

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 4, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

MATRICULATION CLASSES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my question of July 27 concerning matriculation classes.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The following have the metropolitan high school enrolments, details of which were requested by the Leader: Adelaide Boys, 1,075; Adelaide Girls, 839; Blackwood, 543; Brighton, 1,372; Campbelltown, 1,024; Elizabeth, 1,635; Enfield, 1,684; Findon, 1,490; Henley, 1,112; Marion, 1,806; Norwood, 1,219; Plympton, 1,428; Seacombe, 1,126; Unley, 1,802; and Woodville, 1,703. The following have new matriculation classes: Gilles Plains, 1,032; Salisbury, 729; and Taperoo, 658. Those in the country include Glossop, 621; Loxton, 518; Mount Barker, 522; Mount Gambier, 677; Murray Bridge, 757; Nuriootpa, 750; and Port Pirie, 1,039. The following country schools have new matriculation classes as from this year: Gawler, 642; Kadina, 401; Millicent, 452; Port Augusta, 678; Port Lincoln, 591; Victor Harbour, 370; and Willunga, 689. In the Northern Territory, Darwin has an enrolment of 686. The new classes amongst technical high schools this year are as follows: Croydon Boys Technical High School, 720; Mitchell Park Boys Technical High School, 1,148; and Vermont Girls Technical High School, 971. In addition, Woomera Area School, with a present enrolment of 212, will have a matriculation class.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Last week I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding the laying of water to Kimba, and the latter part of his reply indicated that he had conferred with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief and had been told that a camp was to be established for this project and that the

department expected to be able to start main-laying early in 1966. I notified my constituents at Kimba to this effect, but since then I have heard that a start will not be made early next year. Can the Minister explain the reason for the change in plans?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, let me express my deep regret at having given the answer referred to, as I have inconvenienced the honourable member to some extent because he has advised his constituents accordingly. Yesterday I told him that there had been a change in the programme, and I told him why. I thank him for giving me the opportunity to make the explanation so that he will not be accused of having given wrong information, and so that it will be clear that I did say that a start would be made early next year, whereas the work is expected to be commenced later. The facts are, of course, that during the last financial year the Engineering and Water Supply Department rather over-spent its Loan money. There always has to be a reckoning day, and this seems to have occurred during the first year the present Government has been in power. My Cabinet colleagues, however, have been most helpful, and the programme has not been cut to the extent it might have been had it not been for their very fair consideration and their desire to see development continue to the maximum possible in South Australia. The reply was based on a report forwarded to me on July 16 this year, but subsequently substantial reductions were necessary in the tentative Loan programme for 1965-66 and in making these the amount allocated for the Kimba scheme was reduced to £10,000 to cover certain preliminary work only. In view of this and the fact that a reply to the honourable member was pending, my attention should have been drawn to the necessity to make this cut, but because of an oversight this was not done. It will now be necessary to delay the beginning of the main-laying, and in these circumstances the delay will not allow the commencement of actual main-laying operations on the Kimba scheme before July, 1966, although the camp establishment and other preliminary works will proceed in the meantime.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of last week about the various Commonwealth grants being made for educational purposes in South Australia?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The following grants are received annually from the Commonwealth Government by the Education Department:

1. Commonwealth grants for university purposes:
 - (a) For the University of Adelaide.
 - (b) For graduate courses at the S.A. Institute of Technology.
 - (c) For residential colleges at the university.
2. Commonwealth grants for physical education:
 - (a) The grant for this purpose to the Education Department.
 - (b) The grant for this purpose to the University of Adelaide.

Note: The Commonwealth grant for physical education to the National Fitness Council will now be transmitted from the Education Department to the department controlled by the Minister of Social Welfare.

3. The Commonwealth grant for science laboratories.
4. The Commonwealth grant for technical education.

The following schemes are administered on behalf of the Commonwealth:

1. Commonwealth Adult Migrant Education Scheme.
2. Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme.
3. Commonwealth Social Services Education Scheme.
4. Commonwealth free milk for schoolchildren.
5. Commonwealth scholarships.
6. Northern Territory schools.

NARRUNG WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a report concerning progress on the Narrung water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, I appreciate that the honourable member, since asking this question, saw me and the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and resolved what one might term misunderstandings. The department will now submit to the honourable member a proposal for a scheme for the area and, subject to an agreement being entered into with the respective councils, it is hoped that in the next financial year something practical will be done.

TELEVISION NEWS SERVICE.

Mr. RODDA: Recently the time of the news session on the National television network on ABC Channel 2 was changed to 6.30 p.m. I have been asked by many people in the South-East why this change was made. Will the Premier use his good offices and approach the authorities to see whether this news session could revert to its original time? People like to see news sessions on television, and apparently 6.30 p.m. does not suit many people who have appointments at the local hostelry and have no option but to rush off if they wish to hear the news at that time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to make representations but, as this is an entirely Commonwealth matter, they would have to be made to the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The commission may be able to review its decision.

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In reply to a question yesterday by the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) concerning the dismissal of a certain employee of the Crown, the Premier said he did not wish to comment further. Will the Premier make the appropriate docket available to any honourable member who wishes to satisfy himself that no miscarriage of justice has occurred in this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have no hesitation in saying that a miscarriage of justice never occurred and that Cabinet did not impose any injustice on the gentleman concerned. I go further and say that every possible aspect concerning this gentleman's welfare was considered. I shall consult with the Chief Secretary (whose department is concerned with this matter) and try to ascertain what information can be made available for honourable members' perusal within the Chamber, without ever allowing that information to go outside the Chamber or to reach the press. I think the Leader will agree that the Government is responsible to see that a former employee of the Government should not be the subject of harmful innuendoes.

CHOWILLA TIMBER.

Mr. CURREN: In the area to be inundated by the Chowilla dam considerable stands of red gum and box trees exist. As much of the gum is suitable for milling, and as box trees are suitable for trellis posts (for which a continuous demand exists in the Upper Murray irrigation settlements), will the Minister of

Works say what action is contemplated regarding timber stands in this area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Minister of Forests has drawn my attention to the request made by many people on this matter, and I have a report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, which I think will assist the honourable member. It states:

The interests of three departments are involved, viz., the Lands Department, Woods and Forests Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The timber on ground leases is under the control of the Lands Department. I am of the opinion that all timber-getting operations should be regulated and supervised by the Woods and Forests Department. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is interested in several directions. First, it will be advisable to leave certain stands of timber to act as wave breakers; secondly, it will be necessary to ensure that timber felling does not interfere with actual construction operations; thirdly, the establishment of a well-defined navigable channel will be essential; and lastly, it will be necessary for timber fellers to burn or remove all tops and waste wood to prevent an accumulation of debris within the reservoir.

Bearing all of these factors in mind, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief has made the following recommendations:

- (1) That a committee be set up to be known as the Chowilla timber committee and comprising one representative from the Woods and Forests Department, one from the Lands Department, and one from the Engineering and Water Supply Department.
- (2) That this committee be given power to decide which areas should be cleared, and the areas where timber should be left standing.
- (3) That responsibility for the issue of licences or permits, direction of felling and clearing operations, and the collection of royalties be vested in the Woods and Forests Department.

The Director continues:

It is unlikely that Chowilla dam will cause any inundation before August, 1969. In fact, it could be later than this if the completion of the dam happened to coincide with a dry period in the Murray-Darling catchment area.

CLARE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of July 28 regarding the building of the high school at Clare?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department reports:

The Public Works Standing Committee has recommended the erection of the new school. Approval has just been obtained to proceed with the design of the school and the preparation of tender documents. A sum has been included on the 1965-66 Loan Estimates to

cover these costs. With its present priority the project will be ready for on-site construction to commence during the next financial year, 1966-67. However, the letting of a contract will depend on the availability of funds.

ROAD SAFETY.

Mr. LANGLEY: People in this State are perturbed by the number of accidents on the roads. Recently, the fixing of seat belt anchors was made compulsory in respect of new cars registered in South Australia. It has been brought to my notice that on wet roads a traffic hazard is caused by the spraying of dirty water on windscreens. Several new models of car have windscreen sprays to alleviate this hazard. As this is a matter of Government policy, will the Premier ask Cabinet to legislate so that either mud flaps or windscreen sprays are made compulsory?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. CORCORAN.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield) moved:

That two months' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Millicent (Mr. J. D. Corcoran) on account of ill-health.

Motion carried.

OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I move:

That in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria.

In moving this motion, Mr. Speaker, I point out to honourable members that South Australia is the only State in the Commonwealth where legalized off-course betting is not conducted throughout the State. Licensed betting shops do operate at Port Pirie, and have been operating since before the Second World War, and, to my knowledge, no attempt has been made by any organization to have them closed; but for the remainder of this State off-course betting is illegal for the general public. This state of affairs in itself is altogether wrong, because if it is legal for the people to bet in one town in the State it should follow that the people who so desire should be able to make a legal bet in any town in the State. To certain people, not only in this State but in other States of the Commonwealth, the word "betting" is regarded as evil. Perhaps I may be more explicit if I use the word "gambling"; that is, gambling as such is evil. I question this because I believe that

anything which is carried to excess whether it be pride, greed, lust, anger, gluttony, envy or sloth, is evil.

Most of us will agree that at some time in our lives we have been guilty, to a degree which is known only to ourselves, with regard to those evils I have mentioned. This is because we are human and are living in an environment where a man has to adjust himself to his fellow men. It would be just as hopeless to attempt to suppress those evils as it would be to suppress starting price betting. If we could turn back the clock on our civilization we would find that the element of luck or chance has played a part in man's survival; it exists today and will continue to exist in later generations. Most of us could relate that on more than one occasion luck or chance has bobbed up during our life-time. It could be said that most of us take a calculated risk whenever we cross a busy intersection.

Take the stock exchange for example. Every day we see fluctuations, which could mean the loss of a fortune to some people and the making of a fortune to others. It could be argued that only knowledgeable people should play the stock exchange. I agree; but that does not prevent the knowledgeable person from misplacing his judgment. Factors quite outside the knowledge of an investor could mean the rise or fall in shares, hence luck or chance plays a part. This is the chance the investor takes when he invests on a particular investment. Once an investor applies his knowledge and invests and the shares fall, that investor is considered unlucky. If, on the other hand, the shares rise then the investor is rewarded for the chance he took. One does not need to go outside this State to see the masses of people who have a flutter on interstate lotteries. Is it immoral for them to purchase a lottery ticket? Is it an evil intent of theirs to purchase such a ticket? Surely then there is no evil intent on the part of people who wish to invest on the result of a horse race.

As this motion deals with horse racing, Mr. Speaker, let me remind honourable members that racing is a sport. I have heard it referred to as the King of Sport. It dates back 9,000 years at least. There is evidence of this fact, and it has been confirmed that men did actually wager on a horse race. Later great chariot-racing carnivals took place and men were betting on them. In fact, right down through the ages men, and of course women too, have wagered on horse racing. Let me turn now to gambling in general terms. By general

terms I mean all types of gambling, and I drawn members' attention to a survey conducted over a five-year period in the United States of America and completed in 1960.

The survey was conducted by Mr. John Scarne who is recognized as the world's leading authority on gambling. Mr. Scarne incidentally is a consultant to the U.S. Government, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the American Armed Forces, and also consultant to various Governments in South America, Europe and some American States. I can thoroughly recommend his book *Complete Guide to Gambling*, published a few years ago, to all people in all walks of life. Mr. Scarne makes no secret of the fact that anyone who gambles is a fool (and I agree with that), and suggests that the only way to legislate against gambling on race horses is to legislate to close racecourses.

Now is this likely to happen in our society today? I think not. Horse racing has been part of our civilization for centuries, so we must accept the fact that it will remain as such, and while we have horse racing we will always have people who will wager on the horses. During the five-year period of Mr. Scarne's survey, 61,500 men and women gamblers and 10,000 professional gamblers were interviewed. To honourable members this may seem to be a small number when compared with the population of the U.S.A. It was, in fact, 1 per cent of the population. Nevertheless, it was so conducted that the information obtained revealed that the number of persons gambling illegally in the U.S.A. represented 70 per cent of the adult population: 40,000,000 men and 46,000,000 women. And the sum so gambled was \$50,000,000,000 annually. Of this amount, nearly 98 per cent or \$48,000,000,000 was wagered illegally; the remaining 2 per cent was bet on the totalizators on the race tracks. In the U.S.A., totalizators on the course are the only legal means of placing a bet. That coincides with the position in South Australia today, with the exception of Port Pirie.

