racing industry generally.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I think you are pleasing everybody; you've done very well.

Mr SLATER: I am not trying to please everybody; sometimes when you try to please everybody you finish up by pleasing nobody. I know you are regarded as a pretty canny tactician (I think that is the term) and you issue a few sugar-coated pills, but I hope that you do not issue the wrong kind of sugar-coated pills in the horse-racing industry, or a swab might be required.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SLATER: The racing industry is a very difficult industry to please, of course, because there are a number of conflicting interests. I might point out for the benefit of the Minister in the House that they are currently moving in an economic climate that is not conducive to their interests. Despite the hoo-hah which the Premier and other members of the Government make about the economic situation in South Australia, it is fairly obvious to me, to the racing clubs, the trotting clubs and the dog-racing people, from the attendances at the courses and the turnovers achieved by the bookmakers, the T.A.B. and on-course totalisators, that they are not keeping pace with inflation. They are losing custom, and it would appear that they are suffering from the problems of the current economic climate. So we have to take that into consideration.

In addition, of course, we have other competitors for the gambling dollar. Very recently in this House, and this year, the Minister of Recreation and Sport introduced trade promotion lotteries. In trade promotion lotteries no payment is required to compete, and I notice that one can be in it for the price of a newspaper. I believe that that takes something away from the gambling dollar. Other avenues compete for the gambling dollar. The Lotteries Commission and soccer pools, which were introduced by the Minister of Recreation and Sport also, mean that that gambling dollar is in a competitive situation for custom and turnover. It is interesting to note and to make a comparison of the investments. Take the return to the investor in the three major areas: T.A.B., the Lotteries Commission and the soccer pools. The Lotteries Commission is obliged by law to pay back from the pool 61 per cent, I think, in respect of the prizes. The soccer pools pay a miserly 37 per cent from the pool.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Do you want me to take a point of order?

Mr SLATER: You can take a point of order if you like, but I do not believe that it would be valid, because I am just indicating the difference involved for the consumer, who, of course, is the person who bets on the races. The T.A.B. is by far the best investment for the average investor. If you invest $1 on the T.A.B. and back a winner, on average the return is better than 80 per cent. It varies, depending on whether you bet on a win, place or multiple bet, but on average it is over 80 per cent. It is by far the best gambling dollar for the community. Yet we find real problems associated with the T.A.B., and the major problem is to improve public awareness of the T.A.B. operation.

I have raised some questions in this House (and I do not want to repeat them today) in regard to the T.A.B. I point out to the Minister that I have had a question on notice for the past six to seven weeks. I think it is a reasonable question and that it should be answered. I have asked the Minister on how many occasions, on what dates, and for what period of time has the T.A.B. Computertab broken down in the past 12 months, and he has not answered my question. What I am seeking is information that has been sought from me by people who invest in the T.A.B. I believe the public are entitled to know exactly what happens in a statutory organisation which was set up by this Parliament and for which the Minister is responsible.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You will know.

Mr SLATER: I hope it is not too long before I know. It is not I who should know: this question is asked on behalf of the racing public. They want to know, because an important thing about the T.A.B. is not only public awareness but also that the public have confidence in the T.A.B. If they have not got that confidence, they are more likely not to bet at all or, even worse, they will bet with the S.P. bookmaker up the street. If the Minister is responsible for the T.A.B., I ask him, on behalf of the public, to at least give us in the information that we seek. I think that people need to be encouraged to invest in the T.A.B., not deterred.

I wish to relate an experience of my own. I happened to be in the company of the member for Whyalla, who said to me, 'I am going around the T.A.B., they have just been computerised last Thursday'. This was on the Labour Day Monday holiday, so I did accompany the member to the T.A.B. agency. I am not sure—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Was this at Whyalla, or here?

Mr SLATER: Yes, their computer had been introduced that week. I think there were two girls at terminals in the T.A.B. agency and there was a line-up right out into the street. The point I am making is that public relations were lacking completely, because people were making mistakes. It takes a long time for people to adjust to an innovation of this nature. It was significant to me that they made their way right up in the queue, got to the terminal, there would be an error, and a consequent delay occurred. It would be

in the interests of the T.A.B. to have a third party there, a person employed to give information and advice.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I will see that they look at that.

Mr SLATER: I think it is an important thing if we are encouraging people to invest in the T.A.B., particularly where it is a new innovation in an agency because for some people filling out the card it is not as simple as many people might imagine. The member for Whyalla did make an error in his investments. I do not know whether he backed the winners; he did have to make a change to the cards.

Will the Minister influence the T.A.B. to improve its relations with the public? After all, a customer is the important aspect of the whole operation. That is one of the reasons why my Party is supporting after-race pay-outs. It is an additional service to the racing public. We think it important. The racing public are entitled to the best facilities available and that is the basic reason why we are supporting this measure.

We need to encourage people by giving them as much information as possible to invest in the T.A.B. It would have been of great benefit that particular day if a third person, another member of the staff, was available to assist and advise people in regard to the computer operations.

It is disconcerting to a person who wants to invest on the T.A.B. to find that the computer is out of order, and he is not able to invest. That is another matter to which I ask the Minister to give his attention. I asked the question on notice because of public concern. The public have expressed, in letters to members, concern about the fact that they have gone to the T.A.B. and the computer has been out of order.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Let me give you the assurance that the Minister is giving that his earnest attention and has been doing so for some time.

Mr SLATER: We need assurance for the racing public so that when they go to the T.A.B. they are able to invest at their own desire in a particular race. I now refer to clauses 21, 22 and 23, which affect the number of meetings to be held and remove specific limitations on the conduct of on-course totalisators on those particular days. The limitation on the number of meetings is contained in the present Act. I might just relate to the present Act for the moment; section 63, subsection (3), limits the number of horse racing meetings which can be held at Victoria Park, Morphettville and Cheltenham racecourses on days that total in number for all these racecourses more than 73 days, and, in addition, two days on which the net proceeds of the meetings are devoted to charitable purposes approved by the Minister. The racing clubs can have 75 racing meetings a year.

Regarding Globe Derby Park and the trotting situation, section 64 (3) is to be deleted. The club was allowed 55 days and two charitable meetings throughout the year. The Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club was allowed 52 days on which to race and two days on which the net proceeds were devoted to charitable purposes approved by the Minister. Under the Bill, there will be no limitation on the meetings and the codes will be self-regulatory.

I have grave reservations about this. I do believe that they may not act responsibly and that they may want to race three or four times a week. There may be mid-week meetings that affect one of the other codes. It is quite possible that they will want to race on perhaps a Thursday or Tuesday somewhere in the metropolitan area, or alternatively would want to race somewhere else, which would affect to some degree one of the other codes. That is a dangerous situation. I read into the Bill the fact that the Minister still has some prerogative in regard to that, but it is presumed from my observations of the clause that, once that consideration is given, the codes themselves will be more or less self-regulatory. I do not know what powers the Minister will actually have and I will be asking him, during the Committee stages, why that has occurred.

Clauses 27 and 28 relate to the Racecourses Development Board. It is proposed to amend section 133 by striking out subsection (1) and substituting in its place an opportunity for the board to extend the opportunity to provide additional facilities. I do not think we need to quibble with that. We support the opportunity for the racing codes to develop additional facilities. Previously this was expressed as 'public facilities' and was somewhat restrictive. It appears that the restriction is going to be lifted to allow the clubs, for instance, if they want to purchase from those funds a mechanical lure, which is important as part of the sport, to do so under this clause. I am supporting it.

Clause 28 refers to the functions and powers of the board and is an amendment of some significance. It proposes that the function be extended in respect of public facilities on racecourses to allow other than financial assistance for the development of such facilities. We approve of that and we think that the racing, trotting and greyhound racing will benefit to a great extent.

Clause 29 inserts a new section 164 in the Act. In part, it prohibits an employee or secretary of the club or association from being a member of the board.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Without Ministerial approval.

Mr SLATER: Yes. If the Minister did it for one person, he would necessarily have to have a really good excuse for not doing it for another. I agree that it should be the case. I am not arguing that it should not be. I am telling the Minister that I agree with the amendment. I believe it is right and proper. It is a recommendation of the inquiry and I think it is justified.

Clause 29 (2) intrigues me. It provides that every member of the board shall, except where the board is required to give effect to directions of the Minister, make each decision required to be made in the performance or discharge of his function and powers or duties as a member of the board according to his own opinion or belief, and not according to the direction of any person or body. I am intrigued in regard to individual people being appointed by a body. It happens now quite often. The Chairman of the South Australian Jockey Club is also a member of the Totalisator Agency Board. No doubt, there is a conflict. The same applies in the other codes. The President of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club, Mr Brian Johnson, is also on the Greyhound Racing Control Board. Some people involved in trotting are members of the Trotting Control Board. People will be placed in a difficult situation when they are appointed by a particular body. We will now say that they cannot take notice and that they must make decisions on their own. The racing inquiry commented on this. I refer to page 50 of the report, paragraph 82, 'Members of controlling bodies', which in part states:

> The controlling bodies are sometimes obliged to make decisions which bring sectional interests into conflict. Although issues such as the allocation of race dates and the distribution of T.A.B. moneys will be inevitably the subject of some conflict, the committee was concerned by the resentment, often very bitter, felt by some interests against controlling body decisions or proposals which they perceived to be to their particular disadvantage. Obviously, each code needs a controlling body which is both strong and independent. The body must be willing and able to subordinate sectional interests to the overall welfare of the code which it controls. That will only happen if individuals who sit on the body take an industry view.

