

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, August 1, 1963.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

PARKSIDE MENTAL HOSPITAL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I desire to direct a question to the Minister of Health following discussions yesterday on mental hospitals. Can he inform me—and more particularly the public of South Australia—what works, if any, have been carried out since the last session of Parliament or are in progress at the Parkside Mental Hospital to make for the better comfort of the inmates of that institution?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The honourable member told me yesterday that I did not answer part of his question. I am sorry if that is the case, but I thought his question was based on a press report. I think I should get a proper list of what has been done because what has been spent recently runs into many thousands of pounds. Only last week, as I indicated yesterday, I asked the Director if he were satisfied with the progress that had been made. Many things are involved in addition to the building programme. I know that over £60,000 was spent on one project alone and that the work has been continuous and satisfactory to the Director, but to give a direct answer to the honourable member's question I think I should obtain a list setting out the work done by the Public Buildings Department in bringing toilet facilities, exercise yards and general hygiene on to a higher plane than previously. I shall be glad to obtain that and bring it down for the honourable member.

PARKING AT ADELAIDE RAILWAY STATION.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Has the Minister of Roads' attention been directed to an article in the *Advertiser* this morning stating that Professor Newell has arrived in Adelaide on a Fulbright scholarship to investigate the flow of traffic in Adelaide? I understand that he will be attached to the Adelaide University. Will the Minister take the opportunity of discussing with this expert on traffic the possibility of having a parking station erected over the railway yards adjacent to the Adelaide railway station?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: At first glance I consider that this question is a matter for the

Adelaide City Council as it is within the council's jurisdiction. While the land referred to happens to be Crown land of the South Australian Railways Department I am certain that discussion would take place between the Adelaide City Council and the Government. If the honourable member wishes me to pursue the matter I shall do so.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I do.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works obtained a reply to my recent question about the Yorke Peninsula water supply?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: My colleague has supplied me with the following information:

The Engineer-in-Chief reports that the department's programme for the next five years is an extremely heavy one and that to complete it will require an annual loan allocation in excess of the amount which, up to the present, it has been possible to provide. Under the circumstances, therefore, it is not possible to make a firm commitment as to when the extensions to the Yorke Peninsula water supply can be commenced. In this particular case, the Engineer-in-Chief has recommended that the department should proceed with preliminary work (surveys, plans, etc.) as the work load in the department permits, so that consideration could be given to the Yorke Peninsula proposals when preparing the 1964-65 Loan programme, with due regard to the extent and urgency of other commitments at that time.

POLITICAL KINDERGARTEN.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In view of the prominent publicity given in the press about the age of Cabinet Ministers in this State, will the Chief Secretary consider requesting the Government to establish a political kindergarten for the training of political delinquents?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I do not know how serious the honourable member is.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I am very serious.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I think the answer would be that going to the expense of establishing a training school or kindergarten for members of Parliament would not be justified. They are elected by the popular vote of the people and are sent here to represent those people, and I think that the kindergarten is available within Parliament itself. I well remember that when I first entered Parliament (in a different Chamber then) I looked around at those occupying the benches and realized how youthful I was and how much potential was available to me if I wanted to learn something from those of experience. That may have been because I was brought up under

discipline and was not given many explanations. For the most part, I had to learn for myself, with a heavy hand, the difference between right and wrong. Therefore, it was not difficult for me to respect members of Parliament. It was a great advantage to be able to work with those older members and gain some advantage from that association. I think that is what the honourable member is seeking and I doubt whether it can be obtained from textbooks in the kindergarten. It is up to the honourable member to try to develop himself on the experience and intelligence of others. I have heard it expressed and have often expressed it myself—that some grow old and wiser, and others just grow old. So the honourable member can put himself in whatever category he likes.

