

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 11, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the Government intends to subsidize the carriage of store livestock from drought-stricken properties in the Far North to the market?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Government has not considered an all-embracing policy of subsidizing store cattle travelling to the market but the cases of people severely affected by the drought, who desire assistance in transporting stock to the market, or who have any other need (including that of remission of rents) would be considered on their merits. I think the honourable member would agree that some people in the Far North would not ask for such assistance, and that is why it could not be a policy applying to everybody in those areas. Some of those people are probably in a better position than others and, therefore, I do not think they would ask for the concession. However, the Government is sympathetic towards those people who are in need, and if the honourable member has any specific cases he would like to put before me, or if certain people wish to apply, those cases will be considered on their merits.

Mr. Quirke: Are freight concessions to be continued?

Mr. CASEY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what has actually taken place in respect of the provision of assistance to the drought-stricken areas of the Far North?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have a summary of drought relief fodder consignments, as at August 10, 1965, which states:

	Bales.
To Kingoonya, ex Eyre Peninsula	1,350
To Stirling North, ex Cadell Training Centre	200
To Oodnadatta, ex Yatala Labour Prison	500
To Marree, ex Kingston, S.E.	380

2,430

At the weekend the *Troubridge* freighted free 640 bales of hay and some oats from Eyre Peninsula. This will probably be divided between Marree and Lyndhurst, where another centre will be established to serve the needs of stock from the Strzelecki Creek track.

It is expected that the *Troubridge* will bring a further 1,300 bales of hay this week, and that this will be distributed where it is required. The total so far is 4,370 bales. In reply to an interjection, may I say that a

question will be answered today in another place about the continuance of this procedure. There is no truth in the rumour that was apparently concerning a member in another place, that there would be no further concessions. So long as gift hay is available it will be transported to needy areas.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to ensure that the Minister of Agriculture understood my question. I asked him whether rail freight subsidies would be granted on the carriage of store livestock. The Minister pointed out that special cases would be considered, but I think that he meant that in reference to remissions of rent. Can he say whether special cases for subsidies for the carriage of store livestock would be considered?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. I meant that every case concerning freight concessions on transporting store livestock to market (and also any case concerning rent) would be considered on its merits.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding the appointment of a public relations officer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I invited the honourable member to ask this question yesterday but he did not do so. Another honourable member asked me a question on this matter and the honourable member for Ridley will find a reply in yesterday's *Hansard*.

DENTAL SERVICES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A leading article in this morning's *Advertiser* refers to the need for improvement of dental services for school children. My district does not have a dentist anywhere, and great value is placed upon dental services currently provided by the Public Health Department. I understand that in New Zealand female dental assistants are trained to operate these services and that Tasmania has a similar service. As it takes about two years to train such assistants, and as it would involve considerable expansion of dental training facilities in South Australia should their training ever be considered warranted, can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether any thought has been given to training female dental assistants and, if it has, whether every opportunity is being taken to ensure that there will be no unnecessary delay in having them trained?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as possible.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT.

Mr. HALL: My question concerns the transport of secondary schoolchildren from Para Hills to the Salisbury and Elizabeth High Schools. At present the bus fare for this journey is 6s. a week, amounting to about 70s. a term for each child. I notice that in the new electoral proposals before the House this area is still regarded as a country area, whereas for educational purposes, particularly regarding school transport, it is classed as metropolitan. If the Government intends to maintain the principle that this is a country area, will the Minister of Education give the students in Para Hills the country benefits of school transportation, in fact, free transport?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will have the matter examined and give the honourable member an answer in due course.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One of the objectives of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities plan was to ensure that egg producers who marketed their eggs through channels in other States, and hence outside the State Egg Board, should make a contribution to share export losses. As the C.E.M.A. levies are now being paid, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the total equalization levies have increased and, if they have, by how much?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In explanation, I quote from the following letter in the *Murray Valley Standard* of July 30:

One of the district egg producers was told by an official of the Egg Board that nine C.E.M.A. inspectors would be employed in South Australia (two in Murray Bridge), and will be paid in the vicinity of £2,000 per annum, with a car plus some additional expenses.

Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether that statement is correct, and, if it is not, how many inspectors are to be employed under this scheme, and what their salary and other emoluments will be?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think the author of that article was romancing a little. There will not be nine inspectors: there will be two. One will reside in Murray Bridge (he is a local man) and the other will reside at Riverton to service that area. I am not aware of the salary they will be paid or whether a motor car will be provided. The man at Murray Bridge is using his house as an office, and anyone concerned with this matter in that district may consult him at any time while he is there.

MATRICULATION CLASSES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago the Minister of Education was good enough to give me figures regarding schools that would have a matriculation course. However, he gave me the total attendances, whereas the figure I was particularly interested in was the number of children who would be doing matriculation courses at those schools. Has the Minister this information?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think the Leader wanted the estimated numbers in matriculation classes for 1966 and the numbers in Leaving Honours classes for 1965. The position is set out fully in the following table:

School.	No. in Leaving Honours Class, 1965.	Est. No. in Matriculation Class, 1966.
Adelaide Boys High School	142	140
Adelaide Girls High School	77	70
Blackwood High School ..	34	50
Brighton High School . . .	98	120
Campbelltown High School	42	40
Darwin High School . . .	18	20
Elizabeth High School . . .	122	70
Enfield High School . . .	136	90
Findon High School . . .	76	100
Glossop High School . . .	40	40
Henley High School . . .	83	80
Loxton High School . . .	20	22
Marion High School . . .	120	130
Mount Barker High School	28	30
Mount Gambier High School	47	45
Murray Bridge High School	21	35
Norwood High School . . .	126	110
Nuriootpa High School . . .	33	30
Plympton High School . . .	72	75
Port Pirie High School . . .	36	30
Seacombe High School . . .	73	60
Unley High School . . .	197	200
Woodville High School . . .	154	140
Gawler High School . . .	—	25
Gilles Plains High School	—	40
Kadina High School . . .	—	18
Millicent High School . . .	—	16
Port Augusta High School .	—	16
Port Lincoln High School	—	18
Salisbury High School . . .	—	33
Taperoo High School . . .	—	27
Victor Harbour High School	—	18
Willunga High School . . .	—	30
Adelaide Technical High School	62	75
Whyalla Technical High School	37	45
Croydon Boys Technical High School	—	31
Mitchell Parks Boys Technical High School	—	24
Vermont Girls Technical High School	—	28
Woomera Area School	—	18
	1,894	2,189

The figure for Croydon Boys Technical High School includes seven from LeFevre and seven from Thebarton Boys Technical High Schools.

KAPUNDA COUNCIL.

Mrs. BYRNE: During the term of the previous Government, a petition was presented to the former Minister of Local Government by a group of ratepayers from ward 8 of the District Council of Kapunda for severance of portion of ward 8 therefrom and annexation to the District Council of Angaston. In April this year I wrote to the Minister of Local Government about this, and was informed that the matter was being considered. Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Local Government whether a decision has been reached and, if it has, what it is?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information from my colleague.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I previously asked concerning progress on the new Port Lincoln High School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: A project for additional accommodation for the Port Lincoln High School was referred to the Public Works Standing Committee in 1961. The project was not subsequently included in a building programme, although action was taken to erect woodwork and domestic arts centres to meet the immediate needs of the school. In January, 1965, the department was requested to prepare sketch plans for the Port Lincoln High School based on revised requirements. Accommodation for an adult education centre was also included in the project.

In February, 1965, following a direction by the then Minister of Works that the additions at the high school were to be treated separately from the proposed adult education centre, a submission was made for approval of funds to proceed with the high school. Approval of funds of £280,000 was subsequently given by Cabinet on February 11, 1965. Since February, it has been necessary to re-examine priorities in view of the Loan funds available for 1965-66. It now appears that the balance of funds available for letting contracts for schools during 1965-66 will be committed on other urgently required new schools. Planning will proceed during the year on the new buildings for Port Lincoln High School. The letting of a contract will depend on the future availability of funds.

OWEN TERRACE.

Mr. HUGHES: I read in the local newspaper last week that the Wallaroo council was concerned at the lack of progress on the

scheme to replace pipes in Owen Terrace by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The report went on to say:

His Worship the Mayor had been informed that because of new development work at Whyalla the Wallaroo scheme had been postponed for three months.

Can the Minister of Works say whether it is the policy of his department to notify the council concerned when representations have previously been made by the local member for the district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I should be surprised and, in fact, disappointed to learn that the mayor had been informed by anyone in my department of any details relating to this scheme. Whenever I receive correspondence, a deputation, or a request for a deputation, I always ask that the approach be made through the member for the district concerned, irrespective of who that member is. When replying to representations made by a member (again, irrespective of who that member is) that member is notified before anyone else.

BARLEY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that the Barley Board has now agreed to receive barley with a moisture content up to 13.0 per cent, and that it has agreed to have a classification made at the Karoonda silo. I believe that in Victoria the classification is made at more than one centre and, as the Minister of Agriculture knows, more than one centre in South Australia receives barley. Will the Minister ascertain why the board is making classifications at only one centre, instead of at other places in this State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

HOUSE CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier, as Minister of Housing, a reply to the question I asked on August 3 concerning a method of house construction being used in South Africa?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Housing Trust has investigated from time to time many systems of wall prefabrication and has used some of them extensively and, in particular, stand-up plaster walls. Any new system that is brought to the trust's notice is investigated, and if it is economical, every effort is made to encourage its use. Perhaps one note of warning should be sounded, however, and this relates to the fact that almost all systems of rapid building concentrate on the walls. In fact, the walls are a relatively small part of the total cost of a house and, while savings

are worthwhile in any field, nevertheless, it is only by careful attention to economy in all the aspects of a house that the finished article can be rapidly and economically produced.

COOMANDOOK WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my further question on the Coomandook water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's further question on this matter, I have now received an additional report from the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, in which he states that a branch main feeding Coomandook and country lands cannot be provided until such time as the main is laid to the proposed tank on section 22, hundred of Kirkpatrick, and the tank constructed. In addition, because of the acute shortage of Loan funds, work will be confined to the trunk main for some considerable time. When branch mains are being considered, the requirements of Coomandook Area School will be given due consideration, but, in the meantime, an indirect service can be given under the conditions as previously advised.

EQUAL PAY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question follows a recent statement by the Minister of Education to the effect that he intends to carry out a policy of equal pay for schoolteachers. I realize it will take some time to implement the policy fully. Does the Minister intend to have one promotional scale for men and women teachers, or does he intend to have separate scales?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The whole question of teachers' salaries will go before the Teachers Salaries Board soon, and the South Australian Teachers Institute, representing the teachers, is naturally putting forward a case for increases in salaries, as well as various other suggestions concerning the classification of teachers. I think it would be unwise—

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the Minister assure the House that this matter is not before the tribunal now?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is not before the tribunal now.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The Minister may continue.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I think it would be most unwise and unsatisfactory to try to forecast the result of the decision of the Teachers Salaries Board in this regard.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: MARGARINE.

The SPEAKER: This morning I received the following letter from the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon):

I wish to inform you that I propose to move today that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock in order to enable me to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, the influx of table margarine into South Australia from other States.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Several members having risen:

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I move: That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

in order to discuss a matter of urgency, namely, the influx of table margarine into South Australia from other States. I thank members for their consideration. This matter concerns the dairying industry and, like me, the Minister of Agriculture is greatly concerned about the influx of margarine. The Minister and I both represent dairying districts and the Minister offered no objection to my raising this matter. I thank him for this, and I assure him that I have nothing critical to say about him or his departmental officers. I do not have to tell the Minister or his departmental officers that this problem is growing. Advertisements for margarine can be heard on the radio, and anyone who has a television set has undoubtedly seen the expensive advertisements of interstate margarine. I refer in particular to the Marrickville Margarine Company, which is spending untold sums on advertising. I have one advertisement that appeared in the *News* that is typical. Many brands advertise, such as Eta and Miracle. Miracle margarine is expensive, and it is claimed to be cholesterol-free and poly-unsaturated. I do not know whether such a claim is justified or whether it is just good sales talk.

Mr. Casey: It's a ginamick.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not know: I am not a scientist, and I cannot say whether the claims are true. The South Australian dairying industry is heavily supported by taxpayers to the extent of £13,000,000. The Agricultural Council, which the Minister and his departmental officers attend, discusses what can and what cannot be done about the threat to our dairying industry from margarine.

The basic raw materials for its manufacture are, in the main, coconut oil, cottonseed oil and peanut oil. Cottonseed oil and peanut oil

come from other countries. Whale oil is also used as a base material in the manufacture of margarine, and this is also obtained from outside Australia. Although I am a member of the Liberal Party, I am critical of the Commonwealth Government for not first of all introducing legislation on this subject. We have already done something in this regard. The Minister is well aware of the powers he has and the powers that he hopes he will have, and I am not going to tell him what he should do. I shall tell him and other members what steps can be taken at least to hold up the flood of margarine that is coming from Marrickville (New South Wales) to South Australia. I am well aware that at present the High Court is dealing with a case concerning the Government of New South Wales. Like South Australia, New South Wales has a quota; the Marrickville company exceeded this quota, and this is the subject of the case before the High Court. That old bug-bear, section 92 of the Constitution, is mainly used as the reason why we cannot do anything. I shall have a little to say about whether or not that is true in a moment.

The Minister and his departmental officers (as well as his predecessor) have taken steps to try to keep this matter within reason. I have with me a list of the convictions and appropriate fines suffered by people in this connection. I do not wish to publish the names of these offenders because they were published in the press when the cases were heard, and I do not think it would be fair to repeat them. My list contains 12 offences that have taken place over the past three years. The fines have varied from £5 to £40. In some cases the defendant has been charged with selling margarine over the counter as butter. It could be said that this would be impossible to do because margarine is wrapped and labelled, but I am sorry to inform honourable members that this is not true. It is not wrapped and labelled: it comes into South Australia in what are called butter boxes, which are 40 lb. packs.

Mr. Hall: It must be of good quality if it can be sold for butter.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member would be the best judge of that. Anyone who misrepresents an article as some other article is a rogue. It is straightout roguery to try to sell somebody an article alleged to be butter when it is really margarine. In fact, seven of the 12 cases on my list fall within this category.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: They were store-keepers.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. At present there are outlets for these 40 lb. packs. The margarine comes in bulk and is cut out with an ordinary butter trowel. It is put into 1 lb. or 2 lb. packs, or whatever quantity the buyer requires. I presume it is then wrapped in a piece of greaseproof paper, because it is sold at butchers' shops. They allege that it is butter when it is really margarine. When officers of the Agriculture Department inspect the box the margarine is wrapped, but there cannot be any brand on a piece that is cut off and wrapped in grease-proof paper. Those are the sort of things the dairy industry of this State is faced with at a time when our oversea markets for our dairy produce are anything but buoyant. We are faced with this unhappy prospect. If we are to be denied our own market for our own home produce, because of the influx of articles virtually of foreign origin (although the margarine is made in New South Wales it is basically of foreign origin), our butter must be sold on the oversea markets; we would then have to export more butter, and the more we export the lower would be the price the farmer would receive for the fat he sells to the factories that make his butter.

Those are the things that are worrying the dairymen, and so concerned are they becoming that they have approached me to see what I can do. Although there is no accurate information on tonnages, I will give some information about the estimated tonnages of margarine coming into this State from New South Wales. Some of it is manufacturing margarine, for which we have no quota, and therefore it is a legitimate import. However, we do have a quota for table margarine. We have two factories in this State manufacturing table margarine.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: And they have played the game all the way.

Mr. SHANNON: That is true; they have abided by their quotas, and the result is that there are times during the year when their product has to be taken off the market. My wife occasionally buys the best type of table margarine for cooking, and occasionally she tells me that she cannot buy the brand she normally uses. However, one can buy Marrickville margarine in any quantity throughout the year. Is this a fair thing for our local manufacturers? Is it a reasonable proposition to allow our own honest, law-abiding manufacturers to suffer the loss of some of their market? Is it a fair thing if we sit idle and do nothing about it?

I have been given various estimates of the tonnages of this margarine South Australia is likely to receive within the next 12 months, and they range from 600 to 800 tons. Incidentally, our quota is 528 tons; that is what our own manufacturers are pegged to, and they abide by it. Now, somebody comes along and gobbles up a bigger market than we have provided for our own local manufacturer. I say that this is not a fair deal, and I cannot possibly support such a policy. In fact, I am sure the Minister of Agriculture does not support the policy, for I know he is sympathetic. This matter was raised in this Parliament before he was the Minister, and he was always on the side of the dairy farmers because he knew their problems. The figures I have here are also in the Minister's possession, so I will not weary the House with them. However, I will just mention one thing that is of prime interest to all Agriculture Departments throughout Australia. Every State has shown a decrease in consumption of butter per head of population. The decrease ranges from about 1 lb. per head to, in the worst instance, 3 lb. a head. Unhappily, South Australia is not a good butter eater: we have about the lowest consumption per head of population at about 20 lb. a person. A little place like Tasmania had a consumption of 27 lb. per head of population, but it is down now to about 25 lb. Why the people in Tasmania should eat more butter than we eat I cannot understand, unless it is that the insidious propaganda used by the promoters of margarine has been more effective in this State and they have found a readier clientele to listen to their slick sales talk. This matter of whether or not the consumption of butter results in arterial troubles or arteriosclerosis (call it what you like) is just a red herring. Certain people have said that butter is bad for the arteries of man, but I do not agree. I eat a great deal of butter and I think it is jolly good food. It is, in fact, one of the cheapest foods, especially when compared with foods of similar food value such as meat. It is certainly cheap when compared with a pound of steak.

