

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 17, 1956.

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

QUESTIONS.**RAILWAY STANDARDIZATION.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier's attention been drawn to a statement on the front page of today's *Advertiser* relating to a report to be tabled shortly in the Federal Parliament from the Government parties' Rail Standardization Committee, a body under the chairmanship of Mr. Wentworth? The article gives a fairly lengthy explanation of proposals that are to be submitted for various sections of rail standardization to be carried out in the near future. Can the Premier say whether this is an official body and, as South Australia's interests are vitally affected by rail standardization, whether any evidence was taken to ascertain views in this State, particularly those of our Railways Department, on the matter and whether there is any prospect of this report affecting the reasonable agreement which has been approved by both State and Federal Parliaments for the ultimate standardization of Australian rail gauges?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I have not seen the report of Mr. Wentworth's committee. I do not know what it proposes, nor was I consulted about its preparation. On two or three occasions, in conversation with me, Mr. Wentworth has discussed general railway matters and the Government's attitude particularly on the Port Pirie-Broken Hill section. I believe he has also conversed with the Railways Commissioner. As far as I know his committee did not sit in Adelaide to take evidence, but I believe it went to Western Australia. I do not believe the Railways Minister has been consulted and no submissions have been presented to this Government with the object of ascertaining Cabinet's views. The railways concerned in this State are controlled by the State and Cabinet is interested in any proposals affecting them. Until I see how seriously the report is being taken I will not express an opinion on it.

UNLEY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—For a long time the Unley High School has been exceedingly overcrowded. Since I became a member of this House I have discussed this matter with the

Minister on numerous occasions and I understand that plans are in hand to remedy this position. Can the Minister of Education say firstly, what is proposed, and, secondly, what is being done at present?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The growth of enrolments in high schools has been so rapid in many areas that it has been found impossible to provide the many large new permanent schools required to keep pace with this growth while, at the same time, meeting the needs for many new primary schools. The situation has been met by providing wooden classrooms in many centres. The position at Unley is one of the most pressing. This is the largest secondary school in the State and the Government, some years ago, made plans to provide a completely new school on land set aside for the purpose at Urrbrae. Such a building would be the largest educational establishment in the department and would cost upwards of half a million pounds.

The first tentative plans had to be deferred while more immediate measures were taken. I held several conferences with officers of my department and of the Architect-in-Chief's Department, with a view to meeting not only the need at Unley, but in other areas where it was urgent. Standard plans for types of secondary schools have been evolved and these will be the basis of new schools at Unley, Marion, Enfield, Findon, and boys' and girls' technical schools in several areas.

At Unley, the needs for next year are being met by the provision of a suite of wooden classrooms with a permanent amenities block. These will be attractively arranged and provide excellent class room accommodation. I anticipate that this annexe to the school will be ready for occupation in February, 1957. Several of the buildings are now well on the way to completion. These will be used to house the girls of the school for the time being. While this is being done, revised plans are being prepared for a completely new boys section in permanent construction. This will be a two storey building containing all that is necessary for the boys of the school. The revised plans are now in course of preparation and will be ready for submission to Cabinet and the Public Works Standing Committee within the next month. If they are approved, detailed drawings and specifications will be pushed on rapidly with a view to calling tenders as soon as possible.

The next stage will be the preparation of similar plans and specifications for the girl's

section, an equally important project. When the whole school has been completed, it will be possible to transfer the wooden classrooms to other centres where they may be needed, thus leaving a permanent imposing architectural feature in the district. The standard plans which have been devised will result in the erection of many schools at an earlier date than if each were to be planned separately. There will thus be a considerable saving of both time and money. I am advised by the Architect-in-Chief and my officers that the basic design for a variety of secondary schools can be the same with slight modifications to meet the needs of a high school or a boys' or girls' technical school.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION FOR BUS ROUTES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the reconstruction of the road used by buses on the Adelaide-Westbourne Park route?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The Minister of Roads has supplied me with the following report from the Commissioner of Highways:—

The Hyde Park and Westbourne Park bus service runs through the districts of Unley, Mitcham and Colonel Light Gardens. The Trust will be responsible for removing rails and reinstating roadway in the district of Unley. In the districts of Mitcham and Colonel Light Gardens it is understood that the Trust has received permission to run buses. The necessity for total reconstruction of the road is not yet evident, but if required the Trust will not be responsible. As regards grants for this type of work, local government bodies are given proportion of the amount derived from the Trust payment of 1d. per bus mile. Most grants made up to the present are on half cost basis.

FISHING INDUSTRY.

Mr. JENKINS—Following on a question I asked the previous Minister of Agriculture, can the present Minister say whether Cabinet has decided for or against fishermen being required to make returns of their catches in order that the Fishing and Game Department can watch the trend of the seasonal movements of fish?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The matter has been considered and it has been decided that, at any rate for the time being, compulsory returns of fish caught by fishermen will not be required. The reason is that in the main we get on a voluntary basis the co-operation of fishermen engaged to a large extent in catching fish, and to a satisfactory degree from the ordinary run of fishermen in a small

way. Therefore, although complete returns of fish caught will not be available, sufficiently intelligible returns will be available to enable the Chief Inspector to assess the movement of fish at any given time by comparison with previous returns. Compulsory returns from fishermen, small or large, are not at present considered desirable.

SALE OF AIR GUNS TO CHILDREN.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Has the Minister of Education obtained a reply from the Attorney-General regarding the need to introduce legislation to prevent the easy sale of firearms to irresponsible children?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received the following reply:—

A Bill has been prepared and is now being considered by the Government, under which the possession of firearms by young persons will be controlled. The Bill contains a provision that children under 15 are not to have firearms and those between 15 and 18 can only have them if licensed. Air guns come within the scope of the Bill.

HOSPITAL IN SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Can the Premier say whether further consideration has been given to the building of a new hospital in the south-western part of the metropolitan area? I refer to the Marion district where land was some time ago bought for the purpose.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It is true that land was purchased for a hospital in the south-western suburbs. As the area was rapidly becoming built on it was necessary for the Government to secure land for future needs; but at the time of purchase it was implicitly stated that it did not mean the Government would be able to go ahead with the building in the near future. Members know that we have an enormous hospital building programme in operation which is taking up all the resources of the Hospitals Department. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is probably the most ambitious hospital scheme in Australia at present and it is taking the whole of the building resources and money available to the department. The matter is being watched and in due course a project will be prepared for the consideration of the Public Works Committee.

OVERCROWDING IN CLASSROOMS.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—This morning I noticed in the press, under the heading "More Money for Education," a report of the meeting of the Australian Council of School Organizations which is being held in Brisbane. The meeting

decided to ask the Federal Government to make more money available for education, which is something the Minister knows I have advocated at length on several occasions. I was somewhat concerned to notice that the South Australian delegate was reported to have said that 70 children were crowded into single classrooms in some Adelaide schools. Can the Minister of Education say whether that is a fact?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I read the article. I have the greatest respect for the man named, Mr. King who is vice-president of the Schools Committees Association in South Australia. He went to the conference with the president of the association, Mr. Bruce, and if Mr. King has been correctly reported I would believe that there are such cases. Of course, what he said is typical of what is being said by delegates from all States, but the South Australian press naturally would want to give local colour by quoting from remarks by one of the South Australian delegates. Unfortunately, there are a few classrooms which for the time being, for a variety of reasons, have been far too overcrowded and it is possible that there are a few containing up to 70 children, but they would be a very small minority. I do not want to make unnecessary comparisons but I have examined the class loadings in the various States, in Great Britain, and also in the much vaunted United States of America and I am absolutely convinced that, unfortunate as it is that we are overcrowded in some cases, our position bears very good comparison with that in the other States, in Great Britain, and in the United States of America.

MURRAY RIVER FLOOD.

Mr. BYWATERS—The following is an extract from this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading, "Victorian Flood Forecast":—

Tonight the Weather Bureau predicted more rain and certain flooding along the Murray within a fortnight. Heavy rain throughout central and north-east Victoria in the past three days has caused a sharp rise in river levels. The bureau warned that heavy snow on the Alps was thawing steadily to aggravate the position.

Has the Minister of Lands any indication how this will affect the River Murray in South Australia?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—Last week Mr. King asked whether I would get a report on what might happen to the River Murray in the near future. The matter is with the Engineer-in-Chief and I hope to bring down a reply tomorrow.

FILMS FOR GLADSTONE GAOL.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Minister obtained a reply to the question I asked regarding a supply of films to be shown at the Gladstone Gaol?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Sheriff reports:—

The expenditure involved in purchasing a projector and films for Gladstone prison is not warranted as ample amenities are provided. Recently a wireless was installed at the prison and each cell wired and equipped with ear-phones at a total cost of £504. The prison has a library of approximately 2,000 books including text books, also suitable recreational facilities. Prisoners also have the opportunity of furthering their education through the Technical Correspondence School. This institution conforms with modern standards and the prisoners are given every facility to reform.