I wonder how we will overcome this problem. A secretary or club employee may be disqualified from being on one of the boards. If I was a member of a club and was appointed by it as a representative on a body of people who had control of a number of clubs, that would make it difficult, human nature being what it is, to put out of my mind the

interest of those persons who elected me. There is danger in that. I doubt whether it could be rectified, as the Minister suggests, by amending the Act. I hope that it will work, but difficulties and complications could arise.

Clause 30 inserts a new section 149a, which provides that bets made lawfully with and accepted by bookmakers, the T.A.B. or on-course totalisator are to be valid and enforceable contracts in law. In other words, both client and bookmakers can sue and be sued. Concern has been expressed by many people about this clause. People can bet on credit at the races, which is called 'betting on the nod'. I have never done that, but I have been told that this opportunity is available. I would like to know from the Minister why it has been included in this legislation. Have there been incidents that have shown it is necessary? We will oppose this provision, because we see hidden dangers in it. We will seek an explanation from the Minister in the Committee stage.

Basically, the Opposition supports this Bill. We did so in regard to the matters, generally speaking, in what I call the first instalment of amendments to the Racing Act, which came into effect on 1 January 1981 and which have substantially helped all the codes. The T.A.B. annual report indicated that the money allocated to codes has been significant. We hope that they have been able to apply that to increased stake money, the best possible purpose. At present, the trotting code is in the doldrums in South Australia. Any decline is self-perpetuating and gathers momentum unless arrested rather quickly.

If a person went to the T.A.B. in the afternoon and backed a winner, he would be more likely to reinvest his winnings on the galloping code rather than on either of the night racing codes. That will be to the disadvantage of the night racing codes. I hope that the Minister will consider this problem.

I believe the fixed percentage to be paid to the three codes is important, but I suggest that there should be a degree of flexibility in the fixed percentage that is being suggested. I believe it would be beneficial to all concerned if negotiations could be undertaken (by negotiation, rather than legislation) by the three codes. If the South Australian Jockey Club, the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club and the trotting people could come to an arrangement in regard to this matter, I would be pleased. It would certainly be beneficial to the interests of the three codes. As the Minister would appreciate, the racing industry is very important to this State. It employs many people directly and many others in subsidiary industries, not only those directly involved with racing, trotting and dog racing. It is important to ensure that all the advantages that have accrued from the first amendments to the Racing Act are not negated by a decision not to assist the night racing codes in regard to after-race pay-outs.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill and commend the Minister and the Government for their initiative in once again taking positive steps for the betterment of the racing industry in South Australia. Because of time constraints, I will leave most of my remarks until the Committee stage.

I believe one aspect of the Bill can be improved. It was not picked up by the racing inquiry. I am referring to the betting shops in Port Pirie, part of which is in my district. For that reason, I will be seeking the support of the House to move contingent motion No. 2 so that I can, in Committee, move amendments that I believe will improve the Bill. I hope the House will at least support me in the Committee stage when I will move those amendments, which I believe will help make the Bill a better piece of legislation.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I am sure the Minister would be hurt if I did not say a few words in this debate.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Not only hurt, but surprised.

Mr MAX BROWN: Surprised is the word I was looking for. I think the Opposition spokesman on this matter has covered the greater aspects of the Bill. I believe one particular provision will cause real problems within the racing industry. If I interpret correctly, it seems that the metropolitan clubs will be able to hold more metropolitan midweek race meetings. I believe that we will have to watch this closely, because country clubs in close proximity to the metropolitan area, such as Murray Bridge, Strathalbyn, Gawler and Balaklava, have all improved recently their facilities and prize money to such an extent that the racing industry has been helped no end. I believe that this particular aspect of the Bill could have serious repercussions.

I have some interest in the racing industry and my son and two daughters have interests in greyhound racing, so I suppose I have a pecuniary interest in this Bill. I will deal with the remarks of the member for Rocky River a little later. Basically, this Bill makes three or four major alterations to the Racing Act. I believe the alterations are being made as a result of the findings of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry. I want to deal with the changes to be made to the members of the boards of management of the three codes. I also want to deal with after-race pay-outs by the T.A.B. I believe there is a real problem in respect of the percentage of profits from the T.A.B. being paid to the trotting and greyhound codes. I believe this is going to be a problem and I think the Minister will have to come up with a satisfactory answer. Members of the Opposition have made suggestions to the Minister about this that I think are worthy of particular note.

The third point I want to deal with concerns the establishment of separate funds for the three forms of racing, and the fourth point concerns legalising the right of prosecution concerning the collection of a bet from a punter by a bookmaker, which I think needs some attention. I refer to the proposed make-up of the three management boards. I have said in this House before, and unfortunately I have to say it again because no attempt seems to have been made by anyone to alter that make-up, that no matter what may be the political colour of the Party in Government there seems to be this continuing policy of 'I'm all right Jack.'

This applies within the racing codes themselves. There is the South Australian Jockey Club, which is heavily in debt, as the Minister did know, and we find that that club is not really looking after the interests of any other aspects of the code; it does not take the interest that it ought to take in country racing, for example. Indeed, it is so heavily in debt that it does not have the finance or initiative to do much about it. Unfortunately, this applies also to the trotting and greyhound codes. The trotting code saw fit to shift from Wayville to Globe Derby, and in my opinion all that that did was intensify its overheads. I have pointed out before that I believe that the trotting track at Gawler was very well equipped and that it would have needed no money at all to race at Gawler, if there was a desire to shift from Wayville.

Mr Slater: It was too far away.

Mr MAX BROWN: I disagree; one would not say that Globe Derby was in the middle of the city, and I point out that Angle Park has got itself into financial difficulties.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Angle Park is not too far away.

Mr MAX BROWN: I am simply pointing out that each code wishes to operate within itself and that each code has difficulties. Every time one looks at the racing situation it is apparent that that position is intensifying rather than easing, and it is a terrible pity that it has occurred. As the

member for Gilles pointed out on the matter of after-race T.A.B. pay-outs, there is the argument involving the percentage paid from T.A.B. to the greyhound and trotting clubs. Also, the T.A.B., because of its economic situation, closes at 8 o'clock, and therefore, as regards after-race payouts, there will be, at least theoretically, no more actual turnover by the greyhound or the trotting codes.

Mr Slater: There could be less.

Mr MAX BROWN: Yes. The Government is continually having demands put on it by the racing codes for more money and more cuts from the T.A.B., and yet the codes are getting themselves into a financial mess. I think it is time for the Government to stipulate to the racing codes that they have a responsibility to cut down on overheads and rationalise. There is racing throughout the north, with trotting at Port Pirie and at Port Augusta every fortnight; we have daytime trotting just about every fortnight in Whyalla, and there is trotting also at Kimba and Cowell, etc. Sooner or later someone must suffer; in fact they are suffering now. Even greyhound-racing is still suffering.

There should be a rationalisation, and the Government should demand this of the racing codes. Although I mention rationalisation, I did not think that the two sports to which I will refer could get together satisfactorily. Last Saturday afternoon a greyhound-racing meeting was held at the Whyalla Memorial Oval (which can be used as either a football or cricket oval) at the same time as a cricket match, and this event was reported in Whyalla's local paper on 26 October, under the heading 'Cricket/Dogs Trial Success', as follows:

> The result of the experimental cricket match and greyhound meeting at the Memorial Oval on Saturday was a resounding success. A good crowd went to the ground largely to have a bet with bookmakers and to watch the dogs. Between races these people joined the cricket supporters to watch the game in the middle.

I am surprised that it was a goer, but the point I am making is that there should be more rationalisation, and that is a classic example of how it can be done. We can get a rationalisation between cricket and greyhounds, but ironically we cannot get a rationalisation within the greyhound-racing industry itself.

I refer now to the management boards. I and, I know, others have been approached by country clubs wishing to nominate their own representatives on the board, and I support this concept. I believe that a certain country club ought to be afforded the opportunity of having the right to select its own representatives on the board. The system is not a democratic one and does not allow clubs to elect persons who they believe can look after their interests properly. I am not quite clear on how nomination occurs, but apparently three people are nominated, and those nominations are put to the Minister, who in some magical way selects one whose appointment, he thinks, will be in the best interests of the code.

I do not think that that is the correct way to go about this. If the country clubs, whether racing, trotting or greyhound, were given an opportunity to meet and democratically elect a representative, that representative should be accepted by the Government in the spirit in which he was elected. The Opposition will be moving an amendment to this effect.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You are not discussing it though, are you?

Mr MAX BROWN: It is being put up not as a gimmick, but in all seriousness, because of approaches by country clubs and for the reasons I have given the Minister; it is not for some ulterior motive. If the Minister were to allow country clubs to elect their representative, it would let him off the hook. If a group of clubs elected a representative, and if that representative did something wrong, the easy way out for the Minister would be to tell the clubs to do something about it, and not to blame him.

I turn now to the proposal to establish separate funds for the three codes, which is another step, as I see it, towards deepening the resistance the three clubs have at present.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They have always had it.

Mr Slater: It is only an extension.

Mr MAX BROWN: I am supporting the proposal, but I have some reservations about it. The three codes operate separately and independently, and all have major financial problems within their own codes. The South Australian Jockey Club, at Morphettville, is the major club for the racing code, the South Australian Trotting Club, at Globe Derby, is the major club for the trotting code, and South Australian Greyhounds, at Angle Park, for the greyhound code; all have financial problems. We are still not doing very much to curtail the overheads, especially in the racing game; that seems to be increasing, although I do not know why.