FREE RAIL PASSES FOR STUDENTS.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I direct my question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Education. A question was asked this week in another place about free rail passes for secondary school students attending technical high schools outside their own districts, the reason for such attendance being that the education desired could not be obtained locally. I understand the Minister of Education's reply to the question to mean that Cabinet has given him authority in special cases to issue free rail passes to such students. Under the Apprentices Act correspondence courses are provided for apprentices in areas where no local facilities are available for the technical education of the apprentice. As part of the correspondence course, provision is made for the attendance of the apprentice for two weeks each year at a metropolitan apprentice trade school. This attendance is on a voluntary basis. There is no compulsion on the employer to send the boy to these intensive periods of training, nor is there any compulsion on the apprentice to attend. However, the benefit that both the employer and the apprentice would gain from the attendance of the boy is considerable. Some employers recognize this and allow the apprentice time off to attend. A few employers assist the apprentice with the cost of travel and board. In other cases apprentices of their own volition forfeit their annual leave for the purpose of attending these classes. The extension of free rail travel to cover these correspondence course apprentices would result in

more apprentices being given the benefit of this additional training. Will the Minister of Labour and Industry ask the Minister of Education to extend the system of free rail passes to correspondence course apprentices who travel to the metropolitan area to attend apprentice trade schools for the two weeks' intensive training provided under those courses?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I think the honourable member will appreciate that it will be necessary to refer the matter to my colleague before I can give a detailed reply, and I shall be pleased to do it.

PARKING METERS.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Some time ago I think the Premier made a statement concerning the sum gathered by the Adelaide City Council from parking meters. I understand that it is about £100,000. Does the Minister of Local Government intend to approach the Government for the purpose of amending the Local Government Act in order that the fees may be directed into a channel so as to provide more parking facilities within the city of Adelaide?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: The matter referred to is under the consideration of Cabinet at the moment. In view of his question, I think it is desirable to remind the honourable member and others that this Council was emphatic that there should be no direction as to where the funds should go. That was when the installation of parking meters was approved, and it was done on the vote of the Council. Due to the public pressure and general pressure of thought in various directions the matter is under the immediate consideration of the Government in connection with amendments to the Local Government Act.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: When will they be introduced?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This session.

BENARA SEWAGE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Regarding the proposal to run sewage water on to open ground in the Benara district near Mount Gambier, can the Minister of Roads say whether the method of disposal is to be of a temporary or permanent nature? If it is to be temporary, how long will it be used and will it cause a health risk or an inconvenience to adjacent residents?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: This is not a matter that comes under my jurisdiction. I shall refer it to my colleague and get a report.

FLUORIDATION.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: There have been frequent references in the daily press to the fluoridation of the water supply. Can the Minister of Health indicate the steps that have been taken to investigate this matter?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: The matter of the fluoridation of water has caused considerable controversy. I do not open my mail without having some reference to it, and most of the mail is in opposition to it. I do not know whether it is the majority view, but the Government is giving much consideration to the matter. The mechanical side associated with it means nothing other than the cost of doing it; there is no engineering problem at all. The Dental Association advocates it and has produced evidence to me on the way it is done in other parts of the world. On the opposition side I get pressure of opinion about over-fluoridation or something else in the system, so I get weighed down with paper about which is which. A symposium is to be held in Tasmania when the local authorities on health and water reticulation will be present. It will be attended by delegates from New South Wales. This morning I received an invitation, which I submitted to Cabinet, and it has been decided that two senior officers from this State, representing water and health interests, will be sent to Tasmania as a team to hear the discussion and report back to the Government. It is hoped that out of all this we may get a solution. After all, Parliament does not only look after the interests of the majority, but considers the rights of the minority. It is necessary that we obtain the maximum evidence in support of anything we are to will on the people, whatever the objections. I think it is necessary, and Parliament would demand it, that we have all the information before acting. The immediate action being taken by the Government is to send two delegates from this State to take part in the symposium and report back to the Government on what is said about the matter.