The Rev. Father McCurtin who is a visiting chaplain to the prison frequently shows films to the prisoners of a Saturday or Sunday afternoon. He provides his own projector and films. I understand that he has obtained films from the Education Department and the Tourist Bureau on loan and others at his own expense. He requested that films be hired from the various companies. Inquiries were made and it was ascertained that to hire a feature film it would cost approximately £5. This would not include supporting films. The work of Father McCurtin is appreciated, but I do not think that this department should at this stage hire feature films for the benefit of prisoners. No provision has been made for such expenditure.

FLOODED AREAS REHABILITATION.

Mr. KING—Will the Premier send the Director or a senior officer of the Government Tourist Bureau to river towns with a view to encouraging tourist traffic to go there so that those towns may be helped to get back on their feet?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Tourist Bureau has been organizing certain activities in river towns and I am certain that when I bring this matter to the Director's notice he will do his utmost to assist.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I have been to the Murray areas twice in the last few weeks and I think that if the Government and the press gave some build-up to the Murray areas we would again attract tourists there and get business people to go there again to sell goods. My impression is that the Murray areas have been considerably written down over the last few months. They have suffered the greatest catastrophe in the history of Australia, and all sorts of bad things have been said about them. To get them back into production and build up the morale of the business people—

The SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member may not debate the question.

Mr. DUNNAGE—I asked permission to make a statement.

The SPEAKER—The honourable member has leave to explain his question. I do not yet know what his question is, but he is indulging almost in a second reading speech. He must ask his question.

Mr. DUNNAGE—Will the Premier ask the Director of the Government Tourist Bureau and the press to build up the Murray areas instead of writing them down, for I know he can do much to help the Murray areas if he desires?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes.

RAILWAY SIGNALS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In reply to my recent question on railway signals the Minister read a report signed by the Railways Commissioner. Since then I have received further communications from railway employees who say it is felt that the signalling system could be improved and ask whether a report could be obtained directly from the Signalling and Telegraph Engineer in the department. As there is some doubt concerning the suitability of the speeds of trains controlled by the signals, will the Minister representing the Minister of Railways accede to this request?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I shall be pleased to ask my colleague to submit the question to the Railways Commissioner.

TAILEM BEND COURTHOUSE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Can the Minister representing the Minister of Works say whether tenders have been called for work on the Tailem Bend courthouse, and if so, when it will be commenced and completed?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Tenders have not been called, but plans for the work are nearing completion. It is expected that tenders will be called within a month, but at this stage it is not possible to estimate the date of either the commencement or the completion of the job.

CRASH HELMETS FOR MOTOR CYCLISTS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the compulsory use of crash helmets by motor cyclists?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The chairman of the State Traffic Committee reports:—

In 1954 the Australian Transport Advisory Council made some suggestions designed to provide safeguards for motor cyclists, and these were considered by the State Traffic Committee. Included in these suggestions was one that all motor cyclists should wear safety

helmets. After fully considering the matter the committee reached the conclusion that to make it mandatory for all motor cyclists, pillion riders and sidecar passengers to wear safety helmets would place an unnecessary burden on this type of road user. The committee accordingly decided not to take any action in the matter and at present it sees no reason to depart from its previous decision.

MANNUM HIGHER PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS—Can the Minister representing the Minister of Works say whether tenders have been called for the Mannum Higher Primary School craft centre, and if so, when the work will commence?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Tenders are expected to be called shortly. It is not possible to say when the work will be commenced.

TURNING OFF WATER AT MAIN ROADS.

Mr. QUIRKE—Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question concerning the policy of the Highways Department on the turning off of water at main roads?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Highways Commissioner reports:—

By reason of the fact that conditions vary in each individual case, it is impossible to lay down a hard and fast policy. Generally, the water does not originate on the road, but arrives at one side from the property adjoining and has to be passed to the other side. The culverts allowing this to be done have in most cases been in existence for many years prior to the Department undertaking reconstruction works. The general policy, therefore, is to divert water as little as possible from its natural or existing course.

APPROACH TO MURRAY ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister representing the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 2 concerning warning notices on the approach to the eastern side of the bridge at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Through the Minister of Roads I have received the following report from the Commissioner of Highways:—

Accident reports do not indicate that there is an exceptionally large number of accidents at the eastern approach to Murray Bridge. Warning signs are in existence at this approach but their efficiency is impaired by the presence of advertising and roadhouse signs. Plans are completed and the land has been acquired for the complete reconstruction of this approach and it is anticipated that it will be possible to do this work before the Departmental gang, at present working on the Karoonda Road, leaves Murray Bridge.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MINING INQUIRY.

Mr. RICHES—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. RICHES—I desire to correct the *Hansard* report of the debate on the motion of Mr. Loveday that took place in this Chamber last Wednesday. I regret having to do this for it is the first time in 20 years that I have had to claim that I have been misreported. As there was considerable cross-fire of interjection at the time I appreciate how the interjection to which I shall refer may have been mistaken. The correction relates to my interjection when the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) was speaking on the motion. *Hansard* reported him as saying:—

How could we expect another company to come here after we had broken the agreement with the B.H.P. Company?

Then I am reported to have said:—

I do not think we would tell it what we had done.

I understood the member for Onkaparinga to say—

How could we expect another company to come here after we had told it that we had broken the agreement with the B.H.P. Company?

My interjection was:—

I do not think we would tell them that.

I said that because my contention was, as stated by the member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman), that the B.H.P. Company had repudiated the agreement.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT
AMENDMENT BILL (LOTTERIES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 19. Page 657.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I want it clearly understood that I am not seeking permission under this Bill for lotteries to be conducted. It merely permits raffles or art unions to be conducted to assist sporting bodies or for charitable purposes. Some people who conduct sporting functions to raise money for charitable purposes do not charge spectators for admission, but the Bill will enable them to hold raffles to raise money. I shall read from a circular to give an example of what is being done in this direction. It states:—

This time it is a larger than usual raffle. Your committee has decided that our Christmas raffle (which usually nets the club about £70)

should be a much larger one this year. The target is to raise £200. This is how you can help:—Sell the tickets in a big way (they will be one shilling each); we need a few more good prizes. Please advise by the end of September if you have a good prize to offer. Raffle books will be available at the meeting.

That is an example of how some people try to circumvent the Act in order to raise money. They know that the law does not permit them to conduct raffles, but the Bill makes them legal. Many amateur sporting clubs need funds to provide uniforms and other equipment, or to pay umpires' fees and insurance premiums to cover players against accident. I have placed an amendment on the files that the total value of all the prizes in a lottery must not exceed £1,500, and this answers those who say the Bill will enable such valuable prizes to be given as hotels worth £400,000.

The Bill contains ample provisions to prevent any abuses. We all desire to encourage healthy organized sport, such as football, cricket and baseball, but players must have the necessary equipment. Properly conducted and organized sport can greatly assist in cultivating healthy minds and bodies and if there were more sporting bodies financially able to provide facilities there would be less congregating of young people on street corners and beneath shop verandahs, making nuisances of themselves. I believe efforts should be made to erect community halls in more districts, particularly in new housing areas. This Bill will have no harmful effects and will assist organizations that are anxious to help other people. I have spoken of the appeal made by the Olympic Council in support of this measure and I hope sufficient members will vote for it to pass the second reading.

The House divided on the second reading:—

Ayes (9).—Messrs. Davis, Hambour, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday, O'Halloran, Quirke, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, Coumbe, Goldney, Harding, Heaslip, Heath, Hincks, Hutchens, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Pearson, Playford (teller), Riches, and Shannon.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Fletcher, Tapping, Dunstan, and Stephens. Noes—Mr. Dunnage, Hon. Sir Malcolm McIntosh, Mr. Geoffrey Clarke, and Hon. B. Pattinson.

Majority of 8 for the Noes.
Second reading thus negatived.

MINING INQUIRY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Loveday.

(For wording of motion see page 846.)

(Continued from October 10. Page 981.)

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I support the motion. It is apparent that most members appreciate the importance of this matter. Much time has been devoted to debating it and many excellent contributions have been made. The mover, the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), gave a clear and reasoned statement explaining in detail the reasons for the motion, and his speech was commended by Government members. Perhaps that is not always a recommendation, but in this instance they were obviously interested and appreciated that Mr. Loveday had done justice to his case. He set forth a fair and considered series of arguments in favour of the motion, which has the complete support of every member of the Labor Party. The member for Alexandra (Mr. Brookman), who followed Mr. Loveday, made the best speech I have ever heard from him; that, of course, is allowing for his congenitally biased view on such matters. It was a pity his speech was marred by jibes at the sincerity of the Labor Party. I could see no necessity for his dragging in socialism on this matter. Since he spoke I have looked with keen interest to see if any socialistic action was implied in the motion, but I could not find any. I was disappointed that the old story of Labor's secret platform and policy was dragged in again. We were asked whether there is a copy of our platform in the Parliamentary Library. Is a copy of the Liberal Party's platform there? In fact, I wonder whether the Party has a platform at all.