I have never believed that, in the current economic climate, despite what the Government says, the racing industry can afford three major race tracks in the metropolitan area. It is ludicrous to think that that is the solution to the problem. It is a step in the wrong direction to keep building facilities and spending money on the three metropolitan tracks when, if we were to do away with one of them, we would consolidate the racing industry to a large extent. I do not know why that is not being done, and I will keep hammering that point, because I think too much money is being shovelled into this continuing operation. T.A.B. is supposed to be a mint, to produce money as if it were growing on trees. Everyone wants a cut, and yet the people who want a cut are not being told to stop what they are doing. The Government must accept some responsibility in that direction.

I have always supported after-race pay-outs, as I have told the Minister privately many times. The principle in the main slightly improves T.A.B. operation and service to the punter. In my opinion, we will never do away with the S.P. bookmaker, whether we like it or not, because generally the S.P. bookmaker provides a far better service to the punter than does the T.A.B. However, after-race pay-outs on T.A.B. should be a step in the right direction, and for that reason I support it. I turn now to the amendment proposed by the member for Rocky River. It amazes me. I am not sure whether the Government will support it.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member is canvassing a matter that is to be introduced at another stage of the debate. I suggest that he might like to talk about the matter of betting shops in Port Pirie, without mentioning anything else.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Randall): I uphold the point of order. The honourable member is well aware that, when the amendment is introduced, he will be able to debate it in Committee.

Mr MAX BROWN: I will not pursue it now but, when the amendment is before the Committee, I will oppose it and I will point out vigorously that the way in which it has been presented leaves me a bit shaken. After-race pay-out, in my opinion, will improve T.A.B. facilities, but I do not retract my statement that the T.A.B. will have to lift its game in many areas to offset the operations of the bookmaker or the S.P. bookmaker.

I have been a punter, although not a big one, all my life. The bookmaker, in my opinion, does several things that the T.A.B. does not do. First, he provides a personal approach. Secondly, the punter invariably has an alternative. If he wants to bet on a horse at a certain price, that is the price he gets, but with the T.A.B. that is not the case; he might

have got on when a horse was showing a certain price but, by the time the race starts, he has accepted a much lower price. That is a very unfortunate situation. There are other aspects, but I will leave that question on the basis that I think the T.A.B. has to lift its game, or we will find that punters will not patronise it as they should.

I turn now to the proposed establishment of the separate development funds. I take it that the funds will be for the racing industry, the trotting industry and the greyhound industry. I have no basic objection to that arrangement of the funds, but I point out what might happen and what history tells us invariably does happen. Clubs become independent about these funds. They grab them, use them for their own use, and do not again look at the overall point of view. I hope in all sincerity that, with the establishment of these funds, that will not happen. This time I might get some satisfaction that the clubs are looking at it from the overall point of view. I hope so. That is the danger I can see in the establishment of the funds, although I support them.

The South Australian Jockey Club, for example, the major administrator of the racing game, which is in a fairly heavy financial situation in the development fund, could (I would not say 'would') quite easily use those development funds on a self-interest basis. I can say that for both the trotting clubs and the greyhound clubs, but I hope that that does not occur.

The clause, in my opinion, allows a bookmaker to have legal recourse in obtaining a nod bet from the punter. I am not happy about the clause at all. History would prove that anybody that owes a bookmaker money is usually a person who cuts bets; he has got on the nod somewhere along the line. I suggest that that person is probably a very dedicated gambler: he is at the races frequently, probably could phone the bookmaker, or he could certainly nod bet. If the bookmaker is silly enough to accept that his client could nod bet, he surely could only accept that this person has money or assets to cover that bet. If he allows the person to get into financial difficulties by gambling, and then say that he can legally recover the money owing, the family of the punter could suffer, because the gambler has been allowed, unfortunately, to over-wager his assets or his finance. The bookmaker could move in and put at risk the home or the livelihood of the punter or his family.

For that reason, I am not particularly happy with the clause. Perhaps the Minister, in his summing up, could explain what it means, and say whether those dangers do not exist, but I do not think that he can. I think that that is what the bookmaker could do. If that is the case, I oppose that provision.

In the main, I think the Bill is a good one. It will do something for the racing industry, but I leave this final thought with the Minister: I hope that, once this Bill goes through, we will see a more steadying influence in the racing codes, to accept some responsibility for the finances of the racing industry.

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 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): It is a pity that we are being forced to rush this legislation through today. The biggest shame of the whole system is that there are very few in the House. If I were a taxpayer, I would be asking for value for money. At the present moment I cannot see too much value in the Chamber. I want to clarify one point. The member for Whyalla made several very valid points. In relation to the Racecourse Development Board, as it is now known, the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended 30 June 1981 (pages 306-10) sets out the operations of the Horse Racing Grounds Development Fund, the Trotting Grounds Development Fund and the Dog Racing Grounds Development Fund. Of course, clause 27 amends section 133 of the principal Act and streamlines the administration of that.

The member for Whyalla is a little concerned that certain clubs may benefit under the existing fund, and also in the future. The Horse Racing Grounds Development Fund in the last financial year showed a surplus of $158 000 on the operations. The total net assets of that fund now are $1 600 000, and almost $3 000 000 has been lent to various clubs. The Trotting Grounds Development Fund had a surplus of $74 000 for the last financial year. Loans to clubs were $616 000, and the total net assets of that fund were some $394 000. The Dog Racing Grounds Development Fund have a surplus of $57 000 and has loans to clubs of $243 000. It is also interesting to note in regard to the Racecourses Development Board that loans to the South Australian Jockey Club to provide a computerised sell/pay totalisator system involved $805 000 in 1980 and $1 200 000 in 1981. The member for Whyalla is quite right: the S.A.J.C. does very well, thank you! However, at the same time, other country clubs have also benefited in many ways from these funds to improve their facilities.

I want to compliment the Minister on his foresight in insisting on keeping to the time table in bringing this legislation before the House. As all members know, we have had the Hancock Report and the Byrne Report into racing over the last several years. From those reports there have been benefits to the racing industry, but I do not think any Government, any political Party, can claim the credit that the Minister can so rightly claim that his Government has done more for the racing industry in general than ever before in the State.

Mr Slater: What about the introduction of the Racing Act in 1976?

Mr BECKER: The introduction of the Racing Act was just a forerunner. Let us be honest. It did not achieve all the things we really wanted it to achieve. Had big-mouth Hudson kept out of it—

Mr Slater: Be careful now!

Mr BECKER: I am not going to be careful, because Hudson thought he knew everything. That, is why we had to have a subsequent inquiry into racing, and that is why we are dealing with the legislation now.

An honorable member: Are you referring to the Hon. Hugh Hudson?

Mr BECKER: Yes, that is the person to whom I am referring. He and I use surnames only. He professed to be an expert in economics, and I think he is in his rightful place lecturing to students at Monash, or somewhere, because they would not have a clue what he is talking about. Certainly, he did not assist the racing industry as the industry wanted to be assisted. So, we are now having to come through this final stage of clearing up the mess, which was evident during the Hancock inquiry. Even before that I called for the inquiry into racing, and that led to the Hancock inquiry. I want to pay credit to some people who I do not think have even been given credit for what we have before us today, and for what has come from the 1976 report.

As far as horse racing is concerned, the industry can be very thankful for dedicated men and women in that industry. I pay particular credit to Colin Hayes; he is one of those quiet individuals working behind the scenes who was responsible for many of the sound ideas that have come through and he is one of those who have made racing what it is in South Australia. Bart Cummings, Arthur Mooney,

Joe Hall, and Len Smith have worked very hard for very little profit in some cases to keep the industry on a high plane.

There are various breeding studs in South Australia and there is no doubt that one of the most successful of these and probably the one that brings the most credit to South Australia is the Lindsay Park Stud. That is through a large measure of dedication and devotion of Wyndham Hill-Smith. Wyndham has done a lot for racing over the years. I do fall out with him on one issue, that is, the existence of the Cheltenham racecourse. There is the Uley Park Stud, the Millunna Stud, and the Balcrest Stud, which is well known to South Australians and also the Narrung Stud.

As far as jockeys are concerned, we have had our share. We have had Pat Glennon and Des Coleman, and one of the present personalities of racing is John Letts.

As far as trotting is concerned, probably three families stand out more than anyone else. I refer to the Norman family—as far as the top breeders are concerned, and their contribution has been well known for many years. Then we come into the training section and driving section. I have known Len Sugars for many many years, and his son, Ross is the only trotting driver in South Australia to have driven more than 100 winners. He has done more than that in the last five seasons. Then there is the outstanding contribution over the years from the Second World War by the Webster family and the Hurleys.

It is interesting to note that as far as trotting is concerned a Mrs Priest is the leading horse owner at the present moment. As far as horse racing is concerned, the lady trainers are a Mrs S. Hodge and Mrs B. Keene. Mention was made of dog racing. I think in the 1970s dog racing was the real success story as far as the racing industry in South Australia was concerned.

Mr Slater: Who do you reckon set them up?