The survey also revealed that the favourite gambling activity was card playing. Horse racing, strangely enough, was well down the list (about eighth if my memory serves me correctly). I mention these facts, Mr. Speaker, to show that if it is an illegal offence to bet on horse racing off the course, as it is in this State, surely then card playing, poker, and bridge are a form of evil. I wonder what the people who play bridge and poker regularly for stakes would say if they were told

that what they were doing was evil. The whole question of gambling, Mr. Speaker, has to be faced fairly and squarely and not likened to the ostrich who puts his head in the sand (to use a colloquial expression). Turning to our own State, Mr. Speaker, honourable members are well aware of the extent of starting price betting in South Australia. If they are not, then let me point out that in every State of the Commonwealth, when a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into off-the-course betting, the findings with regard to S.P. betting were similar, namely, that S.P. betting was being conducted on a huge scale.

Mr. Clark: Were Royal Commissions appointed in all the other States?

Mr. CASEY: Yes. A Royal Commission was appointed in South Australia in 1933, and it was advocated even then that a system of off-course totalizer betting was best for the people of this State. In Victoria it was estimated that about £250,000,000 was being turned over by S.P. bookmakers every year, made up of about £63,000,000 from street bookmakers and approximately £190,000,000 from telephone operators. (These figures were given by Inspector Healy, who was in charge of the Gambling Squad in Victoria at the time and who supplied information to the Royal Commission.) Mr. Speaker, I make no positive claim on the figures relating to this matter which may appear in any other report of a Royal Commission in other States and countries. Nevertheless, we should be guided by these estimates, because they were given in good faith by men of high repute who were in responsible positions to give such estimates.

Honourable members will agree with me when I say that in every country town in South Australia there is at least one illegal bookmaker, and in some of the larger towns several—usually one to every hotel—who operate on every Saturday and on mid-week racing days. Regarding the position in the metropolitan area, I would not hazard a guess. So it would be difficult to ascertain the volume of money which passes through the hands of the fraternity in this State. As only a small number of country people can attend metropolitan race meetings, it is probable that quite large sums are handled by country bookmakers, although to estimate such sums would be hypothetical, to say the least. Even if S.P. bookmakers were asked to supply information regarding their turnover, I have no doubt that the figure arrived at would be inaccurate.

However, it could be a guide. It has been stated in the report of the Royal Commission in Victoria that the President of the Licensed Bookmakers' Association of Western Australia said that in his experience bookmakers tended to under-estimate their turnover. This is quite understandable, as they know full well that income tax officials are on the alert for information concerning their takings, and all have furnished returns for that tax.

To illustrate this more fully, I refer to the evidence one S.P. bookmaker gave in Victoria. He operated in a foreign club, and he said that his holdings were about £1,100 for metropolitan and £300 to £350 for country meetings, which meant about £100,000 yearly in turnover. That same bookmaker, under cross-examination, admitted that the Commissioner of Taxes had recently required him to pay £45,000, of which £28,000 was for tax owing and £17,000 as penalty. It is not known whether one or more years were involved in this assessment, but that fact is some corroboration of the experience of the Western Australian president, even allowing for the fact that income is a very different thing from turnover. Another bookmaker at first stated that his average holdings on a metropolitan meeting were about £500 a race. However, later, when the police raided his premises shortly before the start of the first race on a Saturday, he admitted he was holding about £1,500 on the race and that the betting on it had not finished. He later admitted that his average turnover would be about £1,000 a race, which would equal £6,000 to £7,000 a day. His annual turnover was not less than £500,000.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That could well be, if he bet on races in other States.

Mr. CASEY: That is true. This man was one of 12 who occupied the same premises, which were divided into separate rooms. He stated that the average holdings of the others would be about the same as his own, making the total yearly turnover of those premises £6,000,000.

Many people (not only country people) find it impossible to attend race meetings because of distance from the course, shift work, being in hospital and many other good reasons, yet they are interested in betting on horses. They resent the fact that there is no lawful facility for them to make a wager. It is these people, and many others, who regard the illegal bookmaker as one who meets the public's need. Their sympathies are with him and against the Gaming Squad which is trying to suppress him, and so they have no hesitation in betting

illegally. An ex-inspector of police, who is now retired and living in a country town in Victoria, submitted a memorandum to members of the Royal Commission in Victoria who in their wisdom referred to the memorandum in their report. I quote from the memorandum as it appears in the Report of the Royal Commissioner appointed to inquire into Off-the-Course Betting in Victoria. It states:

My type of service brought me into close contact with the public and I claim to speak with knowledge on aspects of S.P. betting as it affects the country policeman and the communities under his charge. Many people consider that the present law on S.P. betting is unfair, particularly to country people. For example, after an S.P. bookmaker had been caught in one town a former friend of mine, a man of excellent repute, said to me, "Don't you personally think that the law is wrong. Look at me. I'm too old for football or cricket and I've no time for golf or tennis but I do like horse-racing. It's my hobby. I'm a moderate bettor and I can afford the money I bet with, more so than a lot of city people who can legally go to the races and bet. I get a kick out of it when I back a winner and I get a lot of pleasure out of talking horses and horse-racing. The law is not fair."

A law which cannot be enforced is not good law, it tends to bring all law into disrespect. Under present conditions the law on S.P. betting cannot be properly enforced. On one side we have an apathetic public, sometimes even hostile, with newspapers and wireless commentators lawfully stimulating the public mind with racing news and descriptions and creating an appetite for betting. On the other side a law which many consider unfair and which is without public support and to enforce it policemen well known and easily avoided. A policeman may suspect that S.P. betting is being actively carried on in his town but rarely does he see any sign of it. It is kept out of his sight but not out of sight of other townspeople. Every town has its share of malicious people, of dull and ignorant people and of gamblers with families short of comforts. Seeing the bookmaker operating they cannot understand why the policeman doesn't stop him. Their minds become receptive to the thought that the policeman is being bribed and that he just doesn't care and isn't doing his duty. They become critical or resentful and lose respect for him. A law which brings those charged with enforcing it into contempt is not good law.

Many policemen realize that the S.P. bookmaker is satisfying a public demand, and, if he catches the bookmaker, someone else will start up. If the bookmaker is a reputable type the policeman is strongly tempted to leave him alone on the assumption that, "the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know" and if he stops the present operator a worse one may start up. A law which a conscientious policeman considers it wise not to thoroughly enforce is not a good law unless it has the backing of a moral law. The present law on S.P. betting has no such backing. It has to

be remembered that policemen are individuals, representative of the community, if many of the community see no wrong in S.P. betting then it can be safely argued that many policemen see no wrong in it. Most are aware of the gossip coupling police with bookmakers and the various allegations of bribery. An S.P. bookmaker could therefore be a continual temptation to a dishonest policeman or to one short of money through sickness or other misfortune. A law which continually creates a temptation to bribery is a dangerous law. I have tried to outline the more obvious faults in the present law on S.P. betting. I believe that it has a bad effect on public morale and a bad effect on youthful minds. Youths see a law broken with impunity, hear adverse criticisms of those charged with the enforcement of it and the general effect is to breed within them a disregard for law generally.

The report continues:

Several witnesses, some of whom were bitterly opposed to illegal bookmakers or to the making of them legal, admitted that they themselves bet with them, on occasions, and felt no great sense of wrong-doing in so doing.

The fact that every Royal Commission on betting (New Zealand, Western Australia, Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales and even the South Australian Royal Commission in 1933) came to the conclusion that it was impossible to effectively suppress illegal off-course betting, no doubt derives from the principle that a law which is not generally acceptable to the people cannot be effectively enforced by the Government. Hence it follows that unless some lawful system of off-course betting is provided, it will remain impossible to suppress illegal off-course betting. In view of this, I am of the opinion that T.A.B. is the best lawful system of off-course betting available to this State, and in addition I favour the system as it operates in Victoria. Several people have asked me, "Why do you want to make something lawful when it concerns mostly country people?" I am pleased that question was asked of me, because the answer is a simple one: "At the present time in South Australia (excluding Port Pirie) betting off the course is unlawful only because an Act of Parliament declared it to be so. It is surely within the legitimate province of the legislature to provide that the people in country areas who desire to bet should be able to do so in a legal way."

Another question asked of me is, "Why favour the Victorian system?" My answer to that is, "Winning bets are not paid out until the first business day after the racing day." This system gives a measure of protection to the average punter who is sometimes tempted to chase his losses. All his bets are cash bets except in the case where he uses the telephone system of betting—in this case he must first

establish a credit with the board of not less than £1. The punter knows he has so much money to invest and no more. At present the illegal bookmaker, knowing full well that the majority of punters are honest, is only too happy to give credit. To him betting is a business, and it is of no concern to the majority of them if a punter bets beyond his means and falls into debt with the butcher, the baker and other trades people. In all States and New Zealand, prior to the introduction of T.A.B. many cases of family hardship caused through gambling were brought to the notice of the police. Since the introduction of T.A.B. the number of such cases in all States has diminished considerably. This fact has been referred to in the reports of the Royal Commissions in all States and in New Zealand.

Just recently, Mr. Speaker, I was able to obtain a copy of a statement dealing with off-course betting issued by Mayor Robert F. Wagner (Mayor of New York) and Comptroller Abraham D. Beame dated October 17, 1963. I was able to have a limited number of copies typed and have made these available to honourable members, and I am sure the honourable members who have read this statement will agree that it is a comprehensive statement on off-course betting. I have been informed that it took three years for the fact-finding team to bring down this document, and it states:

Since New York City's team of fact-finders returned from their survey of off-track betting in New Zealand, Australia, England and France, we have had opportunities to discuss their study with them, and to evaluate their findings. The data they have amassed lead us to believe, more firmly than ever, that legalized, controlled, and taxed off-track betting would be useful and beneficial for New York City and New York State. The many interviews our fact-finders conducted, and the records and facts they gathered, show that New Zealand, England and France each has its own unique system of legal off-track betting, as have some of the States of Australia.

Mr. Freebairn: Does France have bookmakers?

Mr. CASEY: No. The statement continues:

Each of the systems can be truly said to operate satisfactorily, from the viewpoint of both government and people.

While the systems do differ, we conclude that there are important resemblances, and these include:

- (1) The conduct of the various systems of legal off-track betting is orderly and dignified.
- (2) There are only invalid estimates of the extent of horse-betting prior to legalization in each country, hence any comparison between amounts bet

before and after legalization is worthless.

- (3) The amount bet on horses since legalization, however, has risen at a rate lower than the rise in national income, per capita income and other related economic factors.
- (4) Legalization of off-track betting has had no effect on consumer purchases generally.
- (5) Legalization has not been a factor in any rise or fall in the rate of consumer credit defaults.
- (6) It has had no effect either on the number of people receiving welfare assistance or on the amounts paid out in such assistance.
- (7) It has eliminated betting by minors.
- (8) The illegal bookmakers have been largely eliminated.
- (9) Following the establishment of legal off-track betting, the police and the courts have been enabled to concentrate more of their efforts on more serious areas of law-enforcement.
- (10) Betting on horses is accepted as something people do. No amount of opposition in the past was successful in making it any the less a way of life.
- (11) People everywhere would rather do things legally than illegally, and betting on horses is one of them.

The city fact-finders are Albert Margolies, Director of the Comptrollers' Research Bureau, and James A. Cavanagh, Assistant to the Chief Examiner in the Office of the Budget Director.

This fact-finding team referred to the fact that, prior to the introduction of off-course betting in New Zealand, three people, who were active in the Inter-Church Council, were against its introduction. In referring to these people, the report continues:

At the beginning, because the T.A.B. system "respectabilized" gambling, they feared the possibility that betting on horses would increase dangerously. But they say today that there are no signs, after 12 years of legalization, of any dangerous increase.

This was the view expressed to me when I was recently in Victoria, and when I interviewed church leaders there. Whilst they said that legalized off-course betting in their State was well run, they could not at this early stage formulate an opinion as to whether it would have an adverse effect on young people particularly, or even on the population as a whole. The report continues:

They took the position, that with off-track betting now the law of the land, T.A.B. was doing a commendable job. They had very little to suggest in the way of improving T.A.B. The attitude of these one-time vigorous opponents of legal off-track betting appeared to be one of appreciation of the way the system is working out.