Mr. Millhouse—There is a copy of it in the library.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I am happy to hear it because I was about to ask Mr. Brookman if he would be kind enough to give me a copy of his Party's platform and policy, and then in return I would be glad to give him a copy of ours. To be frank, I would be happy to give him a copy of ours whether or not he gives me a copy of his. I would like to have a look at the mysterious document which I am informed is in our library, and see how up to date it is. I have no doubts about the veracity of members who tell me there is a copy in the library and I look forward to perusing it because it has intrigued me for some time.

As the matter of socialism was introduced into this debate I openly say that we on this side are Socialists, and I am proud if it. Mr. Brookman's remarks were followed by an equally good speech by Mr. Hutchens. I think it was the best I have heard him make in this House.

Mr. Hambour—That wouldn't be much.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—I know the honourable member has a profound knowledge of what constitutes a good speech but I repeat that Mr. Hutchens gave us one. It was full of logical argument most difficult to refute. As a matter of fact, Mr. Shannon, who followed him, found that to be so. I thought Mr. Shannon made a good speech considering the poor arguments he had at his disposal, but he is an expert in doing a good job with a bad case. I thought the best part of his speech was his commendation of Mr. Loveday's speech. It was a pity that Mr. Shannon had to throw in a thinly veiled slur on the business ability of the Director of Mines. What does "business ability" mean? No one, not even Mr. Shannon, doubts the ability of the Director of Mines in his profession, and surely that is all that counts. To those members who have omitted to read Mr. Dickinson's illuminating reports I say that in every report he has presented he has given a careful analysis of the capital required for the establishment of steelworks. I shall quote only one extract from his reports. The latest contains the following:—

To date Australian capital resources have been largely used to finance the expansion programmes of the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. Ltd. In contrast to overseas major steel producing companies, which have received funds from Governments to maintain a rate of expansion commensurate with their countries' needs, the Broken Hill Pty. Coy.'s funds have come almost entirely from the Australian public without any governmental loans. This achievement reflects great credit on the company, but since the war, there has been an ever-increasing shortage of steel. As time goes on, it is becoming more and more obvious that further funds are not forthcoming in anything like the amounts needed for the country's essential steel needs. It should not be assumed that there is a lack of capital in Australia for steel production, but rather that the fiscal policy of the Broken Hill Pty. Coy. is still geared to the resources and dictates of its few major shareholders. Because of this, its capital raisings have been relatively small and for the most part determined by the ability of these major shareholders to subscribe and retain their equity. A change of policy could allow much larger public subscription and also Government financial assistance for the greater development of steel production.

That shows the keen knowledge of the business he possesses. Mr. Shannon referred only to

what is known as Big Business—Big Business with capital letters—which apparently is a different thing. I am reminded also that Mr. Shannon is chairman of the Public Works Committee, where he does an exemplary job. I am not certain how many members of the committee have what he regards as business ability, but does he regard those he thinks do not have it as of less value to the committee than those who are supposed to have it? After all, the committee approves or rejects the expenditure of large sums of money. We can disregard the business ability argument, even if there were any proof that Mr. Dickinson lacks it.

Mr. Riches—Rio Tinto does not think so.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Apparently Rio Tinto regards both his business ability and his metallurgical ability as high. Following the excellent speeches made by previous speakers, I hope my boldness in intruding into this debate, with possibly an incapacity to deal with the matter, will be excused. My excuse must be that I am in complete agreement with the justice of the motion. It is necessary for the House to carry it. Both Government speakers stressed the integrity and untouchability of the B.H.P. Company Limited. We believe that the interests of the State must have priority over the interests of the company. Members should study the motion carefully, because sometimes when the Opposition introduces a motion it is opposed without being considered.

This motion seeks the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into and report on six things. The first is what action, if any, should be taken by Parliament to ensure that South Australia's high-grade iron ore and taconite resources are used in the best interests of this State. I draw the attention of members to the words "if any." The Opposition is willing to leave the decision to the Commission. Members should ask themselves whether our iron ore resources are being used in the best interests of the State or only in the best interests of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company? Can it be proved that the interests of the State and of the B.H.P. Company are synonymous? I for one do not think they are, but if it can be proved by the Commission that they are, Opposition members will be convinced even though they may not be happy about the decision. In previous sessions similar debates have proved that South Australia has been the loser in this regard for years.

The Commission is to be asked to inquire into what steps should be taken to ensure the imme-

diately establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla. In this paragraph the words "if any" have not been included because Parliament has already agreed that this is necessary. Indeed, a unanimous vote was obtained on the motion, "That this House believes in the desirability of establishing a steelworks in the vicinity of Whyalla." That was passed on November 4, 1953.

Mr. Jennings—Did Messrs. Shannon and Brookman vote for it?

Mr. JOHN CLARK—The vote was unanimous, but although that motion was passed three years ago nothing has been done since. I hope the House is still of the same opinion as it was then, because if it is, all members must vote for the motion if only for the sake of paragraph (2). The important word in this paragraph is "immediate," for this matter is becoming more and more urgent. Our iron ore resources are being rapidly lessened and something must be done immediately. Of course Opposition members realize that "immediately" may mean "as soon as possible," but something should be done as soon as possible. An additional steelworks producing 1,000,000 ingot tons a year is needed to supply Australia's current steel requirements. Obviously we are either importing this quantity or going without it. One Government member raised the old finance bogey, but surely with the combined advantages of low-cost production and the great unsatisfied demand on the home market, finance should be readily available. Paragraph (3) states:—

The negotiations which have taken place between the Government and the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited on the questions of (a) the establishment of industries at Whyalla and (b) the payment of royalties. The words "if any" are not included in this paragraph, but perhaps they should have been included after "negotiations." Can past dealings with the company be classed as negotiations when apparently the company holds a big stick and treats the Premier of the State from which it draws its assets as a small boy to be conveniently snubbed? The negotiations seem to have been a story of sudden action by the Government and then complete paralysis, although that is not a particularly unusual occurrence.

I remind members of the Government policy expressed in the speech of His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor when opening Parliament last year. Several points were stressed in that speech. Firstly, we were told that

the State's most valuable mineral assets were the iron ore deposits in the Middleback Ranges, and that is true. Secondly, it was one of the Government's paramount interests to secure the establishment of a steel industry on Spencer Gulf in the vicinity of those deposits. Thirdly, it was stated that the Government was not prepared to acquiesce in the unsatisfactory position arising from the delay by the B.H.P. Company in establishing a steelworks at Whyalla. I have heard no disapproval expressed by the Government in this matter during recent months and I have been waiting with some interest to hear what the Premier has to say in this debate about his acquiescence in the present unsatisfactory position. Fourthly, His Excellency's Speech contained the statement that, if the investigation to ascertain whether sufficient high-grade iron ore existed outside the company's leases to establish a steel industry in South Australia proved unfavourable, an expert committee would be appointed to advise on what methods should be taken to ensure that the State would derive adequate benefits from its iron ore deposits. All the Opposition asks for in this motion is the appointment of the expert committee that was promised in His Excellency's Speech.

Mr. Brookman—You have left out some important words in that speech: you said nothing about the statement that the Government did not intend to repudiate its agreement with the company.

Mr. JOHN CLARK—Since then at least one important announcement has been made by the company about its developmental programme. A plant costing £100,000,000 and using iron ore from Iron Knob is to be established, but no part of that project is connected with a steelworks at Whyalla. Mr. Brookman suggested that I had misquoted His Excellency's Speech, but I remind him that His Excellency said that an expert committee would be appointed. That speech was delivered on May 19 last year, but apparently that promise has been forgotten. The Opposition, however, has not forgotten it and is simply urging the Government for once to stick to its announced policy. Nothing could be fairer than that. In the fourth paragraph of the motion the Commission is empowered to inquire into and report on:—

Whether the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited has failed to honour either the letter or the spirit of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company's Indenture Act, 1937, or

any verbal undertaking given by representatives appearing on behalf of that company before the Select Committee set up to inquire into the Bill for that Act or before the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works in the course of its inquiry conducted pursuant to that Act.

Some members opposite have interpreted that as repudiation, but if they read it through again they will find not even a hint of repudiation: it is simply one aspect that we want the Royal Commission to examine. The contents of this paragraph have been extensively debated in previous sessions and I do not think there is much point in my dealing with them further. I would not like to be accused, as Mr. Hutchens was last week, of saying a thing four times, but even if the honourable member did that, I do not blame him for it is usually necessary to say a thing a number of times in this place before it sinks in. I shall be happy to allow the Royal Commission to decide the justice or otherwise of our case.