Mr BECKER: The honourable member was here then and I think he may remember the role that the member for Hanson played. The member for Hanson was quite vocal after he came here to see that dog racing would be legalised in South Australia. I do pay credit to the member's Government that it brought in the leglislation, which I have supported, and I believe that we want to look at the dedication, devotion and the hard work of a lot of other people I would like to name and to whom I would like to give credit. However there are so many of them I cannot do that.

So many of them are responsible for bringing dog racing to the very high level and credibility that it enjoys in this State, and it is recognised throughout Australasia. There are a lot of good honest citizens. The honourable member might say working class people. I do not like to say that, I think they are like the member and me, good old dinky-die salts of the earth.

Dog racing owes its success to a lot of people who have worked so hard and a lot of people are still holding administrative positions in that respect. All in all, while I may not personally agree with everything that is contained in the legislation, it is still a continuing step in the right direction to give this industry the help and support that it deserves. I believe that from now on all three codes have to continue to obtain private sponsorship. Sponsorship has played a very important part until now, but I believe that they cannot continuously keep asking the Government for support.

Certainly, the support probably would have been there had we had good sound management with the T.A.B. I think there are many occasions when we can be very critical of some of the decisions that were taken by the board and the T.A.B., certainly in relation to Databet (that set them back $2 000 000); the purchase of the new computers and all the problems and troubles they have had with that, again using untried systems and trying to co-ordinate systems; the huge writeoffs that we find in the Annual Report of the T.A.B. which I have not got time to go through now; and, of course, lately the fiasco of the Riverton agency of the T.A.B.

All these are severe and savage losses to racing in South Australia. They have to be carried and supported by the taxpayers. However, as I have said, sponsorship is the area to which these racing clubs must look. There is Draconian legislation introduced by the member for Mitcham, who would not give a damn about anything, that could seriously affect a sponsorship to these organisations, if that is passed. Irrespective of your own personal morals, I think the tobacco industry has played a very important part in that regard and I hope that it has the opportunity to continue to support the three codes and reduce the impact on the taxpayers in this State through the State Budgets.

I would like to see the reconstruction of the various boards and the powers given to the Minister, which have been criticised by the members of the Opposition, and I would like the Minister to consider appointing women to the various boards. I would like to see a woman on the South Australian Jockey Club—I think that would be the best thing that ever happened to that organisation. I thought some valid points by the member for Whyalla needed supporting. I would like to see a woman on each of the boards and certainly there are many capable women in the trotting area who could make a very valuable contribution in all facets of the industry, including the consumer. I would like to see women represented and I would like to sometime get an undertaking from the Minister that he would consider nomination of a woman to the boards of the various codes.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): This is an extremely important Bill, not only for racing, but to South Australia. I support the amendments to be moved by the member for Gilles, which he covered extremely well. I should like the Government to accept some of them. It would not be a great effort for the Minister to do this. Clause 20 is important and relates to the introduction of telephone betting, about which I heard much criticism some 12 months ago. People from the South Australian Jockey Club were against it, as were bookmakers. The member for Gilles has told me that, from his inquiries, they have mellowed in their opposition. I know that is true from discussions I have had with some of those people, although I would not say that they completely accept telephone betting.

Much has been said by members on both sides of the House about the importance of racing in South Australia. It is an extremely large industry, but it could be severely affected unless stake money is increased in the galloping, trotting, and dog racing codes. I follow racing and am a moderate bettor. I consider having a bet or going to the races is a sport. At my age, I cannot be involved in too active a sport, but I enjoy going to and following races, although I do not like losing money. Sometimes I win. People involved in the racing industry who discuss after-race pay-outs know something about a punter's feeling, whereas someone who knows nothing about racing has extreme difficulty in seeing that those pay-outs could improve the industry.

Anyone who looked through the T.A.B. fifteenth annual report of 1981 would see that telephone betting has increased considerably in recent years. Naturally, that would be so, certainly with the inflation rate. There was not a big increase in 1978-79, because telephone betting only became more popular as people got used to it. Those who used different betting facilities took time to be convinced of its benefits. Telephone betting left much to be

desired. Problems arose because many times when one rang, the telephone was not answered. The computer also sometimes breaks down, but that has been greatly improved, and I think it will continue to improve.

People who bet by telephone can enjoy after-race pay-outs. Immediately the race is over and a dividend is declared, that money is credited to a person's account. He can telephone seven or eight minutes after the race and ask what is in his account, after giving its number. He will be told the amount, and he can continue to use that money for betting. People have argued that the after-race pay-out would be at the expense of people going to the races. I believe that punters who bet on the T.A.B. and punters who go to the races are completely different. One person's enjoyment is to go to a T.A.B. and have a bet; another punter would use T.A.B. and also attend the races. Whatever anyone says, racing gives a certain amount of enjoyment to people who like to see horses race, even to some who do not bet.

Other people do not get any enjoyment from having a bet on a T.A.B., but they like to bet with bookmakers. The bookmaker has always been one of the attractions of Australian racing. If one said that to New Zealand people or to Americans, they would look at one stupidly, because T.A.B. punting operates in their country. However, there is a certain amount of romance in the racing industry, of which bookmakers will always be a part. I would hate to see any Bill introduced that would interfere with bookmakers' activities over the next century. I do not think this amendment regarding after-race pay-outs will be at bookmakers' expense, and I hope I am right in that.

Someone who wants to bet in the T.A.B. should be able to do so, and, instead of having to wait until the last race, about 5 or 6 p.m., he should be able to cash the ticket within about five to 10 minutes after a race, as he can in New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. Victoria introduced the first T.A.B. in Australia. I was there at the time, and one of the biggest fears was that after-race pay-outs might make the T.A.B. too much like a betting shop, and people may have been encouraged to stay around the T.A.B., and I refer not only to punters, but also to women and children. Some women like to have a bet and would have children there. This possibility was seen, especially by churches and other people, not to have been to any State's advantage.

I think that is a falsehood. Anyone who likes to go to the races and have a bet will find that the T.A.B. facility has been improved greatly over the past two years. People can get a bet very quickly there and more would use it. The first argument would be that bookmakers must suffer. I believe that T.A.B. has not made a great deal of difference to bookmakers' returns, or, if it has, bookmakers have not told me about it.

Most people overlook the fact that prize money in racing in South Australia, be it horse, trotting or dog-racing, is not as high as elsewhere. If stake money is not improved, a few more people like Bart Cummings, or Ricky Lloyd, the jockey, who has just announced that he is leaving this State, will also leave, which would be a disaster for the racing industry. Bart Cummings is recognised as one of the best trainers. To a lesser degree, Ricky Lloyd is accepted as an extremely good jockey in this State, and he can hold his own in other States. It is a shame to lose any of these people. Most people who have had a few bets would remember that John Letts left the State, but returned, which was good to see. It is unfortunate that we must be rushed with this Bill. I indicated that I would speak for about 10 minutes only and that my colleague the member for Gilles, has covered the aspects of the Bill very well. As I said earlier, I support the Bill with some reservations in relation to my colleague's amendments.

When asked whether they believe that there is a fault in the racing industry, most people immediately point to the S.P. bookmakers and say that the police are not controlling their activities and that the fines are not high enough. I believe that the amendment in relation to after-race pay-outs will go a long way towards eliminating the need for S.P. bookmakers. I believe that, if a person could be paid straight after the race and he could reinvest that money if he so desired, there would be less demand for the services of the S.P. bookmakers.

I bitterly opposed the Government's introducing soccer pools. I said then that it would be at the expense of other forms of betting which had been operating in the State for many years and which employ a lot of people. The Government has no control over the money involved in soccer pools except for a lousy bit of taxation that it would get from it. This is given to the person who operates the *News*, Sangster and people like that who have no feelings and who put no money back into the State. I was pleased to see the results of the soccer pools. To date, soccer pools have not been successful, and I hope that that situation continues. I am very much against that form of gambling, and I do not think it should have been introduced. I do not want to see other forms of gambling introduced at the expense of the racing codes, whether it involves dogs, trotting or gallopers. Particularly, I do not want to see one-armed bandits, or poker machines, introduced into this State.

I agree with the proposal to establish development boards, but I believe that the Minister ought to watch this matter carefully. I am a great believer that racing could not exist without the public's support. It does not matter which committee or facility is involved: the small punter, not the member in his grandstand with all the facilities, keeps the racing codes going. I believe that money given to the clubs ought to be directed towards improving the facilities for the people who keep the racing codes going. I believe that, if any racing club goes defunct, it will be because the public has not been looked after sufficiently or because of mismanagement, some of which has occurred. I think the Minister would be the first to agree that over the years some of these codes have been mismanaged.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Some of you speak for 20 minutes, and I have only been speaking for a quarter of an hour. The honourable member may not be a person who likes racing: he might be running around racing cars. I support racing to that extent I am not opposing the amendments, particularly those foreshadowed by the member for Gilles. I will not delay the Committee any further, although I do not want the likes of the honourable member who has just interjected telling me what to do. I know more about what to do in this House than he will ever know.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to refer to the agreement that has been reached between the South Australian Country Racing Clubs Association and the other codes. I think it is appreciated that every code within the racing industry is in financial difficulties. I believe that what was happening to the country clubs was a gradual phasing out, by financial strangulation, of the share of funds supposedly to be made available from the T.A.B. surplus funds. What concerned me in my discussion with members of the country racing clubs was that the overall share was declining, basically because the figure at the top used for administration expenses was being increased, and this was being debited against the dividends being paid to country clubs.