ILLEGAL USE OF MOTOR CARS.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Although I understand that heavier penalties are being imposed for the offence of the illegal use of motor cars, the habit is not diminishing as the years go on; in fact, it is increasing. Will the Attorney-General, if it is within his jurisdiction to do so, suggest to the courts that the

full penalty provided be imposed on a person found guilty of the offence?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The position with regard to prosecuting people for the illegal use of a motor car, which is the matter to which the honourable member refers, is that the existing legislation provides adequate penalties. In some instances it is felt that perhaps something more nearly approaching the maximum penalty might be imposed. I do not think it would be proper—nor would I suggest it—for me to tell the courts what penalty I think should be imposed in any particular case. This is a matter which must lie entirely within the discretion of the judge dealing with the case. I think that the courts are aware of the seriousness of the offence and I feel that in appropriate cases they would see that appropriate penalties were imposed.

GOVERNMENT GROUP LAUNDRY.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Government Group Laundry.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1957. Read a first time.

CHURCHES OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST, INCORPORATION BILL.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to incorporate First Church of Christ, Scientist, Adelaide, and to provide for the Incorporation of other Churches of Christ, Scientist, in the State and for other purposes. Read a first time.

BALHANNAH AND MOUNT PLEASANT RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Railways) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the discontinuance of the railway between Balhannah and Mount Pleasant, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 31. Page 255.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): Mr. President, I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and, in

doing so, I should like briefly to congratulate both the mover and seconder. I have always felt that the Legislative Council is regarded, properly, as a House of review. All of us view with some pride the fact that many Bills considered in this honourable Chamber when they go to another place are frequently accepted *in toto*. This is so in spite of the very careful consideration that the members in another place give to Bills before they reach us, the other place comprising a Government and its supporters (a Government renowned throughout the length and breadth of Australia for its progressive action over a period of years) and, of course, an Opposition that carefully and critically scrutinizes such Bills.

May I say that this Chamber has a team of members who can proudly do their job for the sake of the State. What I speak of is purely a matter of the normal bicameral system of government functioning correctly. However, any such system of government necessarily entails a spirit of independence on the part of individual members of a second House. For instance, many of us remember the issues on which this honourable Council divides, not always *en bloc*, not always on a district representation basis, but according to its conscience. I recall such Bills, even in the short time I have been in this Chamber, as the Prices Act Amendment Bill, the Bill controlling rents and the Police Offences Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) that was considered last session where the debate was of a high order and the divisions were not on Party lines. In other words, I suggest that members in voting according to their conscience and beliefs display a certain individuality and impartiality, and a certain elasticity within their Party line which enables government to function properly in this State.

I mention at this stage in the piece that I believe that members have more individuality in essence in this Chamber than is sometimes the case in another place. I regard that individuality as a responsibility that we in this House have. I take it that when issues arise, as they do from time to time and for various reasons, they sometimes do not receive full coverage or debate in another place, whereas we in this Council represent an alternative method of representation of the people.

Bearing in mind again the individual spirit in which members approach their problems, I feel under some obligation this afternoon personally to introduce the subject of totalizator off-course betting. I am not doing this, of course, because of a question that I believe was asked a day or two ago by my

highly respected friend, the Leader of the Labor Party in this House, but I do it quite intentionally, being fully aware of the many consequences of this action because I believe there is a section of the South Australian population whose voice has not been personally heard on this problem on the floor of Parliament. We have all seen certain press statements with which we strongly disagree in this regard. I believe that one of them was (although I have not the particular reference here) to the effect that Parliament was being denied the right to debate this topic. That was a completely illogical and utterly wrong comment. Any member of Parliament, whether he be in this Chamber or in another place, has the right to get up and move a motion, and thus force debate whenever he wishes. When I say "whenever he wishes" I should tie this down, of course, to private members' day.