Let me remind the House of two points concerning the alleged repudiation. Firstly, this Parliament has at times amended or repealed legislation passed by previous Parliaments. That may come as a shock to some members opposite. Secondly, we on this side have been accused of seeking repudiation, but we shall be happy to see whether the Royal Commission discovers that the company has been guilty of repudiation. It will be the duty of the Royal Commission, not members of this House, to decide that issue. If Government members are afraid of the consequences they will vote against the motion, but we shall be happy to accept the findings of the Commission. Paragraph (5) states:—

What action, if any, the Government has taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Director of Mines or to the resolution carried by this House in 1953.

The key words are "if any." Perhaps the member for Onkaparinga gave the secret away, for according to him the Director of Mines is a great metallurgist but a poor business man and therefore we should disregard his expert advice, but that is nonsense. Will the Royal Commission take that view? Again, members on this side will be happy to have this question put to the test. We are not afraid of the verdict, even if it appears that some Government members are. Paragraph (6) states:—

What action, if any, Parliament or the Government should take to encourage overseas interests to establish steelworks in South Australia.

Opposition members believe that it is essential to take action immediately, but apparently Government members prefer inaction. I will happily leave it to the Royal Commission to decide. I ask all members to give this motion earnest and sincere consideration. If they have the interests of the State at heart, as I am sure they have, they will carry the motion, and then South Australia will get back rights it should never have abrogated years ago, and a justifiable error made by a previous Parliament will be corrected. It is our duty to save the natural rights of our people, for they are shareholders in the State. The shareholders of the B.H.P. Company have an interest in their company, which fights for their rights; so should we here fight for the rights of our citizens.

Surely no member will continue to maintain that South Australia's rights should be permanently jettisoned because one party to an agreement cannot see its way clear to honour, or refuses to acknowledge, implicit undertakings. Certainly these undertakings were implied if not plainly expressed in writing, and there is ample proof that they were made verbally. We have ample proof that many promises were made, but apparently they mean nothing. Some members may violently disagree with what I have said, and they have the right to disagree, but I ask them to support the motion and appoint a Royal Commission. Then we shall get the true picture, and I shall be happy to abide by its verdict. In voting on the motion I hope members will be guided by their desires to promote the welfare of the people, both now and in the future.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I oppose the motion, which is similar to several others that have been brought forward by members opposite. Each time the wording has been altered, but I think the purpose is the same. I do not think there is any member who would not willingly and joyfully help the establishment of a steel industry at Whyalla; indeed, a resolution to that effect was carried unanimously some time ago. However, this motion does not further that cause. It seeks the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into several topics, and the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) said it had the support of every member of his Party.

Mr. O'Halloran—Hear, Hear!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Leader endorses that, but I would have gone further and said there was a composite effort in the preparation of the motion. It seems that some legal assistance was obtained in drafting it.

Mr. O'Halloran—I would not back that horse.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am not backing any horse, but expressing the opinion that the wording of the motion was the result of a united effort. I was somewhat intrigued to see in this afternoon's press a report from Canberra, and I wondered whether it was part of the great plan. The press reports that Federal Labor Caucus "seeks a probe on steel monopoly." The reports states:—

Federal Labor caucus today decided to demand the appointment of a Parliamentary Select Committee to investigate the steel monopoly in Australia.

That is complete socialism, for it is in the same terms we always find when any Party is considering socialistic objectives. The probe is usually directed against some reputed monopoly that is functioning successfully; there is never any attempt to probe something that is not profitable. The motion seeks the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into several matters, the first being:—

What action, if any, should be taken by Parliament to ensure that South Australia's high-grade iron ore and taconite resources are used in the best interests of this State?

This matter was dealt with by Parliament and the Indenture Act was passed after a full examination of the measure by a Select Committee, upon which the Opposition was represented.

Mr. O'Halloran—What decision did the Select Committee reach?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It supported the Bill.

Mr. O'Halloran—Pardon me, it did not reach any decision.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The majority supported the Bill, and I believe the Opposition supported it in the House also. I was not a member of the Select Committee, but when the Bill was being debated I said we should be quite clear on the obligation of the company. The only obligation of any consequence was that it would establish a blast furnace at Whyalla with a capacity of 200,000 tons a year.

Mr. Riches—Why did you find it necessary to stress that point in 1937?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I think the honourable member knows the background of the whole matter as well as I do. The Government of the day was anxious to have a heavy industry established at Whyalla. It negotiated with the B.H.P. Company for this purpose, and the Indenture Bill was brought down providing for the amalgamation, extension and confirmation of its leases, and obliging the company

to establish a blast furnace at Whyalla. The Bill did not even provide that the company had to work that plant.

Mr. Riches—Why was it necessary for you to explain that the Bill did not include the erection of steelworks?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I stressed that because some members were saying in the House that the Bill would lead automatically to a large number of other activities. When giving evidence before the Select Committee the company stated, without committing itself in any way, that in other parts of the world the establishment of a blast furnace usually led to the establishment of coke ovens and steel retorts. That was the position when the Indenture Act was considered. The iron ore leases in the Middleback Ranges are covered by Act of Parliament and are the property of the B.H.P. Company. I have been advised that we cannot in any way interfere with those leases without directly repudiating an Act of Parliament and an agreement Parliament entered into with the company. Members opposite have quoted extensively from reports of the retired Director of Mines, Mr. Dickinson. An investigation undertaken by the Crown Law Office did not support Mr. Dickinson's contentions in any way. We can only investigate the use of the iron ore deposits if we contemplate a direct repudiation of an agreement. What grounds have we for establishing a Royal Commission to investigate what is proposed in paragraph (1) of the motion? We would have no power to give effect to any recommendation of that commission unless we went back on a solemn obligation entered into by the State Parliament on behalf of the people of this State.

Mr. O'Halloran—Do you think it would be impossible to get the company to develop our iron ore leases in the best interests of the State?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the Indenture Act was passed Parliament gave the company full authority to use the ore as it saw fit. The appointment of a Royal Commission would not help the position one iota. It would probably only antagonize the company.

Mr. Davis—Wouldn't that be a pity!

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It has always been my experience that if we want to accomplish something we can only do so by not antagonizing the people on whom we have to depend to a certain extent. Far more is achieved by fair dealing and plain speak-

ing than by using the tactics that might arise from this motion. Although Mr. Dickinson was a sincere, enthusiastic and good officer of the Government, I believe his submissions for the establishment of a steelworks at Whyalla did not in any way enhance the State's chance of success in that respect. His reports undoubtedly antagonized the company and, I consider, did far more harm than good. We cannot hope to get anywhere by saying to the company, "If you do not do what we want, we will dispossess you." If members will examine what I said as a backbencher during the debate on the Indenture Act, they will see that what I said then not only represented the position at that time, but represented the position that emerged from that legislation. I sounded a warning note, but it was disregarded. When Parliament enters into an obligation that is properly ratified and assented to by His Excellency the Governor, it dishonours itself completely if, by any sort of quibbling, it attempts to impair that obligation.

I have great hopes that a steel industry will be established at Whyalla. I am not discouraged because we did not meet with success at our first attempt. If I were asked whether a steelworks would be established by an overseas company or by the B.H.P. Company, I could not say, but I am confident that such an industry will be established. I do not believe that all the iron ore in the Whyalla area is in the company's leases. When I discussed this matter with Mr. Dickinson some time ago and suggested that there should be an investigation into our iron ore deposits in the Middleback Ranges he said, in effect, "The Middleback Ranges have been combed through and through by the B.H.P. Company and there is no likelihood that any high grade ore deposits will be found outside its leases." An investigation was commenced, and is proceeding, and already significant deposits have been found outside the company's leases.

Mr. Lawn—High grade ore?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, and in the vicinity of 20,000,000 tons at least. Those deposits are within two or three miles of the Iron Knob township. The company does not own all our high grade iron ore deposits. It does not own one per cent of the enormous deposits of low grade material in that area. I hope that the investigation will establish deposits sufficiently large either to render it advantageous for the company to consider establishing a steelworks at Whyalla or to induce an

overseas firm to commence operations there. There is a deficiency of between 700,000 and 1,000,000 tons of steel annually in Australia at present and that should be sufficient to warrant the establishment of a major steel project.

How much success could we expect if, in negotiating with overseas interests for the establishment of steelworks here, we had behind us the repudiation of an agreement with the B.H.P. Company? What firm would trust us to the extent of investing £100,000,000 in a steelworks venture? I listened to the personal explanation of the member for Stuart this afternoon in connection with last week's debate. I did not hear the original incident, but his explanation was not good. If we are going to negotiate with overseas interests we must be completely frank and not neglect to tell them everything. If we do so neglect it is a pretty poor show.

