

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 17, 1951.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SITE FOR PROOF RANGE.

Mr. TEUSNER—Last Thursday I asked the Premier a question regarding the site which the Commonwealth authorities desire to find in South Australia as an artillery range. The Premier intimated he had received a telegram from the Minister for the Army saying, amongst other things, that he would be glad to have an inspection made of any suitable site that the Premier, with his State-wide knowledge, should suggest. On Monday night at Mount Pleasant I attended a meeting at which a large representation of landowners of Tung-killo and Palmer districts were present. The Premier, who also attended, said that he would have the Minister of Lands investigate the position with a view to ascertaining whether suitable alternative sites were available in the State. Has the Premier any information to place before the House on this matter?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Government has had a report from the chairman of the Land Board. The board has investigated what would be required for such a range. It has had some communications from military authorities, and the chairman has now forwarded to the Government a recommendation that a proposal be submitted to the Commonwealth regarding an area on the west side of the head of Spencer Gulf. It is fairly close to Lincoln Gap and would be sufficiently large to meet military requirements. It has the advantages of plenty of water being available and of being close to a power station for electricity purposes. It is the type of country which the military authorities have said is necessary, and it is accessible to transport. As far as we can understand it will provide all the facilities the military people require.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—What is it used for now?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is part of a pastoral holding, and only one person would be involved. It is low capacity country and its production would be comparatively small compared with the production in the Mount Pleasant country. The recommendation will be forwarded to the Commonwealth Government.

MYXOMATOSIS INOCULATIONS.

Mr. CHRISTIAN—I have seen the programme of the proposed myxomatosis inoculation campaign as far as it affects Eyre Pen-

insula. From it I gather that the top end of the Peninsula beyond Streaky Bay is not catered for in the itinerary. I have received strong protests against the omission of the western districts, where rabbits are a very serious menace at all times, and the manpower shortage is more acute than in the more closely settled areas, and mosquitoes are fairly active. Can the Minister of Agriculture say if it is too late to extend the itinerary of the departmental officers, and, if so, whether he could make myxomatosis available to the district agricultural inspector stationed at Ceduna so that he could undertake inoculation in that locality as far west as Penong and Fowlers Bay?

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—The myxomatosis campaign embarked upon by the Veterinary Branch of the Department of Agriculture was limited because of the fact that there was only a limited quantity of myxomatosis virus available in the first instance, and because it was necessary that a veterinary officer should administer the dose to the rabbits. The suggestion of the honourable member that the district inspector should do it will be discussed with the Chief Veterinary Officer, Mr. Macindoc, but I am afraid there are difficulties in the way of putting the work in the hands of a person without direct veterinary knowledge. Moreover, the ampules containing the virus must be kept at a certain temperature, otherwise the virus quickly deteriorates. I appreciate the position of out-back areas. I met the same position in the north-east a week or two ago. Some of the people interested there were going to catch rabbits and take them to the nearest place the officer would be attending. I suggest to the honourable member that the people in the district he mentioned try out that process, get the cages ready, bring the rabbits down, have them inoculated, and allow the mosquitoes to do their worst after the rabbits have returned to the district.

PORT PIRIE BRICK SUPPLY.

Mr. DAVIS—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question regarding the Port Pirie brick supply?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have made inquiries and have obtained a report from the Director of Building Materials as follows:—

Further inquiries have been made from the South Australian Housing Trust and the War Service Homes Commission, and both organizations would like to see Mr. O'Loughlin supplied with additional bricks. The previous intimations that they were not perturbed were apparently caused by Mr. O'Loughlin's own

attitude and his confidence that he could show Brick Manufacturers Ltd. that he could manage without them. The present position is that O'Loughlin is making 11,000 bricks per week and he requires a further 12,000 bricks weekly to keep his team of bricklayers employed. The War Service Homes Commission let a contract for a group of 14 houses to O'Loughlin and the erection of these houses is held up. The commission's deputy director in this State is concerned about this delay and he would like something done but he is not prepared to initiate action himself as he is afraid that Brick Manufacturers Ltd. will retaliate by reducing his supplies in the metropolitan area.

The matter has been discussed with the chairman of Brick Manufacturers Ltd. (Mr. Tom Hallett) who stated that the present production at his company's Port Pirie kiln is only 10/11,000 bricks per week. In the calendar year 1950, 1,127,000 bricks were made, which represents an average of approximately 21,500 bricks per week. The serious reduction in production is due to the shortage of labour; if this problem could be overcome he could make 40,000 bricks per week. Controlled New Australian labour is not acceptable. The B.H.A.S. is paying £3 per week lead bonus and the men available to the brick works only stop whilst awaiting B.H.A.S. call-up. Mr. Hallett claimed that there is nothing personal in his company's attitude and that he will supply O'Loughlin again when production is increased. However, he thinks it more likely that the works will be closed down if the price is not increased. It is estimated that O'Loughlin builds about 75 per cent of the houses being constructed in Port Pirie. Counting his own brick production together with that of Brick Manufacturers Ltd., he is getting about half of the total bricks being made. There has been no suggestion that the bricks being made by Brick Manufacturers Ltd. are being sold for relatively unessential purposes. On the information at present available I doubt whether there is sufficient justification to take the extreme step of directing supplies to a particular contractor. This is a step which has not been taken in any other case.

UPPER MURRAY ROADS.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Recently the Public Works Committee inquired into certain transport problems in the Upper Murray areas and I understand reported that the road alongside the river between Sutherlands and Barmera should be put in a trafficable condition. Can the Minister of Works say what steps have been taken by the Highways Department to implement that report? What does the department propose to do in the immediate future?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—Simultaneously with the report being received from the committee the member for Light and other members made representations to the Government for the improvement of the road between Eudunda and Morgan as a first step towards

improving Upper Murray road transport. The deputation indicated that the councils in that area were in a position to do a lot of the work themselves towards the betterment of that road. The other section—between Morgan and Barmera—is in another category altogether and was regarded as the lesser of the two problems. Following on that deputation and the report of the committee I got in touch, through the Commissioner of Highways, with the councils in that area to see to what extent they could assist towards effecting improvements to the road. The Commissioner of Highways also reported that an extensive area between Morgan and Barmera would need a good deal of improvement and that some would probably need bitumenizing to keep it in repair. Following on further representations by the member for Chaffey with regard to the area in his district I got in touch with the Commissioner of Highways, who reports:—

General maintenance of the section mentioned between Morgan and Barmera has been continued in the normal manner, but none of these are special works following the committee's recommendation. The section between Eudunda and Morgan was regarded by the Public Works Committee as the more urgent, and lesser emphasis was placed on the Morgan-Barmera section. Work on the investigation and preparation of plans for the former section has commenced but will not be completed for some time. Actual start of construction is dependent on many factors, such as provision of materials, finance, and the more important aspect of securing the necessary plant and labour. With the heavy demand for road works in all parts of the State it is not possible at this stage to give any indication as to the date when the work is likely to be commenced.

As a matter of Government policy I regard this work as being of high priority, and will stimulate in every possible way the co-ordinated efforts of the councils and the Government, through the Commissioner of Highways, towards providing an all-weather road north of the river.

TIMBER SUPPLIES.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have been approached by various persons regarding the timber supplies available today. I understand this commodity is becoming more plentiful. Can the Premier state the true position for the benefit of people interested?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The acute shortage of timber which was felt some few weeks ago has been considerably ameliorated, and during the last 10 days I have received no requests from any contractor actually in trouble in this regard. In addition, jobs which are

being undertaken on behalf of the Government and which were held up because of a shortage of timber have now become active again. Therefore, generally speaking the immediate position has improved; but what is more pleasing is the fact that shipments are coming in much more freely. In conjunction with the Shipping Board the Tasmanian Government has arranged for a ship to come to South Australia regularly twice a month for salt and gypsum and by arrangement this ship will bring regular consignments of timber from Tasmania. In addition, we are getting much better shipments of timber from Western Australia and from overseas than before.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on third reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 854.)

Mr. FRED WALSH (Thebarton)—The object of this short Bill is to legalize an agreement between the parties concerned in respect of the closing hours of shops on Saturdays. The practice in the city is for retail stores to close at 11.30 a.m., but because some business people have obtained an unfair advantage over them by remaining open until 12.30 p.m. the Act should be amended to provide for the compulsory closing of shops by 11.30. The opposition to the Bill has been of no consequence because no sound arguments have been advanced. The member for Adelaide pointed out that from time to time members opposite have stated that they subscribe wholeheartedly to conciliation. When parties can agree on any matter Parliament should ratify their agreement. I believe the Premier only opposed the Bill for the sake of opposing it, for he did not advance any argument other than to say that there was no public demand for earlier closing. The same argument could be applied with equal force to many other questions coming before Parliament. If we always had to wait for public demand not many Acts or amendments would be passed. The public are not prone to make demands, except on very important questions, although at times some people approach their members with a view to correcting anomalies that may affect them individually or their district. The Premier said:—

Never a week passes in which I have not the duty of prosecuting a considerable number of people for having sold some trifling item after the declared closing time. I am not excusing them for not complying with the law, but I mention that to show that there is a public demand for an extension of hours.

How can he say there is a demand for an extension of hours because some people break the law by purchasing goods after hours? Such offences are often the result of a housewife finding she has run short of an item after the prescribed closing time. No matter what closing hours Parliament prescribes there will always be breaches such as that. The Premier's argument would hold good for any move to extend hotel trading hours. Persons are sometimes prosecuted for purchasing a bottle of beer after hours, so the Premier's argument is not logical. The hours prescribed by the Bill would give workers sufficient time to do their shopping. There is not as much business done by storekeepers after 11 a.m. on Saturdays as earlier in the morning. By 11.30 a.m. most people are going or preparing to go to their favourite form of entertainment. The Bill would result in a greater volume of trade flowing to the suburbs. A curtailment of shopping hours on Saturdays would limit the time for shopping in the city and there would be a tendency on the part of bigger firms to establish businesses in the suburbs. Many people do not trade with local business people because of the inducement to go to the city.

Mr. Whittle—Any reduced shopping hours would apply in the suburbs, too.

Mr. FRED WALSH—Yes, but the hours suggested would be sufficient for everybody. Everyone knows what happens in his own home. We know the routine of the housewife. Few women have not obtained the necessary week-end provisions by 11.30 on the Saturday morning. There was a difficulty when one big city departmental store attempted to trade after 11.30 a.m. Conferences were held between the parties and it was shown that the store was not doing the right thing by its employees or the public, and it went back to 11.30 closing. I do not know much about country stores, but most of the trading in the country is done on the recognized marketing days, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. When one passes through country towns on those days he finds them congested because of the large number of people getting their requirements. Mr. Fletcher said there would not be sufficient time for people at Mount Gambier to do their shopping if the stores closed at 11.30 a.m. The Mount Gambier position may be different from the position elsewhere, especially for workers in the forests, but I think there would be ample time for shopping to be done between 9 and 11.30 a.m. If it were necessary, a petition could be presented to have the area excluded from the operations of the Act. Mr. Fletcher seemed to

be afraid that the acceptance of the present proposal might mean the total closing of shops on Saturday mornings and he said that this proposal was the thin edge of the wedge. Whenever a proposal for a reform is put forward someone says it is the thin edge of the wedge, and the proposal is opposed. There is always the thought, apparently, that something more will follow later. Just prior to the war I was in New Zealand for about a month and I found that in the large cities the big departmental stores were closed on Saturday mornings. I understand that now the practice has extended to practically all the rest of New Zealand. It was not brought about by legislation, but in accordance with an Arbitration Court award. Under legislation the court has power to make an award for shop assistants and it has also the power to close shops in any area. On few occasions has the court had to vary its award as the result of a petition. Of course, before closing the shops the court considers what effects there would be on the public. I do not want it to be understood that I suggest the closing of shops here on Saturday mornings, and that is not the wish of the Labor Party. Members should consider only the legalizing of an agreement about 11.30 closing which has been accepted by the parties concerned. We should not oppose a reform which has been found to be advantageous. I hope the Bill will pass at least the second reading.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

COURSING RESTRICTION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 864.)

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES (Torrens)—When this matter was before the House a week ago I moved the adjournment of the debate, but unfortunately the sponsor of the Bill, Mr. Shannon, tried to prevent my getting it. That afternoon 11 members had spoken on this Bill—surely a record number on one Bill in one afternoon. After they had spoken I thought it only fair that the general public should have the opportunity to know what was before the House, and therefore I moved the adjournment; but the member for Onkaparinga apparently wished to have the matter disposed of that afternoon. Fortunately the House was against that view and granted an adjournment. If we are to retain respect for and confidence

in Parliament we must be careful even to the point of fastidiousness not to rush legislation through without giving the public a full opportunity to know and make known their views on what is proposed. This will tend to maintain the stability of Parliament and the respect in which it is held. Usually when the person in charge of a Bill moves the second reading one of the members opposing the Bill is able to obtain an adjournment of the debate. I suggest that this courtesy should have been granted last week without the necessity for the House to divide. Why was an attempt made to rush this Bill through? Was it because there was something in it of which its sponsors did not wish the public to have full knowledge? Was it because they did not wish the public to make known that view? Was it because its sponsors were not in favour of a full investigation of all the matters contained in the Bill and everything else pertaining to the sport of racing dogs after mechanical lures?

Mr. O'Halloran—Those supporting the Bill had nothing to fear from any fair investigation.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—I do not suggest that any of those reasons operated when the sponsor of the Bill attempted to get the Bill through in one afternoon; but if not, what was the reason?