One person remained adamant, and said she did not believe in T.A.B. because it had made gambling far too respectable. Continuing, the report states:

Mrs. Jean Langford, chief social worker of the New Zealand Society for the Protection of Home and Family, a voluntary organization devoted to family guidance, stated that legalized off-track betting has had no effect whatever on family relationships. She felt that, both from a social and psychological viewpoint, legalization was a great improvement over betting with starting price bookmakers. C. L. Spencer, Police Commissioner of New Zealand, and Ken Sampson, a former detective who is now security officer for the Racing Commission, both consider legalization of off-track betting a most powerful weapon against bookmaking. They say that more than 90 per cent of all bookmaking has been eliminated. Commissioner Spencer stated that, before legalization, a little over 3 per cent of New Zealand's police force was exclusively occupied with the enforcement of laws against bookmaking. Since legalization, this segment of police personnel has gone into other areas of law enforcement. Prime Minister Keith J. Holyoake, a noted statesman and a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly in 1962, expressed solid confidence in New Zealand's T.A.B. system of off-track betting. He volunteered the information that he himself has an active pre-deposit account with T.A.B. A pre-deposit account is one in which cash is deposited by the bettor in advance, to be drawn upon as he bets. Deputy Minister of Finance H. R. Lake, and R. M. Algie, Speaker of the House of Representatives, New Zealand's Parliament, are in full agreement that the T.A.B. system is outstandingly successful in its operation, and incomparably better for the people than any associations with bookmakers. Both said they make occasional use of T.A.B.'s facilities for placing their own bets.

Mr. Shannon: Is illegal bookmaking carried on there?

Mr. CASEY: It does not matter what sort of legalized system of betting you have: there will always be S.P. bookmakers. In Victoria or in any part of the world there are always S.P. bookmakers who operate on the telephone. I am sure that honourable members will agree that this is probably the hardest form of illegal gambling to detect. However, T.A.B. would at least get them off the street.

Mr. Ryan: There are no licensed bookmakers in New Zealand. Isn't betting there conducted only on the totalizator?

Mr. CASEY: Yes. There were licensed bookmakers until, in 1951, the totalizator was introduced. The report continues:

The Premier of Western Australia (David Brand) expressed himself heartily in favour of the T.A.B. system. He was confident of its continuing success, despite strong opposition to T.A.B. in the State Parliament, opposition that he said was fostered and financed by the

licensed bookmakers who have great wealth and commensurate political influence.

Rev. G. Donald Limb is President of the Methodist Conference of Western Australia, Director of the Methodist Social Questions Department, and Public Relations Director of the United Council for Social Reform, an organization representing all religious denominations and a number of social service groups. He testified before the Royal Commission studying off-track betting as the spokesman for those opposed to the institution of T.A.B. in Western Australia. Rev. Limb is still unalterably opposed to gambling and to anything that may make it easier to gamble. He insists it is the duty of the police to enforce the laws, and that creating new laws to circumvent the illegality of gambling is wrong. Nevertheless, Rev. Limb gave the impression that he felt the fight was over. He said that it will "not again be a burning issue." He called T.A.B. a vast improvement over the illegal bookmakers certainly, and better than the licensed bookmakers it was replacing.

Asked whether he might let up in the intensity of his fight against T.A.B. if T.A.B. showed, as it has, that it is better for the community than illegal or even licensed bookmakers, he answered that he would, and indeed he has. He said:

I am two people. I am a minister of the Gospel and I am a citizen. As a minister, I must oppose gambling in all its forms as a sin. As a citizen I must say that T.A.B. is far better than S.P. bookmaking.

I mention this statement by the Rev. Mr. Limb because we are all aware of the opposition shown to this motion by several Church organizations, and I make no secret of the fact that I admire these people for the courage they have displayed in standing up and voicing their opposition to legalized off-course betting, which they believe to be morally wrong.

There is nothing I would like to see more than a higher moral quality in our society today, and I know it is the wish and prayer of every God-fearing man to better himself morally in the eyes of his Creator. In these matters I believe that a man is guided by his conscience, and I find myself in complete agreement with a learned man, who follows his church regularly and believes in the tenets of his faith (the Royal Commissioner of New South Wales, Mr. Justice Kinsella), who said during the course of his summary:

Unlearned as I am in theology and unskilled in apologetics, I can only say that I do not believe it is an immoral or sinful act to make a bet or take a ticket in a lottery. I do believe, however, that gambling to excess, for example gambling by which a person may impoverish himself or his home, or may deprive his wife or children or others dependent on him of necessities, comforts or opportunities of advancement they otherwise would enjoy, or

may deprive his creditors of moneys justly owed by him to them, constitutes a grave moral evil as well as a serious social and economic wrong to the community.

Mr. Hughes: Are there any such families in South Australia?

Mr. CASEY: The Attorney-General can give more information on that aspect than I. I believe that this problem would be felt throughout the world today. The learned Royal Commissioner of New South Wales also stated that "it is a basic legislative principle that laws of general application should apply fairly and equally to all members of the community." As was pointed out by the Royal Commission of 1949-1951 in Great Britain, the enforcement of gambling legislation depends to a peculiar extent on the support of public opinion, and if the law is to be observed generally, it is necessary that it should allow all sections of the community the same freedom of choice and reasonable opportunities to avail themselves of it.

Is that the position in this State today? Mr. Speaker, of course it is not. Even if Bill Smith (to use a fictitious name) does not bet on race horses, he could not care less if his neighbour does bet, and illegally at that. This state of affairs, I am sure, would apply to most people today. Several Church organizations have written to me stating their concern at the possibility of increased crime if T.A.B. were introduced. I do not think for one moment that anybody can foresee the future on this score, but I do know that in other countries, where the association between crime and gambling has been investigated, the evidence did not suggest that gambling was an important cause of crime. If honourable members care to read the findings of the Royal Commission in Great Britain in 1949-1951 on betting and so on (it is available in the Library), they will then find that a Dr. W. F. Roper, Principal Medical Officer at Wakefield Prison, supplied valuable evidence of a very precise nature to the Commission. This prison caters for the lesser types of criminal. Murderers and the like are in different prison.

Dr. Roper conducted important research into the background of offenders assigned to Wakefield Prison. He divided the types of offender with whose crimes gambling may be associated into three groups, which he called the borrower, the wage-loser and the hanger-on. I quote his description of these types:

The Borrower:

This man is the man who has access to money belonging to others and who "borrows" the money to finance his betting or gambling.

He manages to conceal from himself the criminality of his action because he assures himself that he will return the money when he wins. However, he never seems to win enough, and a vicious circle sets in; large sums are involved in this way. The culprits are usually cashiers, agents, solicitors, etc.

The Wage Loser:

This is a humbler person who loses his wages or his spending money on betting or gambling and who therefore finds himself in difficulties; his chief difficulty is usually a reluctance to confess to wife or mother. He finds it a lesser shame to steal.

The Hanger-on:

This is the man who frequents race-tracks and the like and who shares in the life of the criminals or near-criminals who are heavily represented there. He is definitely criminally minded, and merely intent on getting a dishonest living according to the standards of the group he has chosen.

Dr. Roper told the Royal Commission that, whereas gambling was regarded as a precipitating factor in only 2 per cent of the cases examined at Wakefield Prison, drink emerged as a factor in 13 per cent and domestic strife in 24 per cent. His general conclusion, based on the results of this survey and his other general prison experience, was that gambling should be considered only as a secondary factor in crime, and of minor importance. The Royal Commission's summary was as follows:

177. The conclusion we have reached, on the whole of the evidence, is that gambling is of no significance as a direct cause of serious crime, and of little importance, at any rate at the present time, as a direct cause of minor offences of dishonesty. We do not doubt that there is not uncommonly a connection to be found between dishonesty and excessive gambling in persons of a generally dissolute character, but we should not regard this as evidence that gambling is, in itself, a cause of crime.

This conclusion was adopted in general terms by both the Victorian and New South Wales Royal Commissioners, and I have no doubt it would be adopted by a Royal Commission in South Australia if such a Commission were set up. On very rare occasions we have heard people say: why should T.A.B. be introduced, so that the racing clubs can get all the money? That kind of thinking does not coincide with mine, Mr. Speaker. In the first place, T.A.B. is provided to give the bettor the legal means to place a bet. Secondly, the commission deducted out of moneys paid in to the totalizer shall be so divided that the Treasurer has first call on his percentage, then the board (and I emphasize that) receives the rest to meet the cost of running and extending the activities of the board. What is left after the board has met its requirements is available to the clubs, and, after all, the racing

clubs should be entitled to something for they provided the money for the establishment of the T.A.B.

In New Zealand, for example, T.A.B. deducts 17.35 per cent of its turnover. Of that percentage, the board keeps 7.5 per cent, the Government gets 9.35 per cent, and the racing clubs get .5 per cent. In New South Wales, the T.A.B. deducts 12½ per cent of its turnover, the same as happens on-course in South Australia today. The board keeps 7½ per cent and the Government gets 5 per cent. Of that 5 per cent that the Government gets it refunds to the racing clubs in the initial stages about 1 per cent, but it is on a sliding scale, just as it is in Victoria, and it can get down to almost nothing after a few years. In Victoria, the T.A.B. deducts 12 per cent of its turnover. The board keeps 8 per cent, and it gives the racing clubs about 2 per cent of that. The Government gets 4 per cent, of which it is reimbursing to the racing clubs at present about .25 per cent.

Mr. Quirke: Have you any figures of the turnover in Victoria?

Mr. CASEY: Yes, and I will give figures on that presently. I have already mentioned the percentages in Victoria. In addition, the Victorian Government gets the fractions. To give members an idea of the present turnover in Victoria, I will quote from a statement setting out totalizator investments and bookmakers' turnover in Victoria from 1960-61 to 1964-65. In 1960-61, the total on-course totalizator investment was £13,855,634; the Government's commission payable to hospitals and charities was £762,322; the total off-course totalizator investment was £1,442,638; the Government's commission payable to hospitals and charities was £43,279; the bookmakers' turnover was £78,585,200; and the turnover tax was £1,449,535. The Government's commission on turnover tax was £1,254,427. I ask leave to have the entire statement incorporated.

Leave granted.

TOTALIZATOR INVESTMENTS AND BOOKMAKERS' TURNOVER IN VICTORIA FROM 1960-61 TO 1964-65.

Year.	Total on-course tote investments.	Govt. comm. payable to Hos-pitals and Charities		Govt. comm. payable to Hos-pitals and Charities		Turnover tax.	Govt.'s comm. of turnover tax.
		Fund.	Total off-course tote investments.	Fund.	Bookmakers' turnover.		
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1960-61	13,855,634	762,322	1,442,638	43,279	78,585,200	1,449,535	1,254,427
1961-62	13,919,171	746,181	13,209,359	396,279	75,823,700	1,396,658	1,198,484
1962-63	14,360,797	748,752	25,567,859	828,731	75,541,600	1,385,385	1,185,518
1963-64	15,511,968	799,324	39,110,366	1,466,640	77,222,500	1,421,053	1,212,359
1964-65	16,000,000 (est.)	909,212 (est.)	56,000,000 (est.)	2,250,000 (est.)	79,861,300	1,455,552	1,242,552 (est.)

Mr. CASEY: In 1964-65, the total on-course totalizator investment in Victoria was an estimated £16,000,000, and the Government commission payable to hospitals and charities was an estimated £909,212. The total off-course totalizator investment was an estimated £56,000,000, and the Government commission payable to hospitals and charities was an estimated £2,250,000. The bookmakers' turnover was £79,861,300. The turnover tax was £1,455,552, and the Government's commission on turnover tax was an estimated £1,242,552.

Mr. Ryan: What was the first year of operation of T.A.B. in Victoria?

Mr. CASEY: The first year was 1960. Honourable members will no doubt agree with me when I say the racing administration in this State is conducted by people of high

repute and I know that many of them are excellent Church members; the same could be said of their Victorian counterparts, men of the calibre of Sir Chester Manifold, Chairman of the Totalizator Board in Victoria, and Mr. John Dillon, former magistrate and now Under Secretary. Would these people lend their support to something that was evil and likely to be a menace to the community? I think not! I appreciate the efforts of Mr. John Dillon and the way he showed me around when I was in Victoria a few weeks ago. I consider him one of the finest men I have met. Not only Mr. Dillon but Mr. Ken Davis, the General Manager of the board in Victoria, and his assistant Mr. Brian Hatton assisted me in every possible way. There is the average better, on and off the course, male and female,

who is, more often than not, a respectable member of society, married, and a Church member. I know of men in all walks of life in this State, excellent members of our society, who have a wager with an illegal S.P. book-maker on a Saturday afternoon. These men would willingly wager in a legalized form of betting if this were possible, rather than break the law as the present legislation dictates. Let me refer again to the survey conducted by that recognized world authority on gambling, Mr. Scarne. The survey disclosed that 90 per cent of horse bettors were between the ages of 25-65. Of these, 50 per cent were business men, professional men, judges or politicians; 45 per cent were factory, office and salaried employees; 5 per cent were gambling operators, bookmakers, touts, hustlers and other easy-money-making persons.