Mr. Jennings: Particularly South Australian Farmers Union butter.

Mr. SHANNON: I expected that to come, especially from such a well-informed metropolitan member. I make no bones about the fact that I am very well informed on the actual manufacture and distribution of butter. As a director of that famous company the honourable member just mentioned, I do not think I need apologize for knowing something about

the subject I am discussing. I hope that, when the member for Enfield next speaks, he is as well informed on his topic as I am on this one.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The honourable member is out of order in advertising Farmers Union butter.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not out of order.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I was talking about the honourable member for Enfield.

Mr. SHANNON: I have an axe to grind in this matter and I make no bones about it. I am speaking for the dairying industry generally, and particularly for the man on the farm whose sole source of income often (and for the man along the Murray River it is always so) is from dairying. Very few of those farmers have any opportunity to diversify their industry, which is a time-absorbing one, seven days a week and long hours every day of the week. Another wellknown factor in the dairying industry is that the more regularly a cow is milked the more milk it produces. I think this House should be jealous to preserve the rights of the dairymen, because in this State so many of those farmers were put on dairy farms after the First World War and others after the Second World War. These men fought for this country and we should fight to save their industry today. I am supported by the opinion of a person I am prepared to accept as one of the best informed persons I know on Commonwealth law. In his opinion section 112 of the Commonwealth Constitution gives the States power to do what our law does. Section 25 of our Margarine Act, 1939-1948, provides that raw materials coming into the manufacturer are to be inspected in South Australia prior to manufacture. I understand that this law has never been enforced, and that no test of its validity has been carried out.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The inspection is at the manufacturer's expense.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. This law was designed specifically by Parliament to provide a method by which it would be uneconomical for those in other States to manufacture margarine in South Australia, as the raw materials had to be sent to this State for inspection.

Mr. Broomhill: What about Victorian cream?

Mr. SHANNON: I prefer the local product, but we have no legislation dealing with that matter. Most of our cheese goes to other States and most factories in the South-East live on the sale of cheese to these States. Our law deals with margarine and butter.

Mr. Hall: Is margarine under price control in this State?

Mr. SHANNON: I understand the question of an extortionate price charged for margarine has been discussed. Miracle margarine is packed in a tin foil, and then has a cardboard or carton pack around it. I have heard of its price being dearer than that of butter, but I understand that its price is about the same as that of butter. This product is of such texture that unless it is kept in a cool place it cannot retain its shape. It has been packed in such a way as to be acceptable to housewives, but they do not realize that it must be handled carefully when taken out of the carton.

Mr. Quirke: Is it in a 1 lb. pack?

Mr. SHANNON: No, $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. packs. Eta is a table margarine, the sale of which is advertised in our papers in defiance of this State's laws.

Mr. Hall: Is it under price control?

Mr. SHANNON: It has been suggested to me that it should be.

Mr. Hall: Don't you think that competition from other States could reduce the price to what it should be?

Mr. SHANNON: Unfortunately, these products have been given an open go. That happened in Queensland but it was soon abandoned as there would not have been a dairy farmer left if there had not been some control. There may be some justification for duties, as the butter price is controlled from the point of receipt in the manufacturer's store until it goes over the counter. I agree that this may be an appropriate time for these products to come under price control, but perhaps this is not the answer to the problem. I know the margin of profit on which these people work, and it is obvious why they can buy time on television and broadcasting and in newspaper media for sales promotion. The dairy farmer has no margin although he is paid a fair wage for his work. The Australian Dairy Council has, from time to time, promoted the use of butter in an attempt to sell its product. Awake and alive, the dairying industry knows the real danger it faces from this unfair and unjust competition. People would not object if the buyer was assured that he knew what he was buying, and if the consumer was sure that what he consumed was butter and not margarine.

Mr. Quirke: There is some crook butter.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not agree: there is second-grade butter. I am not promoting any particular company. Our butter sells remarkably well when one considers the disabilities of receipt, of handling and of manufacture in

this State, compared with conditions in Victoria. Facilities in Victoria are as good as those in the South-East because of the short haul in an area closely packed with dairy farmers. We receive cream from the North, Murray lands, Kangaroo Island and Yorke Peninsula to be made into butter here. By and large, South Australia's quality measures up well with Victoria's (which also had the advantages of short hauls and virtually daily pick-ups). Some of our cream stands in railway stations for three or four days before it reaches the factory.

Mr. Quirke: Some of it gives us poor butter, too.

Mr. SHANNON: Plenty of reasons exist in South Australia why we have seconds, but that particular produce does not reach the housewife's table, for it is exported or used for certain manufacturing purposes. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to raise this matter which vitally concerns the dairying industry. I am not urging the Minister of Agriculture to do anything that I should not want to do if I were in his place as Minister, but I should like to test the validity of the law that has been passed in this State. I think we have had it on our Statute Books since 1946, and I think we can afford to test it. The Parliamentary Draftsman of the day (Sir Edgar Bean) would not have drafted a law that he thought might be invalid, for I know his reputation. He would never have drafted a Bill that could not stand up in a court of law. However, I do not think anybody can say that all of our laws are absolutely foolproof.

They are all subject to the test of the bench in the final analysis, and the men on the bench have their own methods of interpreting them. Whether this law would be interpreted as Parliament intended it to be interpreted, I shall not argue, but we shall not know the answer until the test is made. I should be prepared to take a hat around in my own district to collect the costs necessary to instigate a test case, and I would have the necessary sum within a week, that is how anxious the people concerned are about this matter. However, I do not think any self-respecting Government would allow me to do that. I know the opinion in my district, and I think the Minister himself would know of it in his own district. I am sure that he would have recently received similar representations to those made to me. The longer this law remains on the Statute Book untested, the more margarine from other States will be sold here.

I cannot say how many, but a number of high-pressure salesmen are circulating, in addition to television advertising, etc., and the whole matter is being absolutely thrust under the noses of not only the housewives but every retailer and shopkeeper. The wholesalers concerned are in the happy position of being able to offer the large chain stores a handsome discount, but it is quantity they are after, whereas the quality is uppermost in our minds.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): As the honourable member has said, this matter concerns several members of this House, and it certainly has concerned my department. Indeed, it could have a big effect on the future of our dairying industry. Two companies in South Australia manufacture margarine, but they are now connected with the Unilever corporation, and I point out that this organization has been scrupulously honest in all its dealings regarding quality of the produce. I am told that it approached the former Minister of Agriculture for an increase in its quota, and it certainly approached me after I became Minister of Agriculture. I informed its representatives that I had no intention at this stage of increasing the quota, although I must say that the organization put forward a just case for an increase. However, it has been the policy of all Australian Ministers of Agriculture to meet annually and to discuss matters such as this, in which they are mutually interested.

As most honourable members know, State Ministers of Agriculture, including myself, met here a few weeks ago. Not only Unilever but also the vegetable oils organization (the latter claiming it had no quota at all) and the Marrickville company came to see me, stating that Unilever had a monopoly of the South Australian market. That is perfectly true, but when I looked at the quotas applying to all the States, I discovered Unilever had but a small proportion throughout the Commonwealth. I told the two companies that I would discuss their case at the Agricultural Council but that I would make no move to increase quotas until the council had met. A request had also been made by Western Australia to Ministers of the various States for an increase in that State's quota. The subject of quotas has become a hardy annual.

It has been suggested (and I think reasonably suggested) that, with the increase in population that has taken place since 1957

(when I think the last quota was raised) and with migrants used to eating vegetable oils rather than animal fats, a review of existing quotas should be made. All these matters have been put to the Agricultural Council on many occasions, but I think only once in recent years has the council agreed on an increase of quotas to any State. The council does not necessarily consider the States' requirements together; the States can increase quotas individually, but it has been the accepted practice that there be some uniformity on this matter. Victoria and now South Australia have been at a great disadvantage because their quotas have not been increased. Victoria, which is probably one of the largest producers of butter in the Commonwealth, has rigidly adhered to its policy of no increases in quotas. In fact, Victoria has received large quantities of margarine from New South Wales, and this does not please Victoria. Victorian spokesmen have been vociferous on this point. In New South Wales a large quota applies, and this was exceeded by the Marrickville firm referred to by the honourable member. In the past, quite a large amount of margarine has gone into Victoria under provisions of section 92, and apparently this company has been getting away with it.

The former Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales (Mr. Enticknap), as a member of the council, did his best to try to overcome this firm's exceeding the quota in New South Wales. He asked for returns from the firm, and I am told that it did not produce the required information, whereupon he took the matter to court and was successful. The firm then had to furnish returns to the New South Wales Government, from which it was seen that this firm was exceeding its quota. To overcome this, the firm started another branch of its company elsewhere, and then claimed that it was safe because it was keeping to its quota in New South Wales and was selling elsewhere under the safeguard of section 92. After I told the firms (Vegetable Oils, Unilever, and Marrickville) that I did not intend to increase the quota, I had further visits from representatives of the Marrickville firm. Their approach to me was honest and their statements were fair. They approached me not bombastically but in a friendly manner, and they told me that they intended to bring into South Australia, under section 92, a certain quantity of Miracle margarine which they said was of benefit to certain people. I also had letters from a group of people who were seeking this particular type of margarine.

The Marrickville representatives asked me what my attitude would be, and I told them that, if my department decided to prosecute their firm, I would certainly back it to the hilt. I said that we had certain legislation and that, if it were valid, they would be prosecuted. They said that they were covered by section 92, and that they would bring margarine into South Australia, which they did. They showed me the type of advertisement that they would use (this was referred to by the member for Onkaparinga), and said that they would continue this campaign. They were straightforward in what they told me they would do, and they know where I stand on the matter. They know that they may face prosecution if the law permits. I have referred this matter to the Crown Solicitor and I am awaiting advice from him now. I also had an opinion given to me (which I did not request) formed, about two or three years ago, by an eminent Queen's Counsel in Victoria, who took up this matter on behalf of the Victorian Government. He indicated that South Australia's legislation was much stronger than the legislation in Victoria. I have forwarded this opinion to the Crown Solicitor for his perusal. Therefore, we are aware of the situation, but I thank the honourable member for Onkaparinga for the information he has given to me this afternoon.

Mr. Quirke: What is the effect of margarine on butter sales?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: From what I can gather, South Australia exports only second-grade butter. It imports butter from Victoria every year to supplement its supplies. I believe that dairying interests have real reason for concern about the future. This situation has only applied for about a month. As the member for Onkaparinga pointed out, we have no reliable information at this stage as to just how much margarine is being sold, nor have we any information about the repercussions felt by the dairying industry.

I believe the worst part of this is that manufacturers of margarine who have played the game here by complying with South Australian laws are at a big disadvantage under the present quota system because they sell out in one or two months. They have this quota from quarter to quarter, and they might sell out within six weeks. For the rest of the time shops are without table margarine. However, this firm now brings margarine into the State during that time, and when a firm loses custom and a person buys another brand then he is unlikely to change back to his previous brand. This

means that those who have been playing the game in South Australia are at a distinct disadvantage, and I sympathize with them.

I am not aware of any case where margarine has been sold as butter, but we do know of firms who have told customers that cooking margarine has to be labelled to comply with the South Australian law and that they should take no notice of the brand. Although our inspectors have been told about this often, the only evidence obtainable has been by word of mouth. These firms are selling cooking margarine over the counter as table margarine; it is not table margarine because inspectors have checked it. To comply with the Act, animal fat has to be put into cooking margarine. Because of lack of evidence, we cannot take action where shopkeepers or others sell cooking margarine as table margarine. The reference to the harmful effects of butter to the heart has been most damaging to the dairying industry.

Mr. Shannon: It is very unfair.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The claim has not been substantiated, and there is a difference of opinion in the medical profession about it. Recently, the heart foundation went into this matter and there is still no agreement on it. Many doctors say that butter has no effect on the heart at all.

Mr. Lawn: There are two schools of medical thought.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. This opinion may be evenly divided but at least there is reason to doubt that damage can be caused to the heart.

Mr. Shannon: It has not been scientifically proved.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I believe it is unfair for this opinion to be used in an advertisement. A doctor was to be brought from Victoria to South Australia to prove to people that Miracle margarine was the thing and that it would stop all heart troubles. I have had letters from a certain gentleman in this State urging me to allow Miracle margarine to come into South Australia. I was told in effect by Unilever that it could manufacture the same article much more cheaply. However, apparently the advertising and the way it was done up was quite eye-catching. The letters I received indicated that people were buying from New South Wales but that the margarine was costing about 11s. a lb. Apparently they were so keen to get it that they would pay that much, but they thought it was unjust that they could have been able to buy it for about 5s. a lb. However, I understand that only six people turned up at this well advertised event.

Mr. Shannon: The promotion slipped then.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Either the promotion slipped or the people themselves were not interested. However, I do not think the promotion slipped one bit. The fact that the doctor was coming over was advertised in an article in the press.

Mr. Shannon: Do you know what fee he was getting?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I did not ask and I was not interested. I was given to understand that the meeting was poorly attended. This is not a great issue to me. If people desire to buy this article for what they consider to be health reasons it is entirely their own affair, and there is nothing to stop them doing so. What I disagree with is the high-pressure salesmanship that is used; I do not say that it is a gimmick. I consider that it is an unfair trade practice. The officers of my department are fully conscious of the situation, and we have the matter in the hands of the Crown Solicitor for his advice. The manufacturers of this margarine know full well the risk they are taking. They maintain that they are covered by section 92 of the Constitution, and they are confident that no litigation will be launched while this matter is pending. They even went so far as to say that no litigation could take place until October, although I am reliably informed that it will take place next month. They said also that even if they lost they would go to the Privy Council, and as that would take another two years it would give them 2½ years to operate without any risk. They are working on that assumption.

Mr. Shannon: A pretty good chance to give a lawbreaker, isn't it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: They have been quite open about it. They have come and told me to my face what they have done, and they have been quite outspoken and perfectly frank. It is now a matter of who is right and who is wrong, and if the Crown Solicitor brings down something that we can take some action on I assure the House that we will take action.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the remarks of the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon). I also commend the Minister on his forthright statement and his assurance that should legal action be possible it will be taken. This question is urgent for two reasons. First, there has been an obvious change in the methods of margarine manufacturers in selling in South Australia.

That change has been explained by the Minister, and we see evidence everywhere of this change in advertising methods, as well as evidence that much margarine manufactured outside South Australia is available. Secondly, not only is there an increased selling drive, but it is a well established and known fact that once a product such as margarine gains a position in the market it becomes almost impossible to dislodge. That has happened in every State, and it may well happen in South Australia.

The whole problem has engaged the attention of the dairying industry for many years, as long as I can remember, and the industry has been fighting a difficult battle. It is easy for people to say that margarine should be available to people if they want to buy it, and that perhaps the dairying industry could improve its selling methods. That is frequently said. The fact is that margarine is to a large extent a copy of butter. It is a copy in that the manufacturers colour it artificially to make it appear as close as possible to butter.

Mr. Shannon: They even pack it in the same shape.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. In every way it is set out as an attractive alternative to butter. It is not a product that is sold on its own merits alone: it is still a copy of butter. I do not doubt that manufacturers of margarine are looking forward to the day when their product will be so well established on the market that it will sell without their having to imitate butter, but at present they do imitate butter. It is very easy to say that the dairying industry should improve its selling methods. I have no doubt that there is room for improvement in all these things, but experience has shown that a fully manufactured product such as margarine is much easier to market and to sell than a primary product such as butter.

We find a similar situation today in the wool industry, where textiles of artificial manufacture are put alongside wool, often with misleading labelling to imply that they are woollen articles, and the woollen industry is having a difficult time in holding its position. We have to face up to the fact (and everyone in this House realizes it) that it is not just an academic argument over a matter of selling: there is a very human problem. On the one hand we have the cost of living taken into account in award rates and by the courts, and the consumer price index also takes these matters into account. On the other hand, we have a difficult human problem in that many

of the dairymen are farming areas of land that could not support them in any other form of agriculture. Although many of them are farming areas of land which is often fertile and often in high rainfall areas, they are on blocks that would not be big enough to support them in any other recognized primary industry. All these people cannot grow vegetables, and let us hope that all of them do not try to produce eggs. For years, dairying has been the staple industry in higher rainfall districts and for small farms throughout the State, and the welfare of those farmers has to be considered whenever this most unpleasant problem is discussed. The Dairy Committee of Inquiry set up by the Commonwealth Government recognized in 1960 that this was a difficult problem, but it recommended that while the situation was as it then existed, the margarine laws should not be relaxed. The position today has been well outlined by the honourable member for Onkaparinga and the Minister of Agriculture. In South Australia, we have supported our dairying industry, but the Eastern States do not have such a good record. Victoria has, but in Queensland and New South Wales a huge volume of margarine is produced. I know that during the last few years the Minister of Agriculture in New South Wales was concerned with the margarine situation, but I am not convinced that his Government was as concerned as he was.