Mr. O'Halloran—Because the time for private members' business is limited.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—I do not think that was the reason, for when this Bill was set aside other private members' business was considered. The adjournment of the debate meant that consideration of this measure did not hold up other private members' business. The same time will be granted for consideration of this Bill whether it is disposed of in one day or three days. In any event it seems to me there was evidence of some indecent haste. Be that as it may the House rightly adjourned consideration of the measure, and I think honourable members who voted against the adjournment will see on reflection that they made a mistake in trying to force a decision last Wednesday.

I oppose the Bill. Some months ago I had the pleasure of an interview with a representative of the National Coursing Association of South Australia, a Mr. Hall, when that association was contemplating moving for such a Bill as this. I say frankly that he impressed me with his sincerity. Apparently he thought—and I believe still thinks—that it is possible to have this type of dog racing without betting. He agreed with me that when the filthy fingers

of gambling controls a sport that sport becomes a menace and loses its claims to public support; but I suggest to Mr. Hall and others who think that this sport could be carried on without gambling that all the evidence is that dog racing cannot exist without it. I have consistently maintained the attitude that as a Parliament we should not provide more facilities for gambling. On the face of it this Bill does not do that—in fact, it negatives the very possibility—but I do not doubt that in reality it would provide further opportunities for gambling. Can one member honestly say he does not think there would grow up, with the practice of this type of dog racing, an ever-increasing body of illegal gambling?

Mr. Davis—Doesn't that apply to all sport?

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—The sponsor of this Bill conscientiously believes that dog racing can be carried on without gambling facilities. The member for Stanley approached this matter realistically and said that gambling would be associated with this sport. Illegal gambling on it would become so great that soon we should have reports from the police that they could not control it and there would be an overwhelming demand for the gambling to be legalized.

Mr. Shannon—How soon would there be such a demand?

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—I cannot state any specific period, but I should think within five years. The evidence given before a South Australian Royal Commission some years ago caused it to declare that dog racing cannot exist without gambling facilities; therefore I say to those who are supporting the Bill on the assumption that they can divorce it from gambling that they are on wrong grounds. I was impressed to some extent by the argument that dog racing may be called the poor man's sport. Members of both Parties in this House desire to protect the poor man from people who would exploit him.

Mr. O'Halloran—Where is there any exploitation in this Bill?

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—None in this Bill, but anybody who provides facilities for the poor man to gamble is not serving him to the best advantage.

Mr. O'Halloran—Then you will have to abolish pennies.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—The honourable member may draw fine distinction if he likes, but I am dealing with this measure on broad principles. Parliament has never passed a Bill to encourage two-up. All our legislation is against two-up.

Mr. O'Halloran—It still goes on.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—Yes, but not as much as it would if it were legalized.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Two-up is not a sport.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—The Leader of the Opposition suggested it was on a par with dog racing.

Mr. O'Halloran—I did not.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—The history of the Labor Party shows it has been a bulwark against the exploitation of the poor.

Mr. O'Halloran—The Party also has some regard for the freedom of the individual.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—To be consistent the honourable member should allow betting as a sport. Is not the restriction on betting an infringement of the liberty of the subject? I am not in favour of increasing the opportunities for those who would exploit the poor man in a poor man's sport and thereby rob him of his earnings. The question of cruelty in dog racing has been debated, but I do not know anything about that. The member for Onkaparinga devoted most of his speech to refuting allegations of cruelty. I cannot imagine a dog chasing a mechanical hare many times unless there were some inducement for him.

Mr. Shannon—Do you know that many dogs have never seen live game but still race?

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—I cannot imagine a dog racing repeatedly except for fear or hope of reward.

Mr. Moir—What do horses get?

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—The whip! How can the honourable member compare the racing of dogs with the racing of horses, which are ridden by jockeys? I am opposed to the Bill because I am opposed to increasing opportunities for gambling. Recently all members received a letter from the Bishop of Adelaide and the President and Director of the United Churches Social Reform Board. It states:—

We view with the greatest concern the Bill now before Parliament which seeks to make tin hare dog racing lawful. We are aware that Mr. Shannon's Bill excludes any provision for betting facilities but, were mechanical hare racing allowed, it is certain to lead to a great amount of illegal betting and then to a demand for legal facilities for betting. This has been the case wherever this kind of dog racing has been permitted. With the number of meetings that could be held the police would be set a most unenviable, and indeed impossible, task in trying to prevent wholesale illegal betting. As a spectacle the type of

sport proposed cannot be regarded as elevating or satisfying. It usually takes approximately 26 seconds to run one such race. The Royal Commission of 1938 was emphatic on this point.

If the races took only 26 seconds to run and there were 10 or 12 races in an evening, how would patrons spend the time between races?

Mr. Fred Walsh—Many horse races take only 59 seconds to run.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—Yes, but the patrons can stroll about the lawns.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Patrons of dog racing could cool off between races.

The Hon. S. W. JEFFRIES—They would visit their illegal bookmakers. The letter continues:—

Were tin hare racing made lawful a considerable amount of choice meat would be fed to dogs while many human beings remain in need of it. The Premier was not exaggerating when he said it would be a calamity if this State allowed mechanical hare coursing. In view of the problems facing the nation and the world today it seems tragic that Parliament should be called to give time and thought to such a fatuous proposal as this. We hope that you will do everything possible to defeat this Bill. Thanking you in anticipation, we remain, yours sincerely.

The letter is signed by Bryan Adelaide, E. S. Kiek, and E. H. Woollacott. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY (Chaffey)—I support the measure. I would not have spoken on it if a vote had been taken last week, because it is a straight forward Bill. It merely allows for tin hare coursing. Opponents of the measure have worked up their imaginations and drawn pictures of something which, to use the words of the Premier, will lead to a major calamity. I agree with Mr. Jeffries that important measures should not be rushed through Parliament, which is a deliberative body. Every member should be able to inform himself fully about any subject matter before Parliament prior to coming to a decision. That is why Mr. Quirke and I voted for the adjournment last Thursday. This Bill is something above board and something which will stand criticism, and it should not be rushed through Parliament. In this debate we have had reference to pressure groups. I do not oppose them, because it is the function of Parliament to be subjected to pressure. Mr. F. D. Roosevelt, late President of the United States of America, said it was the function of Parliament to bow to pressure. If we do not do that we shall get a form of government which will ignore public opinion and go its own way. Copies

of a brochure and of a letter on the subject matter of this Bill have been sent to members. The letter is from church people, headed by no less a person than the Anglican Bishop of Adelaide. These church leaders had the good sense to sign their statement, so that it would be known by all where they stand on this matter. This cannot be said about the people who issued the brochure. It was issued by the Anti-Tin Hare Racing League. That body has entered this public debate, but we do not know what it comprises. It would have added dignity to its attitude if its leaders had signed the brochure in the same way as the church dignitaries signed their statement. The brochure is entirely misleading. It is mainly taken up with statements made by various organizations. The opening statement is one by the 1938 Royal Commission and it is headed, "What did the 1938 Royal Commission say about speed coursing or dog racing?" The recommendation of that commission is entirely opposite to what one would expect it to be, seeing that it was referred to by this unknown body. The recommendation was:—

We recommend that it would be undesirable to permit any form of betting on speed coursing and the Act be amended to make it clear that coursing does not include speed coursing. Mr. Shannon stressed the point that no betting was to be associated with the proposal in the Bill. He said that if there was any attempt to introduce betting at the meetings he would take a leading part in opposing it. Evidently the sponsors of the brochure are not prepared to accept Mr. Shannon's word, or the word of those who support the Bill. Last year a Bill was introduced by a personal friend of mine in this House, but I opposed it because I did not believe in betting facilities being available at dog races. I believe there are ample betting facilities now. When a member tells me that a Bill will do such and such a thing I accept his word. I accept the word of Mr. Shannon, who said that the secretary of the Greyhound Racing Association was honest and sincere. Evidently honesty and sincerity mean nothing to opponents of the Bill. They have a Calvinistic background, and therefore oppose everything that savours of enjoyment. I would be the last person to suggest that men who keep greyhounds do not at some time or other use cats for prey. There are perverts in every section of the community, and the dog owners would be the last to suggest that some people in their ranks would not do such things. Mr. Jeffries said that commonsense made it difficult for him to believe that a dog would continue to chase a

mechanical device. If he finds difficulty in believing that I find difficulty in believing that a man who breeds dogs would be so depraved as to kill other animals just for the lust of killing. I think it would be a deliberate lie to say he would. The evidence in the brochure has been put in its wrong perspective. Emphasis is given to parts of statements which suit the cause of the league. One statement concerns a view held by a Labor conference, and it reads:—

It is worthy of note that in April, 1945, the State A.L.P. Conference refused to sponsor any action for the introduction of mechanical dog racing.

But the league did not emphasize the following words contained in that decision—"with book-makers operating at the meetings." The Labor Party did not object to mechanical dog racing, but rightly objected to betting facilities being provided. It perturbs me when people twist facts and statements to suit their own purposes. If that is not a deliberate attempt to mislead Parliament I should like to know what is. Parliament wants to give justice according to the facts placed before it, yet the league makes such public statements. The brochure points out that a Royal Commission on Greyhound Racing in England, in recommending that totalizator betting on greyhound race tracks should be declared illegal in England and Scotland, referred to the voluminous evidence of widespread poverty and distress, family troubles, delinquency and demoralization among young people, embezzlement, and other misdemeanours, all due to betting on dogs. The young people apparently were going to rack and ruin, not because of the dog racing, but because of the betting on dog racing. We hear the same story about football pools, in which millions of pounds are invested. Does anyone suggest that soccer should be stopped in England and Scotland because so many people take part in football pools? Some people abuse the eating habit and get all kinds of troubles, and have to drink all sorts of concoctions, but does anyone suggest that we should stop eating? We should not prevent people from breeding dogs and watch them race because someone is silly enough to abuse the position. The whole purpose of the introduction of this brochure was to build up an atmosphere of fear so that members would not treat the Bill on its merits. Dealing with the "serious social consequences" of this sport the brochure continues:—

Economic wastage and deterioration of character have followed in the wake of dog rac-

ing wherever it has been established. With regard to deterioration of character, attention is drawn to page 74 of the final report of the British Royal Commission, which reads:—"We were impressed by the evidence as to deterioration of characters among young persons. . . . Betting on greyhound racing drove out every other interest."

The elements of betting is stressed throughout, but the sponsors of this Bill emphasized the fact that betting would be excluded from the operation of this sport. Hitler once said that the British character had deteriorated, but later he found he had been mistaken. An observant traveller who recently returned from Britain told me that he considered British character to be as strong as, if not stronger than, ever before. In defining dog racing the brochure states that "speed coursing or tin hare racing is a totally different proposition to open coursing or plumptons. . . ." It says this sport is "merely a dog race." The sponsor of the Bill asks for dog racing merely to give owners an opportunity to test their dogs against each other so that they may know how their breeding is proceeding. The brochure contains the following statement:—

There is nothing spectacular or edifying in a dog race, which apparently explains the poor attendances at all meetings held where attempts have been made to popularize the sport at which five or six minutes' racing is the evening's sport.

This statement shows complete confusion of thought, because, although it sets out to oppose dog racing, here it says that this sport fails to attract the public. If that is so, why oppose it? If the race takes too short a time for some people they should attend horse race meetings, where the races are of longer duration.

The letter members have received from certain church dignitaries, deals, almost entirely, with the aspect of gambling. The writers seem to have an idea that the introduction of this Bill is a subtle attempt to provide extra betting facilities, although betting has been definitely excluded by its provisions. These church leaders are not prepared to accept the assurance given by supporters of the Bill that they would oppose the introduction of such betting facilities. I would do so, because already ample facilities for betting exist. This letter states:—

With the number of meetings that could be held the police would be set a most unenviable and indeed impossible task in trying to prevent wholesale illegal betting.

The police cannot control illegal betting now, so I do not see what difference dog racing

would make. As the member for Stanley said, Australians will bet wherever they are; indeed many church leaders can see nothing wrong in having a bet. I respect the view of the member for Torrens that betting is morally wrong.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Yes, and very foolish.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—But some church leaders think there is nothing wrong with it so long as a person does not invest more money than he can afford. The letter continues—

As a spectacle, the type of sport proposed cannot be regarded as elevating or satisfying. It usually takes approximately 26 seconds to run one such race. The Royal Commission of 1938 was emphatic on this point.

I say that is a matter of opinion. This sport may satisfy some people. These church leaders missed the point that the Commission did not object to dog racing as such but rather objected to betting on it.

The Hon. S. W. Jeffries—Didn't they find that dog racing could not be successfully conducted without betting?

Mr. Shannon—I do not think that finding has been arrived at anywhere.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—These church people's view of the sport is merely an expression of opinion. Some people may get much excitement from a race lasting only 26 seconds. The letter merely shows the confusion of thought in the minds of opponents of this Bill. The letter continues:—

Were "tin hare" racing made lawful, a considerable amount of choice meat would be fed to dogs while many human beings would remain in need of it.

That is a pathetic approach by people of the intelligence of these church leaders, because already there are many families in South Australia who cannot get all the choice meat they require. Such an argument is beside the point. The letter continues:—

The Premier was not exaggerating when he said it would be a "calamity" if this State allowed mechanical hare coursing.

Here they have quoted the very person who has put betting on such a sound business footing in this State. As Treasurer he receives profits from betting in a way which no previous Treasurer has been able to manage. Today's *Advertiser* contains the following extract from the annual report of the Betting Control Board:—

The total revenue received by the Government from all bookmakers' operations including £33,060 stamp duties and £14,743 unclaimed bets during 1949-50, was £371,396. From the

totalizer, including £4,753 unclaimed dividends, it was £97,865. The total of all revenue received by the Government, including stamp tax, taxes and totalizer percentages, was £488,761—an increase of £280,516.