Among the women bettors, 88 per cent were housewives and salaried employees; 10 per cent were business women, professional women or retired women; and 2 per cent were gamblers and bookmakers. They have women book-makers in the U.S.A., and I am led to believe they have been known to operate in Australia. I cannot say with any degree of truth whether any operate in South Australia. Perhaps other honourable members know more about betting than I do. During my visit to Victoria recently I asked the General Manager (Mr. Ken Davis) whether he had any idea of the average age of horse bettors in that State. Mr. Davis informed me that a recent survey carried out by the board showed the average age to be 45 years. I also learnt that in Victoria at the present time there are about 7,000 people, mostly females, employed mostly part-time by the board; no doubt the extra money coming into the houses of these people is quite considerable and very welcome.

When T.A.B. is adopted in this State, and I have no doubt that it will be, I feel sure that the racing industry will benefit, racing will be cleaner and there will be a better awareness of the responsibility of citizens to their fellow men who want to gamble and whom I believe are just as entitled to gamble as any other section of the community is entitled to do what it wants. In moving the motion I have stated my case why T.A.B. should be established in this State and why I think it would be in the best interests of our community. I have not spoken in favour of extensions to gambling facilities: on the contrary, I am very definitely (and I mean definitely) in favour of control of gambling.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CITRUS MARKETING CONTROL BILL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision for the marketing and control of citrus fruit and for other purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Nankivell:

(For wording of motion, see page 716.)

(Continued from July 28. Page 717.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I said last Wednesday, when speaking on this motion, that I would consider the context of the Bill introduced by the Premier to see whether it conformed to my motion. I have done so, and move that this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ELECTRICITY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 717.)

(Continued from July 28. Page 721.)

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The Government appreciates the necessity for the State to have some new form of low-priced local fuel such as natural gas for use by the Electricity Trust, to provide a cheaper gas for domestic use, to meet industrial demands for heating, and as a raw material for expansion of industry. Some of the possible industries concerned are rubber (both natural and synthetic), plastics, synthetic fibres, fertilizers, insecticides, detergents and explosives. On taking office in March last, my Government immediately made official inquiries about the natural gas reserves at Gidgealpa in the North-East of the State. It found there had been much talk on the part of the previous Government but not much action. In fact, as most matters had been dealt with by the present Leader of the Opposition himself, it was difficult to find out what the late Government had done or had in mind in connection with the use of natural gas. Apparently the necessity for a Royal Commission on this matter only became apparent to the Leader of the Opposition after the electors of the State had decided on a change of Government.

After visits to the Gidgealpa field by the Minister of Mines and other Ministers in my Cabinet, we met the directors and management of the Delhi-Taylor and Santos Companies and the representatives of the French people who are also interested in exploration over some areas of the State with Delhi-Taylor and Santos. We were addressed by their senior geologists and informed of plans which the companies had formulated to continue their search for natural gas in South Australia, particularly of their efforts to find more gas to augment the reserves already found in the Gidgealpa area. This meeting was attended by every Minister in my Cabinet. The representatives of the companies thanked us for the opportunity of being able to put their plans before the Government in a manner never afforded them before.

The Minister of Mines (Hon. S. C. Bevan) has visited natural gas areas outside the State from which gas may be available to this State in the future. On this visit the Leader of the Opposition accompanied the Minister. The House will see from what I have said that the Government has not been idle on the matter of natural gas since taking office. We are fully aware of the value to the State of large reserves of natural gas. In an area such as South Australia where local fuels are scarce, a natural gas supply for power generation is very attractive. So that natural gas may be used at the Torrens Island power station, the Electricity Trust has contracted for the construction of oil boilers capable of being converted to burn natural gas. The trust would prefer not to use natural gas until about 1970 or 1971 in order to commission the new plant at Torrens Island and to allow sufficient time to carry out the conversion from oil to oil and gas. In the meantime, there is unlikely to be any increase in charges for electricity. It is more likely that the trust will be able to make further reductions to its tariffs.

The trust has recently been able to make a particularly favourable contract with the Adelaide oil refinery for a supply of fuel oil. As a result, it appears that electricity from the first section of the Torrens Island power station will be some 10 per cent cheaper overall than electricity from Port Augusta. In fact when the first machine starts operating in the Torrens Island power station in 1967, it is almost certain that there will be a reduction in the amount of Leigh Creek coal burnt in the older and less efficient plant at Port Augusta because power produced by the efficient plant at Torrens Island will be cheaper on a fuel basis alone. The Government and the trust are

alive to the keen competition in power charges to large industries in the Eastern States, and everything possible will be done by this State to meet this competition.

There is no likelihood, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, that "within five years South Australia will be priced out of the market for attracting new industries". He is well aware that the largest electricity user ever to come to South Australia, namely the new zinc production plant at Port Pirie, was attracted by electricity tariffs which were able to compete not only with power in New South Wales and Victoria but with hydro-electric power in Tasmania. This is an industry which has a raw material to exploit over at least the next 30 years, and it was quite obvious to the company that it was not relying on Leigh Creek coal during this period. Because of the special nature of this industry the Government has allowed the trust a small subsidy but this is to cover costs in the early years only, and the trust is quite prepared to supply power to this company for the next 30 years, and does not expect to make any loss thereby.

At the same time another very large user of electricity, the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Ltd. steelworks at Whyalla, has taken supply from the trust. The company has recently asked the trust to build a second 132,000 volt transmission line from Port Augusta to Whyalla and, in consequence, will guarantee an increased consumption of power during a period of 20 years. The company would not be so foolish as to commit itself to Electricity Trust supply if it thought that there was any likelihood of the cost of electricity increasing during the next five years or at any period thereafter. Honourable members will be interested to know that the refinery at Port Stanvac is one of the Electricity Trust's largest consumers. I believe that substantial expansion of the refinery will be necessary to enable it to produce the fuel oil required by the Electricity Trust and the growing demand for other oil products in this State. We may well see an expenditure of millions of pounds in this connection. Here again, this experienced company appears to have no doubts about the ability of the Electricity Trust to continue to supply its power requirements at an attractive price.

The Leader of the Opposition was endeavouring to support his case by comments about the situation in the United States of America. His comments are, however, somewhat wide of the mark. The United States does not possess 500,000 miles of gas pipelines, unless, of course, he is including normal gas reticulation around

urban areas. There are approximately 200,000 miles of transmission gas lines in America. The Leader said that "natural gas has taken over from coal to such an extent that it now produces much more electricity than coal does". He also said that both oil and natural gas were used in the United States to a greater extent than coal in the generation of electricity. The true position is that natural gas produces less than half the amount of electricity produced from coal. Oil produces not more than one-eighth of the amount of electricity produced from coal.

The amount of gas discovered at Gidgealpa is promising and interesting, but by any standard it is not a large amount. One illustration is that the United States of America burns every 10 days as much gas as is available in the whole of the Gidgealpa deposit. Another illustration is that over a period of 30 years the Electricity Trust alone could use five times as much gas as is available at Gidgealpa. And 30 years is merely the normal lifetime of generating plant now being installed at the Torrens Island power station. This, of course, is not to belittle the importance of the Gidgealpa discovery. The Gidgealpa gas may well be of great significance to South Australia particularly if it can be transported economically or if additional deposits can be located. The comparison of the exploitation of natural gas with that of Leigh Creek coal is misleading. The Leigh Creek coalfield was developed with the thought that it was the only suitable coal deposit available in South Australia and no further information obtained in the last 20 years has changed this. In the case of natural gas there is already other exploratory drilling taking place in the State, and it would be shortsighted to think that Gidgealpa or the Gidgealpa area would remain the only source of natural gas in South Australia.

The Gidgealpa gas should be compared not with Leigh Creek coal but with, say, Moorlands coal. It is limited in quantity and is expensive to transport. Does the Leader of the Opposition believe that it would have been a good thing to rush into an expensive development of the limited amount of fuel at Moorlands before proper information was obtained about the much better deposit at Leigh Creek? The Leader of the Opposition has indicated that if an early pipeline were built from Gidgealpa it could not be fully utilized in the first few years. In fact he expects it to lose money in the first year or two. We could therefore find ourselves in the situation of having spent

£20,000,000 in capital and with annual losses being incurred when some other gas deposit could be discovered nearer the point of use. In the circumstances proposed by the Leader of the Opposition this would have to remain unexploited or be peddled to another State.

It is hard to imagine that the Leader would receive any applause from industry under those circumstances. Industries in South Australia, both old and new, are vitally interested in obtaining cheap electricity. They would not welcome a proposal which, by hastily exploiting gas in the short term, would make it expensive or impossible to utilize any new discoveries which may be made in the future.

The discovery of natural gas in Australia is a recent occurrence. There is every reason to suppose that other gas deposits will be found in South Australia and this Government proposes to encourage further exploration to the greatest possible extent. What would be the effect on general gas exploration if a hasty decision were made to build a main to Gidgealpa? It would obviously postpone for years any chance of a main from elsewhere. Would this be any incentive for exploration companies to expand or even carry on their search for natural gas?

The proper procedure is to obtain as much information as possible about the natural gas resources of this State before committing ourselves to the expenditure of millions of pounds on a main. Fortunately, because the Electricity Trust has made a favourable contract with the Adelaide Refinery, we can afford sufficient time to seek this further information while being assured that electricity tariffs will remain favourable. Having now satisfied itself on the natural gas position, the Government has arranged for an investigation and report on the feasibility of natural gas mains from known sources of supply. This work will commence almost immediately, and will include estimated capital costs of mains and costs of operation. The Government, knowing of the need to ascertain the most comprehensive knowledge, is assured that with its selection of consultants and the co-operation of the Mines Department the report to be submitted will furnish answers to some of the important questions which have arisen.

No large industry will consider establishing a plant in the State unless the Government is in a position to indicate the firm quantities of natural gas available and the price at which it could be delivered to the proposed factory. This vital information will be available only after proper investigation from people qualified

by experience and practice to examine such problems. Our policy provides that an investigation be undertaken forthwith. The Government considers the action it has taken to be preferable to the appointment of a Royal Commission as proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. The Government's method will ensure more direct action and a quicker answer to the problem.

I wish to refer to the figures quoted by the Leader of the Opposition relating to the usage of gas by the South Australian Gas Company. Whilst it is not my business to inquire how the Leader obtained these figures or who was responsible for furnishing them to him (it could have been a board member), I should like to say that on the information available to me the Leader's figures are inaccurate and greatly inflated having regard to the average consumption a day by the company. As a Government, we are satisfied that all that can possibly be done to develop an economic natural gas supply for this State is in progress. The information that I have given to the Parliament is of paramount importance to this State, and very creditable to this Labor Government that it is my privilege to lead. As Leader of the Government I have been requested by its members to say deliberately that there is no need for a Royal Commission, and to further indicate that one will not be appointed as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. I oppose the motion.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRAVEL CONCESSIONS.

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr. Millhouse:

(For wording of motion, see page 627.)

(Continued from June 30. Page 633.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I do not hesitate to say that I intend to oppose this motion. It is one of the most audacious motions ever to come before the House: it is an impudent and arrogant motion. It presumes to tell the Government to legislate for what was in the policy speech of the Leader of a defeated and discredited Party. Surely this is something that Parliament cannot countenance. Therefore, I move the following amendment:

To strike out all the words after "should" and insert the following: "be commended for its policy announced by the Premier on June 30, 1965, that the Government would subsidize the Municipal Tramways Trust for children's travel to school by licensed privately operated buses to the extent necessary to enable it to issue one and two section passes at a

reduction from the present charge of one pound to the trust's own normal charge of ten or twelve shillings".

The wording of my amendment, which I ask honourable members to support, was reported in the *Advertiser* of June 30 in an article headed "Approval of Bus Subsidy", which stated:

The Premier (Mr. Walsh) said yesterday that Cabinet had endorsed his recommendation that he should make arrangements with bus services in the metropolitan area licensed by the M.T.T. for the issue of scholars' monthly concession passes covering one and two sections. He said licensed private operators at present generally carried scholars between home and school at children's cash fares provided they were under 19. This was not seriously out of line with the M.T.T.'s charges for scholars for travel beyond two sections.