In that State it was a difficult situation with pressure placed upon the Government, and a defiance of the laws by the company referred to, but the New South Wales Minister wanted to frame laws to assist in controlling the industry. A conference was held in Sydney, and was attended by an officer from the Dairy Branch of the Agriculture Department (Mr. Masters) and a Crown Law officer (Mr. Wells). At the beginning of the conference there was much talking, but by the end of it most delegates were referring to the South Australian officers for their opinions, and to a great extent, the advice of our officers was adopted. They were two efficient officers and gave good advice. However, to my knowledge, nothing came of that conference and no brake was placed upon the manufacture of margarine as a result of that conference. Now, an enormous quantity of margarine is manufactured in New South Wales, but in South Australia one company is observing correctly its small quota without deviating from the law. At the same time, the State is being flooded by margarine from other States.

The Marrickville Margarine Company is pushing its product as much as it can. Today, 1 lb. of butter can be purchased at a supermarket for 4s. 10½d., but 2s. 6d. is paid for half a pound of Miracle Poly Unsaturated margarine. This margarine is being sold and advertised as possessing health properties, and as doing no harm to the heart and arteries. No-one can prove this one way or the other at present. The medical profession has laid down certain rules to generally safeguard people against heart disease, and the profession agrees on most of these rules. However, what it cannot agree on are the reasons for heart disease and the different diets liable to cause it. Miracle Poly Unsaturated margarine meets the demand from people who think it has some particular health property, although it is a high-priced product. Eta is another margarine available in large quantities, and selling for 1s. 11d. a ½ lb. One can see how quickly these products will be accepted if the type of advertising continues at high pressure. A particular company has decided to defy our laws, and both the honourable member for Onkaparinga and the Minister of Agriculture agree that, if these laws are being transgressed, they should be rigorously enforced. I am grateful to both honourable members for their clear statements, and particularly to the honourable member for Onkaparinga for introducing the matter. He has been and still is, since being a member of Parliament, a vigilant observer on behalf of the dairying industry. Sometimes, in levity, one talks about the company with which he is associated, but everyone recognizes that he fully supports the dairying industry, and the dairy farmer realizes that. These farmers will be pleased to hear the statement of the Minister and know that he, too, is fully aware of the problem, and that the matter is continually being considered so that the necessary future action can be taken.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I understand that the purport of this motion of urgency is a complaint about the quantity of margarine that is coming into South Australia and available for consumption in this State. I accept that that is the gist of the honourable member's complaint, because it is one that he has been making in this House for 10 years to my knowledge, and his interest in the matter is well understood. However, I must say that I cannot support him in what he says, and I can easily indicate the reasons for my lack of support.

Mr. Shannon: You haven't any dairy farmers in your area, for certain.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But I have many consumers who eat butter and margarine, and in fact I should be hypocritical if I did not indicate my lack of support, because I found only a few weeks ago that members of my own family consume margarine, when we can get it, because it is cheaper than butter.

Mr. Shannon: Are we underpaid?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: While my wife continually complains about the fact that she cannot get margarine, she points out that it costs only about half as much as butter, and in her view it is just as good. Of course, that is the real reason why I oppose the sentiments expressed by the member for Onkaparinga and the member for Alexandra.

Mr. Jennings: What about Susy the dog?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Susy is on heat at the moment, so she is not eating at all, if the member for Enfield wants to know.

Mr. Jennings: I had no means of knowing that, had I?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: She is away on holidays at the moment.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Order! The member for Mitcham must address the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought you would be interested in Susy, Mr. Acting Speaker: you always have been, before. I do not mean at this particular time, though. However, I cannot see why people who desire margarine, and who have been used to eating it (and I refer particularly to migrants as well as other members of the community) should be denied the right to choose butter or margarine as they wish.

Mr. Shannon: Why don't you attempt to amend our law with regard to the quota?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Onkaparinga tempts me too far, perhaps I shall.

Mr. Shannon: You wouldn't get very far.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the member for Onkaparinga had better be pretty sure of what support he has in this matter.

Mr. Shannon: He is pretty sure.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Personally, I cannot support him in this matter, because I think there should be a completely free choice open to people to consume what they like, either butter or margarine.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): Of the three interests mentioned here today I represent two, namely, producers of butter and the consumers of margarine and butter. I do not represent a

manufacturing company involved, but, as the member for Onkaparinga points out, he does.

Mr. Clark: After all, you represent your constituents.

Mr. HALL: True, but I think (and I certainly hope) that I represent the interests of the whole of the State. I understand that this motion of urgency is aimed in some way at encouraging a restriction to be placed on the interstate trade of margarine, and if the motion is carried we shall, of course, be re-establishing the quotas as they have been held in the past. I have great sympathy for members of an industry who, with capital investment, have engaged in a long-term project of processing dairy products. I think that to wipe the ground suddenly from under their feet would be unwarranted, but I also believe that by a transitional process, we can introduce a greater supply of margarine to this State.

Mr. Freebairn: Do you consume butter in your house?

Mr. HALL: My experience with margarine is rather poor, because the only time we eat it is when we run out of butter and when, having been to the refrigerator, we find only cooking margarine there. I must say it is a pretty poor substitute for butter. I know that certain quality grades of margarine are manufactured, but I think we have got our principles a little twisted here. It is all right to have section 92 in the Constitution to protect interstate trade in this country, to which trade South Australia owes almost its entire industrial prosperity. By taking away this State's trade with other States, little would be left for the manufacturing industries here, yet we want to destroy with this measure trade with other States merely because it affects one particular section of our community.

Mr. Shannon: What about the wheatgrowers?

Mr. HALL: If we do it for one, why not do it for others? If we can do this for butter why not do it for fish?

Mr. Shannon: It is done for wheat and barley.

Mr. HALL: We know that this applies just as much if not more so to fish, and if the honourable member takes the trouble to look at the millions of pounds in Australia's overseas credits spent each year to import fish I think he will realize that it overshadowed the sums spent on oils used in margarine production. What does he intend to do about that?

Mr. Shannon: Everything in its turn.

Mr. HALL: I believe in properly regulated subsidies for maintaining certain industries.

Mr. Shannon: We are paying £13,000,000; that is not a bad sum.

Mr. HALL: Of course, we generally like to spread this subsidy as equitably as we can over the community, and naturally it comes from taxation sources. In this instance a subsidy is paid to the dairying industry. The member for Alexandra has pointed out that margarine sells so freely that the manufacturers do not have to advertise it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I did not say that.

Mr. HALL: I beg the honourable member's pardon. It sells itself, then. We are restricting margarine because it sells freely, and therefore because the housewife cannot buy it and has to buy butter it means that she is subsidizing the butter industry.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Is butter taken into account in the consumer price index?

Mr. HALL: It may be, but everybody does not have an equal income. This particular subsidy comes from that portion of a person's income devoted to the purchase of basic commodities used in the house, so we are, in effect, taxing a basic household commodity to subsidize the dairying industry.

Mr. Shannon: What about a loaf of bread? That is taxed, too.

Mr. HALL: I think this motion is ineffectual. What the member for Onkaparinga says about interstate trade under section 92 will have no effect on the outcome whatsoever.

Mr. Shannon: Thank goodness you are not my legal adviser.

Mr. HALL: Although this is an expression of opinion, I say that the motion will have no real effect, and that it will not help South Australian Farmers Co-operative Union Limited. I think that we have gone a little off the rails and that the right people are not providing this subsidy. On this side of the House we have so frequently relied on section 92 of the Constitution, yet in this debate we are condemning it. However, I do not condemn it and I state my disappointment that it is being attacked.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I think that I can claim to have a sense of the fitness of things, and I realize that those engaged in the dairying industry have a great interest in the motion. I believe that the consumer's views should be put, and I support the views of the honourable member for Mitcham. It is pleasant to be associated with him on a matter of a household commodity. Some years ago in this House, when he and I found ourselves opposed, he said rather chidingly that

my knowledge of these matters did not go beyond my shopping bag. Be that as it may, I believe that the consumer's point of view should be put and, in this case, by "consumers" I mean those in homes in the community who use margarine. Many women have asked me why it is that there is not a ready availability of table margarine because they find with the existing price of butter they have to make do with a cheaper substance. They use either table or cooking margarine to stretch their budget to the extent it must in a family. A few minutes ago, on telephoning one city store to find out the price of 1 lb. of butter and of 1 lb. of margarine, I was told that the price of butter was 5s. 1d. a pound. There is a choice of two types of table margarine and two types of cooking margarine.

Mr. Shannon: You can buy cooking butter.

Mrs. STEELE: I asked about that.

Mr. Shannon: The store the honourable member asked may not have had it in stock.

Mrs. STEELE: This is one of the largest stores in Adelaide. I asked about Farmers Union butter and was told that they sell only one grade and that, if there were more than one grade, the store did not buy it. I was told that there were two types of margarine in both cooking and table varieties. Imported table margarine was sold at 3s. 9d., while that manufactured here was sold at 3s. 6d. Imported cooking margarine was sold at 2s. 8d. and the locally produced product was sold at 2s. 6d. Honourable members know that South Australia has a fixed quota of the quantity of margarine that can be manufactured.

Mr. Shannon: There is no quota on cooking margarine at all.

Mrs. STEELE: I know that. There is a quota of 528 tons, and it seems fairly obvious to me that people who are not able to afford to pay 5s. 1d. a pound for butter and would like to buy margarine should have sufficient of it available (even if it is cooking margarine) to meet their needs.

Mr. Shannon: Would the honourable member be prepared to say what she thinks is a family income that would not allow for the purchase of butter?

Mrs. STEELE: Women with large families have told me that they cannot afford to pay 5s. 1d. a pound for butter and would like to buy margarine.

Mr. Shannon: Do they buy steak?

Mrs. STEELE: When I had a young family I bought margarine for school sandwiches, and

also used it for cooking. I am certain that thousands of homes in South Australia use margarine because 5s. 1d. a pound for butter is too much to pay when they use a quantity. As a metropolitan member speaking on behalf of consumers, and with practical knowledge of many people using margarine, I cannot support the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the motion. As an ex-primary producer, I believe that goods should be supplied as cheaply as possible to consumers; I have their interests at heart. We can produce primary products as cheaply as any other country in the world. It is only because of protection given to other industries that dairy produce cannot be sold at a reasonable price. It is interesting to look at what happened to dairy farmers only last year in regard to baling twine. They were able to import it from overseas at about two-thirds of the Australian price. However, they were not allowed to buy it because a tariff that was imposed kept it out. Therefore, if other industries are to be protected then the dairying industry, which has been built up, must be protected too.

A subsidy of £13,500,000 for the butter industry has been referred to. Although the cost of production of butter is determined on a wage level that is much below that earned by factory workers, dairy factory workers get double time on Sundays, and this increases the cost. The subsidy of £13,500,000 is not for the dairy farmers: it is for the consumers. The cost is worked out, and the price at which it is sold to the consumer is lower than the cost of production determined on a lower standard of living than that which applies to a person working in Adelaide. I am speaking for the dairy farmers in my district. A Commonwealth report states that inefficient dairy farmers should be assisted to leave the industry and produce something else. If there were over-production to that extent then that should be done. However, if this were done in the dairy industry then many small, inefficient industries around Adelaide that are lowering the standard of living of Australian people should also be considered. For instance, if people were taken out of an industry like belt-loading and paid £2,000 a year, Australia would be better off. There are many inefficient industries but we should be prepared to get down to a common basis where we can produce as cheaply as other countries. We can produce dairy products more cheaply than anywhere else. In Canada cattle are stalled overnight and stall-fed for six months of the year, and when I was there

many years ago they wanted to know what was wrong with us in Australia.

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung, the motion lapsed.

OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Casey:

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.

(Continued from August 4. Page 820.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I am sure that when the honourable member for Frome tabled this motion there was an intense sigh of relief from the Government's front bench that the honourable member was removing from the Government the responsibility of having to make up its mind whether it would give effect to the requests made to it by the racecourse proprietors for a system of off-course betting similar to that in Victoria. If I were to make a prediction (and provided the policy of my friends opposite changes in the meantime) I would almost expect that the honourable member might feature in the Birthday Honours for the services he has given his Party in putting this matter on the notice paper so that the Opposition will be (he hopes) obliged to take the responsibility for this legislation, legislation which in my opinion is extremely doubtful and on which the Government is divided about whether it should be introduced.

Mr. Shannon: He doesn't look very enthusiastic, does he!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. The Government is divided on whether such legislation should be introduced, and consequently it is seeking the support of the Opposition to have the legislation virtually endorsed before it comes into the House. That is the proposition we have before us. We are told that the member for Frome is prepared to accept amendments. For instance, we are told that although the words "similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria" are included, he is willing to settle for something less than that. The only thing that we on this side of the House understand—and when I say "we" I am speaking for myself and, I hope, for some of my colleagues—

Mr. Jennings: Are you triplets, or something?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be quite frank—

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We are not amused!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In social matters every honourable member on this side takes his own view. Of course, my Party is an extremely enlightened one. Members opposite will have noticed this afternoon that members of my Party have different views sometimes on the same topic; that is permitted in our Party, and that is the difference between my Party and the Party occupying the Treasury benches at present. Of course, although the honourable member is happy and willing to accept various amendments if we like to move them, the fact remains that the amendments will not be what we will be considering in the House: we will be considering a Bill in the House, and that Bill will contain all sorts of specific provisions which obviously will not be covered by this motion that the honourable member hopes to induce us to accept unsuspectingly today. The Labor Party has a policy on most matters, but what is its policy on this matter?

Mr. Jennings: You know very well we haven't got a policy on it.

Mr. McKee: The Leader is trying to play politics with it now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am shocked that I should be accused of playing politics.

Mr. Lawn: You have done it all your life.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: What is the policy of the Labor Party on this topic, and why is it such a difficult one for it at this time?

Mr. Ryan: Page 28 of the Rule Book.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is a social question, and the Labor Party believes that social questions should be submitted to the people by way of a referendum. Do honourable members opposite say that that is not a correct interpretation of Labor's policy on this matter? Of course they do not. In fact, I could quote the rule on it. I know that honourable members do not want to provoke me into making a long speech this afternoon, and as it is private members' day I want to be both fair and brief.

Mr. Jennings: We would appreciate both for a change.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At election time my very good friend the Premier announced that if he were elected to the Treasury benches he would take action to have the question of a lottery referred to the people of South Australia.

Mr. Clark: We are going to do that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly. The honourable member has helped me along considerably, and I always like to have the support of Gawler. The only difficulty about the lottery (and there is a difficulty) is that before the election the Premier was sufficiently indiscreet to say that the lottery would be conducted for charitable purposes. No doubt the Government would want the charity to commence at home. I notice in the stop press of today's *News* that the lottery is to go ahead. Why is it that the Labor Party does not want to put this question of off-course betting (a similar type of thing) to the people of South Australia?

Mr. Clark: You wait and see!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am waiting. Why is it necessary to try to borrow a bit of support from my poor, unsuspecting colleagues behind me on this matter? Members opposite know that the public of South Australia is not so gambling-minded as to be likely to support two referenda upon gambling extensions. I make no apology for saying that, because I believe Opposition members know that, if there were two referenda on gambling matters, whatever dim chance the lottery might have without having T.A.B. tacked on it would have no possible chance with T.A.B. tacked on. If the extension of hotel hours were included to give good weight, it would sink the whole boat, as honourable members know. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) looks very puzzled about this. He will say presently that he does not understand any of these things, but he knows very well that the obligation of introducing into this House legislation on money Bills is that of the Government only, and I intend to keep it that way.

Mr. Jennings: You have not told us yet whether you are opposing the motion or not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member will get my views on that in a moment; these are only preliminary remarks. Under the Constitution, the introduction of money Bills is the distinct prerogative of the Government, and I do not wish to take that out of its hands. If a vote is taken this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, you will see the surprising position of the Premier voting in favour of this resolution, which in effect says, "Please, Frank, will you bring in T.A.B." and Frank will vote for a request for himself to bring in T.A.B. Many other Government Bills are to be introduced, but the Opposition is not being consulted on whether they should be introduced. If this consultation is to take

place and some money Bills are to be introduced by a system of having resolutions passed, let them all come that way, and we will express our views on them. However, I want to make it quite clear that I think this motion is designed purely and simply for political purposes to assist the Government out of a dilemma. I oppose it, as I am not assisting anyone on this matter. I think that is reasonably clear but, if honourable members want it to be made clearer, then I say that I oppose the motion.