I have kept in close contact with the negotiations that have been going on, and I understood there was a move to

try to introduce by legislation a set percentage for country clubs. I am pleased to say that in the past few days an agreement has been reached between the various racing codes that country clubs can have 11.5 per cent, provided that the figure for administration expenses at the top is set at $460 000 and is then indexed accordingly.

A vast component of the retention of country clubs is carried out by voluntary labour and, if it were not for voluntary labour, almost certainly every country club would have to fold. That point must be made, as most of the larger racing clubs within the metropolitan area are almost totally financed through their fund-raising efforts and the share from the T.A.B. dividend. Apart from the use of volunteer labour, country clubs run massive fund-raising programmes by way of cabarets, bingo nights and raffle tickets in order just to maintain their grounds. I do not wish that part of the racing industry's activities to go unnoticed by the Government or any other member of the House, because I believe that, if it were not for the dedication of these individuals, the services of racing would not be brought to country people.

During discussions I have had with my constituents, the subject of betting shops has been raised. I think the comment was well made that, when the original Racing Act was introduced, an agreement was made that betting shops would be phased out by 1983. So, a seven-year phasing out period was to be undertaken. More particularly, if this is allowed in one area of the State, why should not other areas of the State not have the benefits or disadvantages?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I am not suggesting that, but if Port Pirie can have it, why should not the same privilege be given to Port Lincoln, if it is considered to be a privilege? Some people might consider it the other way.

If a certain town or area is exempted from the legislation and allowed to have betting shops, that weakens the effectiveness of the measure, and to that extent I could not support it. I register my concern at the difficulties experienced by country clubs in securing, at least momentarily, their share of the T.A.B. surplus funds. I trust that the agreements reached between the country clubs and the Jockey Club will be honoured and that the two-year trial period will prove satisfactory. I would be saddened to think that it was necessary to legislate for a set percentage, particularly when people involved in the same industry cannot reach a reasonable agreement and compromise concerning the distribution of funding. I support the Bill.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I can guarantee members opposite that my remarks will be brief. Very few members of the House would remember the old betting shops, but I fear that after-hours payments, as provided for in this Bill, will cause concern similar to the concern felt during the time of these betting shops. Although I know that T.A.B. branches are far better managed than were betting shops, the Liberal and Labor Parties at that time said that we would never again get back to the situation involving betting shops. I support the second reading, but I am perturbed that we are gradually moving back to that situation, even though the Minister may say that we are not.

During the time of the betting shops we saw people in dire straits, people who could not afford to bet. I was playing sport then; I can remember going to those shops and always finding someone in front and someone behind, and we had a lot of trouble getting them to the sporting field, with a shortage of players. Maybe times have changed, but I do not think they have: a person who is winning money wants to win more, and will wait for the after-race payouts, while the fellow who is losing will want to stay there also to have a further bet. I assure members opposite that I have received submissions from racing clubs and bookmakers concerning the matter, and they have done an about turn. I can understand the S.A.J.C.'s attitude, because it is having a little trouble with its finances, and this provision may help it. I admit that winnings from telephone bets are paid straight after a race, but what worries me considerably is that which happened before; I hope that it does not happen again or that, if it does, the Minister will look into the matter further. It may now be a little harder for S.P. bookmakers but their activities will go on yet for quite some time. I would like to elaborate a little more, but I cannot do so because of an undertaking given. I can assure the Minister, however, that if I observe any more people in T.A.B. premises, or if this affects sport in any way at all, I will have more to say.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill, which I consider has a number of worthwhile provisions, and I am pleased that agreement has been reached to improve the lot of country racing.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It has involved a lot of hard work.

Mr GUNN: I appreciate that, and probably the candle has been burnt well into the night to achieve this. I believe there is only one defect in the Bill, and the only reason that I have risen to speak on this occasion is to say that, if the opportunity arises, I look forward to supporting the course of action that the member for Rocky River intends to take, as I think it is a logical and proper course of action to take. There is no good reason whatsoever to put these people out of business.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have heard members during the last few minutes saying that there has been some arrangement that the Bill is going through by 6 o'clock, or some jolly thing, but I am not bound by that.

Mr Gunn: You're never here, and that's why—

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am here now, and I am exercising my right to speak to the Bill, I hope, helpfully to all members. If the other two Parties do not care to consult with me on what they want to do about the business of the House—

Mr Gunn: You weren't available.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I was available; I have been here during the afternoon, and if members do not care to consult with me they can do what they jolly well like, but I am not bound by any arrangement. I oppose the Bill, and I propose to call against it. One of the main reasons that I—

Mr Evans: You won't be here at 10 o'clock tonight to call against it.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The old gentlemen are having their dinner tonight. We ourselves cannot sit after dinner because the staff cannot take it, so we know perfectly well that there is no question of our sitting. I am opposed to this Bill, and I should have hoped that the member for Goyder, if he has any guts, would support me in this. I am opposed to the Bill principally for two reasons, but I may say that I have had a number of submissions made to me by people who do not like other parts of the Bill— the provisions relating to the choosing of members from a panel, and so on; they want to choose their own members, and I cannot see why they cannot do so.

Mr Slater: I have an amendment on that.

Mr MILLHOUSE: We will get it through in the other place, then, if the Minister does not accept it here. However, to me that is only a minor thing. I am completely opposed to after-race pay-outs, and I would have hoped that the member for Goyder would be, too. Let us see how he votes when the time comes. The member for Unley was entirely correct in what he said. I have not had his experience in

sport, and so on, but I can remember the old betting shops; I did not ever go into them, but I used to peer through the door as a kid, because I was told that they were dens of iniquity, and therefore I wanted to have a look to see what I was missing. I can very well remember what was said when we set up the T.A.B. in this State. I was a member of this place then, and the solemn undertaking was given that there would not be after-race pay-outs, because it would make the T.A.B.'s like the old betting shops: that was the very argument that was put and accepted, and I believe it was right.

It was accepted by Parliament, and it was on that condition that many members voted for the legislation in the first place. We were told (I can remember the very words used in some of the propaganda put out by the pro-T.A.B. people) that the T.A.B.s were going to be nothing like the old sinful betting shops, and the reason they were not going to be like that was that there was not going to be an after-race pay-out, and people would not be encouraged to hang around in T.A.B. premises as they did in the betting shops. We were told that they would be a simple office, clear and uninteresting, where people would go in and lodge their bets and go out again.

It was on that basis that the legislation was passed. I cannot even remember how long ago it was, but that was the basis upon which it passed and upon which I supported it. Now, little by little, as the member for Unley said, we are getting back to the old situation and we are going to have after-race pay-outs if this Bill passes. I do not think we should. Just because one can do it over the telephone is not a good enough argument for allowing it to be done generally.

I believe that it is a breach of faith by the Government with those who accepted the undertaking in the first place that this was being done. Of course, it was said at the time that it would not be long before we got these things, that this was the thin end of the wedge, and so it has turned out, if the Government has its way. For that reason, I am opposed to this Bill going through, and I propose to call a division. I think both Parties are so far committed that, unless I get someone with a conscience, like the member for Goyder, I will have no-one to count. I invite him and other members with a conscience to support me. The member for Unley probably is bound by a Caucus decision, and cannot do anything about it. Obviously he would like to, and he is going out at the next election, anyway, so why should he not support me if he feels that way? I feel strongly about this, and if it were only for that reason I would oppose the Bill.

Mr Evans: Do you support the suggestion of the member for Rocky River?

Mr MILLHOUSE: About having betting shops open in Port Pirie? I am in two minds about that. I remember that the only reason they were not closed was that even Tom Playford, in wartime, was not strong enough to be able to close them. When all the other betting shops were closed in about 1942, an exception was made for Port Pirie, because the Government was not strong enough to enforce it. It is only because of the influence and the force of the people at Port Pirie that betting shops have continued up there ever since then. That is an anomaly, and we will argue that at some date later. I am not much of a gambler in any way.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought you played soccer pools.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, I do not even understand how they work.

Mr Gunn: That makes two of us..

Mr MILLHOUSE: Good. One of the things I have always approved in the law is that one cannot sue for gambling debts, and I do not think one should be able to. If people are damn fools enough to risk their money and not see that they can be taken down, I do not believe that they should be able to sue for it. I propose to oppose that, and that is another jolly good reason for opposing the second reading.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: It is all very well for the member for Eyre to say what he has said about getting the numbers. Perhaps we have not got the numbers, but I will jolly well say what I think about this. Particularly because of the after-race pay-outs, because of the provision to allow people to sue for gambling debts (which is against the whole tradition of the common law in this country; the member for Goyder, a good church man, might be interested to know that, and because of the representations I have had about country racing clubs and the nomination of people on the various committees, and so on, I oppose the second reading.

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

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate, and I am pleased that most members will support the Bill. I want to make a few comments. I will not speak for as long as I had intended, because time is running short, but I want to canvass one or two matters. Some honourable members had fairly trenchant criticisms of the T.A.B. The member for Gilles was fairly strongly opposed to some of the things that the T.A.B. has done. Let me say that the T.A.B. is looking at itself very thoroughly at the moment, and I hope to be able to inform the House, and the public of South Australia, as the member for Gilles reminds me, of some developments in that regard in the next couple of weeks.