But for one and two sections, an M.T.T. scholars' pass costs 10s. a month plus a further 2s. if available to 6.30 p.m., while regular travel on a private bus would at present cost about £1 a month. Mr. Walsh said it was proposed to arrange for the M.T.T. to issue one and two section passes for the licensed operators at the trust's normal charge of 10s. or 12s. a month. The Government would make good the difference to licensed operators on the basis of them receiving £1 a month for each pass. He hoped to have the plan operating from August 1 and a further announcement would be made later.

Let me say that the plan proposed by the Premier and announced on June 30 is in operation. I shall give the House a few figures that I have found from my exhaustive inquiries into the matter. These figures would have been available to any honourable member on either side of the House had he sought them in the right places. Of course, these figures I am giving now were before the adjustments that were made on August 1. The present rates for scholars upon M.T.T. and licensed services are as follows: for one and two miles, the unit fare for a child is 6d., and the monthly pass is 10s. and 12s. As I explained before when I was reading from the Premier's announcement, the difference between the 10s. and 12s. relates to travel after 6.30 p.m., and that will be the difference in all of the second figures I read regarding monthly passes. For three to seven miles the unit fare is 6d. and the monthly pass is 17s. 6d. and 19s. 6d.; for eight and nine miles, the unit fare is 1s. and the pass is 25s. and 27s.; for 10 and more miles, the unit fare is 1s. and the pass is 32s. 6d. and 34s. 6d.

We see that there was operating a very different situation altogether regarding the licensed services before the present subsidy was granted by the Government. The unit fare for

a child for one and two miles was 6d.; for three to seven miles, 6d.; for eight and nine miles, 1s.; and for 10 or more miles, 1s. However, the average monthly fare for one and two miles was 20s.; for three to seven miles, 20s.; for eight and nine miles, 40s.; and for 10 and more miles, 40s. Now, that 40s. for eight and nine miles on a licensed service compares with 25s. on the M.T.T. service. The foregoing are the standard rates for licensed services, but there are a few light cross-suburban services where the rates are somewhat higher. Rail fares are broadly equivalent to the M.T.T. fares, but rather lower for periodicals.

It is proposed to issue 10s. and 12s. monthly passes on regular licensed services and to reimburse the operators £1 a month. There would be little gain in passes at M.T.T. rates for three to seven miles, as scholars up to 18 years are normally granted children's fares by private operators, and there is little travel beyond seven miles. However, to assist the latter and those travelling on light cross-suburban services at fares higher than 6d. a trip, arrangements are being negotiated to allow such scholars to purchase a two-section pass for 10s. (equal to about 3d. a trip) and for the operator then to allow the scholar 6d. a trip off the fare ordinarily charged. This total cost is about £10,000 a year. The proposal made by the Opposition is estimated to cost £140,000 a year. There has been very little public agitation for the extension of concessions that have been demanded in the honourable member's motion. The principal unhappiness has been with the 6d. a trip for one and two miles upon licensed services, while the M.T.T. issues passes for those distances at about half the cost.

The member for Mitcham is in error in endeavouring to interpret the remarks in our policy speech about honouring the promises made in the policy speech of the now Leader of the Opposition. I think it would be an absolutely ludicrous position for any Party to go to the polls saying: we are proposing something and despite what we are proposing we will incorporate all that our opponents promised you last night as well. It is an absolutely fantastic interpretation that the honourable member is placing on those things in our policy speech. Of course, what the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) said was that all works undertaken or for which pledges had been made would be honoured, not promises made in a policy speech which the previous Government had no intention itself of honouring anyway, or which

it had never done anything about in all its long and wearisome years in office. The whole motion is deserving of very little answer.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, you are certainly giving an answer.

Mr. JENNINGS: This is a matter to which the Government will give attention in its proper order of priority (we have heard this so often, of course, from the former Government, too) and just as soon as available finances will allow. However, I am authorized to say on behalf of the Government that it certainly will not permit the Opposition to decide for it the timing, priority, and precise nature of its programme. It certainly will not agree to the Opposition's policy promises, which were rejected by the people at the election, being put into effect before and in priority to the Government's promises stated at election time and endorsed by the electors.

Regarding benefits to scholars, I have told honourable members about what has already been accomplished in the way of school travel concessions. The Government has also promised to make provision as soon as possible for free books, and this once again is in accordance with the decision of the electors at the election. The motion is absolutely hypocritical. The member for Mitcham, together with his Leader, has made a habit of claiming for himself and his Party the virtue of financial responsibility. He has claimed to see in my Party's policies and proposals a lack of financial responsibility, yet now he proposes what amounts to an instruction from Parliament for the Government to incur financial responsibilities exceeding £140,000 a year on a scheme of subsidy without considering it in relation to other competing demands for financial provision out of public funds, and without even ensuring by proper budgetary methods that the public funds will be forthcoming.

The hypocrisy of the Opposition in this matter, to which I have just referred, is shown to be much worse when it is realized that although it had control of the House for so long it allowed serious injustices and anomalies to develop and persist in scholars' fares in the metropolitan area without any attempt at remedy. The licensed private bus operators had not been required or enabled to provide the same scale of fares for regular travel by scholars between home and school as were provided by the public utilities. For this injustice, I offer no criticism of the private operators, who undoubtedly have serious financial problems. The responsibility is entirely that of the previous Government, which took no

steps, however small, to give any relief whatsoever to the parents of scholars who had to travel by private bus to school. Now it is in Opposition it wants to instruct the Government to remedy forthwith those deficiencies which it had made no effort to remedy, and to go further still. The Government has already implemented the plan promised in a public announcement by the Premier on June 30, and negotiations are being undertaken for, as far as possible, further concessions in this regard. I believe that I have effectively disposed of the arguments of the honourable member for Mitcham and, on this occasion, his supporter, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: I am afraid your belief is misplaced.

Mr. JENNINGS: I shall inform the honourable member what has been done by the Education Department to financially help scholars generally. Section 38a of the Education Act provides that the Minister of Education may, in such manner and subject to such conditions as he thinks fit, provide or arrange for the transport of children to and from any public school or may pay the whole or any portion of the cost of transporting any children to or from any public school.

Mr. Lawn: The previous Government did not inform the House that it was doing anything in that regard. Perhaps members of the Opposition did not know that that provision was there.

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course. I inquired of the Minister of Education about this matter and he told me that this section was rarely availed of. It has obviously been kept a close secret.

Mr. Lawn: By the previous Government.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes. The school transport scheme consists of three types of service: first, fully paid services operated by contractors; secondly, fully paid services operated by departmental buses; and thirdly, subsidized services. For fully paid services operated by contractors: the department is prepared to consider a fully paid service where not less than 10 children travel at least three miles from their houses or existing bus service to the school, provided the majority have to travel more than five miles; the measured distances to be from home to school by nearest practicable route. Claim forms for each monthly running are submitted through the headmaster and payment is made by the Education Department directly to the bus operator.

For fully paid services operated by departmental buses: where there is no satisfactory response to a call for tenders, the department may provide a State-owned vehicle, provided there are satisfactory servicing facilities and the services of a suitable driver, acceptable to the parents and the department, is available.

Subsidized services are considered on the merits of each particular case. The department is prepared to consider a subsidized service where at least seven children are required to travel at least three miles from their houses to school or existing bus service to a school provided the majority are required to travel more than five miles. A subsidized service is operated by the parents of children travelling on such a service, the department's responsibility being payment of the approved amount each calendar month. If the subsidy offer is accepted, a bus committee shall be formed from among parents of children using the service to manage financial matters pertaining to the service, and when necessary correspond with the department on other operational factors. Claim forms for each monthly running are submitted through the headmaster and payment is made by the Education Department directly to the bus operator. The parents pay the bus operator their portion, if any, of the cost of the service.

Concerning general conditions: children attending independent schools may travel under the same conditions as those attending departmental schools, except that they may be conveyed to the nearest private school provided no additional cost is involved. The approval of the department must be obtained. Irrespective of age, children residing within three miles of a school have no entitlement to provision of transport, but may travel provided accommodation is available. Routes are varied only with the approval of the Education Department. All vehicles are regularly examined by departmental bus examiners who issue instructions for repairs or alterations considered necessary. Bus services may be terminated if numbers of children conveyed fall below the required minimum. Bus services are under the control of the headmaster of the school served, subject to Head Office administration. The Education Department is responsible for organizing school transport for children residing outside the metropolitan area only.

At June 30 (and I chose this time as it was the date on which the Premier made his public announcement) there were 73 subsidized bus services; the services operating under contract numbered 308; bus services operated with

departmentally-owned buses totalled 222; 21,400 children were carried daily on buses, and 31,698 miles were travelled daily by buses.

Mr. Heaslip: All done by the previous Government.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have not said that it was not, and I have said nothing that would lead the House to believe that I did. I am quoting the result of my exhaustive inquiries into this matter. The estimated cost of bus services operated by contractors and on a subsidized basis for the financial year 1965-66 was about £414,000, and the estimated cost of bus services operated with departmentally-owned vehicles for the same period was about £200,000. Allowances and concessions for children who reside not less than three miles from the nearest departmental school or school transport include free rail passes; an allowance when conveyed by authorized conveyance at rates according to distance travelled to school of 7d. a day for three miles to a maximum of 1s. 2d. a day for 10 miles and over; and an allowance when travelling by bicycle—is this something that the House was aware of?

Mr. Hall: Yes, seeing that we introduced it when we were in Government.

Mr. JENNINGS: Many things were done so surreptitiously by the former Government that its supporters knew nothing about them. An allowance is given to children when travelling by bicycle, according to distance travelled to school or school transport, at the rate of 5d. a day for three to eight miles, and over eight miles at 6d. a day. In addition, the Minister may authorize an allowance in excess of these allowances if it is considered that exceptional circumstances exist. These allowances and concessions are only available for children who attend school under the control of the Minister of Education. Allowances are also paid to parents for retarded or physically handicapped children to attend special schools or classes approved by the Minister, with actual expenses up to 32s. 6d. a month, and when the actual cost exceeds 65s. a month, then half the cost is paid. There is no age limit for children in this category. I acknowledge that members opposite probably know something about this because honourable members receive many inquiries about the transport of physically or mentally handicapped children.

Mr. Heaslip: We know about everything that you have been saying.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am making a good case for the adoption of my amendment and the

defeat of the motion. Where handicapped children attending special schools, including two independent schools for handicapped children, are not able to travel by public transport and hardship exists for the parents in transporting such children to school, the Education Department organizes taxi services as economically as possible to convey the children to school.

I think I have shown that the Education Department is doing a tremendous amount already to help overcome financial difficulties that may confront certain parents of schoolchildren in transporting their children to school. I think I have also shown that already, since August 1, travel concessions have been granted by the present Government which were never granted in the 32 years of office of the previous Government, and that the Premier has pledged that the matter will be kept under constant surveillance to see whether further concessions can be made when the opportunity occurs and when finances are available. I think I have shown, too, that the motion of the member for Mitcham is financially impossible and irresponsible in the present circumstances—£140,000 a year—and that it is blatant political hypocrisy.

Mr. Lawn: Did the previous Government leave anything in the Treasury?

Mr. JENNINGS: As a consequence of these things the motion should be defeated and my amendment carried.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I am disappointed in the speech of the honourable member for Enfield; we have had a higher standard from him in the past. I was surprised, too, to see him reading so frequently from a prepared document. He concluded his remarks by saying something about the motion of the member for Mitcham being blatant political hypocrisy, and yet we can still read that portion of the Premier's speech at the election campaign in which he said the following:

I want to make it quite clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

It makes one wonder whether this blatant political hypocrisy—

Mr. Lawn: Read the rest of it!

Mr. HALL: The member for Adelaide is casting doubts on the veracity of his Leader, not on me.

Mr. Lawn: You haven't finished the quotation.

Mr. HALL: I have finished that quotation, except for the examples that are given—"for example, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital extensions" and so on. The speech goes on to refer to other matters, but, for the benefit of the member for Adelaide, the policy speech continues with the words "extra concession for school travel and boarding allowances". The promise relating to boarding allowances has been repudiated; indeed, I have received acknowledgment of that repudiation by letter from the Minister of Education.

Mr. Heaslip: That is the way they honour their promises.

Mr. HALL: Yes. The member for Enfield said that there had been little public agitation about the matter of school fares, but I do not believe that. I know of the agitation by the metropolitan dwellers in my own district for some alleviation in the costs of transporting their children to school for a secondary education. In a new community, such as Para Hills in my district, parents are paying about 72s. a term to transport each child to a school for secondary education. If a family with two children attending a school six miles away is paying 72s. a term for that transportation and is holding a second mortgage on a house, as well as meeting the costs confronting many residents of a new locality in trying to set up community services, such as meeting places and sports fields, 72s. a term for each child is an imposition.