Part of the democratic function of government for many years has been the fact that on a certain day of the week private members can introduce Bills and motions and discuss them. Although the House of Commons has a great number of members, not all of whom can sit in the Chamber, the backbenchers hang on to their right to discuss and debate issues at the permitted time. They have other opportunities, too, such as on the motion for the adjournment, that we do not have in this Chamber. I bring forward today quite intentionally and for my own edification, and because I feel that no harm can be done by expressing it, the arguments for both sides regarding the totalizator agency board. I think only good can come from it.

Lest any honourable member of this Chamber imagine that I am being disloyal or brash as regards loyalty to the Party and to the Government, may I point out from the outset that this is not the case. I suggest that nobody would take more pride than I do in the actions and administration of the Government in power today. Later on I hope to refer to this in more detail. I believe that the Premier of South Australia has acted with tolerance and wisdom in this issue of totalizator off-course betting. I think I can prove my point to the satisfaction of the Chamber as I proceed. I completely approve of this issue being decided in due course after proper inquiry on the floor of the House, that is, if action is taken at all. I consider that the point is that this is a matter for Parliament and not for a referendum. One thing that I believe in very

strongly is that rule by referendum can lead to anarchy and is not an example of proper and responsible government, and I would make that point very plain before continuing.

What were the origins of the people of South Australia? Very largely we owe our roots in this State to the fact that many years ago religious persecution was in some countries the order of the day. We can thank the Lutherans who came to South Australia in the early years for some of our best citizens today. They are hard-working people who have become a great integral part of South Australia. We can thank all the dissenters who came from Great Britain and other countries to South Australia with their own religious beliefs of many varieties.

The membership of the churches in South Australia today is indicated by these 1961 census figures: Roman Catholic 19.9 per cent of the population; Church of England 26.3; Methodist 22.4; Lutheran 5.6; Presbyterian 4; Church of Christ 2.5. That leaves approximately 20 per cent not allocated, of which about half are either people of no religious beliefs or people who do not reply to the statistical forms sent out. I mention this because it is obviously a great source of satisfaction to us in this State that all religions here are tolerantly treated by Governments of the day. We all work and live to the edification of our State in an extremely amenable fashion. On the issue of T.A.B., we have a slight difference in attitude on the part of some of our churches.

It is fair enough to state that there is one church so far that is noticeable by its absence in offering any information through the press in regard to totalizator agency board betting. I respect the view of all churches that contact me—and obviously many members of Parliament have been receiving letters on this matter from their constituents. No matter how much we are influenced by our churches or how much we believe in the good that churches do there is one point at issue, and that is that we are here, not as direct representatives of the churches, but as representatives of the people who put us here. I am not a regular racegoer: in fact, the annual sojourn at Oakbank under picnic conditions is my total attendance at race meetings. I am no betting expert and only have an annual Oakbank bet.

Any time honourable members pass through Mount Compass they will find one of the nicest and most charming new-style churches in South

Australia, and I take some pride in the fact that my family and I played a prominent part in the establishment of that church. But I say again, we are here to represent people in our electorate, and this issue must be tempered, one side with the other. I intend, first of all, to go into the case in a general manner. I believe many people, particularly in the metropolitan area, favour establishing T.A.B. off-course betting facilities and I shall explain their views. Then I intend to develop an argument against it. If honourable members like to say that I am sitting on the fence I am prepared to let them think so. On the other hand, at the end of my argument I trust all honourable members will see where I hope we shall head in due course on this matter.

What are the arguments in favour of T.A.B. betting today? They are many and varied. One of the more valid arguments would be that in a democratic society people should have the right within reasonable limits to do as they please. We all know we must have police regulations and the State enforcing law and order, and this is right and proper. But it is the view of many people in South Australia that they should be allowed to exercise their particular likes and dislikes in the realm of sport or in any activity that gives them amusement in their spare time and at their own expense. I think this is a reasonably good argument and see nothing wrong with it, but naturally it is subject to the wishes of Parliament, which must decide where the line of division shall fall. Secondly, are the suggestions in letters many honourable members have received from country racing clubs asking us to take up a case closely or exactly on the lines of the T.A.B. scheme? I am not necessarily getting up today to join the pressure group of the blood horse breeders and racehorse owners or other interests that are very much concerned in a vested way in this matter. I am putting the view held by the ordinary person, the man in the street, and I make no excuse to the Council for doing so. I received this morning the following letter from the Murray Bridge Racing Club:

Experience has shown that it is notoriously unprofitable, if not futile, to enforce laws which exceed the moral standard of conduct of the community.