Mr. RICHES—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In my personal explanation I pointed out that I did not make any suggestion of secrecy in our negotiations, and I object to the Premier's implying that I did. I ask that he withdraw his remarks.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Nothing has been said about the honourable member that he should ask to have withdrawn, but to save you giving a ruling, Mr. Speaker, without hesitation I withdraw the statement to which the honourable member objects. I now pass from the remarks made by the honourable member. In negotiations with overseas interests we must be frank. If they are to be asked to invest money here, irrespective of the amount, there must be a searching inquiry. They will want to know not only about our ability to supply raw materials, but also whether we carry out agreements and whether they will get a fair deal if they come here. The acceptance of the first part of the motion will only offend the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, and interfere with any negotiations we may have with overseas companies in the future. Parliament must be careful not to repudiate agreements, for the basis of our welfare depends on sanctity in connection with agreements.

Mr. Riches—Does not that apply to both sides?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes and I think it has applied.

Mr. Riches—I don't.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The matter has been reported on by the Crown Law Office and I shall be glad to show the report to the

honourable member if he wants to see it. Mr. Dickinson presented his case and after examining it the Crown Law Office said "No." We stand by our agreements to the greatest extent. It may be asked why Parliament at the time of the indenture willingly accepted so little when it handed over the leases for a long term and under such favourable conditions. I believe that at the time the company representatives favoured the establishment of a steel industry here, but they did not commit themselves. After that time I got to know two of the directors fairly well and was able to accurately gauge their characteristics and qualities. I refer to Mr. Harold Darling and Mr. Essington Lewis, both South Australians. Both were men of great probity, with a great regard for this State and a desire to further its interests. Mr. Darling is now deceased and Mr. Lewis does not take an active part in the conduct of the company. Other officers of the company have since come into prominence and I do not think they view the establishment of a steel industry here in the same light as the two gentlemen mentioned.

If we are to get a steel industry here we must consider the weakness and strength of our case. Our strength is that we supply the necessary raw material. We have made it available freely and it has formed the basis of much industry throughout Australia. It has provided opportunities in other States and has created tremendous national wealth. In view of that we have a strong case to submit for a fair share of the company's industry being established here. It is not a legal case, but there is much merit in it. We have made available high-grade iron ore at a price as low as any I have heard of in the world. As a result our great steel industry has developed, and so have subsidiary industries. The economy of Australia has received a tremendous benefit. Unfortunately South Australia has not benefited greatly economically. We have received our share of the goods produced with steel, but there has been no special consideration for us because of the iron ore being produced in this State. I have tried to learn why the company has not considered that in its forward planning. I had a conference with the directors of the company following on the passing of the last motion by this Parliament and, in effect, I was told that the company was not able to consider our representations because it had already entered into commitments that would take it

along to 1960 or 1961. At the time the company had commenced the establishment of a hot strip mill at Port Kembla that was capable of producing tremendous quantities of ingot steel, but a supporting plant was not available to make the mill a success. The chairman of directors at the last annual meeting of the company said that the forward programme which at one time was estimated to cost £67,000,000 would now cost £100,000,000. Members asked whether South Australia had been by-passed again. I have a copy of the official report, which is a public report, and in it are the following remarks by the chairman of directors:—

The most striking figures in this year's accounts are those relating to capital expenditure. For the B.H.P. Coy. alone expenditure on fixed assets has increased from 5.9 million pounds in 1955 to 16.1 million in 1956. For the group it has increased from 9.8 million to 21.6 million. These would be regarded as substantial figures in countries much larger than Australia. In March, 1955, we announced that our estimated expenditure on plant expansion would amount to at least £67,000,000 spread over the next five years. Since then there has been no basic change in our plans and some of this £67,000,000 has already been spent. However, some projects which were then contemplated as being completed after the five-year period have now, because of better availability of labour and materials, been programmed to be completed within it. In addition, there have been modifications and improvements which have substantially increased estimated expenditure and there have been important increases in costs, due largely to inflation. As a result, installations which are now planned to take place up to 1960-1961 will involve an expenditure which on today's price levels is estimated to exceed £100,000,000. Should inflation continue at current rates over the next four or five years, today's estimate will be substantially increased.

The programme of £67,000,000 has not been altered in the sense that there has been a departure from it to the detriment of South Australia. Owing to inflation and necessary improvements and modifications in the design of the plant, what was to have cost £67,000,000 and taken a little more than five years to complete is now expected to be completed within five years at a cost of £100,000,000.

Mr. O'Halloran—Does the report indicate how much of the increased cost was due to inflation and how much to modifications?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. I have quoted the words of the report and there is no further statement. The statement by the directors of the company sets out the position clearly for the benefit of shareholders and was

not designed especially for publicity. Two principles are involved in the establishment of a steel industry in this State. Firstly, there is the discovery of a significant quantity of high-grade ore. True, we have discovered probably over 20,000,000 tons of ore in connection with which there are no difficulties of procurement or use, but that would not be sufficient for a steel industry. We have been steadily working on the use of taconites of which we have enormous quantities both inside and outside the Company's leases. That ore is low-grade, but not of a grade below that which has been worked successfully in other countries.

Mr. O'Halloran—Today about one-third of America's steel is produced from ore not quite as good.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The cost of production from this type of ore would be much higher than that in the B.H.P. Company's plant, where high-grade ore is readily available. The establishment and production costs of a new company would be higher, so any company competing with the B.H.P. Company that had to depend on taconite would be economically embarrassed, for it would have to compete with a lower cost of production.

Mr. O'Halloran—But isn't that a good argument why we should start using the taconites now?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I do not object to the Leader's using the taconites now. In fact, if he lets me know how much he requires I will see that it is made available.

Mr. O'Halloran—That is the purpose of the motion.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No. If there is any method of using the taconite now there is no objection to its being used that way. In fact, the document I quoted had something to say about taconites, the use of which is not without technical problems. The Chairman of Directors said:—

For some years we have been giving a good deal of attention to the possible development of low grade hematite quartzite deposits which exist in Australia in abundant quantities. Considerable progress has been made on research into the beneficiation of these ores and we are hopeful the stage is not far off when work can commence on a pilot plant. To this end arrangements have been made for Mr. R. T. Kleeman (recently appointed South Australian manager) and Dr. S. G. Salamy, our senior research officer concerned with this matter, to go overseas to look into the latest equipment and processes available.

In regard to the first part of that statement I do not know whether the research referred to is research carried out by the company or by the South Australian Government at Thebarton on the use of taconite ores. We believe we are getting substantial success; means have been found to separate a substantial percentage of this ore, but some problems are still associated with its treatment. Experiments are being continued and I believe that in due course they will be entirely successful, but I do not know to which experiments the Chairman of Directors refers.

Mr. O'Halloran—Did he say where the pilot plant was to be established?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, but as soon as we have reached the stage where we believe our laboratory tests justify a pilot plant, if no-one else is willing to establish one the South Australian Government will not hesitate to do so. After all, we have had to do that in connection with our uranium deposits in Mr. O'Halloran's district in order to prove and make effective the methods of treatment of that ore.

Mr. O'Halloran—And we had to establish a treatment plant.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes. The reason why taconites cannot be used today, quite apart from economic considerations, is that at present the research work is not complete. Indeed, even if members had untold millions, the use of taconites could not be speeded up until the research work had been undertaken.

Having dealt fairly fully with the first two paragraphs of the motion, which I believe are important, I ask honourable members to consider the rest of the motion. Paragraph (3) empowers the Commission to inquire into and report on the negotiations that have taken place between the Government and the company on the questions of the establishment of industries at Whyalla and the payment of royalties. The Government was not in a position to negotiate with the company on the royalty, for the royalty was established by Act of Parliament at 6d. a ton. Following some criticism in this and another place, however, when it was suggested that the real value of the royalty had depreciated because of the inflation of the currency, the company offered to alter the amount and increased it to 1s. 6d. a ton, but I point out that that was not done on the basis of negotiations because the sale had been made and the price could not be negotiated. Members wishing to see what was involved may read the letters on the file;

indeed, a Royal Commission could do nothing more than that, so what point is there in establishing such a Commission for that purpose?

The industries established at Whyalla as a result of negotiations with the company have been reported on by the Public Works Committee, which under its Act has the full authority of a Royal Commission, and those reports are in the Parliamentary Papers. I remind members that that committee is an all-Party committee that has already reported on and confirmed the negotiations with the company. This was a two-sided deal.

Mr. Riches—The Committee only inquired into the pipeline.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It inquired into both projects: a pipeline was to be constructed because a steelworks—

Mr. Riches—That's right—a steelworks.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It was because a shipbuilding industry was to be established. Just now the honourable member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) objected to my putting a few words into his mouth and I readily withdrew, although he had no claim to make me withdraw, but when he knows that, by a slip of the tongue, I said something that was quite inaccurate he tries in a tricky manner to pin me down. That is a type of ethics which we sometimes encounter in this House, but which I do not personally support. The Committee's alleged investigations into the establishment of industries was really an investigation into the establishment of a pipeline to Whyalla, and the consideration for that pipeline was the establishment by the company of a shipbuilding yard at Whyalla.