Betting revenue, at the Premier's instigation, has increased by over £250,000, yet he says that any increase in betting facilities would be a calamity. Evidently betting is not a calamity if the Treasury benefits. The Premier has made every legalized bookmaker a taxation collector for the Government.

The SPEAKER—I hope the honourable member will round off his argument soon, because this is not a betting Bill.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—From listening to the debate one would assume that it was. The legalized bookmaker gets protection for collecting revenue for the State in that those not lucky enough to obtain licences cannot compete against him. The Premier's remarks should be the last quoted by those who oppose this measure, because he supports racing clubs in order that they may have bigger and better racing meetings. I have no doubt about the sincerity of those who wrote this letter to members of Parliament about this Bill, but the church's approach is somewhat different from that of the man in the street and the letter does not do much service to the people. I believe that excessive drinking or gambling is often an effect and not a cause. It is the effect of having to live on a lower standard of living than the average person should have to live on. People drink or gamble to excess in order to escape from reality. This is often overlooked by those who condemn drinking and gambling rather than the conditions leading to it. The member for Onkaparinga handed me a letter from the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club, which has been in existence for 11 years but not once has had a conviction for betting. That bears out the statement of the member for Torrens that the secretary is a man of integrity and enthusiasm. One paragraph of the letter states:—

During the week-end a meeting of interested country open and coursing plumpston coursing officials was held, and three clubs that have been conducting such meetings with legalized betting facilities have intimated that if this Bill is successful such clubs will run mechanical lure meetings only, so naturally their decision will do away with some of the betting facilities now available.

That is a concrete statement that not only will betting facilities not be sought, but three bodies already affiliated will carry out the provisions

of the Bill and sacrifice whatever betting facilities they now have.

Mr. Shannon—Two more bodies are now affiliated.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Then five bodies now entitled to betting facilities are prepared to give them up. That proves the sincerity of those sponsoring the Bill. It would not be long before all dog racing bodies would fall into line. The member for Stanley made a fine speech dealing with sentimental statements about the cruelty of greyhound racing.

Mr. Whittle—He said it was nonsense to say that the Bill would not encourage betting.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Who would deny that if hundreds of Australians were present at a racing meeting not one person would say, "I bet you 2s. so and so wins"? That is the sort of thing being thrown up as a reason for opposing the Bill. Nature is red in tooth and claw, but does not like lingering deaths. When an animal is badly wounded Nature usually sees that it is destroyed quickly. Why do men keep dogs? Australia is a nation of uprooted people. Many have been forced by economic circumstances into the few big cities. When people are uprooted they take their traditions with them, so the man in the city has the inherent instincts of his father who was associated with the land and with animals. Most of the small stock exhibits at the Royal Show are entered by people living in the city. The breeding of fowls, birds and dogs keeps the city dweller in touch with Nature. These birds and animals can be judged on the spot, but greyhounds cannot. Other tests are necessary because although a greyhound may have a fine appearance, it may not be exceptionally speedy. That is the reason for this measure. Those sponsoring the Bill are merely asking Parliament for an opportunity to test their dogs against those of their competitors to see if they are bred on the right lines. What is wrong with that? Who would suggest the breeder of race horses should not be allowed to test them in a race? Nothing has been made available by Nature but someone has tried to pervert it. There are perverts in every walk of life. Possibly some people will use dog racing for illegal betting purposes, but that is no reason why the Bill should be opposed. It is a simple and straightforward measure, sponsored by a reputable body. Mr. Jeffries said that the secretary was a man of integrity and sincerity, yet he will not support the Bill. I ask Parliament to put aside bias on this matter. Let us

consider the question of betting at coursing meetings when it comes up. Unless there are strong reasons for changing my present view I shall oppose the provision of betting facilities at speed coursing.

Mr. HAWKER (Burra)—Mr. Macgillivray said that this is a simple and straightforward measure and indicated that it would enable dogs to chase a mechanical lure without betting facilities being provided at the meetings. In supporting the Bill Mr. Stephens justified gambling at the meetings, and Mr. Quirke said that wherever dogs raced there would be betting. However genuine the sponsors of the Bill may be, we cannot forget that two of its supporters agree that sooner or later there will be legal or illegal betting at speed coursing meetings. The Bill hands over most of the control of speed coursing to the National Coursing Association, which will regulate the number of meetings throughout the State: Parliament will not do it. The Premier said that it would be possible under the Bill to have 660 meetings in a year. I do not know how many meetings are held in Victoria now, but in 1946 when Mr. Slater introduced in the Victorian Parliament a Bill dealing with dog racing there were 82 day meetings and 812 night meetings. If we hand over the control of speed coursing to the National Coursing Association it will be in the form of a blank cheque, because, like every other association, it can alter its rules. A dog will not forever chase a mechanical quarry. It is possible to fool all the dogs some of the time and some of the dogs all the time, but not to fool all the dogs all the time, so a kill is necessary. That is supported by the following rule of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club:—

Any person being an owner or trainer, or carrying out official duties relating to racing, who infringes or attempts the use of live game in the training of greyhounds, plumpton or open coursing excluded, together with all dogs belonging to such person or persons, shall be disqualified for life.

As I read it, that rule excludes dogs from being trained for plumpton or open coursing.

Mr. Shannon—No.

Mr. HAWKER—In other words, it is permitted to train a dog for open coursing with live game, but not permitted for speed coursing?

Mr. Shannon—No.

Mr. HAWKER—Apparently it is possible to get around the prohibition by saying that dogs are being trained for plumpton coursing.

Mr. Shannon also quoted the following rule:—

Disqualification imposed on any person or dog by the committee of the club or the stewards shall not be removed without the consent of the committee of the National Coursing Association expressed in writing under the hand of its secretary or other officer authorized for the purpose.

Although it is possible to disqualify a person or dog for life under the previous rule, there is provision for lifting the disqualification. The safeguards provided against cruelty in the use of live game for training for speed coursing, or the chasing of a mechanical quarry, are not worth anything. There have been cases of cruelty in connection with greyhound racing, and a report in the *Adelaide Truth* of August 18, 1945, referred to two men being fined for killing an opossum, which is a protected animal.

Mr. Shannon—Where did the offence take place?

Mr. HAWKER—In Victoria. In connection with the case the following evidence was given by Inspector C. M. Clift in the *Sunshine* court:—

On the morning of June 29 Inspector Charles Moore Clift, armed with powerful binoculars, was at the rear of White City ground in a position to overlook the "killing yard." The killing yard, it was explained, is situated at the end of the racing track at White City and dogs run there at the conclusion of a race. Dogs are given "kills" in the killing yard because it encouraged them to go there.

The *Argus* of November 21, 1945, referred to a case in which two men were fined £2 in the Geelong City Court on the previous day after being charged with committing an act involving cruelty upon a rabbit. The evidence showed that the witness on October 10 saw the defendants on National Park coursing ground with two dogs. The dogs were released and one defendant stood near to the entrance of the killing pen with a live rabbit in his hand. A rope was tied about the rabbit's flank. When the dogs reached the pen they jumped into the air and seized the rabbit. I sent a telegram to an association in Victoria yesterday to get the latest information, and I learned that the killing pen is still in use at White City. The *Sydney Morning Herald* of July 14, 1945, referred to a case before Mr. Hardwick, S.M., in the Central Summons Court, when the owner of a greyhound was sent to gaol for three months for having "needlessly caused a cat to be killed" by greyhounds. This shows that live lures have been used and that people have been convicted for doing so. That would not have been the case if there had not been cruelty. Mr. Shannon quoted a letter which had been

received from the Hobart Greyhound Racing Club, and contained the following:—

The R.S.P.C.A. in Victoria recently supported the introduction of the mechanical hare in preference to live hares, as at present used on Victorian racing tracks.

There is no R.S.P.C.A. in Victoria: the organization is known as the Victorian Society for the Protection of Animals. At my instigation Mr. Banister made certain inquiries in Victoria and in a letter dated October 15, signed by the secretary of that association, which Mr. Shannon said was a particularly reputable one, it was said that Victoria had never advocated the use of tin hares. Therefore it seems to me that there is much doubt as to what actually goes on in this type of dog racing. Mr. Shannon challenged Mr. Banister's mention of the killing pen, the existence of which I have proved from these two extracts. Mr. Shannon said:—

Mr. Banister was actuated by a motive not connected with the merits or demerits of the Bill.

That statement was entirely unwarranted. The R.S.P.C.A. has an extremely hard road to hoe, as it is very hard to get convictions for cruelty to animals. It should have the support of every member of this Parliament. At least two supporters of this Bill who have already spoken realize that betting will take place. Also cruelty will occur. The safeguards against cruelty which it has been claimed are used by the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club are not safeguards at all: cruelty will take place in this sport. Reports from various parts of the world of the evil social results attributable to dog racing show that it would be better for Parliament to reject this measure now than have to take drastic steps later when this sport gets out of hand. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—I oppose the Bill. I agree with most of the arguments raised by those who have already spoken against it, but there are one or two others to which I wish to refer. I do not question Mr. Shannon's sincerity in his belief that there would be no gambling on tin hare races, but the sport is such that I believe it would not function without gambling. In that view I am supported by the member for Stanley who interjected at one stage that dog racing could not exist without gambling. I do not agree with him that gambling is so ingrained in the Australian make-up that the Australian would gamble whatever action was taken to prevent him. I admit that some Australians are keen on gambling, but as a race not so keen as some

other races. I have travelled a little and have come into contact with people in different parts of the world. I have on occasion attended race meetings, trotting meetings, two-up schools, and poker schools. I have never seen Australians so excited over gambling as I have seen members of other races on two occasions which I vividly remember. One was at a cock fight in France, where birds equipped with 3in. steel spurs fought to the death. The Frenchmen crowded around, threw their money into the ring, and worked themselves into a frenzy such as I have never seen in Australia. The other occasion was when I watched Chinese labourers gambling in their camp. They also worked themselves up into a frenzy which I have never seen in this country. To say the Australian must gamble because there is something inherent in his make-up is wrong. The Australian is no more addicted to gambling than members of any other race. We should not encourage such a tendency. As far as I know there is nothing in dog racing which would entice people to watch it unless facilities for gambling were afforded. If this Bill is passed I am sure there will be gambling, even if it is illegal, and that before long an attempt will be made to legalize it. Usually I give the member for Chaffey credit for some logic in his speeches, but this afternoon he talked about much that had no connection with this Bill. He made one or two strange statements. I deeply resented his reflection on the honesty and sincerity of opponents of this Bill. He also quoted a statement of President Roosevelt that it was the function of Parliament to accede to pressure. Where does the pressure come from for the introduction of this measure? No-one has approached me with regard to it. So far as I can gather the pressure comes from a very few people interested in the breeding of greyhounds who desire to breed and race their dogs here with a view to selling them in other States where dog racing is run in conjunction with legalized gambling. There has been no pressure on me, and therefore there is no reason from that standpoint why I should support the Bill.

Mr. Moir—Has there been any pressure the other way?

Mr. MICHAEL—No; nobody has approached me.

Mr. Pattinson—You believe in maintaining the *status quo*?

Mr. MICHAEL—Yes, according to the rules of procedure, when there is insufficient evidence to warrant a change. The manpower and

materials which would be used in this sport would be better used in other directions in these times of shortages. The Premier said that it would be possible to hold up to 600 meetings in the year. Not nearly so many could be held without much materials and manpower being employed on work directly associated with this sport. I have never attended dog races in other States, but in travel I have met many people ready to express an opinion on dog racing and not one has attempted to justify its existence, although many have stressed its undesirability. That applies not only in Australia but throughout the world. In this regard Beverley Nicholls, a writer of repute, whose books are widely read, in his book *News of England*, describes a dog race meeting as follows:—

For of all the organized fatuities which have yet been devised to satisfy the cravings of a leaderless democracy, dog racing is the supreme example. Come with me to one of the most renowned tracks of London, and see this sport with unprejudiced eyes. The stadium holds, at a moderate estimate, 30,000 people. It is lit by lamps whose beams radiate into the foggy night, so that from a distance they looked like pale, ghostly ballerinas, with milk-white skirts, poised before a vast audience. It is bitterly cold. There is no gaiety. It is all strangely silent. Suddenly there is a roar. You stare out and you see a white streak flash round the course, followed by six other white streaks. And before you realize it, the race is over. How long does each race take? Thirty seconds? It doesn't seem as long as that, but even assuming that it takes a minute, it is indeed a brief reward for a quarter of an hour's wait, on a night like this. If I went to a play and each of the intervals lasted one hour (which is exactly the same proportion), I should demand my money back. But such an attitude would be regarded as eccentric by the devotees of the dogs. Turn round, and scan the faces of England's youth, lit by the lamp-light. They look doped. Hunched shoulders, caps over forehead, a half-burnt cigarette drooping from lips which occasionally part and reveal blackened teeth. Hands deep in pockets which still contain a few coppers left over from last week's dole. It is not an inspiring sight.

That description suggests that dog racing has undesirable characteristics. I realize that we cannot stop people from gambling by Act of Parliament; but it is our duty to do what we can to direct the community along lines that will give them a desire for things more uplifting than dog racing.

Mr. PEARSON (Flinders)—It would be far easier to give a silent vote on this measure than to speak on it, but one or two aspects have not been covered. I was surprised to learn that

the Bill would be introduced by the member for Onkaparinga because not long ago, when speaking on a motion regarding the minimum bet, he indicated that Parliament's time was being wasted on something of no importance. He said:—

I am amazed that we have been asked to consider this matter, especially in view of the major issues which the board should be considering. It could be advising the Government on major matters that have been raised during this session. For instance, I see no reason for having more than one country race meeting a week.