That is its view. The letter continues:

The present restraints and restrictions on the establishment of a T.A.B. system in South Australia are an example. Thousands of people in all walks of life are currently breaking the law because they see no harm in having an occasional bet off the racecourse.

I need not read the rest because honourable members have received similar letters. With certain country racing clubs the problem is accentuated by nearness to the Victorian border. In many areas two things happen. First, the stake money of country racing clubs in South Australia cannot compete with that offered across the border. The reason given for this is that the T.A.B. system returns money, in this case, to the racing clubs on one side of the border, but not to those on the other side. Secondly, large sums leave South Australia weekly to T.A.B. betting facilities in Victoria. People establish their credit, ring through their bets, and money changes hands with the T.A.B. agencies in Victoria. As a member of the Southern District, these are some of the problems with which I am confronted.

The third point raised currently is whether we are encouraging an illegal practice. I think that is probably so. The report of the 1933 Royal Commission on Betting includes the following:

Having dealt with the question of totally suppressing betting and showing, we think, that it is inexpedient to attempt to do so at the present time, we now proceed to discuss the problem of control.

The report goes on to say that it does not recommend entire suppression, and continues:

That is to legalize some form of off-course betting. We believe that doing so will have the effect of bringing betting out into the open, where it can be properly regulated and controlled, and not letting it lurk, as it does at present, in hidden and underground places. . . . We believe it would reduce the volume of betting, and that only in this way can the State suppress the existing evils, not the least of which is the contempt for the law which we have already indicated.

Therefore, is Parliament, inadvertently and with the very best of motives, forcing people, who feel they have a democratic right to place an occasional bet, over to the illegal side of the fence, instead of allowing betting to become legal, which would mean that in some cases it could be channelled differently?

My fourth point is that if we were one day to accept the T.A.B. system, would it not aid sections of the community by avoiding such frequent increases in various forms of taxation? Would it not, in fact, gain funds for the Government coffers which might allow taxation in other fields to be less onerous? In Victoria the T.A.B. system channels a percentage of its proceeds into a fund for charitable purposes. I do not know whether honourable members think this is a good or bad thing,

but for the sake of the record I say that these are the types of issue that people in this State are discussing, and quite purposely I therefore bring these views before the Chamber.

Fifthly, Gallup polls show that 47 per cent of South Australian people bet, and of the other 53 per cent only one-third are against the T.A.B. scheme in principle. However, do we believe the results of Gallup polls? This is open to doubt. One classic example of misrepresentation caused by Gallup poll sampling happened in America some years ago on the issue of the acceptance of Jews in society. What happened, I believe, was that teams were sent around as an exercise to see whether some statistical answer could be obtained. One team was comprised of dark-haired, rather long-nosed collectors of information, and the other blond Aryan types. The two groups asked people their views of Jews in the community. As you can imagine, the views were completely dissimilar and the result showed that a Gallup poll can be misleading.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Generally, they are within reason.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I agree that they are fairly close, but they were not at the time of President Truman's election. We have a case to support the T.A.B. scheme, but is it one that we, as members of Parliament, can accept without more careful study than we have been able to give up to now? Another aspect of the problem is whether T.A.B. betting would clean up some of the more unsavoury aspects of Saturday afternoons in hotel bars. This, again, is perhaps open to doubt. Victorians maintain that under their scheme all facilities for this type of betting are away from hotels and picture theatres and in more isolated localities. They say also that when the T.A.B. agency closes, which it does before the first race in Victoria, the money won on a winning investment is not re-invested. This means that people do not sit around bars. They might go home and even cut their lawns; who knows! The point is that winning stakes are collected not on the day of laying the bet, Saturday, but on the Monday. This is logical and a good talking point and an issue that one hears discussed as one moves around South Australia today.