T.A.B. is not without problems. When I was privileged to occupy the Treasury benches before I was tipped out so unceremoniously, I made overtures to racing clubs to give them what I believed was a fair proposal on this matter. I reported to the House what the proposal was, and I was able to report that the racing clubs had accepted it. If honourable members would like to ask the Premier to allow them to see the file on this matter (I do not think public interest is involved in this) they will see that it shows clearly that the racing clubs accepted the proposition in its entirety. The Government of the day then proceeded to give effect to the proposition so far as was practicable before the election. After the new Government assumed office the racing clubs did not continue to advance the previous proposals but went to the new Government and asked it to go back to the original proposals for T.A.B. similar to that in Victoria. In accordance with instructions, that is what the member for Frome has put on the Notice Paper today, and I notice that he does not deny the instruction.

I have not done a tremendous amount of homework on this matter because the question is not whether the Government will introduce T.A.B. but whether the Opposition, plus some Government members, will tell it to introduce T.A.B. We are not saying that the Government should not introduce T.A.B.; all we (I am speaking in the singular) are saying, or all that is desired, is that the role of the Opposition being free to criticize legislation when it is introduced should be maintained. If this motion is carried with the support of the Opposition (and I mean the substantial support of the Opposition) before the legislation is introduced we shall be tied to legislation that we shall not be drawing up. We will not know the provisions and we will not know whether the measure is desirable. I have never asked someone to do something and then turned around and kicked him for doing it. What

would be the position if we asked the Government to bring in T.A.B. similar to the Victorian system? Obviously, before starting to discuss the Bill, the Opposition would be tied to its provisions.

Mr. Casey: If what you say is true I could have added the words "in all respects".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If what I say is true the honourable member could have moved his motion at any time in the last three years. In those three years, however, it was much better for members opposite to let my Government take the responsibility for making decisions. However, the matter has been turned around. Members opposite still want us to inherit the responsibility we had last year, but we do not get paid for that any more! The members of the present Cabinet and not members of the Opposition are now responsible for introducing money Bills.

I do not want to take away the honour that may be coming to the honourable member, but I know this is a lump of cheese that has a trap on the end of it, and I will not bite it! I will not speak long on the T.A.B. issue, but I should like to say one or two things so that if the mover and the Party opposite decide ultimately that they will scrap the referendum and deal with the matter in the ordinary way they will have a few of my views, which they can expect will remain reasonably steadfast. I favor providing limited opportunities to bet for persons living in the country who at present cannot have a bet. I use the word "limited" because I believe that facilities should be provided and designed, as far as possible, not to encourage or permit gambling. Although the honourable member for Frome sanctimoniously said that he wanted to do something for the country, it is obvious that T.A.B. is not a country device at all. It is too expensive to operate to be of value to the average man in the country. A recent survey has shown that it is doubtful whether there would be more than eight or 10 centres in South Australia where T.A.B. could be successfully established.

Mr. Nankivell: Including Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that the honourable member for Port Pirie has a divided allegiance, and I do not wish to embarrass him now. The honourable member has a devious course to pursue on this topic. I assure him that if he supports T.A.B. it is for Port Pirie as well as everywhere else.

Mr. Casey: Who made that survey?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The racing people gave me that information and so did the Betting Control Board. It was the basis on which the 14-point plan was drawn up. In South Australia, in only a limited number of country places would it be possible to operate T.A.B. successfully. Victoria, with a greater density of population than has this State and with large country towns, has 91 agencies established on a commission basis. Sometimes we are told that T.A.B. will not promote gambling, but would this argument apply to people in charge of an agency on a commission basis?

Mr. Nankivell: The number is now 200.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was quoting figures for country areas. In Victoria, in 1962 there were 83 agencies; in 1963, 140; in 1964, 203; and in 1965, 268. Speaking from memory, they operate on two race meetings a day, every day except Sundays. No wonder churches in South Australia are alarmed at the honourable member's proposal. I know that the honourable member spoke of a couple of instances and tried to give the impression that churches favoured this proposal. That impression is entirely and utterly wrong, because churches are violently opposed to this proposal. I know of one member who has had petitions from no less than one-fifth of the total number of constituents in his district. In Victoria, in the first year of operation of T.A.B., the turnover was £13,900,000, and in 1963, it was £26,400,000; that is it almost doubled in one year. In 1964, it was £40,000,000, an increase equal to the total turnover in the first year of operation. In 1965 the figure increased to £55,800,000. A press report I noticed last week stated that the management hopefully and confidently predicted that the figure would increase to £80,000,000.

Mr. Shannon: They have struck a bonanza.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This thing grows on itself. I am not going to take the responsibility that justly belongs to the Government: it is the responsibility of the Government to introduce all financial measures. I could not introduce a Bill on this topic if I wanted to, as honourable members know that that is an exclusive right and obligation of the Government. I am not deceived by the fact that this motion has been moved by a Government back-bencher, because I know that it has the goodwill of the Government. Caucus rules would not allow the honourable member to move it without his first consulting the Government. I know that it is contrary to the policy of the

Labor Party, as published in a little book for which my colleague from Mitcham foolishly paid 5s. On the broad issue, I do not oppose limited facilities being made available in the country. However, I oppose the wholesale setting up of a system of gambling houses in the metropolitan area. We have been assured that it is not intended to have many metropolitan agencies but I noticed that the off-course betting committee reserved to itself the right to establish as many as it considered necessary. I understand that in Victoria agencies have been established within a mile of each other in the metropolitan area. That system has been worked out and they find there that, if people are over half a mile away from an agency, that tends to create illegal gambling. This afternoon I am discussing not T.A.B. but a fundamental question of Parliamentary practice—that the Government of the State is the authority to introduce and to take the responsibility for money Bills. That cannot be denied by anyone. In my opinion, this is purely and simply a device to try to get the Opposition to assume responsibility for something which the Government wants but which it is not game enough itself to introduce. I oppose the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): This is one of the few occasions on which the Leader of the Opposition and I are in entire agreement.

Mr. Quirke: One of you must be wrong!

Mr. HUGHES: It is with a deep sense of responsibility that I speak to this motion. Perhaps one of the first questions to be asked of me is this: should we in our era of enlightenment endeavour to impose upon educated people certain laws of conduct; should we act as our brother's keeper? Despite our modern education system, there are a number of citizens who do not fend and care adequately for themselves. Because of this, the majority of people in this State would oppose any extension of legalized gambling because they are conscious of what can happen to people who become psychologically sick but are held responsible for their actions.

Every effort should be made to improve the conditions of man. The late John Kennedy, just before his death, had this to say:

Never before has man had such a capacity to control his own environment, to end thirst and hunger, to conquer poverty and disease, to banish illiteracy and massive human misery. We have the power to make this the best generation of mankind, or to make it the last. We shall never attain the former if we

retreat from social problems. Those who advocate any extension of legalized gambling in our midst become, perhaps unknowingly, the opponents of the influence of home, school and church, and definitely contribute towards the destructive forces of our youth, which needs to be encouraged and aided to spend leisure time in enjoyable activities that will stimulate the imagination and contribute to healthy, physical, mental and social developments.

I do not intend this afternoon to quote extensively from Royal Commissions, as was done by the honourable member who moved this motion; nor do I intend to quote from documents that have been supplied to me from various English-speaking countries, but I want to look at this matter (with the exception of just one quotation that I shall use from a Royal Commission) from the point of view of how this affects the people of South Australia. I am not concerned with how it affects the people of Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia, New Zealand and other places, but I am concerned with how it affects the people of South Australia.

Mr. Hall: Then why quote an American authority?

Mr. HUGHES: I think the quotation I gave about mankind is totally different in its application to gambling. If the honourable member objects to any statements I am making and he thinks I have done wrong, he can get up on his feet (if not this afternoon, then perhaps soon) and point out to me where I have made mistakes in my statements today.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Would you believe that you had made a mistake on this matter?

Mr. HUGHES: No, I did not. I am definite on that.

Mr. Hall: I am only seeking information. Could the honourable member tell me—

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member will wait, perhaps I shall be able to give him all the information he requires as I proceed. That is final, so far as he is concerned. If he wants to make a speech on this motion, let him get up and make it. I have already told him that he has an opportunity in this House to do so.

Mr. Hall: What age group is the honourable member concerned with when he speaks of "youth"?

Mr. HUGHES: Over and over again we are being told that our attitude in frowning upon this measure is unrealistic. Heaven forbid that we, as Parliamentarians, should become complacent on such issues! It may not satisfy

the honourable member who has been interjecting, but I say that we should discourage all young people from entering upon what would appear to be an innocent experiment but which ultimately could lead to sorrow and heartbreak.

When Parliament sanctions any form of gambling and provides the places in which it may be indulged in, naturally many of our young people become confused and say, "The law-makers of our country say it is right to do something absolutely contrary to the teachings of our parents. We do not know where we are." I venture this afternoon to say that it will be difficult for many not to take the easy way should Parliament approve of this measure. I have received communications from New South Wales and Victoria pointing out the benefits to be derived from the establishment of this form of betting, particularly by the Government. My attention has also been drawn to the fact that bets can be lodged with the agencies until 40 minutes before the start of a race; no odds are broadcast afterwards and no racing broadcasts are allowed on the premises; and winnings cannot be collected until the next business day.

I understand that in Western Australia winning bets are paid immediately after the running of a race, and that odds are broadcast after the race. I understand, further, that there has been agitation in Victoria for winning bets to be paid after the running of each race. Should South Australia adopt off-course betting and then should Victoria decide to alter its legislation to provide for the payment of winning bets after the running of a race, it is only natural—and the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) has just agreed with me—

Mr. McKee: I don't agree with the Victorian system.

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to hear that and to realize that I have someone on my side. But, naturally, the promoters in this State would want to do likewise. The question is: where should we be if this came about? We should be right back to the old days of the betting shops.

Mr. McKee: No.

Mr. HUGHES: Oh, yes! I think I shall be able to convince the member for Port Pirie, because I have a quotation here on this matter, as late as October last year.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: We've got betting shops now.

Mr. HUGHES: I realize that. However, many people today, including members of this House, have forgotten about betting shops or have not experienced the unfortunate South

Australian experiment of off-course betting in the 1930's. Betting shops, as everyone in this House may know, began to function on December 26, 1933, and existed for some years. They have been condemned by several Royal Commissions and by many prominent citizens of both South Australia and other places. I have undertaken a little research to find out what some present and past members of Parliament had to say about the eight years' betting shop experiment in South Australia, and their comments make interesting reading. The first quotation is from a statement made by the present Leader of the Opposition who at the time was Premier of South Australia and who made out such a good case against the motion this afternoon. He previously said:

'I believe that there is no public demand for the re-introduction of betting shops in the metropolitan area—there is tremendous public opposition to it.

Mr. Lacey of Port Pirie had this to say:

Betting shops in the metropolitan area eventually became objectionable and insulted the susceptibilities of people living in the vicinity of them.

Mr. Nicass, who then represented Norwood, said:

When betting shops were open, I, as a union official, had more worries and troubles in trying to settle the domestic affairs of many of the workers as a result of the betting shops than I had in the whole of my experience previously. . . . Since betting shops ceased to operate I have not had one of these cases to deal with.

Mr. McKee: There is no comparison.

Mr. HUGHES: Mr. Fred Walsh, then representing Thebarton, said:

Betting shops have been condemned, not only by the general public but by those who used to frequent them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard had this to say when he represented Prospect:

Parliament in its wisdom introduced the greatest curse ever inflicted on the people of the State, the betting shops. . . . I frequented betting shops and say without fear of contradiction that all the bad things members have said in this debate are not bad enough.

Mr. Quirke, who then represented the district of Stanley, said:

One afternoon was sufficient to convince me that betting shops were a vicious imposition on South Australia.

Mr. Quirke: So they were!

Mr. HUGHES: I agree with the honourable member, and so would they be if they came into operation again today.

Mr. McKee: That is not the question.

Mr. HUGHES: There is agitation in Victoria today to introduce a system of off-course betting similar to the one functioning in

Western Australia, but we must emulate Victoria, because that is already conveyed in the motion this afternoon. The Hon. Norman Brookman, then representing Southern, had this to say about betting shops:

At all costs, we must avoid the re-establishment of betting shops.

The Hon. L. H. Densley, also representing Southern said:

Betting shops definitely affected sports in the country as they attracted to them many lads who would otherwise have been taking part in cricket, football, tennis and other sports.

Mr. Clark: That is true, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, I recall only too well the days of the betting shops, because that is when I used to play football. Other responsible comments at that time included those of Mr. T. S. Hill, the then Secretary of the South Australian National Football League, who said:

Since the introduction of betting shops the enthusiasm for the national game has been on the wane. I doubt whether the game will return to its former financial success in the country so long as the present system of betting shops remains.

Mr. T. S. O'Halloran, who was Chairman of the National Football League, said:

There is no doubt in my mind that betting shops are causing a falling-off in attendance at football games. I have heard football executives say that they have had to go into betting shops to drag out their men to play. Indeed, I believe that was true at the time.

Mr. McKee: They could have been the selection rooms.

Mr. HUGHES: That may have been so. Mr. J. Angus, Secretary of the South Australian Lawn Tennis Association, said:

In my opinion betting shops are a blot on the community. I think they have taken from sport many young fellows who would do far better both for themselves and the community if they were out in the open air playing healthy, manly games.

Surely, statements made by such responsible people should be given careful consideration, before we launch out on a system of legalized off-course betting. I venture to say that the public's memory is lamentably short, for today we have advocates agitating for a return to that unfortunate era.

Mr. McKee: You're doing a better job than the Leader of the Opposition; I'll give you that in.

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to hear that. I have already intimated that I have the member for Port Pirie on my side.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Don't you believe it!

Mr. HUGHES: The member for Port Pirie has indicated that his thinking was similar to mine, and what is more, he will not mind my reminding him later that he must be in agreement with me if he wants to be consistent with what he said in the House last October. Football, cricket, tennis and other popular outdoor sports will be adversely affected if the motion is carried, and nobody will convince me otherwise. It happened in the days of the betting shops and it can happen again.

Mr. Quirke: I suppose that is why South Australia beat Victoria at football.

Mr. HUGHES: I will not be dragged into that one. I am aware that the present proposals suggest the closing of betting agencies at midday on Saturdays, but I am convinced that this is merely a subterfuge to have the principle established, for, as in other States, the agitation will inevitably be for services more akin to those given by the bookmaker. In small country districts, where every able-bodied male is enlisted in the local football team, it needs only half a dozen to be prevented from participating to wreck the entire team, and the disbanding of one team can mean the ruination of the whole association. I believe that we must warn sporting administrators in the strongest possible terms of this danger if we are sincere in our attitude. I do not know whether the member for Frome used these words, but he indicated—

Mr. Casey: The honourable member did not read my speech.

Mr. HUGHES: I did, but the honourable member quoted from so many Royal Commissions, from letters he had received from the Mayor of New York and so on, that I became confused. The member for Frome indicated that gambling had been described as a Frankenstein monster with an insatiable appetite.

Mr. Casey: I didn't say that.

Mr. HUGHES: I know that the honourable member did not use those words, but that is what he meant.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The member for Frome will have to get the member for Wallaroo to prepare his speech.

Mr. HUGHES: The honourable member wanted me to help him with his speech but I had to tell him that I could not do that on principle. I showed the member for Frome the amendment that I shall move later in my speech, and he said that he could find no fault with it. Therefore, I expect that he will ask to have his motion withdrawn in favour of my amendment. If the principle of legal off-course betting were accepted, sooner or

later there would be demands for the immediate settlement of wins, the broadcasting of odds within the precincts of the agency, and the provision of seating and other amenities. Then, as I said earlier, we would have a repetition of the betting shops; nobody can deny that. Even the mover of the motion cannot deny it.

Mr. Curren: The honourable member cannot prove it.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes I can. We know that the young, the immature, the foolish, and the weak need the protection of the laws made in this House. Therefore, no section of the community or the Government should ever be given the green light to exploit the weaknesses of their fellows in the interests of revenue or of charities. The present desire to get something for nothing indicates a moral sickness in our nature.

Mr. Rodda: How about the illegal book-making going on?

Mr. HUGHES: I will have a little to say about that later.

Mr. Ryan: Do illegal bookmakers exist?

Mr. HUGHES: The matters I am raising before the House are worrying the consciences of some members.

Mr. Quirke: The honourable member is making us tired.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought, because of the interjections he was making, that the member for Burra was enjoying my speech the same as I enjoy his speeches.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It seems that the honourable member supports the illegal book-makers of Wallaroo.

Mr. HUGHES: We hear some foolish interjections from time to time, but that is one of the most foolish I have heard.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The honourable member has not said anything to convince me otherwise.

Mr. HUGHES: It is hard to get some things through to some people. When in South Australia, Sir Chester Manifold, who is Chairman of the Victorian Racing Club and also the Chairman of the Victorian Totalizator Agency Board, made a speech, which was sent to me to peruse. One thing he said in speaking about the betting shops in South Australia was:

I want to congratulate South Australia on the wonderful job they did for racing in Australia by introducing betting shops.