He then continued in that strain. Although he was opposed to allowing more than one country race meeting a week he introduced a Bill allowing 600 dog racing meetings a year.

Mr. Moir—That has never been suggested. That is one of the red herrings thrown in.

Mr. PEARSON—The Bill allows 600 meetings a year, and no-one can deny that.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Where could that number be held?

Mr. PEARSON—If that number could not be held there has been a fault in drafting the measure. The member for Onkaparinga and others supporting the Bill have been influenced because they are lovers of animals and take a keen delight in seeing animals performing at their best in competitions. One of my principal objections to the measure is that one authority is proposed to be set up as the governing authority which alone may issue licences to clubs for holding meetings. Only such clubs as are licensed will be able to hold meetings. The National Coursing Association will be the licensing authority and may collect the fee specified in the Bill from the club it licences. It may licence one club in the metropolitan area, which would enjoy a complete monopoly of patronage in that area. It may also license 10 clubs in the country. I am not so much concerned about that as about the fact that one club will have the entire control of the sport in the metropolitan area. I would not create a monopoly. My strongest criticism of the measure is that all the speeches I have heard or read supporting it have been entirely defensive. The speakers mentioned what harm it would not do, but I have not heard a word about what good it will do. It is the responsibility of any member introducing legislation to show what benefit it will confer upon the community. The arguments advanced in favour of the Bill have been purely negative and its passing would not produce anything of value. If the Bill had any good in it the fact would

have been brought before the House. I therefore assume that there are no positive reasons for supporting the measure and that there is no popular demand for it, nor will it serve any useful purpose. Some members have stated that the Bill would result in an increase in the breeding of dogs, but such dogs are bred entirely for speed, and not for stamina or intelligence. Animals are very useful in this country, particularly in rural areas, but the dog whose breeding would be stimulated by the measure does not serve any useful community purpose. I am satisfied there is much potential harm in the Bill. The member for Chaffey stated that we had been assured by the member for Onkaparinga that there will be no gambling associated with this sport and that we should trust him because he is a man of honour. I entirely agree that he is a man of honour, but that was a peculiar statement from the member for Chaffey because often he waxes eloquent in trying to convince the House that certain members are not to be trusted, particularly those supporting the Government. No member can say what will happen under this Bill in two, three or five years. We know from experience how public pressure builds up, and having established an institution there will be a growing pressure for the introduction of betting facilities for this sport. People cannot be made moral by Act of Parliament, but Parliament should not deliberately place a stumbling block in any person's way.

Parliament is responsible for the physical, mental, and spiritual welfare of the community. The Speaker opens the sittings with a prayer in which he refers to the responsibility of Parliament. I have not often attended dog races, but I know what would happen if this legislation became law. In 1922 whippet racing was conducted at the Prospect recreation ground, which later became the Prospect oval. I went to the ground as a child to see what the noise was all about. The dogs were nothing but a yelling, yapping mob of cadaverous streaks of lightning. That so-called sport had to be banned as a public nuisance. I was informed by the member for Prospect that it did not last more than six months because the residents complained of the noise and smell and general atmosphere. I remember being in Launceston on two occasions, the last in 1948. On a Saturday night the ebb and flow of population density was most marked. At tea time the streets were empty, but soon after they were full. At about 7.30

they were empty again. I made inquiries and found that the whole population of the town had gone to the dogs.

Mr. SHANNON—That shows the sport is popular.

Mr. PEARSON—In Launceston there are gambling facilities for the sport, but the honourable member says they are not sought here. I oppose the Bill not because of narrow-mindedness or bigotry, but because it will not do any good; there is no public demand for it, there would be great potential danger for the people of the State, and Parliament should prevent it from coming into operation.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—The members who oppose this Bill say it will increase illegal betting, but is there any form of sport where gambling does not take place? How many of those who oppose the Bill have attended a dog racing meeting? I attended one at Broken Hill and was impressed by the way it was conducted. I was surprised at the small amount of betting. There were 30 bookmakers at the grounds, but only four were betting on the dog races, the others being interested in the horse races at Melbourne and Adelaide. The money held by the bookmakers operating on the dog races was only a mere fraction of the money held by the other bookmakers. Mr. Jeffries opposes the Bill because he wants to protect the poor man, but the measure provides a sport to be indulged in by a poor man. Why doesn't he oppose the holding of horse races and betting facilities being provided at those meetings? Why should speed coursing be picked out? More illegal betting takes place in South Australia now than ever before. Members who oppose this measure because of the illegal betting which is likely to follow the acceptance of the proposal previously supported a Bill which imposed a winning bet tax; it was the most unfair Bill to go through this House.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member cannot continue to debate that measure.

Mr. DAVIS—Opponents of this Bill supported a move to increase the number of race days. When that Bill was discussed the gallery was not full of people opposed to the move. Members did not receive letters and brochures asking them to oppose it. It is only when something is put forward in the interests of the poor man that opposition is raised. The poor man can train and race dogs, but he cannot train and race horses. The breeding of good greyhounds could become an industry in this State. At present many of the dogs bred here are sent to New South Wales and

large sums of money are paid for them. We should not prevent breeders of dogs from trying out their animals. When the Premier introduced the winning bet tax he said it would bring a better type of horse to race in this State so why not support the Bill and have a better class of dog bred here? Mr. Pearson said that the passing of the Bill would mean dogs being bred for speed and not stamina, but if he wanted a dog for country work he would go to the man who bred dogs for the type of work he had in mind, and not to the man who bred dogs for speed. I remember the time when we had whippet racing in South Australia, and I do not recall any excessive gambling. Admittedly some noise was made at those meetings, but plenty of noise is made at football matches by barrackers. The Bill does not provide for betting at speed coursing meetings. Gambling takes place wherever sport is held. It would be as difficult to stop betting at coursing meetings as it would be to prevent people playing two-up. I hope the opponents of the Bill will realize that speed coursing is a poor man's sport. I remind some members that dog racing does take place in this State. I have seen in the country a man riding a horse and dragging a fur or some other object in the training of dogs. I know one club which holds regular meetings and it is doing good work on behalf of organizations in the town. There is a demand for speed coursing and I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—Obviously it devolves upon me to reply to certain criticism levelled against the Bill, especially criticism by the Premier, whose opinion is always listened to by members with respect. I would be the last to deny the Premier the right to express his opinion on any matter coming up for debate in this place. I have not always agreed with him on the many matters we have had to decide, but that does not in any way weaken my opinion of the thorough grip he has on all matters. Generally speaking, I wholeheartedly support him and the policy his Government pursues. I know he is acting with the best and highest motives in opposing the Bill. He believes that it will create another opportunity for gambling, and it is upon that aspect that opposition to the measure hinges. Mr. Hawker quoted cases of cruelty associated with the sport, but they took place where there was gambling. I am aware of the elements associated with any sport where gambling takes

place. I am not unmindful that in horse racing there are exposures which every decent man deplores. There is always somebody who is out by any scheme or strategy to get something for nothing. That, of course, is the gambling element. It is my duty to reply to remarks by the Premier and Mr. Jeffries. I know the latter so well that I do not for a moment doubt that he is actuated by the highest motives in opposing the Bill. He believes that it will bring about an undesirable state of affairs, and if I believed as he does I would be the first to oppose the Bill, but I do not so believe and I have therefore to bring forward evidence to show that it is not likely to occur in South Australia. It has been irksome to listen to some of the ill-informed argument on this matter. I suggest to any honourable member who finds he has made a *faux pas* in this debate that it may cure him of making statements without being sure of his facts.

It was suggested by the member for Torrens that if this Bill were passed within perhaps five years we should have so much illegal gambling in connection with this sport that Parliament would have to do something about it, either by repealing this measure or by legalizing the gambling so that people would not be continually breaking the law; but the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club has existed for 11 years—more than double the period mentioned by the honourable member. During the whole of that time no prosecution has been launched with regard to illegal gambling on this sport. The police are not only invited by the committee of the club to attend meetings, but are actually present at every one. It was not until the exhibition held in conjunction with the Royal Agricultural Show last year that the police awoke to the fact that this club was breaking the law. The mechanical lure was used for 10 years because the rules of the club debarred the use of live game. A stuffed hare was attached to the end of a cord which was operated by means of a handle.

It appeared to the dogs waiting in their boxes that there was a live hare on the track. When the dogs were released they raced away expecting the hare to be further ahead, whereas it had been drawn off the course by the operator. That method was carried out for 10 years without any attempt being made by the police to deny the club the privilege of racing in that way. No offences, either of a gambling or of any other nature, were reported by the police during that period; but when a similar event

was carried out at the showgrounds a police inspector, either because of his greater knowledge of the law or because he had had his attention drawn to the method of racing, launched prosecutions, and fines totalling over £120 were imposed on certain committee members—men with hitherto unblemished records. Yet these men were only conducting a meeting as suggested by the Royal Agricultural Society Committee in the same manner as they had been doing for 10 years!

The member for Flinders wants to know what good I hope to do by the introduction of this measure. An eminent lawyer has advised this club that these fixtures could be operated under the present law with a live lure. It would be perfectly legal for the club, if it wished, to liberate a live hare within almost smelling distance of the dogs in their starting boxes. That would be inhuman, as the hare would have little chance of getting away from the dogs on an enclosed track where it could not use its natural method of twisting and turning as in an open field. It would mean murder for the hare, and would not be countenanced by people with the sentiments which actuate committee members of the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club. This morning Mr. Hall, the secretary of that club, and I met a deputation regarding this matter. The deputation leader was good enough to say that he had no doubt about our sincerity. A few questions were asked and a few answers given by Mr. Hall and myself, but I am afraid that, as is usual in such circumstances, I made very few, if any, converts. I explained that gambling would not be permitted on this sport. As it stands today the law covering dog racing not only permits cruelty to the hare, but suggests that cruelty must be inflicted wherever the sport is conducted, because a tin hare may not be used. If our effort to eliminate a mediaeval idea with regard to the treatment of animals is considered as being bad for society, I do not know what is good for it. Frequently we debate such matters as the methods of handling and killing stocks, and I suggest from the humane point of view alone that the member for Flinders should thoroughly examine this law.

The Premier suggested that under the Bill over 600 meetings a year could be held throughout the State. He based that estimate on the fact that I seek to licence one club in the metropolitan area and up to 10 in the country in such localities as the National Coursing Association considers are warranted. The actual racing season for these meetings is from

October until April—a period fixed in the licence granted by the National Coursing Association. I understand the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club is perfectly satisfied with that arrangement. Obviously some dogs used during the summer months on speed coursing are later used for open coursing. I point out to Mr. Pearson that I would, perhaps, have incurred more of his criticism had I proposed to give the National Coursing Association the right to establish, not simply one track in the metropolitan area, but any number—a blank cheque, as it were. We do not want clubs which will not flourish because of lack of support.

Mr. Macgillivray—Are you not paying too much attention to the member for Flinders.

Mr. SHANNON—Perhaps I am, but he made a very good speech. Although I do not agree with all of it his approach to the question was good. Now I come to the brochure which the member for Chaffey dealt with a some length. I think every member has received a copy and some were not sure at first whether it did not comprise my own arguments against my own Bill, for the only name which appears on the front page is “Mr. H. H. Shannon, M.P.” Perhaps the authors’ courage failed them when it came to disclosing their names.

Mr. Hawker—I thought the honourable member published it.

Mr. SHANNON—Naturally the honourable member would. Those who criticize men in public places who are honestly trying to do something for the good of society should at least have the gentlemanly attribute of attaching their names as critics. Let me comment on the summary of arguments at the end of the brochure. Number 1—“The Bill provides another means of gambling”: I would not like to put my name to that statement when the Bishop of Adelaide and the Revs. Keik and Woollacott say quite fairly in their letter that my Bill does deny the right of gambling on dog racing. At least they are gentlemen and the others are, to keep within Standing Orders, incorrect. No. 2—“There is no public demand for this type of sport”: that has been said by many opponents of the measure, but in addition to the Adelaide Speed Racing Club there are clubs at Peterborough, Murray Bridge and other towns. Clubs are in the process of formation at Millicent and Kadina, with the possible revival of a club at Mount Gambier, so for anyone to say there is no public demand is simply to deny pure facts; it is merely the attitude of hiding the head in the sand—“I have not heard of it, consequently there can be no demand.”

Number 3—“The Coursing Restriction Act, 1927, was placed on the Statute Book for the purpose of suppressing a new form of gambling.” I have examined that Act and my friends who are very free with my name but not their own should have known their facts; one would have thought that the Act would be the first thing they would have turned to. It does not mention gambling and I propose to leave section 3 unamended, although I do propose to add a few words to it. There is no prohibition of gambling in that Act, otherwise why would I have to put it in by my Bill? Why did these eople say that the law of 1927 prohibited gambling when it did nothing of the sort? I do not think there would be any breach of the law if these folk carrying on greyhound racing used a live hare as a lure and applied to the Betting Control Board to have a licensed team of bookmakers because licensed bookmakers can operate at both open and plumpton coursing. I am pointing this out to show that those who so freely use my name are not adhering to facts. They are out to mislead this House in every possible way, and this is one of the unjustifiable things which members of Parliament, on occasion, have to put up with. No. 4—“The 1938 Royal Commission recommended that no betting facilities be granted for speed coursing”: That obviously implies that I am recommending betting facilities; no-one could read anything else into it. We all know that commissions in various parts of the world have pointed out the evils of gambling in connection with this sport, and I agree with that entirely, so that if these people want to bring arguments to bear as to why my Bill should not be carried they should at least say that Mr. Shannon’s Bill does prohibit gambling. On the contrary, their statement is totally unfair, for it suggests to the ill-informed reader that I am pressing to bring in gambling. No. 6—“It is the thin edge of the wedge for the establishment of wholesale gambling on tin hare racing”: I propose to allow certain sections of the existing Act to remain in force as I think they provide desirable restrictions upon this form of sport, but I shall read only subsection (5) of section 3 dealing with the restrictions on the use of a mechanical lure. It is as follows:—

(5) No person shall print, write, exhibit, publish, sell, circulate, distribute, post up, or cause to be printed, written, exhibited, published, sold, circulated, distributed, posted up, or given away any placard, handbill, card, writing, sign, advertisement, or notification

which directly or indirectly relates to any intended racing of dogs after a mechanical quarry, or to any gathering of persons for the purpose of witnessing any such racing.