These and many other arguments, which honourable members will enlarge upon in their own minds, are the type heard today. What do we say when we look at the other side of the picture? After looking at the complex

arrangement of society in South Australia today I believe that, in many ways, the Government is at present acting most properly in this matter. Rather close to my conscience would be exactly what eventuates in the future.

When there is tremendous excitement in the press and in the conversation amongst people we can usually say that there is a lively interest in a matter. In other words, I suggest that there is a genuine and lively interest in the matter of a totalizator agency board in this State. In the booklet issued by the people in support of such a board there is a paragraph headed "Are South Australians different?", and they explain that we are no different. With this I disagree. If we generalize, in many ways South Australians are different from people in other States. We have discussed the representations of the various churches. In some cases they are 90 per cent different from the average Australian view. I suggest we are different in other ways. True, workers in industry in this State produce more than similar workers in other States. Is this due to the social differences that exist in South Australia? I do not know, but it is a line of thought. Farmers in this State produce more per head of population than do farmers elsewhere in Australia. Again we differ. If the people behind the T.A.B. movement think as they say, that we are no different from people in other States, and that we should follow every pose set by New South Wales and Victoria, I am against that also. Undoubtedly in many ways South Australia is currently more advanced in certain directions than other States.

I do not come here today to look at this subject as the second cousin of someone. I do not accept the concept insinuated in the booklet issued by the committee. It has been proved that politically South Australia has grown up and that we are no longer a mendicant State. We now stand on our own feet and do it with credit. Probably the problem exercising the minds of the people is this. Have we grown up socially as much as we have in the political field? Whatever the answer, I believe that we are a mature society in South Australia that can readily look after ourselves in social matters. I hope that this will be so, whatever decisions are made on this contentious matter, which, after all, is only a minor one. It is not a major matter like waterworks, or the expansion of the economy, or even pumping costs, about which Sir Arthur Rymill gave notice of a question today. It is a relatively minor matter, but because it is

a social issue it is contentious. I make no apology for bringing up this matter today, particularly as I feel that a section of the community has not had its views put before members of either House of Parliament. There are reasons for that. We know that on the one hand the Government must give much consideration to the matter before taking any step. In the past betting shops proved to be a dismal failure. On the other hand, the Opposition has troubles, and I believe they are related to the Leader of the Party in another place. However, these are not troubles of which advantage should be taken. I hope that it is all done on a non-political basis and that we do not have the shabby side of Party politics dragged into the issue to the detriment of the people. I believe that as a society we can handle the position and come to a workable arrangement on all such social issues. My fondest hope is that this can be done in a pleasant and unbiased atmosphere.

Now I come to the big issue—the case against the establishment of a totalizator agency board system in South Australia. If as members of Parliament we regard ourselves as having responsibilities we must listen carefully to the attitude of the churches on this question. I refer to the influence on the younger members of the community. They have their lives before them. The churches take them in hand to teach them the religious beliefs they should have and the difference between right and wrong. They teach them also what are proper values, which South Australians, ahead of people in other States, hold to be matters of some importance. We had before us the illustration of the reaction against a country when proper values go overboard. Nobody in his right mind wishes to see it happen in South Australia. This is probably the most salient point of all. We are faced with the problem of bringing up children in a proper environment. On the other hand, I suppose, the argument could be put forward that whatever fault is picked up it comes primarily from the home life. But the argument could be used in two ways. If the father of the family is in the habit of squandering on betting more than a reasonable portion of his earnings, how will it affect the children? I think it depends largely on the children. The son of a bishop appears to me to react in a slightly wilder way and so often a child of a strict family may even drink more than he should on reaching adolescence. In other words, the problem is complex. As long as a proper set of values is instilled into

children, by and large they will react properly to anything outrageous that may happen to them in life; they will react along the lines they feel they should. It is usually a matter of exaggeration: they will react a little more in one direction or in another, but this is an interesting point when we consider the impact of the T.A.B. principle on the family life of South Australia as we know it and as we are proud of it.