Honourable members are silent. Sir Chester added the proviso:

That might make you laugh and wonder why I say that. The introduction of betting shops in South Australia had such a disastrous effect on racing in Australia that everybody in Australia is quite convinced betting shops will not

be tolerated in any circumstances whatsoever. If it had not been for the experiment in South Australia, where you tried it out and showed what a complete failure it was and so courageously got rid of it, it might have spread into other States.

Mr. Casey: Does Sir Chester favour off-course totalizators?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not going to be side-tracked by the honourable member for Frome.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: If the honourable member is going to quote Sir Chester at all, let the honourable member quote him in full.

Mr. HUGHES: I have quoted him in full on betting shops.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Read what he said about T.A.B.

Mr. HUGHES: I do not want to do that. However, I am willing to get the whole statement and read it to the House, but that would not alter by views.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: We know that; that is why you are wasting our time.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not wasting the honourable member's time. I think he may have a guilty conscience on this matter.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: I should have a guilty conscience if I supported illegal bookmakers.

Mr. HUGHES: If the honourable member can put forward something satisfactory, I shall give it careful consideration. I am always open to suggestion. I am being very fair to the honourable member this afternoon; and also to Sir Chester. I was dealing with betting shops, and I do not think that I was suggesting that members should read something into the statement that was not there. I read what Sir Chester had to say about betting shops. That is all I thought was necessary in connection with it, and the last few words were, "It might have spread into other States." I think it has spread into other States, not under the name of "betting shops", but under the name of "off-course betting". As has already been indicated, in Western Australia, when a person backs a winner, he can collect and continue betting on the following races.

Mr. McKee: Why shouldn't he do that?

Mr. HUGHES: The main suggestion is that we should have it under the Victorian system, but the honourable member sitting on my left wants to have it under the Western Australian system. To go back to what I was about to say, broadcasting facilities are available in Western Australia, so that riders and barrier draws are known. There is no T.A.B. system in Tasmania. Betting shops operate in that State. I consider that the agitation in Vic-

torial for settlement of winning bets immediately the race has been run and for the broadcasting of odds, shows that the people who use that system are not as satisfied with it as we are led to believe and the agitation could eventually lead to the immediate payment of winning bets and the provision of broadcasting facilities, in accordance with the system operating in Western Australia.

As I mentioned earlier, it is only natural that if T.A.B. was introduced in South Australia there would be no option but to adopt that system here. I consider that my fears are well grounded. We have in our Parliament men who would accept T.A.B. under those conditions. My honourable friend who sits alongside me and who, as I informed the Caucus last week, was acting as my legal adviser on this matter—

Mr. McKee: I didn't do a very good job with you!

Mr. HUGHES: I want to quote what the honourable member said in regard to T.A.B. when he was speaking in a debate on October 22 last, as reported at page 1638 of *Hansard*:

The suggestion that this is a leg-in for T.A.B., to support the Premier's proposal to racing clubs, is a further reason why I do not support this legislation, because T.A.B. as proposed by the Premier, would be taking away a freedom from people I represent. We have betting shops in Port Pirie and the people enjoy being able to patronize betting shops and bet on races in other States and the metropolitan area and collect immediately after the race. With T.A.B., credit has to be established and one cannot collect winnings until the following Monday. That is not satisfactory for people who like a small gamble, particularly on horses.

Mr. Shannon: I don't suppose that would apply to Port Pirie only.

Mr. McKee: That is just what I said and that is why I do not support the Victorian system.

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to hear that from the honourable member. If the honourable member for Onkaparinga allows me to continue, I want to say that the honourable member for Port Pirie is just as entitled to his opinion on this matter as is any other member, and I highly respect him for having stood up last year and declared his attitude on the measure. In the same debate, the then honourable member for West Torrens, who was highly respected by every member of this House who was privileged to serve with him, had this to say in *Hansard* of last year at page 1563:

My attitude to T.A.B. is fairly well known. I am not very impressed with the system that operates in Victoria.

I hope honourable members were listening to that. The honourable member went on to say:

Any system of T.A.B. should eliminate S.P. betting and should have facilities for people who wish to bet off the course. I suggest that the system that should operate should allow people to bet at all times. When a person backs a winner by any chance (and it is a pretty remote chance at times) if the dividend has been declared he should be able to collect his bet and continue betting in the following races.

He also added some provisos, as follows:

Facilities should be provided so that the names of horses, their riders and barrier draws are known. If necessary, broadcasting facilities should also be available. This method is used in Western Australia and Tasmania. Tasmania has no T.A.B. system, but betting shops are operated in an orderly manner.

This afternoon I have brought to the notice of the House two opinions. One is that of a country member who represents a district in which there are betting shops and, as he has indicated again this afternoon, he wants them retained. The other opinion is from a former member, who was a follower of racing, and whenever he was speaking on that subject he was always listened to with great respect, because every honourable member knew that by listening to Mr. Fred Walsh, one could always learn something of advantage.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: He was always honest in his approach.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. That is why I have referred to him this afternoon. I have demonstrated to the House that there are schools of thought from the country and metropolitan areas of this State against the Victoria system of off-course betting, and that further strengthens my belief that, if South Australians adopt the Victorian system of off-course betting, in time the Western Australian system will also be accepted, because of strong public opinion that is already evident in South Australia. This was further substantiated by the opening remarks of Mr. Fred Walsh when he spoke on the Lottery and Gaming Bill in October last year. His remarks are to be found at page 1562 of *Hansard*.

Mr. McKee: Would you prefer the Western Australian system?

Mr. HUGHES: I told the honourable member a moment ago where I stood on this matter. This is what Mr. Fred Walsh had to say at that time:

I regularly patronize the noble sport of racing, as some are pleased to call it, and I have a modest investment on horse races. I do that, I consider, with considerable experience behind me, and I am not affected by any amount of money that I lose on horses because my invest-

ment is modest. I have no brief for book-makers as such. I know some of them and I think that in the main they are reputable citizens. To be quite frank, I would much rather trust those whom I know among them than I would trust many of the so-called leading members of some of the racing clubs.

Mr. Clark: That was exactly what Fred thought, too.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. I know Mr. Walsh and I know he would not have said that unless he really meant it. Apparently the reference to members of some of the racing clubs (and I use that word "some", as the honourable member at that time did) was true, because I do not recall that that statement was ever refuted. However, I did read the speech in the same debate by the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon), who said:

I listened with interest to my friend, the member for West Torrens (Mr. Fred Walsh), to whom I take off my hat when it comes to the ins and outs of the racing game, for very few people know more about it than he does.

Mr. Shannon: And I still hold that view.

Mr. HUGHES: I am pleased to know that. I think we all hold that view of the former honourable member. I do not know the leading members of the racing clubs as apparently our friend Mr. Fred Walsh does, but I know that last year they stooped to some pretty cheap publicity in an endeavour to enlist public support for T.A.B. in this State. A submission sent to the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) by the Secretary of the South Australian Country Racing Clubs Association had this to say (according to the *News* of June 23, 1964) about the regular Methodist church-goers in Port Augusta:

A check on the regular Methodist church-goers in Port Augusta has shown that 75 per cent could not care less about T.A.B., on the principle of live and let live. Many of those in the 75 per cent bet on the races. Many church members said protests against T.A.B. were being lodged by church leaders, but the extremist views were not the views of the ordinary church-goers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, immediately this accusation appeared in the newspaper contact was made with 50 Methodist families at Port Augusta, all regular church-goers, and it was found that they had no knowledge of any survey that it was claimed had been carried out, nor did the Methodist minister in charge at Port Augusta have any knowledge of such a survey. Therefore, I heartily agree with the comment that appeared in the press a few days later that the association's letter was cheap and extravagant and bore all the marks of a cause that had become desperate and bankrupt of ideas.

At this juncture I want to deal with the allegation by the racing clubs that many church members said protests against T.A.B. were being lodged by church leaders but that they were not the views of ordinary church-goers. That, Sir, is a general statement which is completely unsupported by any data and which cannot go unchallenged. Only last week one honourable member of this House told me he had received a petition signed by more than 600 ordinary church-goers from within his own district. Another member told me that he had received a similar petition with 500 signatures asking him, as their representative, to vote against the motion. I think every honourable member would have received similar petitions. The question I ask this afternoon is: how many received counter-petitions prior to the motion being moved on August 4? I asked this question of most of my colleagues on this side of the House (I think I would not have missed more than one or two of them), but only the honourable member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) could give me a reply in the affirmative. I have received petitions from the individual Methodist churches within my district. I have also received petitions from the Church of Christ in my district and from the Salvation Army. I have a list here which any honourable member can look at.

Mr. Jennings: We have enough of our own.

Mr. HUGHES: I sincerely hope that honourable members will look at them. My list contains petitions from the individual Methodist churches in my district, and surely these people must be heard. The list includes such places as Moonta, Cunliffe, Agery (that town is in the district of the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula, but it was sent to me because Agery is in the Moonta circuit), Moonta Mines, Kadina, Wallaroo, Alford, Wallaroo Mines, Jerusalem, Bald Hill, Bute, Wiltunga and Willamulka. In addition, there were petitions from the Kadina Church of Christ and from the Kadina and Wallaroo Mines Salvation Army.

Mr. Shannon: How many signatories?

Mr. HUGHES: I have not counted them, but I should think there would be about 400. When a person lives in a district such as Wallaroo for over 50 years, as I have, I think he can claim to know most of the people there. I move around amongst the church folk and can claim to know them; as I received each petition I carefully checked the names, and I can say without any doubt that, apart from the ministers themselves and those whom I

know to be church leaders in that area, the signatures are from what we would term ordinary church-goers. I have received correspondence from a number of church synods, church circuits, leaders' meetings, congregation meetings, and women's organizations not only from within my own district of Wallaroo but covering a large portion of this State, as I will demonstrate shortly. All of these people oppose the suggested introduction of T.A.B. in South Australia. I have another file. I do not expect honourable members to read all the files, although they are open if they wish to peruse them. The one I have on the top of the list is from the Rev. V. Cracknell, of Riverton, who wrote:

Dear Sir,

The Synod of the Methodist Middle District met on Thursday, July 29, at Balaklava and passed the resolution contained in this letter. The Methodist Middle District covers Gawler, Two Wells, Port Wakefield, Balaklava, Auburn, Mintaro, Riverton, Saddleworth, Mallala, Hamley Bridge, Kapunda, the Barossa Valley and Eudunda.

Mr. Freebairn: Mr. Cracknell is my constituent.

Mr. HUGHES: Did the honourable member get a similar letter from him?

Mr. Freebairn: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: I thought he would have got a letter from this reverend gentleman. I will read the resolution that was brought to my notice, and honourable members will notice from the number of towns that I have mentioned that it is a large district. For the information of honourable members, I point out that the synod consists of ministers and elected laymen from each church within that area. The letter, which also mentions a State lottery, continues:

This Synod opposes the suggested introduction of the T.A.B. system for the following reasons: we are convinced that these would be a danger to family life and that they will ultimately hurt people; that in regard to T.A.B. no one sport should merit special attention, and that this move would have unfavourable effects on country sport; because both schemes will direct moneys from home and industry into the unproductive T.A.B. or lottery systems; because of the danger that the T.A.B. shops will degenerate into the old form of betting shops; and because above all either move will mean the lowering of the moral standards of the community because of the inevitable increase in gambling which will result.

I think the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon tried to convince the House that if T.A.B. were introduced it would increase gambling. If he did not say that in relation to South

Australia, I know that he said it in relation to Victoria.

Mr. Shannon: The figures speak for themselves.

Mr. HUGHES: They do. When the Leader was speaking I had to go out of the House for a few moments, so I do not know that he gave them, but he was mentioning this matter when I left. I have received another communication from the Tailem Bend Methodist Church. There is no need for me to read it; I am only directing attention to a few letters that came to me from outside my district. Then I received another letter from the district of Gouger, representing the Port Wakefield Methodist circuit. I also received one from the Women's Christian Temperance Union at Bute. There are others, but I am not so much concerned to bring them before the House as I am the individual letters.

Reference was made by the mover of this motion to the assurances that had been given him by church leaders in Victoria about the operation of T.A.B.; I think he used the Rev. Mr. Westerman's name. I have before me a paper on gambling compiled for the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia. It is a lengthy document, but because the leaders of the churches were attacked in the *News* last year I wish to read it. I have given the individual views, and I do not want the House to think that because of that article the leaders of the churches are not concerned about this matter and are leaving it to the individual. They certainly are not. They are the leaders of the church and they uphold the principle of leading their people. This is what the paper that was compiled for the church had to say on gambling:

Gambling is a passion common in some form or another to every race and every rank of society. We are not dealing with some new form of activity but with the twentieth century development of an ancient habit.

In our time. Today, gambling has reached alarming proportions. It has become big and lucrative business. It has been seized on by Government and organizations seeking easy money. Fabulous sums are offered to entice people to take comparatively small risks.

What is gambling? Gambling may be defined as the means, based on chance, by which money or goods are transferred and for which the gainer renders no service of approximate equal value and the loser suffers a total loss. This transfer is effected by chance through the creation of an artificial risk or on circumstances over which the gambler has no control.

What is the attitude generally towards gambling? Long custom and habit and legalizing of some methods by the State have made

gambling accepted as part of life. A habit used in the interest of charities is given a certain value and warrant. Why do people gamble?

- (a) Desire for gain.
- (b) Desire for excitement.
- (c) Opportunity to pit skill or intuition against others and gives some satisfaction to the competitive spirit in human nature.
- (d) Creates an additional interest in events (sporting, etc.).

Is gambling economically sound? Being dependent on chance, in its very nature, gambling is economically unsound. It is an unbalanced and unsatisfactory means of distributing wealth or exchanging property.

Is gambling anti-social? Herbert Spenser in *Ethics* has written on what he calls "rebarbarization". He affirms that gambling is based on a barbaric habit. It is the kind of action that provides pleasure at the cost of pain to another. He classes it as a return to barbarism. Such an act is plainly anti-social.

The effect on the gambler? This varies with persons, but no person has ever been made a better character by gambling. For all too many it becomes a dangerous obsession to which they give too much thought and time. At its worst, gambling can become an almost uncontrollable impulse and lead to crime.

The degradation of sport. The close links between gambling and sport form one of the unfortunate features of today. To transform players, horses and hounds into gambling machines is a negation of sport. Gambling tends to corrupt everything associated with it.

In moving the motion, the member for Frome referred to the stock exchange, about which there are different opinions. However, in fairness to him I shall read what the document said in relation to this matter:

In the legitimate buying and selling of shares is the provision of capital for commercial enterprises and is an essential part of modern business life. But if the buyer is seeking excessive gain dependent on chance, then it is gambling. Whether the use of the stock market is a gamble depends on the motive of the person buying or selling.

I think that is a very fair opinion of the church.

Mr. Quirke: You could not apply that to T.A.B.?

Mr. HUGHES: I am not going to be sidetracked whilst I am on this subject.

Mr. Quirke: That is a pretty good track.

Mr. HUGHES: I am not sure that it is. The attitude of the Methodist Church is as follows:

Living in the world where gambling is an accepted habit of countless people, where gambling customs are freely exploited in support of causes good in themselves, the Christian is forced to examine the question and determine his attitude to it. In the light of all the facts regarding gambling, Methodist conferences have spoken in no uncertain voice, and

the attitude of Methodism has been declared in its law and by resolutions. The Church is pledged to the support of legislation and other measures directed to the suppression of gambling in every form. It forbids the resort to lotteries, raffles, or any other devices of hazard or chance in any money-raising enterprises in its buildings, . . . and it requires its members to abstain from and discountenance any such methods of amusement or gain.

That is where the Methodist Church conference in South Australia stands on this issue. Another document is a letter sent to me from the United Church Social Reform Board. It contains a copy of a letter sent to Sir Thomas Playford when he was Premier. I refer to this to show that the leaders of the church, on principle, are prepared to go to the highest person in the State to air their grievances on these matters. The deputation that disapproved the introduction of T.A.B. in this State represented the Church of England (Diocese of Adelaide); the Baptist Church of South Australia; the Churches of Christ of South Australia; the Congregational Church of South Australia; the Presbyterian Church of South Australia; the Salvation Army in South Australia; the Methodist Church of South Australia; and the United Churches Social Reform Board. At that time this deputation indicated to the Premier that, in addition to the evidence presented, it had correspondence from the Right Rev. T. E. Jones (Bishop of Willochra) and the Rev. H. D. Koehne (President of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Australia), both stressing strong support for the cause being represented by the deputation. I received a letter from the Secretary of the Congregational Union of South Australia informing me of a resolution that had been passed unanimously by that body, which was:

That this council of the Congregational Union of South Australia strongly opposes the move to legalize off-course betting through a totalizator agency board in South Australia. The council believes it would be in the best interests of the community if strong measures were taken to suppress all off-course betting. There is much merit in the sentiment expressed in the last sentence of that resolution. It has been stated that the S.P. bookmaker will never be eliminated, but if legislation were amended to provide for a stiff gaol sentence for these people when they were apprehended, S.P. bookmaking would be reduced to a minimum.

Mr. Quirke: You would not advocate that, would you?

Mr. HUGHES: Wouldn't I! I am advocating it.