Mr Millhouse: After what happened at Riverton it should be looking at itself.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member will be glad to know that I am assisting it to look at itself; that is all I wish to say on that matter. I turn now to the question of after-race pay-outs. The member for Mitcham has signified his intention of opposing this initiative in the Bill, because he thinks it will lead back to the old betting shops situation. I assure him that that has been given very careful consideration by the Byrne Committee of Inquiry, which this Government set up on coming to office. That committee was quite satisfied in its recommendations that after-race pay-outs should be brought in and that T.A.B. agencies would not revert back to the old betting shop principle.

That is confirmed by interstate experience, because after-race pay-outs apply in all States except Victoria, and there has been no sign in those States of a return to the old sinful betting shop syndrome mentioned by the member for Mitcham.

Mr Millhouse: But the undertaking was given.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I cannot help that. This Government set up a committee of inquiry to look at the problems in the racing industry, and surely all members realise that there are problems. The committee made certain recommendations. It sat for more than 12 months to hear the volume of evidence put before it, considered the evidence carefully and made its recommendations, and this Bill follows very closely the recommendations of the committee of inquiry, rarely departing from them at all, including recommendations on the matter of the panel, which we will discuss in Committee. On the question of after-race pay-outs, by far the most serious side effect is the lowering of the percentage of the night codes. The Government

recognises that this is a serious matter. However, the committee of inquiry did not recommend that the night codes, greyhound racing and trotting, should receive any special treatment at this stage.

Mr Slater: No special treatment?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: We can discuss that at length in Committee, if the honourable member wishes. The Government realises that there may ensue, because of the introduction of after-race pay-outs, a reduced amount of money payable to the night codes. We have first to see how much T.A.B. turn-over increases through the introduction of after-race pay-outs. We have to see what effect that will have on the night codes, and at this stage I cannot give an unequivocal assurance that we will introduce legislation, but we will monitor the situation very closely and, if it appears that the night codes—

Mr Slater: For how long?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: We have to give it time to work. I am sure the member for Gilles does not expect me to review the situation or to ask Mr Byrne, an independent Chairman, to review it for me in January or February. We must give the legislation time to work.

Mr Millhouse: In other words, it will be an indefinite period?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am prepared to treat this very seriously. We will review the situation and, if it is necessary to introduce legislation, we will do so. At that stage we will consider the percentage of T.A.B. turn-over received by the night codes as of now, before the introduction of after-race pay-outs.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What do you think is a fair trial period?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am thinking of about 12 months, certainly no longer.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Will you make it retrospective?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In fairness, if I were to get one person, Mr Des Byrne, to do a short inquiry for the Government, to review the effects of the legislation, and if it was found that the night codes were severely disadvantaged by after-race pay-outs, we may have to have retrospectivity; in other words, the percentages would have to relate back to what applied before after-race pay-outs. I am not prepared to give any further assurances than that at this stage. If the member for Gilles wishes to comment on that, he can do so in Committee.

The member for Gilles mentioned the question of the country racing clubs. Most members would have been lobbied by the country racing clubs for a fixed percentage of the distribution made by the South Australian Jockey Club to country racing associations. I am happy to say that what the member for Gilles had to tell the House this afternoon is quite correct—that agreement has been reached. I chaired a meeting between the South Australian Jockey Club, the Country Racing Clubs Association, the Onkaparinga Racing Club and the Provincial Racing Clubs Association, and for the layman it can be very confusing. I chaired a meeting of representatives of those bodies, and certainly it did not appear that any harmony could be reached; in fact, however, an agreement was entered into between the Country Racing Clubs Association and the South Australian Jockey Club. I will not repeat the figures that the member for Gilles gave this afternoon; they are quite correct.

I now turn to the question of why the Bill provides for in a nomination to the Minister from any of these bodies to the controlling body, or for allocation to the controlling body, a panel of three. The simple answer is that it is a recommendation of the committee of inquiry. Certainly the committee of inquiry does not go into any great detail about it, but it is a recommendation and it is Government policy, in fact, that when persons are nominated for any position the nomitation should be in the form of a panel of three.

Mr Millhouse: The clubs don't like it, though.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I can understand that.

Mr Millhouse: Well, why do it?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Because there is a difference between understanding and agreeing. I do not wish to canvass any other facts at this stage. Because of the legislation passed by this Parliament, from implementation on 1 January last the racing industry received a great boost; in fact, an extra $1 100 000 has gone into the racing industry in that time. I think the member for Peake was quite right when he mentioned the need for the racing codes to increase their stake money, because if that does not occur more than it occurs at this moment then the benefits of this legislation and the previous legislation will not be obvious. The only way in which the racing codes can recover completely—and I believe they are recovering already—is to increase stake money. That is extremely important.

Finally, the member for Gilles mentioned the question of the T.A.B. turnover. Over the last three years, it has been as follows: 1978-79, $97 030 079; 1979-80, $111 962 803; and 1980-81, $120 903 603.

Mr Slater: You have to take other factors into consideration.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am well aware of that. The member for Gilles mentioned the fact, and I thought I would put the figures on record.

Question—'That this Bill be now read a second time'—declared carried.

Mr Millhouse: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Bill read a second time.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to the registration of certain premises.

I move this motion in accordance with the remarks I made earlier in the debate, to afford me the opportunity during the Committee stages of the Bill to introduce an amendment which I believe will make an overall improvement to the Bill.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—'Constitution of board.'

Mr SLATER: I move:

Page 2:

Lines 37 and 38—Leave out 'nominated by the Minister from a panel of three persons'.

Lines 41 and 42—Leave out 'nominated by the Minister from a panel of three persons'.

Lines 45 and 46—Leave out 'nominated by the Minister from a panel of three persons'.

I believe that the clubs, particular country clubs want to nominate one person. They have made representations to members of the House, and in particular to me, in regard to having this opportunity to nominate one person. I will not belabour the point. I know the Minister has said in his second reading speech that it was a recommendation of the committee of inquiry. I accept that, but what I would say is that the committee of inquiry did not give any reason why that should be so. I also point out to the Minister that the present boards are constituted by a nomination of one person, so I cannot see the rationale for this requirement. The Minister also said that, for some unearthly reason, it is Government policy. I ask the Minister whether it is Government policy for every Government appointment that is made, including the Governor. Perhaps he was chosen

from a nominated panel of three. It seems rather ridiculous. We oppose the principle that the clubs and respective bodies will have to nominate three persons. They are capable enough on there own behalf of putting up their own nominee. I think that is fair and reasonable, and I ask the Minister to support the amendment.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Government rejects the amendment for the reasons I have already given. It is a recommendation of the committee of inquiry and it is Government policy that, when nominations are put forward for particular positions, there should be a panel of three. Notwithstanding that, I am well aware of the membership of the racing fraternity in the different codes. I have no doubt, from the people that I know in those codes, that none of them will have any trouble in putting up a panel of three people each of whom would be excellent in the particular job for which he was nominated.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson (teller).

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the member for Gilles intend to proceed with other amendments?

Mr SLATER: I do not necessarily wish to proceed with the amendments, but do I still have the option to comment on the clauses involved?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—'Constitution of Board.'

Mr SLATER: I wish to make a brief comment in relation to this clause, which provides for the reconstitution of the Greyhound Racing Control Board in a similar way to the matter that we have just discussed in regard to the Trotting Control Board. I refer to a comment made by the Minister in reply to my statements about that board. He said that judging from the people that he knew in the industry, he considered that they were quite capable of making three nominations for the panel. No-one suggested that the boards are not capable of making the nominations of three people to the panel, but I point out strongly to the Minister that it is the wish, particularly of the country clubs, that they have the opportunity to nominate one person of their choice.

They want that opportunity, and I believe that the Minister is sowing for himself a harvest of hate from the country clubs, particularly the trotting clubs, with regard to this amendment. I do not wish to proceed further with my amendment to this clause. I accept that the other section was a test vote. I express, again, the concern that will be expressed by country clubs because they will not be able to make their own nominations.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—'Acceptance of, and payment on, off-course totalizator bets.'

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister say what discussions he has had with the two night codes, the trotting people and the dog racing people, regarding a fixed percentage of T.A.B. turn-over, and what were the results of those discussions?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I have had extensive discussions with the night codes a few weeks ago before the Government approved the drafting of the Bill. Strong representations were made to me, and written material was left with me, which made it known to the Government at the time the decisions were made that there were strong objections from the night codes. However, I have been well aware of the situation for many months, because representatives of the night codes had spoken to me at various stages. I cannot give the honourable member dates of those occasions. There were various statements in various places on the question of fixed percentages, and I was well aware of the situation. I believe full consultation was undertaken.

Mr SLATER: The Minister has indicated that he is prepared to consider reviewing the situation in due course (I think he mentioned a time of about one year) with regard to the distribution of T.A.B. surpluses to the respective codes and the effect that after-race pay-outs may have on the percentage of turn-over required by each code. If it is to be retrospective, and the legislation provides for a quarterly pay-out to each code, how will the Government be able to make that payment retrospective? In the case of the South Australian Jockey Club, for instance, if its percentage went up to 70 per cent, and if it received that percentage, I believe it would be reluctant to return any of that percentage. What sort of arrangement will be made if the Minister is to offer the racing codes or night codes some retrospectivity if they were dramatically or substantially affected by the introduction of after-race pay-outs?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am sorry if the honourable member misunderstood me. I did not mean that there would be a retrospective payment, necessarily. I meant that any review of that nature (and I will say something about that in a minute) will have to take into account the percentage of T.A.B. turn-over as of now or as of before the introduction of after-race pay-outs. I was talking about the percentage. I am not going to give an undertaking at this stage, before the review has been carried out, as to whether there will be retrospective payments. If during the review it becomes obvious that retrospective payments are necessary, they will be considered by the Government at the time. The honourable member knows that I cannot give any undertaking other than that. What I will say, so that it is clear to the honourable member (and I am not going to go into the details of what sort of review it is, because I do not know at this stage) is that there will be a review 12 months after the introduction of after-race pay-outs to ascertain whether the night codes have suffered as a result of the introduction of this measure. I am not going to say anything more than that: there will be a review.