I want that to go on record because that is what I am leaving unaltered and it has been overlooked by most members in this debate. It has been suggested that illegal gambling will be associated with this sport. The only illegal gambling connected with horse racing today is what is known as S.P. betting, off the course. Why is it possible and why is it prevalent? Largely because the press gives such full and detailed information, not only with regard to the form of horses, but what Ted Madigan or "Tracery" or "Aintree" says, and what someone else says is a track certainty, and so forth. All this encourages people who are not going to the races to look for a bookmaker to take their bet, and having done it once it becomes a habit; each week part of their spare time is spent in reading up the racing news. The publicity given by the press to race meetings is one of the major causes of increased betting.

Mr. Quirke—Would you stop it?

Mr. SHANNON—I am simply suggesting now steps desirable to prevent off-the-course betting on dog racing. The provision I have quoted, and which will remain in the Act, prohibits the publication of any information anywhere with regard to greyhound racing meetings.

Mr. Riches—That is an attack on printers.

Mr. SHANNON—The honourable member, perhaps, speaks with feeling, but he probably agrees with me that the more publicity there is about any sporting event the more people are encouraged to bet.

Mr. Riches—I agree with the honourable member that far.

Mr. SHANNON—I shall conclude on a point with which the Premier made a good deal of play—the possible number of meetings. He suggested about 600. The evidence I have is that these meetings occur only during the summer months and this means that in the city a maximum of 34 Friday nights is available; and inclement weather may preclude the holding of meetings on some of those nights and there is no provision for the postponement of any meeting. If 10 clubs were established in country towns the maximum number of meetings which would be held is estimated at 170, and that is likely to be in excess of the actual number. There is an established course at Peterborough now, and not more than one meeting a month has been held in the past.

That would considerably reduce the maximum of 170 meetings. The remark made both inside and outside this Chamber that the police force would be charged with an impossible task in policing these fixtures is denying the actual facts. In a town of any size where a fixture would be run members of the police force would be stationed, and in some cases there would be two or three of them. For instance, there are five at Peterborough. Obviously one or two could spend the Saturday afternoon at a dog racing meeting to see that nothing was done contrary to the law. I understand from Mr. Hall that all the clubs encourage the police to attend.

Mr. O'Halloran—And because the sport is so popular there is nothing doing "up the street."

Mr. SHANNON—That is so. The police will be asked to do no more than they do now in attending a horse race meeting. Mr. Hall told the deputation this morning that at the meetings held in the Payneham district during the last 12 months the average attendance was 800, with a maximum of 1,400. In the 10 years in which meetings have been held not one charge of illegal gambling had been laid against those attending, and every fixture is attended by the police. Among them have been Inspectors Duthie and Phin, and no-one would suggest that those officers are not energetic. I thank honourable members for giving this matter almost the same attention as an Address in Reply debate. I have never seen a private Bill so keenly debated, and I have been almost embarrassed by the support. On the other hand I pay a tribute to those who have opposed me. I know they are actuated by the best of motives and are convinced that the introduction of this sport will lead ultimately to illegal gambling. That is their considered opinion after giving it much thought. Mr. Hall said at the deputation this morning, "If in future while I am a member of the committee of this club an attempt is made to bring before Parliament a Bill to legalize gambling in connection with mechanical dog racing I will not only oppose it personally but use all the resources of my club to oppose such a move." When asked, "Would you be agreeable to the law being rescinded if such a move were successful?" he replied, "Certainly. It would be in the best interests of all concerned that rather than have gambling associated with this sport it should be wiped out." I am heartily in accord with the sentiments expressed, and if

honourable members had an opportunity to speak with the people concerned with the control of this sport some of their fears would be allayed.

The House divided on the motion that the Bill be read a second time—

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Davis, Dunn, Dunnage, Fletcher, Heaslip, Hutchens, Lawn, Macgillivray, McAlees, Moir, O'Halloran, Quirke, Shannon (teller), Stephens, Stott, Tapping, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Brookman, Christian, Clarke, Goldney, and Hawker, Hons. C. S. Hincks, S. W. Jeffries, Sir George Jenkins, and M. McIntosh, Messrs. McLachlan, Michael, Pattinson, and Pearson, Hon. T. Playford (teller), Messrs. Riches, Teusner, and Whittle.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Exemption of certain dog races."

Mr. HEASLIP—I move to insert "afternoon" after "or night" in line four of subsection (3) of new section 3a. This will give country clubs the option of holding a meeting either in the afternoon or night of any Saturday or public holiday not being Good Friday or Christmas Day. Under the clause as drafted a meeting could be held only on an afternoon. Some country towns have lighting facilities which would enable the sport to be held at night and they also have industries, some of which work shifts. This would preclude workers from attending meetings unless held at night or unless they absented themselves from work. No-one desires that this legislation should interfere in any way with industry.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not object to any country club having the right to say whether it will hold a meeting on Saturday afternoon or evening, but not both.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HEASLIP—I move:—

To insert after "afternoon" in paragraph (b) "or night."

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HEASLIP—I move to insert after subsection (4) of new section 3a the following new subsection:—

(4a) Where a club holds a meeting under this section on an afternoon, it shall not hold a meeting on the night of the same day.

This will ensure that a club cannot hold a meeting in the afternoon, as well as at night, on the same day.

New subsection inserted.

Mr. STEPHENS—I move to insert the following new subsection:—

(4b) A licence shall not be granted under this section to any club carrying on coursing for the purpose of profit or gain to the individual members of the club; and a licence held by any club so carrying on coursing shall be invalid.

The object is to prevent people from forming themselves into a club to make a profit out of the sport. Members are aware that other sporting bodies were ruined through making the sport a business.

Mr. SHANNON—Although the matter is covered by the rules of the National Coursing Association they can be altered, and the new subsection would prevent any likelihood of the sport being turned into a business activity. I have no objection to it.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have no objection to the new subsection, but I am doubtful whether it will do what Mr. Stephens desires. How is it proposed to police the matter? The mere fact of saying that a permit shall be invalid will not stop meetings from being held. What penalty is provided for the granting of a permit to a club if its individual members make a profit or gain? Any person who attended an illegal meeting would be liable to prosecution. Is the secretary of a club who receives an honorarium for his work included in this provision?

Mr. STOTT—The new subsection provides that a licence shall not be granted to any club carrying on coursing for the purpose of profit or gain to individual members of the club, and that if a club does so the licence will be invalid. Is the new subsection tight enough to prevent one individual who gets a licence from making any profit or gain?

Mr. SHANNON—My only fear is that it might be too tight. An individual or a group of individuals would not get a licence from the National Coursing Association to operate a meeting for profit. The amendment might prevent a member of a club who was the owner of a greyhound from accepting any stake it won, because the stake would be a gain to the individual. I suggest to Mr. Stephens that it would be wise at this stage not to pursue his amendment. He should accept the assurances given that the National Coursing Association will not issue licences to any proprietary body.

Mr. STEPHENS—I want the position safeguarded. I have seen some disgraceful things done by sporting bodies. I have known of men being told by a company running a sport, "You must lose tonight or we will not give you another match." However, I would sooner accept the assurances given by the sponsor of the Bill than see the Bill talked out. I am not prepared to be caught by a trick and not responsible for the measure not going through. If any club is formed into a proprietary body I will take action about it later.

Mr. Shannon—And I will help you.

Mr. STEPHENS—I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause as previously amended passed.

Title passed. Bill reported with amendments.

TRESPASSING ON LAND BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment and suggested amendments.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

Sitting suspended from 5.55 till 7.30 p.m.

BUDGET DEBATE.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from October 16. Page 947.)

Legislative Council—£7,215.

Mr. DUNNAGE (Unley)—I pay a tribute to the Premier for the way he introduced the Budget, and compliment him on making one of the shortest Budget speeches I have heard. The Budget contains record figures. Since 1941-42 there has been an extraordinary increase in Government expenditure. In that year it was £13,000,000; now it is £42,000,000. If the increase continues at the same rate in the next 10 years the expenditure at the end of that period will be £150,000,000. State expenditure is becoming colossal, and the future

seems to be in the lap of the gods. Several years ago the Premier placed great faith in the Mines Department, and it has been justified. It began with the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield, and now there is the task of developing our uranium deposits. The department is also doing good work in exploring the State for mineral deposits. I commend the Government, and the Premier in particular, for sending overseas Mr. Dickinson, Director of Mines. Every member will be wholly behind the Premier in spending money on developing our uranium deposits. Last night I spoke privately to him about the sending of a man overseas to gain valuable knowledge about brick production, and perhaps inducing someone to come here and produce bricks. I have the greatest confidence in Mr. H. S. Dean, and if he could go overseas to interview brick manufacturers it must be of help to the State. He might be able to induce someone to come to South Australia to produce from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 bricks a year, which number could easily be used. Before the war South Australia produced from 80,000,000 to 90,000,000 bricks a year; now the production is only from 45,000,000 to 50,000,000. Members have repeatedly brought the matter under the notice of the Government and the Industries Development Committee has tried to induce brick manufacturers to increase their output, but it has been successful to only a limited extent. We may get an extra 14 million to 20 million bricks, but that will not really meet requirements. We go to all sorts of trouble to bring Mount Gambier stone to Adelaide, make asbestos sheeting, import asbestos fibre, and find materials for wooden homes, but more should be done to produce bricks. We have all that is required except plant. If Mr. Dean could be sent overseas it would be money well spent in gaining knowledge of help to the State. Other departmental officers have been sent overseas but nobody has gone to inquire about brick production. Our housing problem is getting worse. Tonight I had a telephone message from one of my constituents who has to appear in court on Monday. He knows that if the Housing Trust will not assist him to get a home we will find it impossible to get one. If we exerted all our energies in the one direction of building houses the problem could be solved. If the Premier put as much time into house building matters as he does into other matters we might get a few more homes built. The Minister of Railways concentrated on bringing diesel electric engines to South

Australia and they will prove of incalculable value. If we concentrated on housing, and all members got behind the Premier the problem could be overcome. The Premier may say we have built 7,000 houses this year and will build 8,000 next year, but that will not be enough to meet the demand, especially as we have so many migrants coming here. To build 10,000 to 15,000 houses a year is only playing with problem. More should be done to help people who urgently need homes. Years ago many houses were built by private enterprise for letting, and up to the end of World War II. it was a successful way of housing our people. Then we had controls and ordinary investors could not build houses for letting; only the Government could do it. If private enterprise could do the job so successfully surely the Government could do more.

Mr. Macgillivray—Socialism controls the world, and not only South Australia.

Mr. DUNNAGE—It seems that the day of the private investor in connection with home building is gone. The man who owns a house and lets it is regarded as something like a criminal, according to what we hear. Many people come to me wanting houses. Since I have been in Parliament I do not think 200 homes have been built at Unley, because land is not available for the building of more, yet the population has risen from 17,000 to 22,000. This means that many people are living in rooms, apartments, tents and sheds. Other metropolitan members find it distressing to have people continually asking them for assistance to get homes. People come to me every night in the week for assistance, and I find their plight very distressing.

Mr. Macgillivray—Don't you think that your remarks call for a vigorous policy of decentralization away from Unley?

Mr. DUNNAGE—As chairman of the Industries Development Committee I have repeatedly said that the committee should not have to go out looking for industries. I believe it is the duty of members to come to the committee and make suggestions regarding industries suitable for their districts. Recently I received a letter from a gentleman in the Goolwa district with regard to the construction of a brick kiln. This is typical of letters which are forwarded direct to me.

Mr. Macgillivray—But you can't do anything about it except refer it back to the Premier.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have the right, as has every member, to submit a case to the Premier.

Mr. Macgillivray—But the Premier is trying to do everything.

Mr. DUNNAGE—If South Australians are not satisfied with the Premier they may elect another Party to office. Two years ago the late Mr. Chifley and his colleagues were put out of power in the Federal sphere because the people wanted a change.

Mr. O'Halloran—But in this State the answer lies in the distribution of electorates.

Mr. DUNNAGE—If that is so, it is up to the honourable member to see that the distribution is altered.

Mr. O'Halloran—You did not give us much support when we tried to alter it.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I considered your proposed redistribution was wrong. This State is fortunate indeed to have a gentleman such as Mr. Playford as Premier. Country members who talk so glibly about decentralization of industry and suggest that the Government has done nothing in this regard would be amazed if they stopped to realize what it has done. Many industries have been established in the country by this Government or at least assisted on the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee. One of the most valued members on this committee is a member opposite who helps in the establishment of industries in the country as well as in the metropolitan area. The committee is to inspect a big industry tomorrow to see whether financial assistance should be granted. The work of this committee is referred to in the Auditor-General's report. Last week I was surprised to see quite a number of Housing Trust homes at Kingston in the South-East—some already occupied and others in the course of construction. The Government would be willing to assist in the establishment of any worth-while industry brought to its attention by a member.