We promised to reduce that to £1 a term. The Leader of the Opposition in his election speech specifically promised to honour that, yet we find that it was profusely and directly repudiated today by the member for Enfield. One excuse he made was that a similar promise had never been put into effect in the 32 years of the Playford Administration. What a ridiculous counter to something that was referred to in the Premier's election speech! If this were the case, we could say that everything promised and undertaken in the future has not been effected in the last 32 years. Every honourable member knows that the capacity of the State's economy to provide more services for its citizens will increase as our economy grows.

We also know that each election will see further services offered to the public whether a Labor or Liberal Government offers those services. It is futile to say that this measure has no validity because it did not occur in the past 32 years. Our Leader stood up as the Premier of the State and made promises that would have been carried out. The opposite Party was prepared to honour this promise,

and it is no use for members opposite to deery this matter, for it seriously affects some of their own districts as much as it affects other districts, mine included. Anyone opposite who repeats what I have said, is repudiating a promise to grant this concession for school travelling.

Mr. Hughes: A promise made by someone else.

Mr. HALL: I know that the district of the member for Wallaroo has, under the previous Administration, received great assistance in the matter of schoolchildren's transport. As a country member I am more than willing to see this concession extended to city districts. I believe this promise should be honoured as it was claimed it would be.

Mr. Hughes: You have changed it around.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to read the speech again; the honourable member can read it. He ought to know what his Leader said. Surely, he heard the speech before it was delivered, or even contributed his thoughts to it, if his is a truly democratic Party. He would not be ignorant of the contents of the speech. That would not be the way things are done in political parties.

Mr. Coumbe: You wouldn't think so.

Mr. HALL: I must admit we received a treat on *Four Corners* last weekend, when the Premier said his members would have to do as they were told. I am sure that prior to the election the member for Wallaroo was quite conversant with the facts of the Premier's speech.

Mr. Hughes: I am conversant with them, but they are not as you put them this afternoon.

Mr. HALL: This amendment is a poor substitute for the election promise. Continuing to pay 72s., unassisted by the Government is a hardship on the parents concerned, about which I protest. In my district where schoolchildren from Para Hills are transported to a school at least six miles away for secondary education, transport should be absolutely free because the distance is over the five-mile qualification, and in Para Hills it should be free until the new school is built there. I urge the Government, if it cannot see fit to honour this promise, to look at individual instances and consider the Para Hills district as one suitable for assistance equivalent to that received in the country. The honourable member for Wallaroo, who has had something to say on this matter, is aware of what is in his Leader's policy speech; I have gone through this before. If he is as fluent as is the member for Enfield

(Mr. Jennings), he can repudiate it in as eloquent a fashion. If each honourable member opposite wishes to repudiate this statement, it will be illuminating to us all. The member for Enfield said he had been authorized to say what he did. Judging by his Leader's comments at the weekend, it was just as well that he was authorized. I protest at this repudiation. I support the motion and oppose the amendment.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the amendment. In case there should be any repetition of the panic shown by the members opposite last week when an amendment was moved to another motion, I point out to them that, when we were in Opposition and moved a motion along these lines, it was invariably amended by either the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) or the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon). I instance one previous occasion, in 1952. Honourable members can check this if they look at page 944 of the *Hansard* of 1952.

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member is living a little in the past.

Mr. LAWN: The Opposition (our Party in those days) moved the following motion:

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that the Government should take steps to provide suitable houses both in the country and the metropolitan area for aged and infirm persons who are pensioners.

To this the member for Onkaparinga, on behalf of his Party, moved the following amendment:

To strike out the words "it is desirable that" and also "take steps to provide suitable homes both in the country and the metropolitan area for aged and infirm persons who are pensioners," and to insert instead "be commended for the broad policy which it has pursued in providing housing for all sections of the community according to their respective needs."

The amended motion then read as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should be commended for the broad policy which it has pursued in providing housing for all sections of the community according to their respective needs.

That is only one illustration. On many occasions since 1950, since I have been a member of this House, similar tactics have been adopted by the previous Government. So, when I read this notice of motion on the Notice Paper, I smiled to myself and thought, "I can see why in the days prior to March of this year the master had to keep his thumb on the members of his Party: they could have led the Party into no end of trouble." Obviously,

the member for Mitcham moved this motion without consulting his Leader. He has led his Party into moving in this House a motion that will commend the Government for its policy in regard to concessions for schoolchildren. Before going further, I refer to an interjection by the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) when the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) was speaking. The member for Rocky River said that the previous Government's action in this regard was very good. I think the honourable member will agree with that.

Mr. Heaslip: Yes.

Mr. LAWN: He still believes that the action of the previous Government in regard to concessions for schoolchildren was very good.

Mr. Heaslip: It was very good.

Mr. LAWN: Then honourable members can understand how misguided was the member for Mitcham in moving a motion of this description. The member for Rocky River says that the action of the previous Government (and the position has not been worsened by the present Government) in regard to concessions for schoolchildren was very good.

Mr. Heaslip: The previous Government promised more.

Mr. LAWN: As explained by the member for Enfield, this Government has improved the position as from August 1. Evidently the member for Rocky River is not aware of all that his Government did. The year 1964 was the year before the 1965 election. The *Government Gazette* states that the previous Government on June 25, 1964, by Executive Council decision, increased from 7s. 6d. to 10s. the concession fares for schoolchildren on the Municipal Tramways Trust buses and trams for journeys up to two sections, and increased all other concession rates by 2s. 6d. as from August 1. Immediately prior to the election, the Playford Government increased the fares that children had to pay when travelling to school. In February of this year it said, "Now, if you return us as a Government, we will reduce them to something like what they were previously, or even a little lower than that." It put up the fares prior to the election and then promised a reduction if it was returned to office.

Mr. Clark: On past performances, that didn't mean it would be done.

Mr. LAWN: It does not necessarily follow that the previous Government would have given effect to its promise had it been returned. Even though it did honour its promise, it

may have been three years before it gave effect to it just before the next election. Alternatively, it could have said that, because of increased prices and wages and one thing and another, by leaving the fares at the 1964 level it was in fact effecting a reduction by not increasing the fares.

Mr. Hughes: It would never have carried out its promise until January or February of 1968.

Mr. LAWN: It would have waited until just before the next election. I suggest that this motion is not sincere; it is playing politics. Members opposite laugh. Honourable members opposite, and particularly the Leader of the Opposition, spoke in the debate on the Address in Reply, prior to the member for Mitcham giving notice of his motion. We can now see how the Leader of the Opposition had to change his views in this debate from those he expressed in the debate on the Address in Reply. At page 93 of this year's *Hansard* he said:

In fact, I believe it would be correct to say that about 80 per cent of our secondary production is exported to other States. This has been achieved because we have placed our entire emphasis upon the development of our resources. We were criticized by members opposite for not spending as much on social welfare directly as some of the other States have.

There is one instance where the Leader was suggesting not that we should look at items of social expenditure, such as concession fares for schoolchildren, provision for the Children's Welfare Department, and other items, but that we should concentrate on increasing our production. Here is another statement by the Leader:

I maintain that the constitution of the new Ministry shows that there is a shift of emphasis from the devotion of energy in the things that cause the development of the State towards the development of social expenditures. Honourable members opposite are not entirely alone in this matter.

Perhaps he had in mind the member for Mitcham. Whether the Leader knew it or not at that stage, the member for Mitcham did share our views on some of these matters in regard to increasing social expenditure, but obviously he thought there was someone in his Party who thought the same as we did—that we should spend more money on social matters. The Leader said:

Honourable members opposite are not entirely alone in this matter, but this will inevitably lead to a grave situation.

He was warning the House, including the member for Mitcham (I am not suggesting

that he was right, believe you me!) and telling the member for Mitcham and anyone else like him that they would inevitably lead the State into a grave situation. I think we should spend more money on the social affairs of this State—that we should increase our social expenditures, to use the Leader's words. The Leader said this in the Address in Reply debate before the member for Mitcham gave notice of this motion. On May 19 the Leader is reported to have said:

We can see that the greatest emphasis must still be applied and the highest priority must still be given to the establishment of industry.

He was concentrating on the development of the State, not on social matters.

Mr. Jennings: Now he is supporting spending £140,000 a year out of the air.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. I will come to that later. The Leader also said:

I assure the Premier that, if it is necessary for some sacrifice—

listen to this; it is a beauté—

to be made to secure a long-term permanent industry in this State, I will support him in the event of any consequent unpopularity. For instance, it may even be necessary to defer some social amelioration in order to achieve such an industry. There is no politics in this matter, and I and my Party would be prepared to support any move at all to secure a worthwhile industry in this State.

What he said in effect in the Address in Reply debate on May 19 was that there might be some unpopularity. He was telling this Government that he would give it all his support in any consequent unpopularity should anyone attempt to increase social expenditure. He wanted to concentrate on the development of the State and get industry established. On June 30, when speaking on another matter, the Leader said:

I know some members opposite have some qualification about whether we should assist children attending private schools, but I believe we should assist all children trying to get education. I believe there is no case whatsoever for discriminating against a child merely because that child is attending a private school.

The Leader had no right whatever to suggest that this side of the House was discriminating between sections of schoolchildren. It was this Party that promised free school books to all children. This is the only Party that has ever promised that in this State, and I can go back to the 1920's. My Party has always believed that all children, irrespective of the school they attend, should have free school books.

Mr. Heaslip: They haven't got them yet.

Mr. LAWN: No, and that must be borne in mind by members supporting this motion. As the member for Rocky River has mentioned this matter, I will refer to it now. My Party in its election campaign promised increment payments to Government employees. The House was advised in June, during the discussion on the Supplementary Estimates, that these payments would cost over £1,000,000, and they were endorsed by the House. This Government promised, and has granted, unlimited rail travel to pensioners, which is something that the previous Government always refused; the previous Government permitted country pensioners to have only two visits to the city each year. This Government promised pensioners unlimited rail travel, and they have already got it.

It also promised concession fares for schoolchildren using private buses to bring those fares down to those charged by the Municipal Tramways Trust. As the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) has said, that has operated since August 1, so the Government has given effect to that promise, too. The Government also promised in its policy speech to grant increased boarding allowances, and the Minister of Education has already given effect to this by giving increased allowances to each college students. These are to take effect from June 26, and will cost the state £224,000.

This Government has been in office for only four months, but it has done a tremendous number of things to honour its promises. However, the Party opposite, which was in Government for 32 years, after the few months that my Party has been in office is telling it what it should do. That Party had 32 years to do these things, yet its members now say, "Do not tell us we were in Government for 32 years", but they were. If they were there for the next 32 years they would not do what is provided in this motion.

Mr. Heaslip: I do not think the previous Government promised these things.

Mr. LAWN: I do not care what it promised. It had the opportunity to give concession fares to schoolchildren, and what did it do? On August 1 of last year, six months before the election, it increased fares for schoolchildren by 33½ per cent on the first and second sections. Despite this, members opposite come here and say, "You should do this."

Mr. Clark: "You should do this because we promised it"!

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The motion commences "That in the opinion of this House the Government should forthwith"—that is not very cheeky, no! What it really says is,

"Because we as an Opposition promised something in our policy speech, this Government should give effect to it forthwith." This Government has done more in social matters during the three or four months of its term of office than the previous Government did in 32 years. We criticized the ex-Premier for years, saying that South Australia, like other States, should spend more money on hospitals, the Children's Welfare Department, schoolchildren and pensioners, but he resisted that, and now he promises that he will still support this Government despite its unpopularity if it follows his footsteps. He said that in the Address in Reply debate. A couple of weeks later, however, the member for Mitcham shot this motion in, and, if members will recollect, there was nobody to second the motion. When a seconder was called for, no member opposite seconded the motion, and very slowly the Leader of the Opposition rose to his feet and seconded the motion. I was sitting where you are, Mr. Speaker, and saw what went on. I thought the motion would lapse for want of a seconder. I believe this is not a genuine motion: it is not a sincere effort by the Opposition in the interests of schoolchildren. I have quoted the Leader's remarks, and I now turn to those of the mover of the motion. On page 628 of *Hansard* the member for Mitcham said:

I now come to the policy speech referred to in the motion and delivered on February 18, 1965.

He does not say it is the Opposition's policy speech so that the inference could well be drawn by those reading *Hansard* or the newspapers that the Government promised this in its policy speech. People do not check back to see whose policy speech was given on February 18. The honourable member continued:

That was the policy speech delivered by the present Leader of the Opposition—the Leader of the Liberal and Country League.