Mr SLATER: I do not believe that that is satisfactory. The average T.A.B. punter will develop a habit of betting on the galloping codes. They will have the opportunity to obtain their winning investment and to reinvest that money during the day. That habit will be established to the extent of taking business away, if I can use that term, from greyhound racing and trotting. If that habit is established, the person concerned will bet only on galloping activities, which get a greater percentage of the turn-over now. That will be greatly accentuated. The Minister will then try to retrieve the situation and try to change people's habits, based on that. The experience in New South Wales indicates clearly that that situation should not be allowed to develop.

I would like to see, even though the Minister says it is too soon, an indication given in the first few months, in regard to what is to happen concerning after-race pay-outs and the effects on the T.A.B. I ask the Minister to initiate a review much earlier than he anticipates to ensure that the people who bet on the T.A.B. are not developing a habit of betting on the galloping code only, because I think that that is important.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I mentioned before that I would monitor the situation, and I shall do that.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

New clause 23a—'Registration of betting premises at Port Pirie.'

Mr OLSEN: I move:

Page 5, after line 1—Insert new clause as follows:
23a. Section 105 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (2).

The effect of this amendment will be to remove that subsection in the principal Act, which would remove the necessity for betting shops in Port Pirie ceasing activity on 31 January 1983. Following representations from Mayor Jones, those associated with betting shops at Port Pirie, and constituents of the area that I share with the member for Stuart, the residents of the City of Port Pirie, I felt compelled on their behalf to bring before the Parliament an amendment for the option for those betting shops to continue. When looking at the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, upon which the legislation before the House is based, one sees on page 2 of the introductory remarks the following:

> The committee is satisfied that illegal betting is diverting a substantial amount of turn-over from legitimate betting operations, resulting in a loss of revenue to both the Government and the industry. With this in mind, we have made recommendations on penalties, enforcement and prosecution procedures designed to assist in the elimination of illegal betting.

The legislation before the House, because the Committee of Inquiry has not given the option for the betting shops to continue, will aggravate the problem referred to. By the closure of the betting shops at Port Pirie, it has been suggested to me most forcefully that illegal bookmaking will take place again in that community, because people have been used to the option of using betting shops since 1946. That was a result of very lengthy tribunal hearings in the district by the Betting Control Board, and as a result of those inquiries it was felt that illegal betting presented the Police Force with a major problem. In addition, obviously the Government was not gaining revenue from it.

It was agreed in 1946 to allow the City of Port Pirie to have betting shops in its midst. Four or five years later there was a review of the operations of betting premises and once again, after the Betting Control Board had spent two days taking evidence, at the completion of its inquiry it directed that 'they were still reasonably necessary in the public interest.' Thus, the betting shops in Port Pirie have operated and will continue to operate, under the existing legislation, until 31 January 1983. Hopefully, with the removal of that provision, they will continue to operate for a long time into the future.

The turnover generated through the betting shops returns to the Government a figure estimated in the 1979-80 year at $120 000, so they are contributing to the income of the State. I do not bet. I am not a gambler, and my most significant bet would be the buying of a lottery ticket on a rare occasion. In this instance, on representations from people in the district and some of my constituents, I believe that there is a justifiable argument for this Committee to consider allowing those betting shops to operate.

Mr Whitten: Are they in your electorate?

Mr OLSEN: Some of the constituents of that town certainly are in my electorate. If the honourable member had listened clearly to the remarks I made earlier, he would have heard that some of the residents of the City of Port Pirie are in my electorate, as some are within the electorate of Stuart.

Shop bookmakers within the town have about 100 clerks registered to them. In addition, a number of women are employed, some deserted wives, separated, and a small number who would normally be on the dole. The 76 male clerks include 15 pensioners earning what is an allowable amount without affecting their pension, and the remaining 55 are supplementing their incomes for a variety of reasons, including education payments, home buying, and so on. Wages for the 1979-80 year amounted to about $110 000. Failure to allow this industry to continue within the town, failure to allow the employment of these people, will cause some hardship to a large number of people, in addition to the effect that it will have on the business community within the City of Port Pirie.

There is no doubt that that affects constituents in my part of the City of Port Pirie. Like other areas throughout the Commonwealth, it has a major unemployment problem, and closure of the betting shops in the town in January 1983 will merely aggravate the problem. The operators of the betting shops have what I believe is a very good reputation within the community and the surrounding districts. Certainly, I can refer to their generosity to sports bodies, charitable organisations and other worthy causes which they support within the community. They conduct their business in a quiet and efficient manner and are not a nuisance to the public.

I understand that there has not been one complaint in relation to the operation to the Betting Control Board, the Port Pirie District Council or the Police Department in the manner in which they are conducting themselves within that community. I indicated in the second reading explanation that I support the Government's move in relation to its amendment to the Racing Act, and I commend the Minister for the initiatives that he has undertaken on behalf of this industry.

The acceptance of the amendment that I put before the House will allow an industry in Port Pirie to continue—one that has been able to continue during a period of time when there have not been other areas in the State that have had betting shops. It is part of the community in Port Pirie. I do not think that the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry did justice. On pages 42 and 43 of its report, the Committee has not argued reasons for their removal, that is, it has not argued reasons why the amendment to the Act put in by the former Labor Government, that they should expire on 31 January 1983, should be removed. It is a bland statement which is not qualified in any way and does not justify the stand for leaving that clause in the principal Act.

I said that a number of organisations supported betting shops at Port Pirie. A number of those are from a whole range of interested groups within the community. For example a number of church groups within the district have supported its retention. I will quote from part of a submission to the committee of inquiry by a church group in the community. It said:

> The bookmakers are men of probity, honest and decent citizens. As individuals they are a group that are generous in their support of worthy causes.
>
> We should see to it that people are not deprived of the means of earning an income. I therefore submit that Port Pirie's betting shops be allowed to remain in operation for a period beyond 1982.

There are other letters from religious organisations within the community. Various sporting organisations are supporting the application for the continuation of the betting shops. Service clubs, such as the Lions Club of Port Pirie, said:

> The fact that betting shops being in operation is unique throughout Australia and since it applies to Port Pirie we would like to preserve this uniqueness by the retention of the betting shops.

Various cricket assocations support the application. The Australian Hotels Association also supports it. Its submission said:

> Over the years the betting shop system in Port Pirie has operated most reasonably and has been largely the means of restricting illegalities with betting in the city of Port Pirie.

That is one point addressed by the committee of inquiry in its introduction: the purpose of some of the amendments to the inquiry into South Australian racing inqustry. The letter continues:

> The present arrangement provides employment opportunities which Port Pirie can ill-afford to see eliminated. On behalf of members of the Australian Hotels Association at the Port Pirie Branch, I strongly recommend that the committee of inquiry see fit to endorse a proposal that the existing facility at Port Pirie be retained.

I am in receipt of correspondence from the Chief Inspector of Police at Port Pirie who indicates that during his period as duty officer in charge of the division those betting shops have been extremely well conducted and have presented no policing problems.

Interestingly, the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council supports the retention of the betting shops. The council says they provide an alternative place of betting to the T.A.B., that they are well policed with no history of violence, and that they are an amenity to the district both through employment and relaxation. Their rating must be very high, as many people make use of them in a friendly manner. The Chamber of Commerce also supports the retention of the betting shops, as do Mayor Jones and the Corporation of the City of Port Pirie.

The extracts from those letters that form part of the submission to the committee of inquiry clearly indicate to the Committee that the operation of the betting shops in Port Pirie has not caused a problem for that community. The betting shops have answered a need in the community and have provided employment and generated income that has moved throughout the business community. The betting shops have not presented any policing problems, and have been well run by men who are held in high esteem in that community.

I was disappointed to hear the member for Flinders say that he and his Party, the National Country Party, could not support the retention of betting shops in Port Pirie on the basis that, since the shops were not in Port Lincoln, why should Port Pirie have them. They have been in Port Pirie for 35 years, efficiently and effectively run. Quite different criteria from that applied by the honourable member should apply to the question of whether those betting shops should operate. Indeed, if we want to achieve the objective set out in the introductory comments of the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry, we would do well as a Parliament to allow the continuation of those betting shops, because they cause minimum concern in the community and fulfil a need within the community. I have pleasure in moving this amendment on behalf of my constituents who have made representations to me.

Mr SLATER: The Opposition opposes the amendment. The member for Rocky River has given some history of the betting shops at Port Pirie, but I remind him of some of the more recent history on that matter. When the Racing Act was introduced in 1976, there was absolute and complete agreement between the Government and bookmakers' representatives in Port Pirie that betting shops would be phased out by 31 January 1983. That agreement was accepted by all parties. Doubtless, to bookmakers, that was some time away—seven years. In 1976 they had what I would describe as a stay of execution. The member for Rocky River cannot be sincere in his approach to this matter. He has referred to the committee of inquiry. The honourable member has quoted letters that were all submissions to the inquiry.