Mr. Davis—What about starting a brick kiln to make bricks?

Mr. DUNNAGE—If the honourable member has money to invest in a brick kiln or can influence somebody else to invest in such an industry the Government would consider assisting him. Today the building and staffing of schools is an urgent problem. In a school in my district in which I am interested the number of pupils is growing so rapidly that accommodation is lacking. The department promised 12 months ago to erect two temporary structures, but that work has not been started.

I hope that by the beginning of next year those additional rooms will be ready for occupation.

Mr. Stephens—That problem is present in every district.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes; the numbers in this school are increasing rapidly because of an increasing interest in higher education. At one time this school had no fourth year class, but today many girls are completing their fourth year with the idea of going into the teaching profession. The activities of the Education Department are given very little publicity, although I am amazed at times at that given to other departments. The staffing of our schools with the right type of teacher is a matter with which we are always concerned, but nowadays it appears that anyone may become a school teacher. Apparently nothing is being done to encourage our young people to enter the teaching profession, which is one of the best vocations they may choose.

Mr. Davis—If conditions were made more attractive more young people would become teachers.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Not necessarily; in the past not enough publicity has been given to their recruitment. Our young people should be told more about the advantages of a school teacher's career. I consider the salaries and conditions of the teaching profession are most attractive. If more teachers could be obtained conditions would improve still more because teachers would have smaller classes to care for. Many students from the Unley Girls Technical School have become school teachers, and I think they are doing a good job. This school is one of the few in this State which takes in trainee teachers. It has often been said that country teachers are forced to live under poor conditions but if those conditions were brought to the notice of the Minister he would probably consider the building or purchase of homes in those areas, as has already been done in some instances. I commend the Government for that move, which should help make the conditions of country teachers more attractive.

Mr. Shannon referred to the work conducted in our area schools. Recently I inspected area schools in Tasmania. I believe our area schools are superior to those in Tasmania, both with regard to the buildings and teaching standards. I also had the opportunity of seeing one of the new community schools recently established in that State. Launceston, a fair-sized town, has both a high school and technical school. There the school leaving

age is 16 and children not considered suitable for either of those super-primary schools are sent to the community school where they are taught to live as ordinary citizens performing useful work in the community. It seemed to me to be a great success. I do not know how it would apply in this State because our children go either to the high school or technical school and have no alternative. This community school is set in a delightful park-like area of 180 acres on the banks of the Tamar River, on the outskirts of Launceston. Each schoolroom is separate and set among the trees, and the whole atmosphere is delightful. The children are well trained, and the teachers apparently hand-picked, for I was very impressed with the headmaster and his wife. She looks after the hostel in which country children are boarded. At the time of my visit there were 48 girls at the hostel, which is a very old home converted for the purpose. I commended the headmaster and his wife on the work they were doing and said I hoped to take back the idea to my own State. I procured some literature on the subject and it is my intention to discuss it with the Director of Education when opportunity offers.

This afternoon we heard a great deal about gambling, and apropos of this I had a very interesting experience in Launceston, where I was introduced to a gentleman who is a teacher of science and mathematics in one of the ladies colleges and is, at the same time, a licensed bookmaker; during the week he teaches in the college and on Friday nights and Saturdays he is in the betting shop or on the racecourse. I thought this a most unusual arrangement and told the people there that it could not happen in South Australia, firstly, because we did not have dog racing with betting and, secondly, because we would not have bookmakers in a ladies college. Everyone knew all about it and this gentleman informed me that his contract had been renewed for a further two years.

Mr. O'Halloran—Was it a Government institution?

Mr. DUNNAGE—It was a private college. Although, as members are aware, I am not a betting man I seemed to become involved with bookmakers in Launceston, for I met another bookmaker—

Mr. Davis—Do you think the betting shops there are a success?

Mr. DUNNAGE—They appeared to be a success. Tasmania has a different system

from what we had. In Hobart the bookmakers are accommodated in cubicles in one big barn-like structure, and this is the only place in the city where they operate.

Mr. Davis—And it is at the rear of a hotel?

Mr. DUNNAGE—Yes. I went there on a Saturday afternoon and I estimate there were up to 2,000 people present. The interesting point is that the bookmakers operate in that betting shop on Saturday afternoons when there are no local races, but if there are races in the vicinity they close at mid-day; they are open all day Friday and Friday night and Saturday until mid-day, and I saw none of the terrible things we hear so much about in South Australia; I did not even see a policeman.

Mr. Stott—Do they take telegraphic bets from the country?

Mr. DUNNAGE—I do not know, but I think one could place a bet on almost any race in Australia. Everyone seemed to be quite satisfied with the system. I am quite certain, however, that it does not prevent illegal betting, nor do I think all the talk we heard this afternoon will do so, for I have a faint suspicion of what is happening with regard to illegal betting in South Australia today, and all the laws we pass will not affect it.

Our railways have been criticized fairly extensively during this session, but I have travelled a great deal on the Australian railways and I think our Minister is at last getting somewhere. When we can say the same about the railways of some of the other States I am sure one of our transport problems will have been solved. Everywhere I have been I have found our railways highly praised. I defy anyone to point to a better system in Australia and I congratulate our Minister and his department. I know they still have problems, but I believe they are being overcome and that in the very near future our railways will be in a position to transport all the materials and passengers offering. I saw in Albury a very grave congestion, with loaded trucks piled up on all the sidings around the town, and I should imagine that goods are being held up, not only for days, but weeks. It is pleasing to say that I have not seen anything of that kind in South Australia.

Mr. Macgillivray—Then the honourable member is not very closely in touch with conditions in his own State.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have travelled very extensively in South Australia and I know that the difficulties of the manufacturers are not nearly as great as the honourable member suggests they may be. Although it is gratifying to find our railways in such comparatively good shape, with even better conditions in the foreseeable future, we ought to be thankful that private enterprise has seen fit to undertake the transport of goods by road from the other States, for apparently that is the only way we can get many commodities, especially iron and steel from Newcastle. It ill behoves us to criticize these operators. On the contrary we should encourage them in every way to continue to operate until the Minister of Railways is in a position to handle all the goods offering. At the moment these transport companies are rendering great service to South Australia, and I hope that the Premier will not see fit to antagonize these people by prohibiting them from travelling on Sundays, as has been suggested by a Government supporter. That is uncalled for, but if we do take that action we should also prohibit the railways from shifting goods on Sundays.

I have often criticized the Government Tourist Bureau, but now I wish to pay a tribute to it. For years this department was far removed from the centre of activities of our railways and tourist organizations, but since it has been shifted nearer to North Terrace its business has grown so rapidly that soon it will be necessary to enlarge its quarters or find a larger building for it. It is one of our busiest Government departments. No doubt this is largely the result of the prosperity of the community, enabling people to enjoy holidays, which was not their privilege before. The department is rendering a great service to the State in helping to circulate money. It has developed to such an extent that it is one of the best tourist organizations in Australia, under the efficient control of Mr. Baker. I congratulate him on the Jubilee train which visited this State. Members of Parliament and the public were critical when it was suggested that it should come to South Australia, but I am sure that everyone who saw it was satisfied that the Government did the right thing. It was of great educational value.

I congratulate the Government on the Budget and hope that the £10,000,000 increase on the Budget of last year is not the forerunner of an increase of £20,000,000 or £30,000,000 next year. I am wondering when there will be an end to the amount of money which appears to be so readily available. One of these days the

reservoir will dry up and then I think we will get a jolt. It cannot be said that the State Government is throwing money away. During his speech the Treasurer said that no South Australian Government employee would be retrenched. That is interesting when one knows what has happened in the Federal sphere. The number of Commonwealth employees has increased rapidly in recent years, but the State service has not increased at a similar rate. In 1939 there were about 30,000 to 40,000 Commonwealth employees, and this grew this year to about 140,000. It is about time we knew whether this number was justified or not. I commend the Government and congratulate the Treasurer on what I think is the finest Budget brought down since I have been a member.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—Mr. Dunnage referred to the possibility of the monetary pool drying up. In 1933 our Budgetary expenditure was about £12,000,000, whereas this year it is more than £42,000,000, an increase in 18 years of £30,000,000. That is an indication of the State's development. Many years ago I drew attention in the House to the overseas public debt, and referred to the calculation of interest and the maturing of loans in London and New York. The Treasurer took no notice of my comment at the time. Today we find ourselves faced with an expenditure of £30,000,000 greater than 18 years ago and as a consequence the interest rates on loans are increasing. From an economic point of view no-one can seriously criticize the Government on its expenditure on public works while the development is justified, but under no circumstances can we continue paying the present tremendous amount of interest, which is absorbing much of our revenue. Possibly we shall reach the stage when interest will take such a large proportion of our revenue that a complete overhaul of our financial system will have to be undertaken in order to adjust our position to the economic set-up. Interest payments are leading not only Australia, but many other countries, to a grave state of affairs.

Today we see the disintegration of the British Empire taking place. Persia has taken drastic action to nationalize the oil industry which for years has been operating under the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. and now Egypt seeks to divorce itself from any form of British occupation. In addition South Africa contemplates certain steps to break away from the British Empire. It is time that the British people, including this Parliament, looked into the position to see where we are leading. In

1914-1918 India was promised self-government if it would throw its troops into the holocaust of war to contribute towards the efforts of the British Empire, but the British Government did not keep its promise and Gandhi stirred his people to such an extent that public opinion could not be appeased and as a result India became a self-governing nation. Pakistan followed suit, and now we have difficulties in Persia associated with the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. The Persian people, realizing that they were poverty-stricken, were concerned about the tremendous amount of money earned on Persian soil from its fabulous oil resources which was leaving the country in the form of dividends. That is the crux of the problem. Some years ago an officer of the C.S.I.R.O. was commissioned by the Commonwealth Government to enquire whether there were any soda ash deposits in Australia. After 18 months' investigation he reported that no suitable deposits were available in Australia. Six months later he left for Great Britain and was employed by the I.C.I., which commissioned him to report on the possibilities of suitable soda ash deposits anywhere in the world, and within six months he reported that Port Adelaide was the most suitable site in the world.

In South Australia we have a Public Works Standing Committee to inquire into all kinds of public undertakings, and it takes evidence from so-called experts. Unfortunately, it accepts their evidence as being gospel, and yet it can be proved time without number that they are wrong. I am not criticizing the committee, but there should be a greater realization by the men appointed to the committee that experts are not always right. It is the committee's job to inform Parliament whether it agrees with the experts' opinions. In 1933 or 1934 the Public Works Standing Committee inquired into the question whether the railway line should be broadened from Wolseley to Mount Gambier. The Chief Mechanical Engineer, the present Railways Commissioner, told the committee that the proposal was neither economical nor sound. He raised the question of loss of freight on goods between Mount Gambier and Melbourne. The expert evidence was that expenditure on the scheme was not warranted and the committee reported accordingly. A year or two later another inquiry was held and the same official gave evidence that the expenditure was not justified. I think that about 1944 or 1945 the committee held a further inquiry when the same official said that the proposal was

economical, although it would cost three times that of the 1933 estimate. That is the kind of thing that Parliament has to put up with.

Mr. Fletcher—You are wrong!

Mr. STOTT—If you read the report you will see that I am not wrong.

Mr. Fletcher—You are, definitely. I know why the proposal was turned down.

Mr. STOTT—In 1936 the Public Works Committee reported that transport facilities which would be required in connection with any scheme, including the broadening of the railway gauge from Wolseley to Mount Gambier, were not warranted, yet in 1944 or 1945 this official recommended its broadening.

The Hon. T. Playford—At the same cost?

Mr. STOTT—No, the costs had risen considerably. I turn now to the Loxton irrigation settlement scheme. The engineer in charge of the work is supposed to have designed the whole settlement, but I will prove that there will be a great financial loss on the undertaking. Unfortunately the Minister cannot do much about the matter as he is bound by the provisions of the Public Service Act so far as public servants are concerned. It is a sad state of affairs when high Government officers, who receive tremendously big salaries, make such grave mistakes. How long are we going to put up with the position of expert officers wasting thousands of pounds of the taxpayers' money? Something must be done about it.

Mr. Frank Walsh—Have you brought the matter under the Minister's notice?

Mr. STOTT—Yes, and I have also brought it before the House. Members will recall the opening of the undertaking by the Premier. A large channel, which narrows as it gets further from the river, has been constructed to supply water to the settlers' blocks. It was recommended that a pipeline instead of a channel should be constructed not far from the feeding point. Notwithstanding evidence given to the Land Settlement Committee the engineer would have nothing to do with a pipeline and a channel was constructed. Today the cracks in it are so wide that water seeps through to the blocks. It is essential that the channel be removed and a pipeline constructed. What is known as "C" channel is supposed to serve six settlers with water, but it is too narrow for the purpose. A dead-end channel, it has no provision for taking away the overflow; the water simply flows over the blocks and will eventually cause seepage. That will necessitate bores being sunk. The whole thing

is an engineering monstrosity. I do not criticize the Minister of Repatriation or the Minister of Works, but the engineer in charge of the scheme.

The Hon. T. Playford—Do you think that the Public Service Act should be amended?