Thirdly, I would suggest an argument exists against this particular type of betting because, on Victorian figures, it is apparent that an increase in the volume of betting does occur. Again, at face value this is an argument quite inescapable in its implications. Are we in favour of a system of betting that encourages an increased volume of betting? At first glance, I should certainly say "No". At second glance I am not quite so sure. Who are the inveterate gamblers in the community now? I suggest that those are the ones who will go on Saturday afternoons and squander too much money at the corner hotel and spend all their afternoons putting everything barring their shirt on a horse—and, if they win, that goes on it too. I doubt very much whether T.A.B. in actual fact will do other than decrease this type of investment (if we can use such a high-falutin' term for it). I suggest probably it will tend to sever the relationship between hotel drinking and betting which we know exists so illegally in this State today.

Also, I am not quite so sure that the increase in the volume of betting may not come from the likes of those in this Chamber who at present do not bet. Many of us sit watching the sporting round-up on television on Saturday nights. My wife and I sometimes see a horse finish rather rapidly, if we watch the horse-racing, and say "That horse has finished pretty well twice in one week and it is still not placed." With a betting shop around the corner we would probably go and put 2s. on it to see whether it would be lucky enough to come home. In view of the volume of betting in Victoria, I suggest that the increase came mainly from those people who did not bet previously. In other words, would we be doing real damage or merely giving a facility to people who probably could afford it?

The Hon. C. R. Story: Would T.A.B. completely eliminate illegal S.P. bookmaking?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I am not certain whether T.A.B. would, in fact, completely eliminate illegal S.P. bookmaking.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It can be taken for granted that it would considerably reduce S.P. bookmaking.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I thank the honourable member for that interjection. I think that is so. Speaking as a man with little knowledge of betting, I should not like at this moment to venture a further opinion on that. The point is that the introduction of this type of scheme would greatly diminish illegal S.P. bookmaking and I also suggest, when saying that—and this was the point I was trying to make a moment ago—that the way in which it would operate would be mainly through racehorse owners. They are the ones who will probably ring up before their horse starts and say, "What odds will you give me on my horse?", with a pretty big stake at issue. They are the ones to keep it going. I do not think the ordinary bettors would or that the contention of the Leader of the Opposition is incorrect when he suggests, as I believe he did, that the ordinary person would forsake the illegal bookmaker and be channelled into a legal course if T.A.B. schemes were introduced. Many other features could be mentioned, but there is one aspect I should mention now in all fairness because in this case it is an argument to be used against T.A.B. principles, too. It is purely hearsay and I make no bones about that, but put it before this honourable Council because it is the sort of issue that must exercise members' minds and the minds of the public before they can feel that any such T.A.B. scheme is a proper one further to consider. The first newspaper cutting I have here is taken from the *Melbourne Truth*, dated July 27, 1963. It is written by a man called Alan Dower, national special correspondent. It reads:

The police and the Government this week have launched a secret and concentrated probe which may rock the framework of the Victorian Totalizator Agency Board. They have commissioned a leading detective to marshal all evidence of (1) apparent embezzlement, (2) false telephone accounts, and (3) betting on horses after the races were run.

This is interesting stuff, but it is the opinion of only one man. I put it before this Council because I believe we should have access to what information we can get.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Is *Truth* more reliable there than it is here?