Mr. Quirke: What a ruthless man!

Mr. HUGHES: My case was supported by evidence placed before the Royal Commission in Victoria, as recorded on pages 21 and 22 of its report:

One such bookmaker stated that, after members of his staff had been convicted for illegal betting and the authorities had taken away his telephones, he rented up to 25 other telephones in private houses or offices at an average rental of £12 weekly. The same man admitted he had employed about 20 agents to canvass for bets, in factories and residences, who were paid a commission of 10 per cent on all losing bets booked by them, and that a good agent would return him up to £100 weekly. The telephone bookmaker does a much greater volume of business than does his brother of the street, since the big bettors deal with him, and sometimes goes to extraordinary lengths in erecting barricades and other obstructions to defeat or delay a raid by police.

One of them built a block of flats, the top floor of which was designed to be, as he said, "police proof" and which was divided into about 12 cubicles each occupied by a bookmaker. By taking great risks a policeman got into this floor and obtained evidence which led to the conviction of the owner and others. This man had not done any betting business before he built, what he termed, "the fortress", but acquired a clientele by taking over the customers of another for a commission of 10 per cent on all losing bets made by those customers. As this commission amounted to £3,000 for the first 12 months of the take over, it can be seen there is a substantial goodwill in the business of illegal bookmaker. The same man also said that a fine of £500 would not stop his operating, but that a threat of imprisonment would do so. Evidence of the same kind as this last statement was given by many of the bookmakers who gave evidence.

Most of them, apart from violating the gaming laws, have no criminal records. Some of them have children at expensive schools and almost all of them admitted they feared the disgrace of being imprisoned, and would give up bookmaking entirely if they thought there was a prospect of a gaol sentence for them. It is to avoid such a prospect that, after his first or second conviction, a bookmaker generally employs an unconvicted agent to carry on the business, while he himself goes to golf or the races on race-days. Mr. Alderton, a New Zealand witness, already mentioned, stated that a bookmaking friend of his in that country told him that, when the relevant legislation was amended, to make a penalty of three months' imprisonment for illegal betting, he retired from the business so, apparently, the fear of imprisonment is not peculiar to the Victorian bookmaker.

According to the Royal Commission, that proves conclusively that if legislation were amended and a stiff prison sentence (I am not naming the length of it) were meted out to these people when apprehended it would be found that the number of S.P. bookmakers in any State would be reduced to a bare minimum.

Mr. Quirke: They are not committing a very serious crime.

Mr. HUGHES: That is not the line of my argument, and the member for Burra knows it. I find it hard this afternoon to believe the claim of the Secretary of the South Australian Country Racing Clubs that country people are becoming increasingly resentful of the present situation. My reason for making that statement is that I move around a lot, as other honourable members do; and I state that, outside of the secretaries of the racing clubs, I have been approached by only one person saying that he thought that, if it was good enough for a person to be allowed to bet at Port Pirie, it should be good enough for people to have a bet at, say, Port Augusta, 60 miles one side of Port Pirie, and Wallaroo, 60 miles the other side.

Mr. McKee: You would agree with him, of course.

Mr. HUGHES: I want to give this man a hearing because I believe in the minority being heard. I have always believed, in spite of what the Leader of the Opposition said the other day about rural areas (I do not want to bring that in), that if the law is good enough to operate for one section of the people it should be good enough to operate throughout the State. I have always maintained that. The minority voice should be heard. If I had to assess this one voice against the hundreds of people prepared to state their objections in writing to me, and give their names, this lone voice would be outvoted by 500 to 1. I believe that only a minority is asking for T.A.B. to be introduced in this State.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Would you accept the decision of a referendum?

Mr. HUGHES: I would be prepared to accept the voice of the people at all times.

Mr. Quirke: You will vote for T.A.B. if the people want it?

Mr. HUGHES: If it is the wish of the people I shall not oppose it. I did not say I would vote for it: I said I would not oppose it, and that is a fair reply.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: What have you been telling us all the afternoon?

Mr. HUGHES: Other honourable members know what I have said but, apparently, the honourable member has been asleep. The one person who spoke to me in support of T.A.B. had a strong argument: if it is good enough to have a legal bet in Port Pirie, it is good enough for people 60 miles on either side of that city, living perhaps under identical conditions in other industrial towns, to do likewise.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Would the majority of people in Port Pirie be in favour of it?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not know about the majority, but I am prepared for this to go to the people. I am concerned with all sections of the people in this State, and that is what I am trying to put before honourable members this afternoon. I am prepared for this to go before the people of the State. I shall not oppose their decision. Before I was interrupted again—and the honourable member is entitled to interject if he wants to: I do not hold that against him—I had just made the statement that I believe that, if people in Port Pirie have a bet legally, people 60 miles away, living perhaps under identical conditions, should have like consideration.

Mr. McKee: Now you are switching.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I am not. I say in this House that I am prepared to stand or fall on my principles. I shall not depart from them on this question.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Even if the people say so?

Mr. HUGHES: I do not think I will reply to any further interjections from the member for Ridley, because he is becoming unreasonable.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: You have been that way all the afternoon.

Mr. HUGHES: No, I have not; I think I have been very fair. The member for Port Pirie thinks I have been fair—and he is my legal adviser! If people subscribe to a policy to do something if elected as a Government, the minority must be prepared to accept its share of the pudding. But here we have a set-up where both major Parties in this House went to the people last March with no policy on T.A.B. The members of the Labor Party subscribe to a policy on lotteries. Before a Bill is introduced by the Labor Party to provide for lotteries in South Australia, the sanction of the people must be sought by means of a referendum. Coming to the real crux of the matter, I would not show any opposition to a measure passing through both Houses on this matter, with a proviso in it that before it is proclaimed it must receive the sanction of the people by a referendum. I have already put that to the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) and he could not see anything wrong with it. I think he subscribes to that sort of thing. If he does not, he is not being consistent. Because of the statement I have made, at this juncture, with the permission of the House, I move the following amendment to the motion:

To leave out all words after "House" and insert in lieu thereof "any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum."

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) seconded the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES: I move this amendment to be consistent with the policy I have enunciated over the years, namely, that where my Party has no specific policy I shall support a move to give the people an opportunity to decide such an issue. I am prepared to offer no opposition to a Bill for off-course betting, provided the amendment is carried, because the people would then have had an opportunity to closely examine the proposed contents of the legislation, and they could go to the ballot box with a clear mind as to what they were voting on.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The honourable member understands, of course, that he can seek to insert a clause in the Bill to give effect to his amendment?

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and I also understand my amendment. After hearing the evidence quoted by the mover of this motion (Mr. Casey) from various Royal Commissions that were held on similar issues, and after hearing him say that church leaders in Victoria had given an assurance that legalized off-course betting in that State was well conducted, surely neither he nor any other member of this House can offer any opposition to my amendment. It was pleasing to see the Premier himself reported in *Hansard* as saying that this issue could be resolved by conducting a referendum. During the debate on the Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment Bill last year, at page 1642 of *Hansard*, the following appears:

Mr. CORCORAN: . . . The racing clubs in the South-East are close to the Victorian border and, because of T.A.B. in Victoria, the stakes in that State are very much higher. As a result, the good South-East horses go to Victoria, and the Victorian horses that would otherwise come to South Australia race in Victoria also. The amount that will be received by South-East clubs will not make much difference.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What would you offer them in lieu?

Mr. CORCORAN: Possibly T.A.B. This has been discussed for 12 or 18 months, or even longer.

Mr. Frank Walsh: It could be done by referendum.

Mr. CORCORAN: Of course it could.

Mr. Frank Walsh: It would not depend on one person then.

Mr. CORCORAN: It would not. If the people voice an opinion in a referendum, surely they should be able to have a T.A.B. system.

I think that therefore I have some people on my side in relation to my amendment, for both the present Premier and the member for Millicent have intimated that they favor a referendum on the introduction of T.A.B. To those honourable members I can also add the then Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Hon. C. D. Hutchens), for, as reported in 1964 *Hansard* at page 1637, he said:

I would not agree to any extension of gambling unless it was demanded by a referendum, and I would be happy to grant that referendum when a sufficiently strong request was made for it. Even though I am not in favour of gambling, I would accept the decision of the referendum to extend gambling facilities if that were the will of the people.

Surely, by now the House can see that other honourable members are of the same opinion as I am, and that where a precedent has been established in policy one must be consistent when debating an issue similar to one that has been debated previously. In my research on this matter I find that, because the Labor Party had no specific policy on it, a certain honourable member held the opinion that no T.A.B. Bill would be introduced from this side of the House. Therefore, I think he must have been disappointed when notice was given that on August 4 a certain motion would be moved, which, if carried, would leave the Government with no alternative but to introduce a Bill to establish T.A.B. on similar lines to those in Victoria. I think the honourable member's words were repeated throughout the whole of South Australia. The reference is in last year's *Hansard*, at page 1645, where the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) said:

Today one member said he would support this measure only because it was a first step towards the establishment of T.A.B.

The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) interjected, "But is it?" Then the *Hansard* report continues:

Mr. LAWN: No. I offered to bet any sum with anyone that no Bill on T.A.B. would come before this House.

Mr. Frank Walsh: At even money, or at odds?

Mr. LAWN: I would have offered odds. I will bet today that there will be no Bill next year, as we shall be on the other side of the House, and we will not introduce a Bill for T.A.B. Had a Bill dealing with T.A.B. come before us this session, I would have opposed it.

I know that the honourable member will be consistent when it comes to voting on this motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 10. Page 932.)

Grand total, £36,964,000.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): Last evening I was dealing with matters of some importance related to the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I was pleased to receive, in answer to a question about the position at the Kangaroo Creek reservoir, a report from the Minister in which he was able to set at rest some fears which were current in the department, and which I had entertained myself last March, about the possibility of constructing this reservoir near the proposed site and also about the ultimate cost of the project, which appeared likely to be substantially increased above the original estimate because of geological faults in the abutments of the proposed double-arch curvature dam. I was pleased to hear the Minister say that the driving of adits into the abutment had shown that the rock was rather better than we had at one time feared it would be, and that it would be possible, in all probability, to retain the proposed design for the dam, which is the cheapest possible structure that can be constructed to give the requisite strength.

A very talented officer of the department went overseas a couple of years ago to inquire further into this matter, and at that stage, of course, we did not expect that the difficulty in respect of the abutment would arise. However, later geological work showed a fault to exist and in this type of structure it is absolutely essential that the abutment be capable of taking the load without the slightest movement under pressure. It appeared as though this type of construction would have to be abandoned in favour of a gravity arch dam which, because of the volume of concrete required, would necessarily be much more costly. I hope that current expectations will be realized, and that it will be possible to get on with this job, because the metropolitan water supply, in spite of some notable extensions and expansions in its capacity to serve the metropolitan area in recent years, is still inadequate without resort to an extensive use of the Mannum-Adelaide main. This is costly, and it is rather a pity to see water running to waste down the Torrens River, water that could be impounded and could gravitate to the metropolitan area at little cost.

Reference is made in the Loan Estimates to the Kangaroo Island scheme, and it appears from the information given by the Treasurer that the plans for the dam on Middle River are taking shape and that the foundations at the site are satisfactory. I have assumed that from comments made by the Treasurer. It appears that it will be possible to have this scheme completed soon. The pipeline has been completed and temporary pumps at Middle River were able to fill the storage tanks above Kingscote. This is a great improvement on the previous position. During the latter part of the summer, almost invariably the tanks had to be replenished from the very saline waters of the Cygnet River running down to Kingscote. From then onwards, the residents of that town and the many tourists who frequent the locality during the tourist season had to put up with extremely poor quality water.

In addition to the need to supply the town, requests have been made for water to be supplied as far down as American River. This would be possible technically, but whether it is possible financially is another matter. Nevertheless, it is hoped that these extensions will be made to meet subdivisional activity in and around Kingscote and on the farmland adjacent to and spreading outwards from the trunk main around Parndana and eastwards. In particular, we hope that where the water supply from surface catchments is inadequate, a supply will be provided to give the island a real water service.

The Chowilla dam is another important project that is exercising the minds of the Minister and his officers. I understand that there are some problems regarding the procurement of rock for the embankment and that this could be a costly item in the overall construction. I believe I am correct (and if I am not, I apologize in advance) when I say that in his tour of the Upper Murray districts during the election campaign, the Treasurer said it was about time the Government gave up talking and got on with the job at Chowilla.

That may have been a useful political comment, but the Treasurer and Cabinet, having now become more conversant with the job of building Chowilla dam, will have realized that this comment was somewhat out of place. Everybody knows that it is desirable to have this work completed at the earliest possible moment but everybody also knows (and nobody knows better than the honourable member for Chaffey) that it would be a tragedy of world dimensions if the 4,750,000 acre feet of water proposed to be impounded in the Chowilla dam broke the banks, because in a matter of hours

the river towns would be obliterated in the same way as certain townships in Italy were obliterated consequent on the breaking of an embankment of a reservoir.

I know that the Engineer-in-Chief has had this problem heavily on his mind. It is no light decision for a responsible officer to have to make. I am sure that it is extremely wise to take all possible precautions and to examine the matter from all angles to ensure that, beyond any shadow of doubt, the bank will do the job for which it is intended. Mr. Chairman, I do not say this for the purpose of being an alarmist or of raising any fears, because I believe there are no grounds for fears provided the job is done wisely and well. The previous Government did authorize the engagement of consultants in this matter, I think at a cost of about £270,000, to advise the Government's officers. Because of the factors involved we had no hesitation in agreeing to that proposition, expensive though it appeared to be. I would commend the Minister if he endeavoured to ensure that the engineers of his department were given time to come to firm conclusions in this matter before they went ahead. However, I believe these problems are largely overcome and resolved to the satisfaction of the departmental officers, and that we can expect real action and some contracts to be let soon.

Another matter that has been brought to my notice regarding this Loan programme concerns the provision of water and sewerage to new subdivisions. A policy was inaugurated two or three years ago (perhaps longer ago than that) under which it was agreed that the department would provide water and sewerage services in subdivisions provided that the subdivider would put up the money for the work to be done and keep the department in funds ahead of requirements so that no departmental money would be actually involved, and that in return for this the subdivider would be rebated progressively over a period of five years an amount of £250 a house. In other words, when the house was built and rated by the department the subdivider would be rebated £250 of his original capital input in the scheme. Speaking from memory, this was subsequently revised and reduced to £200 a house because it was considered (and the subdividers agreed) that the provision was perhaps generous. I am informed that this provision for rebate has now been reduced from £200 to £100; in other words, instead of being £100 on account of water and £100 on account of sewerage, it is now £100 in total for the two services.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The total amount is £100, but it is 60-40.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then my information is generally correct. We have yet to see whether this will have a delaying effect on the progress of subdivisional building.

Mr. Shannon: Is there any variation in the time factor for the return of the money?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The time for rebate has been reduced from five years to three years.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: That is so.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I see that the Minister concurs.

Mr. McKee: You have got quite a source of information.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Surely the honourable member does not blame me for trying to get my facts straight.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: It has been publicized: there is nothing secret about it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sure that the member for Port Pirie does not mind my getting the facts straight. I estimate that of the total number of houses built in South Australia each year most of them (I would think 55 per cent or 60 per cent) are built by private subdividers or private owners. However, I am subject to correction on that. Despite the magnificent achievements of the Housing Trust, we have had to rely on private investment for housing, and if this reduced rebate in terms of money and time affects the willingness of private investors to invest in houses to the same extent as they have in the past we shall begin to lose the ground in providing housing that we have gained remarkably in this State compared with most other States over the last five or six years.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: We are still better than other States in this respect.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think we are still better in the general provision of housing, and I do not want that to fall behind. Other States copied our legislation in this regard. I think it was taken up by other State Parliaments as a solution to the subdivisional problem. It spread from South Australia to New South Wales, and probably to other States.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: They do not make any rebates at all.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I commend the Treasurer for the provision for hospital buildings in this State, and in this category I include stage 2 of the Royal Adelaide Hospital rebuilding programme, which is now getting well under way. I believe that in this building we shall have a magnificent hospital.

Thanks are due to the Public Works Committee for its activities and to the Principal Architect of the Public Buildings Department (Mr. Lees), who I believe is worthy of special commendation for the splendid set of drawings and plans he prepared that made this project possible and enabled it to get under way.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Thanks are due also to Mr. Roberts.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; a unit of the department under Mr. Roberts is working at the hospital. He is in charge of the project, and I readily couple his name with that of Mr. Lees. Progress is being made, and I believe that in this building we shall have a first-class hospital, which of course is needed. Coupled with the university, it will provide a first-class teaching institution.

The Dental Hospital has been a problem over the years. There is a big docket on it and the plans had to be revised on several occasions, but I believe the green light has now been given for the project to go ahead. This will be another difficulty solved. I again commend the Government for making reasonably adequate financial provision for this project.