If the honourable member's Party is to be be consistent at all, in no way can it not support that recommendation of the inquiry, which was that the bookmakers' shops in Port Pirie are to be the last of the licensed betting shops which originally came into operation in South Australia. I point out that Port Pirie is the only town in Australia that has betting shops.

Mr Becker: They could become a tourist attraction.

Mr SLATER: I doubt whether they would be a tourist attraction. On the two occasions that I have visited Port Pirie I have had a bet, unlike the member for Rocky River who does not bet but who is prepared to be the bag man for the Liberal Party. I remember going into the betting shops. They may have improved as far as premises are concerned, but at that time I thought that they were the scruffiest dumps I had ever been to in my life. I thought that they were a disgrace to the town of Port Pirie, but everyone sees it through different eyes. From memory, I believe that it was past the 6 o'clock closing era.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr SLATER: The Minister is out of order, as he is interjecting from out of his place.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr SLATER: It is not my fault that we do not have the arrangement that might have been made. Members opposite have taken the opportunity to speak on this matter. The very point that we are making now has been introduced by a member opposite. This Bill is too important to race it through this House in three or four hours. It is important to the racing public of South Australia and to the racing clubs. If members opposite want to bulldoze the bloody thing through the House in one afternoon it is a reflection on the Government and not on the Opposition.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: It was agreed last night.

Mr SLATER: I do not care what was agreed last night—it is not my responsibility.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: No, you don't care.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr SLATER: It is out of character for the Minister of Mines and Energy to come in here, when his colleague moved an amendment, and try to stop me replying on the matter. An agreement made in 1976 was accepted by all parties concerned. It would be a sad situation if this House were to accept the amendment. If the betting shops go out of operation in Port Pirie, they will be replaced by the T.A.B. That is Government policy as well: to promote T.A.B. The Minister said that in this House this afternoon. The Opposition opposes strongly the retention of any shops in Port Pirie, and I hope Government members will do the same.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I congratulate the member for Rocky River on representing the interests of his constituents so strongly in this place. Soon after I became Minister I visited Port Pirie, and the Mayor, Bill Jones, took me around to see the betting shops and made strong representations to me on whether we could extend the 1983 date for the betting shops. I noted with interest many of the things that the member for Rocky River said. However, I thought that it was not a decision that I could make, and I referred it specifically to the committee of inquiry to see whether it thought that there ought to be any alteration to the 1975 Bill, bearing in mind that that had flowed from the recommendation of the Hancock inquiry in 1973.

As the members for Rocky River and Gilles have said, this committee of inquiry (the Byrne committee) recommended that there should be no alteration, which means that it has been supported by two committees of inquiry. On that basis, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr KENEALLY: I support the amendment moved by the member for Rocky River. In doing so, I point out to the Committee that I have had no approach from the Port Pirie City Council, the Chamber of Commerce, the book-

makers of Port Pirie, or from any of my constituents, despite the fact that every bookmaking premises in Port Pirie is in my electorate. I was not aware that this motion was coming before the House until I read it in the *Recorder*. I telephoned the Port Pirie council and the bookmakers and had a pleasant discussion with them about the fact that I was not told about this matter. Nevertheless, it was pointed out to me (and I accept it) that the issue is of such importance to so many of my constituents that I ought to have a close look at the merits of it.

The people that I am representing here today are not from the Chamber of Commerce, the Port Pirie City Council or even the bookmakers; I am representing all the people of Port Pirie who enjoy the facilities of the betting shops there. I do not have the recollection of betting shops that other people seem to have. I can remember as a young boy the betting shops at Quorn which my father used to frequent to have 6d. each way, although he rarely backed a winner. It was a meeting place those days, not for drinkers but for people who would meet once a week at the betting shop.

My experience of Port Pirie betting shops is not like that of my colleague the member for Gilles. I am also not a punter: they get very little money out of me. However, they are well run and they are popular meeting places. They are not places that resemble what we are told a traditional betting shop is.

The member for Rocky River has made the appropriate points about employment. I believe that if the betting shops go, illegal bookmaking will take over in Port Pirie. Of course, there are illegal bookmakers there now, and it will increase. I expect illegal bookmaking will take place even if we have the most magnificent T.A.B. facilities and betting shops. It just seems to be a fact of life. I was disappointed that the spokesmen for the Government and the Opposition have indicated that this measure does not have the support of the respective Parties in the South Australian Parliament. Nevertheless, I do urge upon all members who may wish to support this measure that they should do so.

What we are trying to achieve here is not the creation of additional rights and privileges, but the retention of existing privileges, and it is a privilege. I do not accept the argument that, if they continue to exist at Port Pirie, other major country areas will want the same privilege. I live at Port Augusta and I do not believe there is a demand in that city. Everybody accepts that the situation at Port Pirie is unique: it is one off, it is a historical factor now, and I consider that this Parliament ought to think seriously about retaining those betting shops that currently are in operation at Port Pirie.

Mr OLSEN: I shall not detain the House for long but there are one or two comments that I must make. First, I want to thank the member for Stuart for his support this measure now before the House. I must say that I take some exception to the comments that were made by the spokesman for the Opposition, the member for Gilles, when he said that I was not sincere in endeavouring to take this measure through the House. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nobody, as a member of the Government, when a Government introduces a piece of legislation into Parliament, lightly moves an amendment against a Government measure before the House.

I would have thought that the mere fact that I have put an amendment on file, being a member of the Government that was introducing the legislation, would at least indicate to the most simple-minded citizens of South Australia that at least I was sincere in what I was doing, because I believe those people who have spoken to me about it were sincere in their representations to me, and I wanted to reflect their concern to the Parliament. The best way I can do it is by the measure before us.

I am disappointed that the National Country Party and the Opposition cannot support my amendment. I suppose, therefore, there was not a need to call a division. The voices would have carried. In the light of the remarks of the member for Gilles, I indicate it will be my intention to call a division.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (5)—Messrs Becker, Glazbrook, Keneally, Olsen (teller), and Oswald.

Noes (29)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, L. M. F. Arnold, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Billard, M. J. Brown, Chapman, Corcoran, Eastick, Evans, Hamilton, Hemmings, Langley, Mathwin, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Slater, Tonkin, Trainer, Whitten, and Wilson (teller).

Majority of 24 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clauses 24 to 28 passed.

Clause 29—'Special conditions of appointment to boards.'

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister explain this clause? It worries me a little that persons appointed to a board could have a double function. The interpretation is a bit unclear.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I understand that it is a legal opinion, based on case law by Justice Street, in New South Wales. I believe it involved a trade union nomination to a board, in quite a famous case. I have come across it several times. As I understand it, a person appointed to a board does not represent a body from which she or he is appointed. In other words, anyone appointed to a board or a committee does not represent a particular interest, but has to represent the interests of the body itself. Of course, that sometimes conflicts. That is why the question of conflict of interest is important. I do not know whether that answers the honourable member's question. However, this clause makes it quite plain what is expected of a nominee to the board.

Mr SLATER: The Minister has given the legal interpretation, and I do not doubt that that interpretation is absolutely correct, but I believe it would be far better not to place people in that conflicting situation, particularly as it relates to the horse racing, trotting and greyhound industries. I am casting no reflection on those persons who are currently members of the board. No doubt, some comments have been made in the racing inquiry about conflict of interest which, in effect, is behind this clause. Conflict of interest will still exist. Human nature being what it is, and regardless of the legal interpretation, I believe that it is important in relation to future appointments to boards, especially in regard to the T.A.B., that it may be better for persons appointed to the board not to be Chairmen or officials of a club.

Clause passed.

Clause 30—'Bets under this Act valid and enforceable.'

Mr SLATER: The Opposition opposes this clause. We believe that it creates a problem for bookmakers being able to sue and to be sued. As I said in my second reading speech, there is a problem with people betting on credit or on the nod. I understand that that is a lawful bet, that the bookmaker retains the ticket, and that settlement is made probably a day or two after the event. At the moment those wagers are not legally enforceable. What problems in the past have affected bookmakers to the extent of not being able to claim moneys owing to them by a client?

I am not aware of any unsatisfactory situation that has occurred in the past. Perhaps the Minister may be able to explain whether bookmakers are unhappy about the present situation. The Opposition is concerned about this clause, and is not sure of its application. As a consequence, we oppose it.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This provision applies in every other State. South Australia is the only State that does not have it. Once again, it was a recommendation of the committee of inquiry.

Mr Slater: I didn't say that.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I know that the honourable member did not say that: I am just saying it. As such, once again, the Government thought it should be introduced. The honourable member knows that some time ago we had a problem when the Government had to bail out a bookmaker's bets to the public to the tune of $12 000. As a consequence of that, and of negotiations that were going on between the Betting Control Board and the Bookmakers League before that, bookmakers' bonds were increased substantially as a protection for the public. This amendment is designed specifically to cater for the possibility of the bond not covering debts to the public. On the other hand, it cuts both ways; it is a protection both ways. Obviously, members opposite do not like my saying that.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (19)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, and Wilson (teller).

Noes (15)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Hamilton, Hemmings, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Plunkett, Slater (teller), Trainer, and Whitten.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Blacker, D. C. Brown, Goldsworthy, Lewis and Wotton. Noes—Messrs Bannon, Crafter, Duncan, Hopgood, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

COOBER PEDY LOCAL GOVERMENT (EXTENSION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.55 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 10 November at 2 p.m.