Mr. Riches—No.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Those are the facts and the documents are on the files.

Mr. Riches—I know they are, and they say "steelworks," not "ship yards."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The original proposals were dealt with in the Crown Solicitor's report. They were that in the event of the company desiring to establish steelworks at Whyalla the Government would provide a water supply to make that possible, but that is not the industry referred to in this motion, which states "The negotiations which have taken place . . ." The company has never been prepared to negotiate on the establishment of a steel plant at Whyalla. The motion deals with something that has passed, not with the establishment of a steel industry, because we have never reached that stage, so the remarks of the

member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) about negotiations for a steelworks are entirely incorrect.

Mr. Riches—That 's in the Public Works Committee's report.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The Committee's report did not state that the pipeline was for the purpose of establishing steelworks.

Mr. Riches—I say, with respect, that it did.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If that is the position I say that the committee's report was not in accordance with fact. I carried out the negotiations myself. They began on the question of the establishment of a tinplate plant at Whyalla, and Mr. Essington Lewis and I placed before a subcommittee of the Federal Government a certain proposal that the company was prepared to carry out. The subcommittee consisted of the Prime Minister (the Right Honourable J. A. Lyons), Mr. Menzies, Dr. Earle Page, and Mr. Casey, and on the first day they accepted the proposal in principle.

Mr. O'Halloran—Where did the company propose to get the steel to make tin plate?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—It did not say it would make the steel at Whyalla. The proposal was for the establishment of a gigantic tinplate industry that would employ 3,000 men and be capable of providing the tinplate requirements of Australia. The company wanted the Australian market assured to it and was prepared to guarantee that the price of tinplate would be maintained at a level not exceeding the world price. The second provision was that the South Australian Government would be prepared to supply sufficient water from the Murray.

Mr. Riches—The company refused to—

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—If the honourable member will be patient I will give the whole story. There is no need for the appointment of a Royal Commission, for I can tell the House precisely what happened. The Commonwealth Government accepted the general proposal in principle, but it referred my request for some financial assistance in providing water to the Federal Treasurer. The industry would have been established immediately but for the fact that there was a premature disclosure of the proposals before they had been approved by the Commonwealth Government. As a result, the British authorities made a protest based on the fact that the industry would have tariff protection, which could not be given without a tariff inquiry under the terms

of the Ottawa Agreement. The Prime Minister told me he thought a tariff inquiry should be held, but that this would not hold up the negotiations. The inquiry was held and it recommended the project, but further opposition came from the United Kingdom Government, this time on the ground that the inquiry had been irregular. Overseas interests had not been given time to present evidence before the commission, and a second inquiry was held, which took much longer. Representations from the United Kingdom were presented to the Commission, which again gave an affirmative report.

I then had a communication from Mr. Menzies that the Commonwealth Government had approved the project. I immediately went to Mr. Essington Lewis and said we could go right ahead, but he said "I am very sorry, but all the offers of plant and equipment have been withdrawn because war is imminent, and we are not now in a position to go ahead." However, he said that if my Government was agreeable the company would establish shipbuilding yards at Whyalla because they would be needed in war-time. I can assure the honourable member that the construction of the pipeline was based on a deal—that we would supply water on the assurance that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company would establish shipbuilding at Whyalla. That is the background of the matter. In any case, it does not need a Royal Commission to establish the facts. The documents are on the file for members to see, and if required I can provide a report from the Crown Solicitor that they do not establish any legal case for action along the lines of the appointment of a Commission. Paragraph (5) of the motion is as follows:—

What action, if any, the Government has taken to give effect to the recommendations of the Director of Mines or to the resolution carried by this House in 1953.

This has already been reported to Parliament, and the correspondence that transpired has been published. I think members can see from what I have said that the appointment of a Commission at present would not carry the position any further. In fact, I believe it would only jeopardize any hope we would have of reaching an agreement with the company and complicate any negotiations we may have with any overseas company if the B.H.P. Company is not prepared to go ahead at Whyalla. Under these circumstances I oppose the motion.

Mr. RICHES secured the adjournment of the debate.

COURSING RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 986.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray)—I support the Bill, but if I believed that cruelty to animals would be increased, or that totalizers or bookmaking would be brought into the matter in any way, I would oppose it. I do not believe cruelty would be increased; in fact, there is nothing under the present set-up to stop any of the so-called cruelties from taking place. There is nothing to stop coursing clubs from conducting live coursing events or from drawing a lure behind a horse, as is done at Peterborough. There is also nothing to stop a club from having a pilot dog, which many of them have, or from pulling a lure behind a push cycle, although there is a law to prevent a lure being drawn behind a motor cycle. This is ridiculous. If people are going to be cruel, they will be cruel under the present set-up. I do not believe that the introduction of a mechanical lure would accentuate cruelty to animals. If it is necessary to have animals blooded to chase a mechanical lure, it would also be necessary to have them blooded to chase a pilot dog or a lure towed behind a horse.

Mr. O'Halloran—And they do not do it?

Mr. BYWATERS—They do not, because it is not necessary. It is natural for dogs to run, especially greyhounds, and mechanical lures are sought to provide for this natural instinct. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) who is an expert on satire, said last week that British high society had gone to the dogs. He also referred to Marilyn Monroe and the Hon. Tony, saying that they might go to the dogs. I am not interested in whether lords and ladies or Marilyn Monroe go to the dogs, but I am concerned that a few people interested in coursing wish to use mechanical lures to further their sport. In most instances these people are from the poorer classes, the ordinary people I am proud to represent, and they are asking for something to enable them to enjoy a sport in which they are interested.

Most people are animal lovers, and do not wish to be cruel to any animals. If cruelty were practised it would be with a mechanical lure or otherwise. I think every member will agree that the greyhound is a very docile and untemperamental animal. I have seen children playing with them, and I am not afraid to stroke them, but I would not stroke many other dogs. If greyhounds are blooded they become

savage, as do all animals when they taste raw meat.

Mr. Jennings—Then you should be opposing the Bill.

Mr. BYWATERS—I am not opposing it; however, I do not wish to be sidetracked now. Most greyhounds are well cared for by their owners and are provided with the best food. They would not be given blood meat. When these dogs go into the field they do not attempt to eat the animal they kill; they merely shake it to instant death. Members have received considerable correspondence concerning this Bill. Included therein is some propaganda from an organization entitled the Anti-Tin Hare Racing League. One pamphlet which suggests that tin hare racing is cruel to animals was quoted at length by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). This pamphlet is not signed, nor is there any indication as to who authorized it.

The Menace of Tin Hares was another booklet prepared allegedly for general enlightenment on tin hare racing and was sponsored by the Anti-Tin Hare Racing League. There is no signature on that booklet, but an accompanying circular letter is signed by W. Richardson. Most communications members receive concerning various legislation bear signatures of groups of people or are authorized by well known and respected organizations. I do not suggest that the Anti-Tin Hare Racing League is not a legitimate body, but I am not prepared to accept one man's opinion whether or not a sport is cruel. This man might be opposed to all forms of sport, including foot racing, and I cannot accept him as an authority.

Mr. Jennings quoted extensively from a press article relating to the cruelty that arises from this sport. A *Sunday Telegraph* reporter, Frank O'Neill, wrote the article, but I believe the position has been greatly exaggerated. Some reporters realize that by bringing forward something spectacular they may reap greater remuneration and earn better prospects of promotion. It is the sensational that sells newspapers. Quite often members of this House make excellent speeches, but the reports in the press next day are confined to one or two lines. However, on one occasion when another member referred to the burlesque of Marilyn Monroe on the steps of Parliament House, he received front page publicity, because it was sensational. On another occasion the exploits of the Hon. Tony Moynihan displaced the Suez Canal

situation from the front page. I think Frank O'Neill made his report spectacular to boost the sales of his paper.

Mr. Jennings—Did you see any denials of his statements?

Mr. BYWATERS—No, but I believe the episode he reported was greatly exaggerated. If it were correct, he should have reported the matter to the appropriate authorities. He criticized what had happened and visited the same track subsequently, I suggest, to seek further material for future articles. If he were as shocked as he pretended he should have reported to the R.S.P.C.A. or the police to ensure that action was taken. He said the cruelty took place at a private house on the Hume Highway and he returned there some days later and witnessed further acts of cruelty. This is an isolated case which has been given prominence in the press. I do not disagree with that, because it may assist in stamping out such acts of cruelty.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Heath) referred to cruelty that took place some years ago in Melbourne, but at that time tin hare coursing was not in vogue there. Victoria has accepted tin hare racing only in the last 12 months and I contend that cruelty, if it does happen, will occur irrespective of whether or not a mechanical lure is used. The people interested in coursing in South Australia have no desire to perpetrate acts of cruelty. The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) quoted from a statement by Mr. Jack Turley, who said:—

On the score of cruelty, if any member is caught destroying any animal with a greyhound he is liable to disqualification for one year to life, and to be reported to the R.S.P.C.A. In 25 years' experience of speed tracks I have never witnessed cruelty. The only "bleeding" our greyhounds get is in the open coursing season when it is legal to race after live hares. The Adelaide Greyhound Club would be happy to meet R.S.P.C.A. secretary, Mr. Colley, and this association, which does so much for animals.