I notice also that the Enfield Receiving Home is to get some attention and I should like not only to commend the Treasurer for the attention it is getting but to commend the staff for the care given to patients of this and other similar institutions. I have had some association with patients at these institutions, and, despite the criticism that one hears occasionally and the letters one reads in the press criticizing the conduct of these institutions, from my association with the staff, from the supervising medical officers down, I know that they are to be commended. I express gratitude to them for the care they take and the nervous energy they spend in looking after people committed to their care. I am pleased that a generous allocation has been made for the group laundry building. This is essentially associated with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as the two projects are inter-dependent in respect of the facilities they will provide.

I express pleasure that good progress has been made on the area school in my home town of Cummins, as it received setbacks last winter because of the 9in. of rain the town received in seven weeks from the middle of June to early August, which caused, in that heavy soil, some serious problems for the builders. Finance is provided for that school to be completed, and I hope it will be completed on schedule, although I doubt whether it will be opened in time for the beginning of the school

year in 1966, as we had hoped. However, I believe it could open within a month or so from that date.

I am disappointed at the reply given to me today about the new Port Lincoln High School. This project, as the Minister rightly said in his reply, was considered some four years ago, as at that time, because of the rate of increased enrolments, it seemed necessary that additional accommodation should be provided immediately. However, immediately subsequent to that investigation, it was evident that enrolments had tapered off, no doubt caused by the upgrading of area schools at Cummins and Tumbay Bay which affected the demand for secondary education at Port Lincoln High School, with a subsequent effect on the enrolment at that school. However, I know that in the last 12 months or so the high school council and the headmaster have been seriously concerned to observe that enrolments are now increasing rapidly, as are prospective enrolments, and an acute situation will arise at the high school by the time a new one can be built. I asked Cabinet in the latter part of 1964 to consider this matter, and it was decided that it should be proceeded with, and Cabinet approved of the project just after Christmas. Now, I am disappointed to learn that although planning will be continued during this financial year, the Minister is unable to say definitely that provision will be made on next year's Estimates for a start to be made on site.

This information will cause some regret and disappointment to the high school council, and disappointment to me, as this school has rendered signal service to people on Lower Eyre Peninsula and has, under the present headmaster, achieved a high standard. In these circumstances, it may be difficult for the school to cope with enrolments. It may be not unreasonable to expect a primary school to cope with crowded conditions, which although not desirable are perhaps manageable, but, as the Minister of Education will agree, it is not desirable for a high school to be seriously cramped for space. Now that both Ministers concerned are here, I urge that provision to start this project be made at the earliest possible moment because in an isolated part of the State, as we are from the point of view of contact with city education facilities, the only alternative a parent has when he wants secondary education for his children is to send them to Adelaide and pay board for them. So I do urge that a lively interest be maintained in this matter. I can promise the Ministers that I shall keep it before them.

A problem is arising (in fact, it has arisen) with primary school accommodation in Port Lincoln. Here again we have two schools—the town school and the Kirton Point school. The town school is already crowded to the extent that buildings are occupying what I think ought to be playing space. The house building activity in Port Lincoln has to be seen to be appreciated. I know that the Minister will want to see it, and I shall be pleased to show him around. I go there every week, sometimes more often, and each time I see new houses being built. The Housing Trust, too, is active there. Private estates that were cut up recently are rapidly filling up. This, of course, imposes heavy pressures on school accommodation. The only solution to this problem, as I see it, is to commence a third primary school at a new site, Lincoln South, about which the Minister knows and upon which he has had reports, so that some pressure can be released from the town school. When this is done it will be possible to rebuild the town school to advantage. The Minister is not unaware of these problems and I believe he will keep his eye on them. I mention this now in this debate because it is of some concern. The Port Lincoln Primary School Committee has been in touch with me over the past year on this matter. I have frequently been to the school and noted that it requires urgent consideration.

I do not have much to say about the general housing programme, because my Leader dealt with it extensively in his speech. I wonder, however, whether there are any firm developments in the Upper Port Reach scheme, which was investigated by the Public Works Committee and has interesting possibilities. The scheme is unusual in its concept, in that it offers scope for a tremendous number of houses within five or 10 minutes' run of the city, a proposition that every other capital city in Australia would like to be able to entertain.

Mr. Ryan: But they would not be working men's houses, would they?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I understand it, they will be. The position is that the Housing Trust will build many houses in that area.

Mr. Shannon: That is correct—over 400.

Mr. Ryan: At £4,000 a block.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No; the honourable member knows better than that. If he does not he ought to, because the Public Works Committee reported on this and its report is on the files. In my opinion, it will be

a judicious arrangement and a good mixture of different types of houses to cater for all tastes. I admit that some of them will of necessity be fairly costly.

Mr. Ryan: Will not the costly ones automatically raise the price of the less costly ones?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, on the contrary; the total cost of developing the scheme is known fairly accurately (indeed, as accurately as it can be ascertained). It is a question of ascertaining the cubic yardage of earth to be moved and dredged, distance of bank protection to be provided and length of water and sewerage mains to be laid. That work will have to be undertaken whether £10,000 houses are built on the blocks or £2,000 houses. I understand that the blocks occupying the more salubrious positions will be sold for their value, which is stated to be very high.

Mr. Ryan: £4,000.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This will enable the Housing Trust to obtain land at prices that are about the norm in relation to the trust's building activities.

Mr. Ryan: Of course, the Government has to supply the finance before any revenue can be obtained.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is not uncommon, and, of course, it is the Treasurer's duty to see (and I know that he will do this) that the investment of public moneys is properly protected. Reports have been made on this scheme, and I am wondering whether the Minister will tell me at some time whether it is intended to start developing housing estates in this area soon, and whether the Harbors Board is to be instructed to call tenders for the dredging contract which will be the first phase of the reclamation works. When the dredging and reclamation are completed the land will, of course, settle down, and it will be possible then to commence building and road construction.

Mr. Shannon: There are some lovely building sites already available on the seafront in this area.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, a large area of broad acres has been levelled and protected from wind erosion, which is waiting for some action. A start can be made in the near future, and I hope this project will not be long delayed, but unfortunately, I see no specific item in the Loan Estimates to indicate that a commencement of work here is imminent. The only fly in the ointment in respect of the Electricity Trust is that the trust will be obliged to undertake most of its capital

development out of its own funds, in spite of its increasing activities, in particular its heavy commitments at Torrens Island, its work in providing extensive 275 K.V.A. mains in the city area and 200 miles of main from Port Augusta to Port Lincoln, its programme of reticulation at Kangaroo Island, and its £660,000 worth of rural extensions (which I am indeed pleased to see). In its total programme the trust is receiving only £3,000,000 from Loan funds but, in spite of this comparatively meagre assistance from the Treasury, it is gratifying that the trust will be able to increase its total programme this year compared with previous years. I do not know for how long the trust will be able to finance its increased growth out of its own internal funds, and it would be a matter of considerable regret if the record of the trust in extending its activities in the fields of generation and reticulation were in any way hampered or curtailed by lack of money.

The trust has a remarkable record of progress and development. Of course, it has had to meet an expansion year by year of at least 10 per cent, and this is the sort of compound interest expansion that it has been required to maintain. It is the trust's proud record since its creation that never has industry or the domestic consumer suffered from a shortage of power because of any lack of generating capacity. I do not think that that record could be equalled by any other electricity undertaking in the Commonwealth. Short of power we were in the good old days, when we used to stand on the sandhills to see whether a coal boat was coming up the gulf, but that was the only reason for a shortage of electric energy in South Australia. In spite of that, industries have grown so markedly that the population has grown to the extent it has and the consumption per person has increased by at least 100 per cent in the last eight or 10 years. Notwithstanding all these things, the trust has kept ahead (not wastefully) of consumer demand. It has done this at a price that has been stable for 12 years, except for downward adjustments in various categories from time to time and particularly in country areas, which now enjoy, throughout the length and breadth of the E.T.S.A. network, a charge for power that is equivalent to that in the metropolitan area. I give full marks to the trust for the way in which it has carried out its job, and I am glad to see that it is able to expand its services in the way that is proposed.

I am particularly interested in the building of the 132-kilovolt line from Port Augusta to Port Lincoln, not because Port Lincoln is short of power at the moment (it is being cared for by the installation of a 3,000 kilowatt diesel plant to tide it over until the main line comes down) but because the line is going through the centre of Eyre Peninsula with a breakdown station near Rudall that will enable the trust to service the water pumps at Polda, the boosters at Lock, and the pumping stations that are required to take the water from Polda to Kimba. It will also link up the towns of Arno Bay, Cleve, Cowell, Kimba and Lock. I believe it is envisaged that, in all probability, it will extend into the Wudinna grid and be able to take over that supply. I am informed that the Wudinna grid, which is extensive and is run by the council in that area, is already faced with the problem of generating capacity. The council is seeking additional machinery, and if there were any possibility of the trust's being able to give a firm date to that authority about when it could assume the load from that grid, I am quite sure that the people in my colleague's district of Eyre would be very grateful.

I come now to the matter of the provision of school buses, which is important to any country member, particularly those representing districts on the west side of Spencer Gulf, because we rely heavily upon the provision of school buses to get our children to school. The mileage covered in this way is phenomenal. Although I took out the figure I have not got it before me. I am pleased that the Treasurer has been able to provide for the expenditure of another £140,000 on school buses. I know that it is wise and necessary and I commend him for it.

In conclusion, I emphasize a point I made earlier. I know that the compilation of Loan Estimates is a difficult job; but I also know that unless one starts with a cake big enough it cannot be sliced up in proportions that are sufficiently generous to meet requirements. As I said, it is a matter for some regret that in the overall provision one department in particular, and others to a lesser extent, are obliged, in effect, to curtail their activities during this financial year. It would be bad enough in a rapidly developing State if they were only compelled to mark time, but to retreat from targets reached in the previous two years is most unfortunate, and I hope that when the Estimates for next year come before us some of the ground lost

this year will be regained. I support the first line.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I, too, support the first line. It is pleasing that the Government has made every effort to marshal the financial resources of the Crown so as to ensure an adequate works programme. It is a comprehensive programme and covers all parts of the State, which is important. However, I intend to confine my remarks to matters that affect my district, and shall refer specifically to certain lines. I note that the following works, at the expenditures shown, are to be undertaken in the Barossa district: a water supply project for Modbury, £2,000; a water supply project for Yatala Vale, £27,000; a branch main from Sandy Creek to Gawler, £90,000; continuation of work on the Banksia Park Primary and Infants School, £190,000; continuation of work on the Beefacres Primary and Infants School, £162,000; continuation of work on the Sandy Creek Primary School, a further £41,000; a new school to be built in brick, to be known as Hope Valley-Modbury South Primary School, estimated to cost £148,000; and a major addition in brick to the Modbury Infants School, estimated at £80,000.

In addition, some houses are to be constructed by the Housing Trust at Freeling, Roseworthy and Mount Crawford. I refer first to the water supply projects for Modbury and Yatala Vale where new subdivisions are continually being opened up, and as a consequence a water supply is required. I have had repeated requests from those areas in support of the provision of a water supply, and the landowners will be pleased that this work is continued in the Loan Estimates. The buildings at the Banksia Park Primary and Infants School are practically completed, but some work has still to be done to put the finishing touches to them. This school consists of two brick buildings and is large enough for 800 children, but only 387 children are at present attending it. Therefore, this will allow for future expansion.

About 100 children who are still attending the Tea Tree Gully Primary School could attend the Banksia Park school, but they have not transferred. Of course, it is entirely up to the parents of the children, but the Banksia Park school would be nearer for them. When that school was first opened in the first term of 1964 there were 170 children enrolled; at the end of the year 250 attended the school. At the beginning of this year 309 were enrolled; today 387 are attending. The new brick build-

ing was occupied only last Wednesday. Previously, the children were housed in one room of the infants school and in some temporary buildings, which I understand are now to be removed and transferred to other areas.

I am particularly interested in the Beefacres Primary and Infants School, which is at present under construction. This school is necessary because the area is becoming more closely settled and most of the owners of the new houses are couples with young children. At present these children are attending schools in neighbouring areas, and the provision of this school will mean that they can attend a school that is closer to their homes; they will not have to travel such long distances, and this will be in the interests of their safety, because nothing worries parents more than their children having to travel long distances to school and having to cross main roads to get there.

The allocation of £41,000 will allow the erection of the new Sandy Creek Primary School to be continued. This school is also much awaited in the area because the existing school is antiquated and in a bad state of repair. The present school consists of one portable classroom and a brick classroom to which is attached a schoolhouse that has been condemned. However, approval has been given for a new schoolhouse to be built by the Education Department, and the Housing Trust has been requested to draw up the specifications. The new school will be situated about 1½ miles from the present site, and it will be a better situation.

I commend the Government for making financial provision for the commencement of a new brick school to be known as the Hope Valley-Modbury South Primary School. At present the children attending this school are actually occupying a wing of the adjoining Modbury High School; 174 children attend the primary school and 110 attend the high school. All the students who attend the high school are in their first year, but next year there will be students both in the first and second years. This will mean that the enrolments will be doubled, and at the beginning of the following year they will be tripled, so that at that stage all classrooms of the Modbury High School will be occupied. Consequently, the erection of this new primary school will be necessary. I point out that the Modbury High School has only one access road at present, known as Pompoota Road, and I trust that more access roads will be considered, probably off Smart Road and Tolley Road.

Although the areas from which students attend high schools are zoned, this is not the case with primary school students. If new access roads are not made to this new primary school, children will not attend it but will continue to attend neighbouring primary schools. If this happens the purpose of building the new school will be defeated, as it was built to relieve pressure on neighbouring schools, as well as to cater for new children arriving in the rapidly expanding area. I am glad that a new building for infants will be built at the Modbury Primary School, as again this is necessary. As this building is to cost £80,000, and as I have been told, correctly or incorrectly, that it costs about £10,000 to build one classroom, I presume that the building will consist of eight classrooms and the usual amenities. It is to be erected adjacent to the present building on Education Department land on the Golden Grove Road.

At present four Grade I classes and two Grade II classes are housed in a stone building, which is about 100 years old, and five temporary classrooms are situated on Education Department land on the Montacute Road. When this new infants school is completed these children will be transferred to it from the existing buildings, which are not adequate. This will be a vast improvement. At present 660 children attend the Modbury Primary School, and if enrolments increase at the same rate as previously about 800 children will be attending it in five years' time, when these new buildings will be filled to capacity. I inspected the recently constructed building at the Modbury Primary School, which is built of Mount Gambier stone, and I was most distressed to note cracks in the structure. I realize that the soil in the area is probably the worst building soil in the State and that every endeavour was made to excavate deeply for foundations, and provide suitable foundations having regard to the area. Nevertheless, the building is cracking, and I hope that when the new building, which will be of brick whereas the existing building is of Mount Gambier stone, is constructed every precaution will be taken to see that there is no repetition of this.

In these Estimates £714,000 is provided for minor alterations and additions, grading and paving, fencing, drains, roadways, etc., at schools. I trust that some of this money will be used for improvements at the Hope Valley Primary School, where the playground behind the residence needs asphaltting and where the lower section of the playing area requires

some quarry rubble, as in the wet weather it becomes boggy and it is impossible for children to walk on it. The reason why it becomes boggy is that the drainage needs attention, as there is no underground drainage at this school and all water must flow across the playing area. The school, which is very old, consists of two stone rooms and six temporary classrooms. The adjoining house, which was previously a school house, is used as an office, staff room, book room and kitchen. At present 280 children attend the school. Again, I am hopeful that some of the £714,000 mentioned will be used for this purpose.

Approval has been given by the Education Department for grading and fencing at the Mount Torrens Primary School and no doubt some of the £714,000 will be used on this work. In the Barossa electoral district there are 23 primary schools and two high schools, and I am sure that there are other schools I have not mentioned that require attention, but their school committees have not informed me of this. Although the erection of new schools in parts of this area are essential, older schools must not be neglected and allowed to fall into disrepair. The sum of £140,000 (£1,000 more than in 1964-65) is provided for the purchase of additional buses and for the replacement of buses for the transport of schoolchildren in country areas. This provision is necessary as, in some cases, when tenders are called none are received, so the Education Department fills the breach and provides a school bus.

I know that residents of Golden Grove petitioned for a school bus to transport their children to the school in the Modbury area, but although the scheme was approved by the Education Department, when tenders were called none were received.

I have referred to works that have been specifically provided for in the Loan Estimates. Much money is provided for various works which are not specifically named, but for which money will be allocated to all areas of the State, including my own district. The hospital building programme has been increased to meet the needs of the community, and I was pleased to note that £100,000 had been provided for the purchase of land for proposed works. When speaking about the proposed hospital at Tea Tree Gully the Leader of the Opposition said that it was obviously election bait and that the people of Tea Tree Gully had been led up a blind alley about this hospital.