Honourable members will have noticed that during the election campaign period from Christmas onwards members opposite called themselves the Liberal and Country Party, but the moment the election was over they reverted to their usual style and called themselves the Liberal and Country League.

Mr. Ryan: Does the honourable member think the member for Mitcham would have any say in the policy of his Party?

Mr. LAWN: I doubt it, but he would like to. Then the honourable member quoted the Leader's promise of what he would do if he were returned: A few weeks ago the

member for Mitcham tabled this notice of motion that said, in effect, that this House should request the Government to reduce the fares of schoolchildren forthwith. I have said what the previous Government did last August and I have given the Leader's views. Now let us look at how the views of the member for Mitcham have changed since August, 1964. On August 1, 1964, the Playford Government increased by 33½ per cent the cost of concession fares for schoolchildren. The following appeared in *On Dit* on July 30, 1964, under the heading "Bus Concessions":

The recent rise in bus fares initiated by the State Government in an attempt (one suspects) to balance the rise in the basic wage, has hit students pretty hard. In many cases this has involved a rise of 6d. a day which, although it doesn't sound a large amount, is nevertheless, in the long run, quite a drain on our finances.

Those who run *On Dit* carried out a canvass. The article continues:

We interviewed a number of prominent people this week, but with fairly unsatisfactory results. Mr. Keynes, the General Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, declined to have his views on the matter publicized, as he said it was the Government, not the M.T.T.— He passed the buck to the Government and said that it increased the cost of concession fares and that the M.T.T. was not responsible.

Mr. Clark: He was obviously telling the truth.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The article continues:

The Government granted concessions in fares and in view of this he could not possibly commit himself.

Then they approached the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. Clark: I thought you said that they interviewed prominent people.

Mr. LAWN: Perhaps I should apologize. At least Mr. Keynes is well-known. The article continues:

We spoke to Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., to get the Liberal view on the matter. Mr. Millhouse felt that concessions for students were in his opinion unnecessary, but said he "was open to correction".

That is typical; I have often heard him say that in the House. He says something and then says he is open to correction. There is no doubt that *On Dit* has correctly reported what he said. However, this is the gem:

He suggested that students ride bikes to university, an entertaining, but in most cases a most impractical suggestion.

When they went to him and asked him to comment on his Party's increase in fares for schoolchildren, the honourable member said that

he did not think it was necessary to reduce them and that it was unnecessary to give concession fares. He said, "Let them ride a bike." As a little corporal in "Call me Jim's" army, the honourable member thought that schoolchildren would get greater exercise by riding bikes to school than by travelling on buses and trams. He thought this would be good for them so that we might have fitter men in future to send to Malaysia or Vietnam, or wherever else his Party might send our young men in the future.

Mr. Ryan: Is the honourable member for Mitcham a corporal?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I do not think there is any need for me to convey further messages to honourable members opposite.

Mr. Ryan: The honourable member has made his point.

Mr. LAWN: In fact my horoscope is usually right. Last night I noticed my horoscope in the *News* and I had no doubt that everything would be all right today.

Mr. Clark: What does the honourable member come under?

Mr. LAWN: Gemini. My horoscope read: You have to convey messages to many people—

and I immediately thought of members opposite—

and your power of spell-binding is at its best on August 4.

When the vote is taken on this motion I doubt whether even the member for Mitcham will vote for it.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I feel inadequate to follow the "Gemini" who has just spoken, but as a country member (or perhaps as a rural member) I do not believe that I should sit here like a sparrow on a rail and cast a silent vote. This is an important matter that has been introduced by my "corporeal" colleague, as he was described by the member for Adelaide. Despite what I have heard from Government members I still believe that the honourable member for Mitcham should be commended for bringing this matter forward. As a country member, I wish to express my interest in city people and, as a family man, I have some recognition of the needs of breadwinners in getting their children to and from school.

As I have only recently become a member of this House I cannot look back on previous utterances. I have heard Government members talking about what has happened in the past, but I think it is good for us all to look forward. If it is my privilege to be in this

Parliament as long as some of the members who have spoken this afternoon, then perhaps I will be lulled into making criticisms such as those I have heard from the member for Adelaide. The whole question of education, whether it be related to school books or the transporting of children to and from school, is something with which we should concern ourselves sincerely. I believe the motion does that.

Last February I listened to the policy speech given by the then Leader of the Opposition. At that stage I had some vested interest in the election campaign, and I was comforted when I heard the then Leader say that matters mentioned by my Leader the night before were purely administrative measures and that they would be honoured. Therefore, I do not think the honourable member for Mitcham is out of order in moving this motion. We all know that fares for schoolchildren represent a not inconsiderable amount in the weekly earnings of many people. I support the request made by the honourable member that the proposition put forward on February 18 be implemented forthwith. It is a long and uphill battle for people confronted with educating a young family today, and I commend my colleague, the member for Mitcham, for bringing this matter forward.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the motion. I regret that the debate has degenerated, as so often it seems to do on private members' day when some member of the Government Party takes exception to fairly constructive proposals (as I consider they are on this occasion) of the Opposition. The motion simply states in unmistakable terms that the Government should put into practice what it promised to put into practice when it went before the electors. It has been shown conclusively that the then Leader of the Opposition (now the Premier) gave an unmistakably clear undertaking to honour this promise, and he is not doing so. The whole tenor of the speeches from this side of the House is that the promise should be honoured, and the tenor of the speeches from the Government benches is that it can ignore the statement made by the then Leader of the Opposition.

This habit of the Government of denying the matters that it promised before the election is all too frequent, and a considerable list could be produced to show that this present instance is not an isolated one. As a matter of fact, the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) said he would not agree that the new Government should go on with the

promise of a defeated Government. That simply means that anything the defeated Government promised before the election can be written off by the new Government, and that even the fact that the new Government had also undertaken to do what the old Government had promised can be ignored. I wrote down at the time what the honourable member said, and I think that is what he did say.

Mr. Jennings: Read it in *Hansard*; they can take it down more accurately than you can.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have no doubt that *Hansard* got it correctly. The honourable member seemed to be quite happy about my interpretation of his remarks, and I think I am reasonably correct. This means that the Government, in order to win the election, set out to do certain things. It took on hire-purchase without deposit, and then renegued when the first payments came along. That is just about the position.

Mr. Ryan: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is also the position with school transport.

Mr. Hughes: Don't you think the Government is being co-operative with everyone in this matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member for Wallaroo is a very funny fellow; he is full of humour, and he is very good at sitting there and making ludicrous remarks. I do not know whether his remarks are expected to make people burst with laughter.

Mr. Jennings: You make everybody laugh when you stand up.

Mr. Clark: Didn't the member for Alexandra say we shouldn't be personal?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Let me finish with the honourable member for Wallaroo. He can sit there making droll comments as much as he likes, but it would be better if he got up and made a statement in this debate, for then everybody could listen to him and reason whether his remarks were good or bad; but simply to interrupt is, to my mind, pointless and a waste of time: it is what I would call a delaying action in the process of Parliament.

Mr. Hughes: In that case, the honourable member wasted a great deal of my time during the last Parliament.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The fact is that there are now some serious problems with school transport in this State. We know that the country areas have bus services, and that various concessions are granted on licensed services, on our railways and on other means of transport, but what is not appreciated often

is that with the growth of the metropolitan area there are many places where the children have difficulty in getting to school safely. This area is growing all the time, and, with the increase in the number of scholars, the amount of traffic on the road, and larger schools, the problem is becoming more and more serious. To my mind, getting children to and from their schools is one of the most serious problems that will face the Education Department in the future. The department has given great attention to this matter in the past, and this Parliament, not only in this debate but over the years, has also given much attention to it. We all recognize that this is a serious problem, and it is becoming more and more serious in the newer areas around the metropolitan area, and particularly for those people who have not been in South Australia very long. People are coming into those new areas from overseas; they are not familiar with the conditions here, and possibly they are more worried about these things than the people who have been here for a longer time. I believe that the transfer, by whatever means, of children to and from school is going to be one of our most serious educational problems.

I commend the honourable member for Mitcham for raising this matter, and I am sorry that it has not had more attention. The moving of an amendment to commend the Government for doing Heaven knows what about it, is, as I said in a similar situation recently, a bit of buffoonery. I do not agree with it, nor does any member of the Opposition. Probably some Government members, if they spoke their minds, would also disagree with these tactics.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): The reason for this motion was to bring to the House's notice a promise made in the policy speech of the Premier before the last State election. This speech followed the policy speech of the then Premier, in which the present Leader promised that concessions would be offered to children travelling on trains, buses and private transport to schools in the metropolitan area and in country districts. Following this policy statement, the Party now in power were able to study the then Premier's speech, and to decide what it would do about certain proposals made in that speech. We know that this is so, because in the course of the speech the Premier said:

I want to make it quite clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

Preceding this was the Premier's promise that only that which could be fulfilled would be entertained. Most members of this House at some time or other have faced the problem of paying transport costs for children to and from school, and that applies to parents whether in the metropolitan area or in the country. In the area that I represent, and in developing areas that other metropolitan members represent, much growth is taking place on the outskirts of the metropolitan area.

The SPEAKER: I ask honourable members to observe more decorum. It is difficult to hear the honourable member who is speaking.

Mrs. STEELE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. New schools are being established for which, in many cases, new zones have been drawn, and children have to travel greater distances than they did in the old days when schools were confined to the central portion of the metropolitan area and to small country towns. Area schools have been erected in the country, small country schools have been closed, and children must travel many miles to school. In the metropolitan area many children travel great distances each day to get to their schools, whether private or departmental. In my district several schools are situated in outlying areas. As honourable members know, a new school has been built at Athelstone and a very old school, dating from the early days of this State, will become vacant, if it has not already done so. Some weeks ago I asked the Minister of Education what was to happen to this old school building, and he said that for the time being nothing was happening, but because of the development in the area, it may be needed for excess enrolments or, alternatively, it may be used as a school in which special classes would be established.

We all know that many new and varied special classes have been introduced in South Australia in recent years. If the old Athelstone school is used for this purpose, it would be a unique happening, as this school is on the fringe of the metropolitan area, and children will almost certainly have to be conveyed to it. Many children are at present being assisted by transport, particularly in country areas, and, in fact, the largest expenditure on school transport systems is used in conveying children in country districts. The sum of £600,000 was estimated by the Leader in the last financial year, and, of this, £200,000 was spent on transport for children attending metropolitan schools. It was expected that the extra sum would provide concessions as outlined by the then Premier

in his policy speech. The transport provided for handicapped children, introduced some years ago by the Government of the day, has been much appreciated and is often used. It is paid for on a contributory basis with parents paying one-third of the cost. This is a kind of transport concession, for the Government pays the other two-thirds. Because of the number of children now enrolled at all manner of special classes, this system is being greatly extended and is working satisfactorily.

It is strange that, although South Australia was so generously treated this year to the tune of an extra £5,000,000 Commonwealth grant, the amount needed for the cost of the transport concessions proposed by the Leader, and accepted and challenged by the Premier, cannot be met out of funds at the Government's disposal. If my arithmetic is correct, the Government received this year (and the Premier publicly said how gratified he was) an extra £4,750,000. Out of this sum, the Government was able to meet an election promise (which was a sectional promise, as it were) that service payments would be paid to daily-paid workers in the Government's employ. If these payments were justified (as they were, and passed by this House) and involved much more expenditure in the last financial year than any transport concessions are going to cost, I cannot understand why a promise to allow concessions to schoolchildren, which will affect almost every home in the community, cannot be honoured. After all, this promise was made in the policy speech of the Premier.

I think it will be interesting to hear the Government's reply to the criticism that has been levelled against it by members on this side of the House. I am sure that other members have had the same experience as myself. While speaking on transport, may I say that people frequently ask me whether representations can be made so that transport facilities can be provided to a special school. On investigation it is often found that the parents or people representing the school committee want existing transport extended to the school gates. I generally do not agree that this should be done as I consider that in these days young people are well treated and I do not think that any of us were hurt in our younger days by having to make the journey to and from school in days of inferior transport facilities. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to comment briefly in supporting the motion. I commend the member for Mitcham for moving it, although I realize that the matters raised are of more particular concern to a metropolitan member than to a rural member such as I. My particular reference is to the proposal that a scholar under the age of 19 years shall be entitled to a periodical pass from the Tramways Trust to travel up to seven sections each of one mile at a cost of £1 a term and that comparable rates shall apply to other licensed private vehicles. Another section to which I refer states:

For scholars travelling regularly by private vehicles that do not at present issue passes the concession will be greater still.