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I suspect it is not. Honourable members can quite well judge the degree to which they believe newspaper reports, whether from *Truth* or from any other

publication. The second quotation touches on New South Wales, and is of a like nature. I will not read it all, but the insinuation is that pressure tactics are being used by the press in New South Wales to push T.A.B. concepts of schemes through. It is in an extract from the *Australian Weekly News Digest* published on July 25. It is headed "Intimidation at its worst", and reads:

Press tycoon Frank Packer last Saturday on the front page of the *Telegraph* said that any member of the Labor Party who voted against the setting up of an Offcourse Tote system which Packer and others are trying to coerce the New South Wales Government into accepting without thorough consideration of all aspects, financial, social and political, would be held to have been bribed by S.P. book-makers.

So it is another matter upon which we have to decide whether, in fact, we can give any credence to these assertions from other States or whether, in fact, we believe, as obviously many of our people do, that such a scheme would clean up the aspects of racing that sometimes upset people here.

At this stage that is all I have to say about T.A.B. I repeat that, to my mind, it is a small matter, though important because it affects so many people. But, put into perspective, in the matter of swinging Governments or bringing about defeats, this is chicken feed compared with things like water reticulation, education, hospitals, etc. Many things are more important for the future of South Australia. There may be far more important issues than those I have mentioned, but they do not intrude into the home in the same way as a contentious and social issue of this nature. I consider that this issue should be raised and discussed in this Chamber. I do not say that I would vote tomorrow in favour of it, but I wait with some degree of interest to see whether the Government will recommend a further inquiry into these matters. When any information is forthcoming from such an inquiry I have no doubt that Parliament is the right place to decide what should be done.

I thank honourable members for bearing with me on a rather laboured subject on which I am probably not greatly qualified to speak. However, I consider it important that the views of a certain section of our community be expressed in this Chamber. We all know there is no reason why members have to speak on this matter; I may be the only one who

will do so at this session. That, at any rate, would put it in its perspective.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You will be the villain in the piece.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: I have been negligent so far in not referring to the capable moving and seconding of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply by the Hons. L. R. Hart and R. C. DeGaris. I was very interested in the subject matter of their speeches. The Hon. Mr. Hart mentioned a wide array of problems affecting his area in which I was particularly interested. I hold him in the highest regard and consider that he is a great acquisition to this Chamber. I am sure that you, Mr. President, will agree that the standard of debate on the Address in Reply up to this afternoon has been of a very high order indeed.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Including this afternoon.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: The honourable Minister is the essence of a gentleman. I am always delighted at remarks as kind as that. I refer also to my own new personal "running mate"—if I can put it that way—the Hon. R. C. DeGaris. I doubt whether anyone in this Chamber realizes this gentleman's ability and capacity for work. Nobody would know how well the two of us get on together as a team. I express my regret at the passing of my previous colleague, the late Allan Hookings, but I am pleased to have Mr. DeGaris as a colleague and I know that his standing here will be of a very high order because of his great capacity in many spheres.

I was also delighted with the speech made by my friend the Leader of the Labor Party in this Chamber (the Hon. Mr. Shard). It was made under great difficulty because, if honourable members remember, on the afternoon when he spoke he had a very heavy cold. It was delightful again to see his great ability to turn any constructive suggestion put forward by a backbencher of this Chamber to the advantage of his own Party line. I think from memory he immediately drew claim to the Hon. Mr. Hart's idea as springing from the old source of all original schemes—the Opposition in this State! This was a good speech by the Leader and I hope that next time he rises to speak he will be feeling much better physically.

I should also like to express my great personal regard for our Ministers in this Chamber. I think all of us that have worked with them—although in my case for only 4½

years—appreciate their strength of character and their co-operation with the backbenchers of this Chamber. I commend the loyalty they show to this Chamber, sometimes in difficult situations. It is a constant source of gratification to me and I consider it right and proper to express these sentiments on this occasion.

Finally, may I associate myself with the remarks of previous speakers, particularly their references to His Excellency the Governor,

Sir Edric Bastyan, and Lady Bastyan. Many other matters have been covered by honourable members, but I shall content myself at this stage by asking to be associated with their remarks. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.33 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 6, at 2.15 p.m.