The people interested in this sport are only concerned with furthering the sport by using a mechanical lure. When I was at Broken Hill recently I was privileged, as a guest of the club, to witness coursing with mechanical lures. It seemed to be properly conducted, everything being clean and above board. The animals were impounded for some time prior to the race and inspected by the stewards, and again inspected at its conclusion.

Mr. Jennings—You would not expect them to be doing anything nefarious in front of the officials?

Mr. BYWATERS—That is true. The honourable member is implying that it takes place. I had heard previously of bleeding, but the officials said to me, "You are not going to take any notice of that rubbish, are you?", adding that they were interested in it purely as a sport. It is only natural for dogs to run, and any likeness of the mechanical lure to a hare on this occasion was purely accidental. Mr. Jennings said that he was opposed to betting being brought into it. I agree; and say that he is consistent in that respect. He added that Mr. Jenkins had stated that he would oppose any method of betting, and I believe Mr. Jenkins was sincere in saying that. At some time members of the House may decide to support betting associated with greyhound racing. They had betting in Melbourne long before they had tin hare racing. If members decided in favour of betting on such events it would not matter if a pilot dog or a mechanical lure were used. The object of the Bill is to enable the coursing people to conduct their sport with the assistance of a mechanical lure.

The question of nuisance has been raised. Mr. Jennings said he did not like the idea of having greyhound dogs barking at night. The Bill distinctly provides that if there is any chance of the sport becoming a nuisance an application can be made to the Chief Secretary for the licence to be cancelled. I think there are sufficient provisions in the Bill to protect the position. I am disturbed in the early morning by the passing of an aeroplane, and I have no come-back in that respect, but in this instance if a person objects to the noise being made at a greyhound race meeting he can apply to the Chief Secretary to have something done about it. I am mainly concerned in supporting the Bill because of the coursing club at Murray Bridge, which has been carried on since 1940 with the aid of a pilot dog. The position has been extremely difficult in the last year or two because this dog is getting long in the tooth and is not fast enough and the other dogs running in a pack gain momentum and pass him. Immediately, their interest in the race is lost. Naturally, a dog likes to run in company and a pilot dog running on its own will not do its best unless specifically trained for the purpose. If the club had a mechanical lure that difficulty would be overcome. Then the pace could be regulated to suit the pace of the dogs. There is nothing in the Bill which will result in increased cruelty to animals. I do not believe that takes place at the moment, and see no reason why it should happen in the

future. I believe that much of the propaganda put before us on this score is grossly exaggerated, and think that Mr. Jennings has done his best to exaggerate it to its utmost, putting forward a case which I do not think he really believes himself.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I support the Bill, which in my opinion merely seeks in a minor and socially harmless way to liberalize the existing conditions for those who desire to engage dogs in a race after a mechanical quarry. My support of the Bill would not have been forthcoming but for the inclusion of proposed section 3b, sub-sections (1) and (2), which completely prohibits betting on this sport.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide)—In 1951, when a similar Bill was before the House, I spoke in favour of and voted for it. The main part of the debate on that occasion concerned gambling. There is nothing cruel about gambling, although some people may consider it harmful. We are indebted to Mr. Jennings for his speech. Until he spoke I believed I would support the measure. I listened to Mr. Jenkins' remarks when introducing the Bill and also those of Mr. Heath, and agree that, irrespective of the law passed by Parliament, there will always be some infringement. It does not mean that the Bill is bad because there may be an isolated instance of cruelty. After hearing Mr. Jennings, backed with facts which I feel at this stage are irrefutable, I feel that as a responsible representative of the people I can not lend my support to the Bill. It is up to Mr. Jenkins or another member to refute the statements made by Mr. Jennings, whose remarks should not have been ridiculed as they were by Mr. Bywaters, who said he did not think that Mr. Jennings believed what he said. I do not think Mr. Jennings can be accused of such a thing. Twelve months ago he introduced a Bill to ban the shooting of live pigeons, so it was wrong to say that Mr. Jennings was not sincere.

I can see no wrong in dogs chasing a mechanical hare. I have seen it done in Melbourne. The important point to me is the cruelty, and Mr. Jennings described what happens at these meetings. Until someone disabuses my mind in regard to such happenings I will not support the Bill. Members who support the measure say the acts of cruelty could happen whether or not the dogs chase a mechanical lure or some other type of bait. We should ban any use of live bait. I oppose the Bill because of the possibilities of cruelty occurring.

If I accept the sincerity of Mr. Jennings and other members as a guide in this debate, I must say that Mr. Jenkins last year opposed a Bill introduced by Mr. Jennings to ban the shooting of live pigeons. Mr. Jenkins has not said it is wrong to feed live bait to dogs but said that it does not happen. Last year he admitted that the shooting of live pigeons occurred, yet voted for its continuance. I voted last year consistently with the attitude I am adopting today. I opposed the shooting of live pigeons and I will oppose any so-called sport where there is cruelty to animals. I cannot see how the Bill can pass. I accepted Mr. Heath's statement about acts of cruelty, but after hearing Mr. Jennings I will do all I can to discourage further cruelty to animals. The happenings described by him were shocking. There is no doubt about their authenticity and I leave it to Mr. Jenkins to disprove the statements.

Earlier today the House voted on the holding of harmless raffles, in which nearly all members participate. They were related to clean sport, yet Mr. Jenkins did not cast a vote either for or against them. When I consider the attitude of Mr. Jenkins on the shooting of pigeons and on the holding of harmless raffles I feel I am right in opposing this Bill and believing what Mr. Jennings said. He made a point about the noise coming from the barking of dogs and the blaring of microphones, but there is a provision in the Bill permitting the Chief Secretary to ban the holding of coursing meetings in a residential area.

Mr. Bywaters spoke about the noise of aeroplanes but it was wrong for him to compare their noise with the noise that comes from barking dogs and blaring microphones. Aeroplanes pass over my home when going to and coming from the Adelaide airport, but they are performing a national service. He said also that he was not interested in whether some people went to the dogs. I think we should all take steps to see that our own State does not go to the dogs, which is more important than whether someone overseas goes to the dogs.

Like the member for Murray, I am not going to be dictated to or influenced by some club which might exist in my electorate, and I will not be influenced simply because there might be some outside pressure. My whole attitude is determined by the degree of cruelty associated with this so-called sport. I will now quote from the scriptures. Psalm 71, verse 4 is as follows:—

Deliver me, O my God, out of the hand of the wicked, out of the hand of the unrighteous and cruel man.

I will leave it to members to determine whether those who are supporting this measure are cruel men. Perhaps the member for Stirling and the member for Wallaroo do not consciously condone cruelty, although I am reminded that the member for Stirling adopted a certain attitude last year with regard to the pigeon shooting Bill. Generally speaking, however, I do not attribute any ulterior motive to members of this House. It is, however, my sincere opinion that cruelty does exist where this sport operates. The member for Enfield referred to a Royal Commission which condemned this practice, and the fact that no action has been taken does not mean that the findings of that Commission were wrong. I quote the scriptures again, this time Proverbs, chapter 11, verse 17:—

A merciful man doeth good to his own soul, but he that is cruel troubleth his own flesh.

The member for Murray has been in a facetious vein all the afternoon, and he can continue in that vein if he so desires. I commend that verse, and I think members will agree that we all receive much more pleasure and satisfaction out of those sentiments than we do in being cruel. I see nothing funny in that. I will have more satisfaction from my vote on this measure if my conscience tells me that I have done nothing which will add to the acts of cruelty which have been described in this House.

I see nothing against dogs running on their own or behind a mechanical lure, and I would rather see them run behind a mechanical lure than a live bait. If there were any other acts of cruelty today I would adopt the same attitude and ban the practice. If we supported this Bill and experienced what is happening in Victoria and New South Wales, as described by the member for Enfield, we would, in my opinion, be bringing into South Australia the undesirable and cruel practices which are associated with tin hare racing in other States. That is my attitude, and until I am convinced that cruelty would not be associated with the operations of this Bill I intend to oppose it.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria)—I rise to oppose the Bill. I realize that all members of this House have a responsibility to their electorates, and that the honourable member for Stirling has done the right thing. He has been requested to bring this Bill before the House, and he has done the right thing in that he

has satisfied certain people in his electorate and presented the Bill in a correct manner. Members who have spoken today are also speaking for certain persons in their electorates, which they are entitled to do and should do, but that does not prove to me that they are giving the Bill wholehearted support.