I realize that this motion is of special importance to the member for Mitcham because of the public transport system that serves his locality and brings children from his district to schools nearer the city. I believe that students from a certain part of his district mainly attend Unley High School. I can speak with knowledge only of the public transport system and of the school bus service in my country district. I suggest that the provision of bus services in the country to serve country high schools in particular has been one of the biggest steps forward in country education in the post-war years. In my district in particular it has brought about the closing of many small primary schools. I know that these primary schools served the district well in past years, but the present system of consolidated primary and area schools is serving the young people better. One of the more important schools in my district, the Eudunda Area School, has an enrolment of about 500 students, more than 400 of whom use the school bus service each day.

I thought it might be worth reminding the House of the extensive network of school bus services operating at present in South Australia. On checking the report of the Minister of Education for 1963, I find that the daily journeys of school buses totalled almost 30,000 miles. The average daily journey is 51.3 miles and the average daily cost of each student only about 2s. 8d. That is a tiny figure when considering the immense benefit obtained by country dwellers from the school bus services provided.

Mr. Nankivell: Hear, hear!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The honourable member for Albert's interjection reminds me that at one area school in his district, at Coomandook, every child attending the school uses the school

bus service. The cost of providing a school bus service in the country amounts to rather more than £500,000 and I suggest that this figure is likely to increase as this transport facility is provided for more and more of our students.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I support the motion, which aims to help children who travel to and from metropolitan schools. I am only sorry that it does not go a little further and include the country areas of the State as well as the metropolitan area. Much has been said today concerning the bus services operating to country schools. All members for rural districts know the great advantages these services are to country children.

Mr. McKee: How did you travel to school when you were a boy?

Mr. FERGUSON: I travelled with a horse and cart over a distance of six miles a day every day. I left home at 8 a.m., returned at 5 p.m., and then did my chores. There are many small places distant from area schools that are not supplied with bus services, and people do need assistance in transporting their children to school. I know that under certain regulations assistance is given to parents to convey their children to school where school bus services are not provided, but this assistance is inadequate. I hope members will not argue that I do not know anything about the transport of children in the metropolitan area. All members of my family had their secondary education in the metropolitan area and half of them received their full-time tertiary education at the University of Adelaide, so I know something of the cost in respect of children travelling to and from school in the metropolitan area.

Just recently the Minister of Education has announced that matriculation classes this year will be zoned, and I presume that when these classes have been filled some students will be directed to attend another school. A matriculation scholar may therefore have to travel much further than he would normally have to had he attended one of the schools in his zone. Under these conditions students' travelling costs would be much more expensive.

In a child's education this is the most costly stage to the parent. It is a stage when the child is nearing the end of his secondary education and approaching tertiary education, and his education costs are at their highest. I commend the member for Mitcham in moving this motion, and I trust that members opposite will see fit to support it.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I think honourable members will give me some credit for showing during most of my 13 years in this House some interest in schoolchildren and in schools generally. I am naturally interested in the transport of children to and from school. I was interested in an interjection made when the member for Yorke Peninsula was on his feet, as to how he went to school, and in his reply. As a boy, I remember walking about four miles to school in the winter time when the roads we traversed were not roads at all, but lakes or streams. Often we had to walk along the fences to dodge the water. That, of course, was over 40 years ago.

Mr. Loveday: Did you have boots?

Mr. CLARK: I freely admit that I came from a poor family with a widowed mother; sometimes we had boots, sometimes we had half boots, and sometimes we had no boots at all. We managed reasonably well in those days, and I think the member for Yorke Peninsula and I have managed to obtain an education sufficient to keep us going. It is well to remember the past, and to remember that some people made sacrifices. That is one reason why I am happy to see the present Government doing something to make things a little easier for people who have to transport their children to schools. I do not suggest that we are doing everything that is necessary, but I suggest that much more will be done before the life of this Parliament concludes. When the member for Mitcham spoke on this matter, in the interests of schoolchildren in certain areas in South Australia, he chided us, I thought, for being in office nearly four months without doing anything about transport for schoolchildren.

Mr. Loveday: Of course, in view of what has happened, that is a lifetime to him.

Mr. CLARK: I suppose when one has not been in Opposition before, and when that is a new state of affairs, four months seems a greater time to a newer member of the Opposition than it does to old members of it.

Mr. Millhouse: Surely, "a member of the new Opposition" is the way to put it.

Mr. CLARK: I beg the honourable member's pardon. The last thing I would say about him would be that he was a new member, even if sometimes he acts like one. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Mr. Millhouse: No! Go on; we want to vote on this.

Mr. Lawn: All right! There's no leave for you blokes in future. I'll object every time.

You asked for it. That's not a threat either; it's a promise.

Mr. CLARK: I do not know whether I am allowed to mention the decision that has been made from the Opposition benches, but it is unusual, indeed, for a member to be refused leave to continue his remarks. It has not happened before this session, and I hope it will not happen often. I always understood that all Parliaments of the British Commonwealth stood for free speech. Indeed, I should have thought the member for Mitcham had been rather vocal on this in the past. I should have thought the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman), who showed great displeasure at the Government's "buffoonery" (I think that was the word) in amending motions contrary to his ideas, would deplore the idea of an honourable member's desiring an opportunity to check remarks that had been made earlier in the day (and in this case, of course, they are not yet printed in *Hansard*), but being denied that right. I am surprised at the attitude of the member for Mitcham. It is contrary to everything that I had thought of him (which is quite complimentary to him, as honourable members will know). The member for Mitcham, as far as I am concerned, has now toppled from the lofty pinnacle on which I had put him, even if other honourable members had not put him there.

Mr. Jennings: He is high now, but in a different sense.

Mr. CLARK: I think the honourable member who moved this motion was otherwise engaged this afternoon when certain remarks were made by the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who made a point of the change of views on the part of the member for Mitcham in the last 12 months on this particular issue. The member for Adelaide quoted from the university magazine *On Dit* an article published on July 30 regarding the recent rise in bus fares which was, as the magazine put it, ". . . initiated by the State Government in an attempt to balance the rise in the basic wage and has hit students pretty hard. In many cases this has involved a rise of 6d. a day." The writer goes on to say that he interviewed several prominent people (and that is his phrase, not mine), including "Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P." Perhaps I had better quote the exact words so that I shall not be accused of misconstruing any remarks:

We spoke to Mr. Robin Millhouse, M.P., to get the Liberal view on the matter. Mr. Millhouse felt that concessions for students

were in his opinion unnecessary, but said he "was open to correction".

To make sure that this correction does at least make a real attempt to correct, I reiterate what the member for Adelaide said earlier this afternoon because, after all, the member for Mitcham himself stated that he was open to correction. I must not leave out this gem—

Mr. Lawn: He is always open to correction.

Mr. CLARK: I think that would be a fairly safe assumption to make that this would not be the first time that he gave evidence of being open to correction.

Mr. Lawn: Even his own Leader has to correct him.

Mr. CLARK: Let me conclude. This is an important part of the article:

He (Mr. Millhouse, M.P.) suggested that students ride bikes to university, an entertaining but in most cases a most impractical suggestion.

There is nothing wrong about riding bikes provided one can afford to buy them. No doubt the exercise would do the students much good. As the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) says, it does, however, to put it mildly, smack of insincerity to speak of students on July 30, 1964, transporting themselves by bikes and being prepared to condemn a Government which, in the words of the member for Mitcham, has had nearly four months in office and has not done anything in that period. We have heard much this afternoon from the member for Enfield about just what the Government has done. As I have suggested, the life of this Government has not yet been very long. However, it will be long—most honourable members will agree with that—

Mr. Shannon: I assure the honourable member it will seem long to us.

Mr. CLARK: I will admit that. I do not think it will be 30 years. It is my earnest hope that the electorates in South Australia before long will be so divided as to give either Party, if it can convince the people of South Australia that it will do a better job than the other Party, the chance to be elected to Government.

Mr. Lawn: No member of this House will be alive when the next change of Government takes place.

Mr. CLARK: That may be so. It is wrong in any country, unless it is a perfect Government, for any Party to be in power for 30 years. The member for Enfield this afternoon made an authoritative statement—I am sure the Minister of Education (Hon. R. R. Loveday) will correct me if I am wrong—on what this Government in the short space of four months has done. There has been

some confusion, a confusion that would not arise on this side of the House but which I can understand arising with members opposite. After all, what Opposition members are trying to do is to tie us to promises made by their Government as a last resort when they realized that they were going down the drain, to put it in vulgar parlance. We must remember, for it is well worth remembering, that after all, many promises made in pre-election times never bound the previous Government. I could mention a long list of them. I can remember when we were canvassing in the South-East (God's own country, my friends will tell me) shortly before a State election. I cannot remember which election it was, but it was a few years ago. We listened to a broadcast from the then Premier. He was talking about establishing an atomic power station at Lake Leake. Not knowing the South-East, we got hold of an atlas and found out just where Lake Leake was. That was seven or eight years ago, not four months ago.

The former Government had a long lease of life on the Treasury benches after that, but we did not hear another word about Lake Leake. I think the present Opposition is making a mistake, and I should like to correct that mistake if I may. When members opposite are trying to read things into the remarks made by the present Premier in the policy speech he made while he was Leader of the Opposition, I think they are missing one word—in fact, about three words. I need not quote the whole thing, although I will do so if members want me to. What has been continually quoted by Opposition members, and what was quoted by the member for Mitcham in moving this motion, was the following statement by the Premier when Leader of the Opposition:

We promise only that which can be fulfilled. I can assure the House that that is so. We did not promise anything that will not be fulfilled if we are given a little longer than four months. I ask Opposition members to make some attempt at patience. The people of South Australia have been waiting for 40 years to get some of these things. We have promised to give them, and we will fulfil that promise. The member for Mitcham went on to quote the following statement from the Premier's speech:

I want to make it quite clear that the promises that were made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

It was obvious that the Premier, then the Leader of the Opposition, had no illusions

whatever about what the promises were; he knew they were election bait. Do members notice the word "mostly" there? I do not know what this word means to other members, but to me it does not imply "all"; it implies "nearly all". I think the Leader of the Opposition, with his knowledge of what had happened before in policy speeches made by the previous Government, knew what would happen. Indeed, I believe it happens often in many countries that when the spokesman for a Government is making a policy speech he hopes that he will be able to do all the things he promises, but very often finds that finances are not available or something else stops these things from being carried out. As we all know, the former Government did not always carry out promises made in its policy speech. The then Leader of the Opposition, who is now Premier, was taking the natural assumption that although the former Government was promising all these things many of them would not be fulfilled in the unlikely event of its being returned to office, so he said (I think rightly) that they were mostly administrative decisions that would be honoured by a Labor Government—and so they will. However, let me point out again that we have been in office for about four months only. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

Mr. CLARK: I am afraid the honourable member must be more fond of hearing me talk than I am of talking. If it is the honourable member's desire that we stay here this evening to continue this debate it will not worry me at all. I have no engagements this evening and I shall not be inconvenienced. I know that the member for Mitcham is interested in allowances for teachers college students.

To show what the Government is doing it might be as well to remind honourable members that substantial increases have been granted already this year to assist these students. I know that the honourable member was urging this, although I cannot remember that he ever showed any real interest in it when he was a Government member. His interest, like the interest shown by one or two other members, has quickened since the previous Government has been in opposition. I do not blame honourable members for that. I have had a certain amount of experience in opposition and I know it is the duty of an Opposition to endeavour to keep the Government in line. I regret that we have been exposed this afternoon to a denial of free speech.

Mr. Coumbe: We have given the honourable member every opportunity.

Mr. CLARK: I did not realize that Opposition members were anxious to hear the pearls of wisdom falling from my lips and to hear me expound for another 20 minutes or so on this subject. If this is the case, I shall be happy to oblige them. A couple of statements were made by the honourable member for Gouger in his speech this afternoon, and I am sure that he will be disappointed that I am being denied the opportunity of studying his remarks and making some constructive comments on them.

However, as I am to be denied the right to continue my remarks on another day, I shall conclude by saying that the Government has given much assistance in this field. The full details were given this afternoon by the honourable member for Enfield. I shall not repeat them as I have done enough repeating this

afternoon already. I believe that the Government has done much that will be of value in the transport of students. I hope that the Government will go further, and I am sure it will go further. After all, as I said before, four months may be a long time to some people but it is not very long for a Party when it is planning many things and when it is doing its very best for the State and hoping to continue doing that in the future. I cannot support the motion, but I am pleased indeed to have the opportunity, by my vote, of adding a few words of praise to the present Government for the work that it has done already to assist these students.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.47 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 5, at 2 p.m.