Mr. STOTT—If the Government cannot get rid of a man he should be transferred where he cannot do so much damage. Every time I have mentioned the matter to the Ministers they have said that they are up against the Public Service Act. Settlers in the Loxton area know that this waste of money will become a debit against their blocks. It is not right that they should be saddled with the cost of mistakes of departmental heads. The Minister of Repatriation is doing everything possible to make a success of the Loxton scheme, but he is up against a difficulty in having an engineer in charge of it who is not in his department. There arises the question of whether the settlers should have portable sprays as against permanent sprays. The matter was investigated in the Ellerslie area in New South Wales where eight or nine permanent sprays were installed and proved successful. The settlers at Loxton were dissatisfied with the portable sprays because they have to be shifted in different lines. A tremendous amount of their time is taken up in shifting sprays on a block of 20 to 25 acres. The settlers say the portable sprays are not such a nuisance when the trees are young, but they will create difficulties when there is not so much room between the rows when the trees get older. Those on the blocks say it would be much better if permanent sprays were installed. In fairness to the Minister of Lands I mention that he received a deputation at Loxton from the settlers, at which departmental officers were also present, heard the views put forward, and said he would have an inquiry made into the matter and a test carried out to see which system was the better. However, there have been delays in carrying out the inquiry.

Mr. Macgillivray—I do not think there is any question which is the better method; the question is whether the extra expense of permanent sprays is warranted.

Mr. STOTT—I believe permanent sprays are better, but there is also the problem of water pressure. However, I think that could be overcome. I do not know whether the departmental officers have decided which is the better method. Now that I have ventilated these matters I hope that the Minister will be able to take them up with his officers and have them

rectified. It may be found that the transmission lines are not capable of relaying sufficient power to lift the water from the channel and drive the pumps and give a satisfactory pressure of water. If so, the power lines at Loxton may have to be taken down if a permanent water scheme is installed. It is time all this unnecessary expenditure was stopped. The settlers at Loxton are not ungrateful for what the Government, the Minister of Lands, or members of Parliament have done for them. However, there are many other things that should have been done, and the provision of permanent sprays is one. The problem of applicants not yet settled was debated in this House not long ago. I believe that the qualifications of all applicants should be examined so that they can be told whether they will ever get a block.

Mr. Macgillivray—It is too late now.

Mr. STOTT—I do not think so. The Minister has stated that applicants are becoming apathetic, but before they settle down in other jobs they should be told of their prospects of ultimately getting a block. I realize the Minister is up against the problem of whether he will have sufficient land to settle all applicants, but surely he should know whether there is sufficient land available to settle, say 300 or 500 ex-servicemen. He should make an assessment of how many soldiers he can settle and inform the applicants accordingly so that they will know whether they will get a block. The unsuccessful men could then map out a future for themselves elsewhere. To have to continue in a temporary job day after day and month after month in the hope of eventually getting a block, but never getting one, is heartbreaking. Further, it is an injustice to the soldiers who fought for democracy. An expert was told by settlers with practical experience of watering fruit blocks that the pressure boxes recommended by him would not be satisfactory. Many of them burst three years ago and have never been replaced. That is another instance of bad administration within the department. The settlers recommended that a pipeline be taken through Tunbridge's land, but their practical knowledge was ignored and the system installed has proved a complete failure. After two long discussions with the settlers I have concluded that permanent sprays should be installed in this area. I think perhaps the Minister would concede that a soldier settler should be appointed to the committee. He could help the experts with his practical knowledge. Only a 5ft. rise is provided at present,

but the settlers think it should be 10ft. If it is found subsequently that they are right further expenditure will be entailed, thus adding another expense for the settlers to carry. They think it would amount to about £3 10s. for the extra rise. Departmental officers told me it was difficult to provide pumps quickly because of the shortage of manpower. I suggest that the Minister should see if it is possible to employ private contractors to instal extra pressure boxes, as well as pumps and motors. I understand that private contractors are doing that work on the Ellerslie scheme. Pressure boxes were installed by the expert against the advice of the settlers who have had years of practical experience. Many of these pressure boxes burst, and will now have to be replaced at extra cost to the blocks. This sort of waste must cease.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—I think the settlers are happy enough with their lot.

Mr. STOTT—They are grateful for what the Government has done and there is no criticism of the way the Minister has handled this settlement. He has always given the men a sympathetic hearing. He was not prepared to accept the expert's views on the spray system and called for a demonstration of the two methods. That was the right way to approach the problem, for if the Minister had not been firm the expert would have got away with his ideas and the settlers would have been saddled with portable sprays instead of permanent ones.

Mr. Quirke—Have any homes been affected by seepage?

Mr. STOTT—The second home on the line has great cracks in the walls which I believe were caused by seepage. Only about nine or 10 chains separate the first and second homes and because of the contour of the land the water flows past the first one but affects the second. This will result in another debit through not putting a pipeline in. The required trellis posts were supposed to be delivered last year, but they have not all arrived yet. The 1950 planting trellises have not all been delivered. I know it has been difficult to get posts, but when they arrive they should not all be dumped on one block. One settler cannot handle them all, so they should be distributed amongst several. They would then be ready to receive the next lot on arrival.

The Hon. T. Playford—Is the honourable member discussing the line "Soldier settlement"?

Mr. STOTT—Yes.

The Hon. T. Playford—That is not in the Estimates.

Mr. STOTT—If the Premier is trying to call me to order I shall refer him to the Auditor-General's report, which has been tabled. The Loxton irrigation area has not been open very long, but it already has one bad seepage area. The Minister of Irrigation asked a departmental officer to make an inspection, and he recommended that a bore be put down, but so far it has not been done. The sooner it is done the better it will be for everybody concerned. The present sustenance allowance is £6 2s. 6d. a week, but on present-day cost of living figures that is inadequate.

The Hon. C. S. Hincks—It has been increased to £6 10s.

Mr. STOTT—I am glad to hear that. I know that the Minister took up the matter with the Commonwealth authorities, and I did so too, and I got a reply a week or two ago that it would be looked into and a decision made. One point for criticism is that some of the ex-servicemen settlers have to sign a form if they go on to other work for two weeks. If they grow vegetables they are told that they do not get the £6 10s. a week, but other settlers do not grow vegetables, and their position is difficult. I questioned the Minister recently about the £300 allowance and he told me that it had been increased to £400. The £300 was fixed on a horse basis at Loxton, but now only two of the settlers work on that basis. The others have gone in for tractors, and for them the £400 is insufficient. As much as £60 can go in the cost of a tyre. If an estimate were made of the cost of the implements required on the small blocks the result would be surprising. In Victoria there is an allowance of £1,000. The South Australian allowance should be increased to an amount approximating present-day costs. The settlers are happy about what has been done for them, except in one or two instances, but they do not like the departmental complex. They say that every time they go in to talk over matters with the department no notice is taken of what they suggest, and that is what they call a departmental complex. Their suggestions have been proved to be right, although they have not been accepted by the departmental officers. I understand that the valuation in the Loveday area will be made this month. The Loxton settlers are anxious to know when their valuation will take place, and they hope it will be speeded up. They took an unfavourable

view of the Premier's action in closing a debate concerning ex-servicemen in this place recently and not giving me an opportunity to speak. I told them that it was the first time I had been gagged in Parliament, and they did not like it. I told them to be patient, because when the Budget was introduced I would have the opportunity to bring matters forward.

The Hon. T. Playford—You say the Minister has done a good job, yet you voted for the motion of no confidence recently.

Mr. STOTT—I voted for it because the Premier would not give me the opportunity to speak and to put forward matters on behalf of the settlers. If I had been allowed to speak the Government would have benefited.

The Hon. T. Playford—The honourable member had made up his mind previously to vote for that motion.

Mr. STOTT—No. The Premier is not clever enough to guess what is in my mind. He may be able to do so with Government members, but not with me. The matter of transport seriously affects the Upper Murray districts. The railway to that part of the State is not good. Some time ago I recommended that our railway services be speeded up by the use of diesel-electric locomotives on main lines, which would enable other engines to be used on other lines. I congratulate the Government on at last getting diesel-electric engines for use on our main lines. Experts said it would not be possible to use them because it would be expensive to purchase the necessary oil, but it has been done. We have, generally speaking, a wonderful lot of departmental officers, but there are one or two gaps and it would be advisable to consider them before we waste too much of the taxpayers' money. The Yinkanie-Waikerie railway line should be improved to give a better service. Today with the high river the Kingston, Berri and Swan Reach punts are out of action, which means that all the traffic must be diverted through Blanchetown. When I came through Blanchetown the other day I had to wait behind 50 motor cars waiting their turn to cross; and this is not a busy period! Surely the Government must be convinced by now that a bridge is necessary at Blanchetown. The proposed railway from Morgan through Cadell to Barmera will not be able to adequately service the industries which are being developed along the river. The Upper Murray areas must be served by a modern road transport system. The interstate tourist traffic alone requires it. Why should traffic be diverted north of the river and through

Morgan when, with a bridge at Blanchetown, it would have a continuous highway? Why were not locks made to take bridges across them? The lack of foresight shown by experts has cost this State thousands of pounds, and now those experts are laughing at us because under the Public Service Act they cannot be touched.

When I was in Vancouver I had the pleasure of seeing the tremendous suspension bridge called the Lion's Gate Bridge across the harbour. The distance between the two points it connects is about twice as far as that across the River Murray at Blanchetown. The Vancouver bridge obviates the necessity of pylons in the centre of the river which would be necessary with an ordinary bridge. I was told that many years ago the people of British Columbia asked their Government to build a bridge across the harbour but were told that it would cost the Government too much money to acquire the land necessary on one bank. Public agitation for the construction of the bridge proceeded for three years, after which the Government gave the right to a public company to purchase the land alongside the river, erect the bridge, and charge a toll for its use. The public is still paying a toll and the company has reaped many times the original expenditure incurred. The people of the Upper Murray districts would be prepared to pay a toll to cross a bridge at Blanchetown. If this Government is not prepared to spend money on a bridge there it should give people in those areas the right to form a public company and later to charge a toll for the use of that bridge.

The Royal Commission on State Transport Services has recommended the electrification of the suburban railway system, but what will be done with regard to the Adelaide railway yards before that system is installed? It is obvious that the Morphett Street Bridge is an impediment to the present railway system. When will the Adelaide yards be widened so that the electrified system may be the more easily handled? The present steam trains must run into a bottleneck under the Morphett Street Bridge which should be lengthened to stretch right across the River Torrens so that the yard could be widened and the trains run through unimpeded. The Morphett Street Bridge itself should be widened so that it could take a modern trolley or diesel bus service—preferably the diesel bus because it can pick passengers up close to the kerb and does not require overhead transmission lines. Such a service could satisfy the transport

requirements of the northern suburbs. Today Adelaide is developing rapidly and the Premier has great visions of developing the Smithfield area, which will increase the amount of north-bound traffic through the city which at present must use King William Street. Today this street forms a bottleneck with its heavy vehicular traffic and with many people waiting in the centre of the street for trams. The trams and tramway poles should be removed from King William Street and a modern trolley or diesel bus service installed. Then passengers would not have to wait in the middle of a busy thoroughfare. The experts may say it will cost too much money, but this development must come within the next five years. Why not start now instead of waiting for five years when materials will probably be even dearer than they are today?

Reference to the Smithfield area opens up the big question of what is going to happen to South Australia. This Parliament must face facts. There must be greater incentives to all forms of cereal production. It is quite possible that in the near future we will be debating what we can do to increase production of food-stuffs in Australia, yet it is proposed to take some of the best land in South Australia out of production. Incentive for production is brought about in two ways; Australia, in her wisdom and her necessity, became a member of the United Nations and an important bastion in the Pacific Ocean, and she must undertake the task of being the food producer in the event of hostilities. War may never come, but even in peace it is still imperative to help our near neighbours. Under the Colombo plan we are committed to making contributions towards the recovery of Colombo and other Asiatic nations in the Near East, which is an excellent idea. However, under the International Wheat Agreement our quota is 88.7 million bushels. The estimated production for this year is 145 million bushels. Internal consumption is going up and it appears probable that we will be able to export only 50 million bushels instead of our quota of 88.7 million. What is the reason for this falling off in wheat acreage, particularly? Mainly it is due to lack of labour and the terrific cost of goods—

Mr. Davis—I thought you said that they were cheap.

Mr. STOTT—I said they were cheap today compared with what they will be five years hence. In view of the prices they have been receiving for stock feed wheat farmers have

become disheartened, particularly as they have to pay such heavy taxation. The industry has been very busy in recent years trying to get this problem rectified, and I believe we have reached the stage when we can overcome it. On Monday we held a conference in Canberra on the question of getting an agreement with the Commonwealth Government and the States. The Commonwealth's proposal is that the price for wheat for stock feed should be lifted to the ceiling limit of 16s. under the international agreement, and because that would increase the price of wheat to stock feeders and thereby increase the cost of production of eggs the Commonwealth Government will subsidize the egg industry to that extent. The State Ministers of Agriculture then conferred, but, with the exception of South Australia, they all voted against the Commonwealth's proposition, saying, in effect, that they were not prepared to accept it without submitting it to their respective Cabinets, but contending that the Commonwealth Government should increase the subsidy to the pig and poultry industries. That does not bear investigation, and I commend our own Minister of Agriculture for the stand he took at the conference, for I consider that the attitude of the Commonwealth Government was right. The other State Ministers will put the pig and poultry industries in a false position if they persist with their policy of forcing those industries to go to the Commonwealth Government for a subsidy each year. That sort of thing is out of date. We remember what happened in regard to butter. Production costs went up, and the Commonwealth Government went to its limit of 1s. 1½d. They could not get agreement among the States, and the butter industry is left high and dry until the present dogfight is settled. We will see the same thing in regard to the pig and poultry industry, for the other States are trying to force the Commonwealth Government to give subsidies. The egg industry will be subsidized for the time being by a subsidy. I submit that it is wrong, but it has to be accepted at the moment because there is insufficient time to get a proper index formula determined before the new price is declared on December 1. The subsidy will tide this industry over, but it should have an index formula, when the subsidy would be adjusted automatically with the rise or fall in the cost of production. The wheat industry, which was wise enough in 1946 to adopt a stabilization plan, is now on a formula basis, and it is time the other industries came into line.