I have had a good deal of experience with animals, particularly dogs, and I say that the greyhound is one of the most docile of all dogs. I say without any fear of contradiction that it is not a vicious killer, but rather a cowardly dog. Any stockman who has had experience of the mutilation of stock by dogs knows that the greyhound is very vicious if taught to kill, but that does not apply to greyhounds generally. That usually applies to a terrier or a sheep dog. Once a greyhound is taught to kill it is a vicious killer. A dog will not perform its best until it is led to believe that the tin hare is a live thing and that effect can only be produced if the dog has been trained to kill. I believe that in this debate the aspect of cruelty has been exaggerated although I admit it is necessary to train a greyhound to kill before it will chase the lure. People do not go to the sport to see greyhounds ambling along behind a perambulator: they go to see dogs race each other to the kill.

Many people today are herded into cities; their lives are regulated by the clock; their bosses tell them when and how to work. I believe people are looking for something in their sport that is exactly the opposite of work—a few moments of tense suspense waiting for the result of a bet. Without gambling I believe tin hare racing would die a natural death. This Bill seeks to eliminate gambling, but I believe that if we sponsor this sport additional regulations and policing will be required. I find insufficient merit in it to support the Bill; therefore I oppose it.

Mr. DAVIS (Port Pirie)—I support the Bill and, like the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), I rise with a clear conscience. It is rather amusing to hear members talking about having a clear conscience when supporting or opposing a Bill: indeed, I thought politicians always had a clear conscience. I do not agree with many of the statements that have been made in this debate concerning the cruelty associated with tin hare racing. Although I have been associated with coursing all my life I have never seen any cruelty. True, I have had little experience of tin hare racing, but I do not believe the opinion expressed by the

member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) concerning cruelty in this sport is correct. There may have been one or two isolated instances of cruelty, but I believe that aspect has been exaggerated. Tin hare racing is a poor man's sport. Any man may race a dog although only the wealthy are able to race horses, and surely the common man has as much right to his class of sport as the wealthy.

In this debate I have heard statements made regarding cruelty in open coursing, but there is no cruelty in that sport. True, a hare may be caught now and again, but after being caught it is killed within a minute for the greyhound pierces its heart immediately. There is therefore no lingering death in open coursing. Although I have seen only one tin hare meeting, I was more impressed with that sport than with open coursing for a man could take his place on the course, whereas in following open coursing he had to travel the field until the meeting was over. There was no 'bleeding of the dogs at the tin hare meeting and I was impressed with their training. Like race horses, on entering the straight they strained every nerve to reach the post. Tin hare racing takes place in South Australia at present and in some places a horse gallops along the track and is chased by dogs, but if tin hare racing is to be conducted let it be conducted properly.

It has been said that gambling will be conducted in association with this sport, but that is not so. It will be the responsibility of the Government to say whether gambling facilities shall be provided. I would not care whether gambling was conducted or not. Indeed, if it were I would go along and punt, but if I had no chance to punt on the dogs I would go merely for love of the sport. Surely, however, I have just as much right to back a dog as a race horse. Indeed, I will probably get a fairer go on a dog because it has no jockey to pull it up. I point out, however, that gambling is not to be introduced in association with this sport.

The sponsor of the Bill said he opposed pigeon shooting. I supported the Bill introduced by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) to ban that sport, and I would support a ban on the sport now under discussion if I thought there was any cruelty in it. Much has been said about the use of opossums, rabbits and cats to blood dogs, but anyone who knows anything about coursing will say that these animals are not thrown to the dogs. The dogs must be trained, but once a dog catches the animal it is dead within a minute.

For many years the nobles of England have indulged in fox hunting, and when the unfortunate fox is caught it is torn to pieces by the hounds. It is amusing to hear some members talk about cruelty. Why do they not ask the Government to ban the use of myxomatosis and gin traps to exterminate rabbits? The member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) and other members know that rabbits caught in gin traps can be heard screaming a mile away, yet we hear no objection to that. I would be prepared to vote for the banning of gin traps and the use of myxomatosis. Strangely, members opposing the Bill are not prepared to prevent that cruelty because by doing so they would interfere with the economy of the country. They try to justify their attitude by saying rabbits are a pest, but cruelty is not right at any time or in any form. I hope the Bill will be passed, not for the purpose of increasing gambling, but for the love of the sport of tin hare coursing.

Mr. HAMBOUR (Light)—I rise only to say why I support the Bill. Dog racing is popular in my district and I have had several requests from constituents to support the Bill. I have listened to the debate with an open mind, but the purpose of the Bill has been clouded by much exaggeration, though this has only strengthened my support for it. Many members have referred to gambling, but the Bill does not mention it. The bleeding of dogs takes place today, but gambling and bleeding have been the main reasons put forward by those opposing the Bill. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) went to great lengths to develop an argument against the Bill. If he had confined his remarks to the facts and not exaggerated his arguments might have been impressive, but he sank to a new low. At one stage he referred to high society in Great Britain and said:—

The member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) wished to convince the House that the Bill had merit, but he went about it by suggesting that we follow the views of British high society. I believe, however, that because of the many recent doings in high society in Britain it is high only in the olfactory rather than the elevated sense; in short, to put it elegantly, it stinks and I do not think this House is likely to be convinced by any such irresponsible argument.

If that is not an irresponsible utterance I do not know what is. I cannot see how his remarks had anything to do with tin hare racing. The Bill simply allows those interested to use a mechanical hare instead of dragging a rabbit skin around the course. Those opposing the Bill say it is necessary to blood the dogs to get them to follow the skin or decoy.

I have no doubt that is true, though I do not know to what extent. Whether this sport will grow I do not know, but there has not been one argument put forward to show that there will be more cruelty or more gambling. I believe there is gambling on this sport today, but no mention is made of gambling in the Bill. I am convinced that the passing of the Bill will not increase gambling or cruelty. If there is gambling or cruelty today another Bill should be introduced to prohibit it, but there is nothing in this measure to convince me I should oppose it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh)—I oppose the Bill, but I want it clearly understood that what I have to say is no reflection upon those who support it. I have come to the conclusion that there is no great public demand for this sport in South Australia, though a few people may want to follow it. The fact that hare racing and speed coursing have become a menace in New South Wales and Victoria should be seriously considered, for in those States they have been declared noxious sports. The House is indebted to the member for Enfield for reading extracts from journals to show the diabolical cruelty associated with coursing. I know it has been argued that the type of coursing proposed in this Bill has not been practised very much in the other States, but that is a stronger reason why it should be opposed, because the type of coursing that it provides for would encourage cruelty to a greater extent. No member who supported the measure has been able to deny that cruelty is associated with coursing. Indeed, they admitted it by stating that the cruelty has been exaggerated.

Mr. Heath—It is happening every day of the week.

Mr. HUTCHENS—It is, and some members are trying to justify the cruelty. It is quite beyond the comprehension of thinking people that any member could be so misguided by pressure groups that he would come here and advocate such things. Where this type of sport has been tried it has always been found to be undesirable. The sponsor of the Bill admitted quite openly, yet unintentionally, that this is an undesirable sport, because he has put provisions in the Bill that would only be necessary if it is undesirable.

I believe new section 3b, which sets out to provide a prohibition against betting on this sport, is the joke of the whole Bill. We all know that whether or not there is a

prohibition this sport can only function when betting takes place, because betting is its only interest. I have taken every possible action to stop the uneven distribution of wealth, and I would rather step down from public life than support anything that would further encourage this uneven distribution. As this Bill would lead only to more diabolical cruelty and to greater gambling, and it would not give anything to this State, I oppose it.

Mr. STEPHENS (Port Adelaide)—I support the Bill. I was surprised to hear about the cruelty that occurs in coursing. Members should be ashamed of themselves because, if they know that it is going on, it is their duty as citizens and as members to try to stop it. I have seen coursing conducted in other States. I once attended tin hare coursing, and when I heard someone say that a certain dog had no chance of winning because it had not been blooded, I did not know what was meant, but I know now. Cruelty has been practised by the highest of society in this State for years in the hunt club meetings. When I was a boy I worked at Athelstone where hunts finish, and I used to see rabbits torn to pieces by dogs.

I believe betting will eventually be allowed on this form of coursing, and if it is suggested I will support it. As betting is allowed on open coursing I do not see any reason why it should not be allowed on this sport. Years ago I moved that trotting meetings should have betting facilities because racing clubs had them, and the House agreed with my proposal. Every member of this House is a gambler. No member can contest an election without betting the Government £25 to nothing that he will get one-fifth of the votes cast. Is that not a gamble?

Mr. John Clark—Not in your district.

Mr. STEPHENS—It is; candidates in my district have been defeated. This week I was approached by a representative of one of our biggest institutions, which is supported by the Government, and asked to buy a ticket for a raffle. Raffles are illegal, but it is only a man-made illegality. I give this Bill my wholehearted support.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I support the Bill, and ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 18, at 2 p.m.