Mr. Pattinson—Can the honourable member work out some formula for subsidizing the consumer?

Mr. STOTT—The consumer has his answer in the Arbitration Court and the "C" series index. All that is wrong with it is that the series is not wide enough to cover all the costs of the housewife. I remind my friend that the wheat industry is rendering him a great service because he is able to buy bread at the cost of production price, whereas without the stabilization plan wheat for flour would probably cost 20s. 6d. a bushel instead of 7s. 10d. The wheat industry has made its contribution to the economic welfare of this country. Only on Monday last I made a speech before the Agricultural Council and said, "The wheat industry does not want to depart from the principle of linking flour to the guaranteed price." In other words, we do not expect the export price to be linked with the flour price. We have linked our industry with the index series principle and the Governments of the other States are on a wrong basis in trying to force the pig and poultry industries to go to the Commonwealth Treasury annually for a subsidy to cover their costs. It will be difficult, I submit, for the pig industry to justify an increased subsidy in view of the prices it is receiving today. However, I am not against them. If they can prove their costs they are entitled to an increase, but they will have to put their industry on a proper foundation and adopt the index formula.

Although an improved water supply for Swan Reach has been approved, it is a long time being put under way and I should like the Minister of Works to expedite it. The local wharf is also in bad repair and with the high river the damage is increasing daily. A matter which concerns every citizen of the State is the dread disease of poliomyelitis. I recently had the pleasure of listening to an address delivered by Sister Elizabeth Kenny at Canberra on her methods of treatment. No person could fail to be moved by her wonderful outline of her work in the U.S.A. She told how 85 per cent of the children she treated had recovered. She needs no visa to enter America, being the only person in the world with that distinction. That speaks for itself. She has been to Portugal and Greece and many other countries, including Canada and New Zealand, where she is welcomed with open arms. She spoke of her experiences in Moscow where she said to her audience with her dry humour, "I have no politics, but I do

not like yours." She was told, "We will open the curtain and let you try your treatment," and her reply was, "That will be all right so long as you keep it wide enough open to enable me to get out again." Numerous Elizabeth Kenny clinics have been established in America. Our Minister of Health has said that everything possible is being done in South Australia to counteract the disease, but why is the Government not prepared to try the Kenny treatment here? There is no Kenny clinic or institute in South Australia. The British Medical Association would possibly say that the system had not been proved beyond doubt. Sister Kenny herself admits that she does not get 100 per cent results, but she has achieved 85 per cent success in Portugal and America. At Waikerie numerous cases of this disease have been reported. I should like to see the Minister of Health establish a Sister Kenny clinic in South Australia where girls could be trained to undertake this system of treatment. Surely it could do nothing but good. It has been sufficiently successful to induce the Queensland Government to stand behind her methods. The New Zealand people are also impressed. One delegate from that dominion at a conference of women's organizations at Canberra gave wonderful praise to Sister Kenny for her work there. If they have clinics in New Zealand and other places, why cannot the Minister of Health establish one here? I am not saying that he has done nothing to combat the disease and believe he would try to do everything possible to annihilate it. I support the motion.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—Housing is the most important question confronting the State. I commend the South Australian Housing Trust for what it has achieved, but much more should be done. Many members are daily worried by people who are forced to live in hovels and tents that are not fit for animals. Some are living in houses that have been condemned by the local health authorities as being unfit for human habitation. We are not doing half as much as we should to house the people. The Government says that it cannot build more homes because of the shortage of materials, but it alone is responsible for these shortages. Some years ago I asked in the House why there was such a shortage of cement here and was told that more could not be manufactured because of the shortage of coal, but when that difficulty was overcome the Government made the excuse

that it could not get the machinery to make more. Yet, I was told by a Liberal member of the Legislative Council that his firm could, if given an order, go straight ahead and manufacture all the machinery necessary for the production of cement. I have often wondered why the Government does not manufacture cement, which is required, not only for home building, but for road, wharf and railway construction. Recently I looked up the list of shareholders of one cement company and found that two of them did not live in South Australia. It is time the Government decided to do something for itself. It is no use it saying, "We will subsidize these private companies," which only manufacture cement to make profits. Before more migrants are brought to this State we should see that our own people are reasonably housed. If a man owns a horse and does not house it in a decent stable he is prosecuted. Every day people come to me requesting assistance in obtaining a house. I had a request today from a man living in the Torrens electorate and a day or so ago had a request from a man at Port Pirie. In opening the Thirty-second Parliament on June 26, 1947, the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Mellis Napier, said:—

An urgent need of the State is increased population. The shortage of manpower is being felt in all fields of activity—in industry, in the public services, and in developmental undertakings. At least 14,000 additional workers could be employed immediately. The Government is closely co-operating with the Commonwealth immigration officers. Under an arrangement between the Commonwealth and the States, the Commonwealth has undertaken to find ships to bring migrants from Great Britain to Australia, and the States have agreed to provide accommodation and employment for migrants on their arrival. My Government has completed its preparations for carrying out this arrangement, but the Commonwealth has so far been unable to secure an adequate number of ships. No migrants have yet arrived in this State, and very few are likely to arrive this year.

Speaking in the Address in Reply debate that year I reminded the Government that it had promised to find accommodation and asked how it would be done. The reply was that when migrants arrived they would get decent housing accommodation, but they have not yet received it. Migrants are being placed in disgraceful hovels. I have seen places where men, women, and children are herded together in a disgraceful manner. Today I saw some who were living in tents. I inquired into a case today in which a husband, his wife and two children were living

in a caravan, which leaks. A child was born recently and later sent by the doctor to Mareeba Babies Hospital. He told the parents that if the child was returned to the caravan it would not live long. I know of another family living in a tent and every morning they get out of bed they have to put their feet in water, the tent being surrounded by it. They cannot obtain better accommodation. This is only one case of many. I have a list of names of returned soldiers wanting homes; yet while all these things exist we invite people from other parts of the world to come here and live under disgraceful conditions.

Some time ago I said that if some of the foreign migrants who were brought here were not watched and more severe penalties meted out to them for offences they committed there would be serious trouble in Port Adelaide. Members are aware of one shocking case which occurred in the area recently. Every day we read newspaper reports of offences being committed by migrants, yet we provide them with homes that our own people cannot obtain. It is high time the Government made a thorough investigation into the housing conditions of our people. These shocking housing conditions do not exist at Port Adelaide only, but in many other districts in South Australia. We are jamming people together in the metropolitan area like sardines. There is plenty of room in the country areas, but the Government encourages large industries to establish factories in the metropolitan area. No part of South Australia has a greater increase in the number of factories and workers than the metropolitan area. There are nearly 30,000 people in the Port Adelaide district. Many people are leaving the country and coming to live in the city and it is high time we built more factories in the country to keep people there. We talk about decentralization, but it would be much better if we practised it. If we cannot bring water to the factories we should take the factories to the water and many could be established along the banks of the Murray. That would require a better transport system, but we could soon provide that when the factories were erected.

I turn again to cement. We cannot supply ourselves with all the cement required because the Government's policy is not to interfere with private enterprise. We are making hundreds of people in this State suffer so that the cement companies can keep control of the position. If it is right for the Government to supply people with timber from its forests

and provide them with railway and postal facilities, should it not also supply them with cement? There must be a reason for the Government not establishing its own cement works. I do not want to name the shareholders of cement companies, but some people would get a surprise if they knew who they were. It is a disgrace that people desiring to build homes are prevented from doing so because they cannot get the necessary materials. Several residences on the Port Road have been turned into factories, storerooms, and other such premises. The former residents have had to occupy other houses that could have been used by others desperately in need of them. We are often reminded that there is a shortage of materials for houses, but on the Port Road many stores, warehouses, and carriers' premises are being built with good stone which could be used to erect first-class houses. A prohibition was placed on the use of cement for paving purposes, but the entrance to the motor garage of the Queenstown Police Station was made with cement. No motor car has yet crossed it, yet cement was used when people needing it could not get supplies for home building. I regret to have to continue complaining on these lines, but every day some unfortunate person comes to my home asking me what I can do to get him a house. He may be living in a condemned house. If any member would like to see these unsatisfactory dwellings I would be pleased to show him over them. People do not live in filthy hovels because they are dirty themselves, but because they have nowhere else to go. Often the walls are falling down and are damp. It is dangerous to live in them, yet we do nothing to help the people.

When the session opened we heard many complaints from members opposite about the slow turn-round of ships at Port Adelaide. For a long time the waterside workers were criticised, but complaints from members opposite ceased suddenly. Nothing was heard for some weeks until yesterday, when one member referred to the slow turn-round. Why did the criticism suddenly stop? It was because members on this side challenged the Government to appoint a commission to inquire into the matter, but the challenge was not accepted. Instead, it appointed one Government officer to go into the question, but he has not had a chance to complete his inquiry. The waterside workers are willing and ready to give evidence, but the Government does not ask the officer to go ahead with his inquiry. Some members have asked several times when the report will be

available. Has evidence been invited? Evidence could be submitted to open the eyes of members opposite. Often waterside workers have been waiting to go to work, but a ship has not been brought into a vacant berth. Ships have been refused the right to berth because preference is given to a certain shipping company. Because of this a wharf has been kept unoccupied. The people have to foot the bill in paying the waterside workers waiting time, but the men are willing to work. Why are not these facts put before the public?

Many criticise the waterside workers for their so-called go-slow policy. Some say the men are not handling as much cargo as they used to. However, the men handle hundreds of tons of cargo for which they get no credit. Many vessels come to the port with overstowed cargo. That for other States is often placed on top of cargo bound for Port Adelaide. As a result the employees have to unload perhaps 500 tons of cargo and store it in the sheds before unloading cargo for South Australia. Then the cargo for other States has to be put back into the ship, but the people are told that the men only handled the quantity landed for South Australia. Actually, they handled 1,000 tons more. Members on this side of the House wanted an inquiry a few days ago in regard to the handling of imported cement, but it was not held and we have received no report about who was right or wrong. However, a judge was appointed to go into the handling of cement in another State and he stated plainly that the trouble was not all the fault of the waterside workers. Mr. Bishop has not had the time to complete his investigation. It was a big mistake to appoint a public servant to conduct an inquiry, for he might have to criticize the actions of another public servant. I asked that a judge of the Supreme Court be appointed and that he be enabled to devote his full time to an inquiry. I hope the Government will not allow my requests to go unheeded. I would like a full inquiry into housing matters. Before bringing more migrants to South Australia we should house our own people. If war broke out tomorrow I am sure the Government would ask the Australian people to defend the country, and they would do so; therefore we should treat them with the respect they deserve and give them decent housing conditions before bringing other people here.

Mr. MICHAEL (Light)—Last night Mr. Frank Walsh dealt with many subjects, some of which seemed to have no relation to the

Budget. He mentioned my district and to one statement I said he did not know what he was talking about, so I shall endeavour to point out where he was wrong. When speaking about the money to be spent on the reconstruction of the Warren main he said:—

Through the improved Warren system a few wealthy landowners will get a greater security and they will be able to change from wheatgrowing to sheep grazing because of the assured water supply. I cannot agree with Mr. Shannon that the expenditure of the estimated £3,000,000 will create new industries. In fact, I do not think it will mean the engagement of one extra man in rural production.

That statement shows that he does not understand the position in my district. Much of the area served by the Warren reservoir is represented by Mr. Teusner and myself and we can produce evidence to show that there has been a great increase in production, and that decentralization is taking place. If the honourable member travelled along the bitumen road from Greenoch to Stockwell he would find that several properties have been subdivided with new homes being built. I do not know of any country served by the Warren reservoir where there is a great aggregation of holdings. I know of no other part of the State where more has been done in subdividing holdings and decentralization. Production has increased on land that is not of very high fertility. I challenge anyone to prove that more is being done in another locality than is being done in the Barossa Valley. In an earlier debate I referred to the industrial activities in various towns in my electorate. They are not big industries individually, but they are successful and the people working in them have no desire to get into the metropolitan area. To say that the Government is doing nothing to bring about decentralization is a lot of nonsense, because it is being done. I think the Government has done everything possible to bring it about.

Mr. O'Halloran—Tell us what the Government has done.

Mr. MICHAEL—It has built houses and despite criticism we have heard we have a railway service which compares more than favourably with railway services elsewhere. People from the Barossa Valley do not want to be spoon-fed. They have a determination to make use of the opportunities available to them. Expenditure on the reconstruction of the Warren system is amply justified. A large section of the area served by it is not yet reticulated, and cannot be because the present

pipes are too small. At Freeling, where industries are growing, negotiations are taking place with the Commonwealth Government for the housing of 60 men who can be employed in local industries if a hostel is available for them. At present the water pressure in the summer in my district is not always good. More could be done if there were a better water supply. The Government plans to bring Murray River water in to the Warren reservoir and to increase the size of the mains. This will provide the water which the people want, and make the area still more productive. No other part of the State could have money spent on it in improving a water supply and get the same increased production. The reconstruction of the Warren water scheme will undoubtedly mean greater production. Generally speaking the Government has done a really good job and is probably doing more than any other Government would do to bring about decentralization. Members opposite have offered many suggestions but have not

suggested where the manpower and materials for their schemes could be obtained. I support the motion.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—“That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Industries Development Act, 1941-1949.”

Motion carried. Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 18, at 2 p.m.