I assure the Leader that the Government is making every effort to make a hospital a

reality in the Modbury area. Negotiations are almost completed for the purchase of a site, the best in the area, for the proposed hospital, and I am sure that the people of the area will be satisfied with the Government's effort to build the proposed hospital during the lifetime of this Parliament. The sum of £445,000 is provided for the sewerage of new areas. The Highbury-Dernancourt area, adjacent to the Hope Valley reservoir, is to be seweraged, and I hope that Holden Hill, Modbury and Tea Tree Gully will receive some attention, as the lack of sewerage is probably the most serious problem affecting people in those areas. When I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Works from Tea Tree Gully District Council on April 21, and again when I spoke in the debate on the Address in Reply on May 18, I advocated that the Engineering and Water Supply Department consider supplying sewer trunk mains to which all existing common effluent drainage schemes should be connected. I should like to see allotted for this work some of the £57,000 that has been allocated for new mains.

I notice that £350,000 has been provided for Advances for Homes, which is administered by the State Bank. When the Treasurer introduced the Loan Estimates, he stated:

In 1965-66 the bank is likely to have available for lending Housing Agreement moneys, State Loan funds, carry-over funds from June, 1965, and repayments of previous advances adequate to carry out a lending programme of about £5,800,000. This will enable the bank to give assistance towards the construction or purchase of about 1,800 homes during the year. The bulk of the funds will be employed in new housing, but it is the Government's intention that at least £100,000 of Advances for Homes money be used in selective financing of the purchase of older homes in accordance with the election policy of the Government. This policy should help toward a more effective use of our stock of older houses including larger houses suitable for young families.

That is most pleasing, as it is important that adequate finance be made available from banks for housing loans. The present waiting time for bank loans is much too long. It is causing much hardship, especially amongst couples who are forced to use temporary finance at high interest rates. This causes many couples to be forced out of their homes before the bank loans are available, and they thus lose the money they have already paid. The more money available for bank loans the better, as it will help to reduce the waiting period. It is necessary that that should be done.

I congratulate the Government on its first Loan Estimates programme and the Treasurer on the stand he took before the Loan Council

when he stuck out to the very last. I conclude by agreeing with what the Treasurer said towards the end of his explanation of these Estimates:

My Government has faced considerable difficulties this year in having no funds carried forward from previous years and in experiencing the smallest increase in State borrowing programmes in the last 10 years. Nevertheless, it has been possible, by a very careful review of all resources and requirements, to present a Loan works programme slightly greater than last year's actual expenditure. I am confident that the programme will make a valuable contribution to the State's further development.

I fully agree with that statement and support the first line.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): These Loan Estimates are remarkable for the number of members on the Government side whose needs are not substantially met by these provisions. For instance, the district of the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) will receive less if the expenditure is to be spread equitably over all the needs of the State. Inevitably, he will receive less money for new sewers in his area. Sometimes people wish the Housing Trust to building a factory for them, and from time to time small industries like to use this provision. However, they will find it much more difficult to have a factory built at Gawler than they would have under the previous Administration. The District of West Torrens will, of course, go begging in regard to its sewerage problem. The allocation for sewerage is less than half last year's allocation by the previous Government. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) will not see flats built in his district, in spite of an agreement previously drawn up between the former Government, the Housing Trust and the Adelaide City Council.

Mr. Quirke: Which would be built in Sydney!

Mr. HALL: Yes. More conspicuous in the Loan Estimates is the great reduction in the overall number of flats in the Housing Trust's programme, which is rather strange when one recalls the pronouncements made by the Minister in charge of town planning. Indeed, he advanced a worthy case for the building up of inner Adelaide areas, and described the general advantages of flats provided through the assistance of the Government. He made it a major plank in his policy in respect of town planning that we must develop flats, but apparently his influence on the Loan Estimates has been nil. It looks as though someone has taken the opposite view to his and has removed any reference to flats altogether.

The member for Glenelg's ideas are conspicuously absent from the Loan Estimates in spite of the views on finance which he so ably expressed on television. It was remarkable to see how, in his television interview, he found so many millions of pounds which were to be at the Government's disposal. However, this Loan programme is similar to programmes that have been presented in the past, the only difference being that it contains many deficiencies. Where are the honourable member's ideas which no doubt helped him win his seat? They are certainly not here. Turning to the district of Barossa, we find no mention of the new hospital that was to be provided without delay. Not even a note appears to the effect that the hospital will be commenced, or even that its planning will be commenced, much less that it will be referred to the Public Works Committee.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: It was mentioned in the policy speech.

Mr. HALL: Of course it was. In his policy speech the Premier said:

Labor's proposals provide for a general hospital at Tea Tree Gully of 500 beds.

Further, the member for Barossa, as a candidate at the last election, said that hospital would be provided without delay, and we await with much interest an official reference to this project. We find that the interests of honourable members, both old and new, are ignored and that any evidence of their individual ideas is absent from the Loan Estimates. This is a most conservative programme based on items included by the previous Government but, as I have said, containing many deficiencies which one would not have expected of a new Government.

Of course, the Treasurer has stated that it is the result of his misfortune in Canberra, that is, in not receiving this year an increase similar to the one received last year by the then Treasurer. Honourable members opposite have made much of the fact that the Treasurer stuck out for the last sum but, of course, we do not know about that. We did hear that one or two other Treasurers named a price for which they stuck out and which they eventually obtained; yet members opposite deny that this happened. The inference to be drawn is that we went short because we did not hold out for long enough. However, I will not hold that against the Treasurer; it was his first visit to Canberra and one would expect him not to be as well up on certain matters as other Treasurers who had attended these meetings over the years. The Treasurer

returned to South Australia with an increase of £686,000. He said in his explanation of the Loan Estimates that recoveries would be £450,000 greater and that, in effect, he would have a programme of, I think, £144,000 more than last year. The increase obtained last year by the previous Treasurer was £2,468,000. The Treasurer could not have expected to get a greater allocation than that obtained last year, and therefore it can be said that he is short by about £2,500,000 if we accept his argument that he received less than we would have expected from a generous Commonwealth allocation. The allocation for waterworks and sewers is nearly £3,000,000 less than last year's allocation. Therefore, the excuse for deficiency is more than used up in one account, so there is no reason for any deficiency in any other department. If that is the case, then why is less provided for housing?

Mr. Hudson: How do you arrive at the figure of £3,000,000?

Mr. HALL: Actual payments are £3,000,000 less than last year.

Mr. Hudson: They are net payments.

Mr. HALL: This will be the sum that goes from the funds; if it is net, it is net. There are deficiencies throughout the Loan Estimates. Country areas are affected. On such lines as loans to producers, advances to settlers, loans for financing water piping and so forth, irrigation and reclamation, South-East drainage, and fishing havens, allocations are £337,000 less in the aggregate. However, the sum provided for one item is greater this year. It can be seen that this is a programme from which moneys previously spent on the country have been deliberately taken out. The Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme allocation is greatly reduced. The general trend is for a reduction in the finances, and some programmes approved last year are not now in the Loan Estimates. The Snowtown courthouse, which was approved, is not mentioned.

Mr. Hughes: There are some goodies in it.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but it is no excuse to say that the expected allocation did not come from Canberra. As I have said, less money is provided for housing and for many country projects. The line for police and courthouse buildings has been reduced substantially from £750,000 last year to £400,000 this year. I know that these figures do not tell the whole story. The Snowtown courthouse was a small concern but it is one of the projects which is not mentioned, although it was decided last year to proceed with it. The provision for the Taillem Bend to Keith water scheme last year was

£673,000, whereas this year it is only £435,000. There was another matter of interest in Labor's policy speech. Referring to something dear to his heart, railways, the Premier said:

As already mentioned the freight tonnage has been static for 1955-1963, both years inclusive. Rolling stock for freight cartage is needed. We as a Government will insist that more is provided.

However, the vote for the Railways Department is down £400,000 and the brave promise is not to be fulfilled. One thing that alarms me greatly is that the provision for sewerage in new areas is down by over half, from £1,056,000 to £445,000. How are new areas to be seweraged at the rate that applied in the past and at the rate at which it is necessary to provide sewerage for new houses, when the allocation is less than half what was provided last year? Does this mean that the standard of housing in South Australia is to be reduced because sewerage will not be provided? Where is the money to come from? This is a matter of immediate impact on people intending to settle here and to provide themselves with new houses.

It is well to remember the great price advantage we have in South Australia, compared with the other States. The other day I read an article in a supplement to a reputable magazine in which the cost of houses in the various States of Australia was given, and I found that the cost of obtaining a house here was remarkably lower (about £1,000 lower) than in the three Eastern States.

I was interested to hear the Treasurer's reply yesterday in regard to over-award payments in the building industry in South Australia. Although I listened intently, I could not gather whose side he was on. At one stage I imagined that he was advocating over-award payments, but at another stage of his answer I imagined that he might be against such payments; yet his opinion, and that of his Party and Cabinet, on this matter will govern what people will pay for houses in this State.

I remind the Treasurer that, although there is great agitation among his supporters on his side of the House for a higher wage, people living here after having lived in the Eastern States will say that the cost of living is much cheaper in South Australia. The fact that a person receives a higher weekly wage does not mean that he can take home as many goods at the end of the week as he can purchase in South Australia. Many people who have lived in Melbourne and Sydney will corroborate this and say that the cost of living is immeasurably lower here. They would prefer to live here and not receive this over-award payment:

they can buy more goods. The way in which the Treasurer becomes involved in this matter may have great significance in the matter of how the £10,000,000 or £11,000,000 is spent on housing each year.

There is one matter which I think alarms many members on both sides of the House and which requires some thought to gain a solution over the next few years. I refer to the needs of the rapidly developing Salisbury council area which is shared by the member for Gawler and me. This council provides most of its services from its own revenue and through its own loan-raising ability, and I know it is finding it very hard going indeed to provide essential services in its district. In comparison, we have next door the city of Elizabeth, a city which has been built by the Housing Trust with the very great assistance of funds voted each year through these Loan Estimates, a city which has most of the essential services provided for it, and which finds itself now in an enviable position in raising new loans or providing facilities from revenue.

Mr. Clark: It has plenty of problems.

Mr. HALL: I agree that any local government area has problems. I do not wish to minimize the efforts made by the Elizabeth council in solving these problems, but that council area, together with the Munno Para council area, is entirely different from Salisbury in the availability of funds for necessary work. A person who knows the position well (and he is not a member of this Parliament) has expressed it to me in this way: Elizabeth was handed on a plate, already constructed, to this local government body. What do we do for a district like Salisbury, which has not had the advantage of Housing Trust money and planning, a district which is advancing and growing at a very fast rate indeed? Some members opposite have looked with glee at the expansion of some of the southern areas in my district. Although I think their prognostications of impending gloom for me are wrong, I agree that this area is growing at a remarkable rate, and it has very great needs, not only for roads and footpaths but for public buildings, meeting places, clubs, scout halls, youth centres and so on. The Salisbury council does not have the funds to provide the necessary long-term loans to assist these areas, and therefore it has a great problem. I have here a letter, written by a gentleman who is very much concerned about this problem, which states:

In the Salisbury area we are meeting with considerable difficulties in obtaining finance for the erection of facilities for scouts, guides,

bowling clubs etc., due to the fact that the only land available suitably located is owned by the council and controlled under some Parklands Act. As the various bodies cannot get a title to the land they cannot borrow from any recognized authority, and to make things worse the council is not in a position to either make the money available or guarantee any advances that may be made by a bank without reducing the amount of money it can make available for district roads and footpaths. As you are no doubt aware, two of our neighbouring councils are able to make such money available due no doubt to their much stronger financial position brought about mainly by having most of their work done by the South Australian Housing Trust. Is there any way we can get around the Local Government Act and have the council guarantee these various public bodies without having their borrowing powers reduced by the amounts they make available?

That, in essence, is the problem. We have an area being built up very greatly by migration and by young people from the inner part of Adelaide moving to these new districts and setting up homes there. This is highlighted by the fact that last year South Australia took 29 per cent of the nominated British migrant intake to Australia. This is an abnormal rate of growth, and I have no doubt that the Treasurer uses these facts when he goes to Canberra. However, I believe he needs to revise his attitude and consider giving some direct assistance to councils in these rapidly developing areas by making loans available to them in addition to what they now get. I hope that the Treasurer will consider this during next year and that something will be done about it in future Loan Estimates, because it affects not only the physical development of a district but its morale to have facilities for boy scouts and other young people, and to have meeting places and clubs. I know that many bodies would go ahead and erect permanent facilities for district services if they could get finance. I therefore ask the Treasurer if he will consider this matter before next year's Loan Estimates are prepared.

In the provision for school buildings two items that particularly interested me were mentioned; one is the new school at Parafield Gardens and the other is major additions to the Para Hills school. The schools being built in this area are fine types of school of very good design. The Parafield Gardens Primary School is almost completed, and the infants section has been in operation for most of this year. I do not know the expected date of completion, but it is a fine building that would grace any district. I am not sure whether it has an air-conditioning

unit or just an air circulation system, but it is an elaborate school—almost too elaborate for present-day needs. However, I believe that in a few years as the State progresses the standard of buildings will improve and that we should not lower standards now and thereby have inadequate buildings in 10 years.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you suggesting that buildings should be ahead of progress?

Mr. HALL: They must be some way ahead at present because these permanent buildings are constructed to last for 50 to 70 years, and possibly longer. The Para Hills Infants School is now being completed, and it is a fine building. I do not wish to criticize the present methods of the Education Department, and I realize that all these buildings were approved and commenced some time ago, but Para Hills has presented a fantastic problem to the previous and present Minister of Education because of the fantastic enrolment growth there. I believe that in one year enrolments increased by 800 or 900. Nobody, even the developers, thought this district would grow at such a rate, and its growth has caused many problems.

Mr. McKee: It's got you worried, has it?

Mr. HALL: No, I am happy to say that I have received great co-operation from both Ministers. The previous Minister was quick to solve the immediate problem, and adequate timber classrooms were provided. At the same time, the Public Works Committee was asked to consider a plan and site for new permanent infants and primary schools. The infants school is almost completed, and a promise has been made that the primary section will be ready for occupation on the first school day of 1967: preparations are well in hand for the establishment of this section. This school is necessary because enrolments reached 1,500 at the mid-year intake. These buildings are in addition to the new Para Hills West Primary School, which is using temporary buildings while awaiting the construction of a permanent school. I understand that the Public Works Committee has reported on, or is about to report on, this school. Many problems have arisen in the Para Hills area, and no doubt more will arise, but I am pleased that every time I raised a problem the department has done its best to remedy the trouble. At present a medium term building programme for the district is well in hand.

Mr. Jennings: Perhaps it is your persuasive manner.

Mr. HALL: No, I think I have spread the praise evenly. As member for the district, I

have taken a great interest in the problems, and when the department has appraised the situation, it has done everything it could to solve the problems. Secondary schooling is a difficult problem in this area. The department cannot be expected to erect a large secondary school for a limited number of pupils. Students have to pass through the infants and primary schools before being ready to attend the secondary school, and this has to happen before a secondary school can be built. At present, secondary students from Para Hills attend the Salisbury and Elizabeth high schools. The shortest distance to travel to these schools is six miles, and this causes difficulties for the parents of children because of the cost of fares. I understand that one student has to pay 72s. a term, a noticeable expense for one family's budget.

I am disappointed that our proposals for assistance for school travel, made during the election campaign, have not been implemented. Had this been done it would have assisted parents who have to pay for their children's transport to school. I hope the member for Port Pirie will prevail upon his Leader to implement those proposals, even at this late stage. It is interesting to note that that honourable member is supporting the proposed electoral reforms in this State, in which the division between city and country shall be as it is now, around the metropolitan area. As far as he is concerned, this is brought up to date to include Para Hills and Salisbury in the country areas; it is not something that is out of date. The honourable member now says that this is so. If it is so, why are these children not getting country transport facilities?

Mr. Jennings: Which line is the honourable member speaking to?

Mr. HALL: I am speaking to the line on education and the expense of providing education facilities for one's children if one lives at Para Hills. I think the honourable member could think about that. He cannot have it both ways. I think he will try to, but I do not think he is justified in having it both ways, in having that boundary fixed there for one purpose and not the other. As a country and metropolitan member, I am greatly alarmed about this.

Mr. Clark: That shows how silly this division is.

Mr. HALL: That is what I am saying. I am always willing to take advice. I agree with the member for Gawler that it shows how silly this is. He has said it for me in a better way than I could.

Mr. Clark: That is nothing very unusual.

Mr. HALL: No, it is not and, so long as the honourable member continues to give me such advice, I shall continue to accept it. It just shows how silly it is—I must remember that. At least, I have drawn out the honourable member's opinion—given, perhaps, incautiously but, I suggest, in a nice frank way.

Mr. Clark: I have been saying it for 15 years.

Mr. HALL: If that is the case, the honourable member joins the ranks of honourable members whose influence is not in these Loan Estimates or in the legislation presented by this Government. His influence is not there. I am trying to find something that has been influenced by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). One would not expect an honourable member in his first year in Parliament to have a great influence on the financial affairs of this State, but he was the previous Opposition's financial adviser. We were going to spend millions of pounds more each year, starting from now, but we find, as I have said, nothing new, and a great division. I have quoted from the election policy speech of the Treasurer. Perhaps some day we will close that book and read from it no more, and no doubt some honourable members will be pleased about that. So many mistakes are being made in so many directions that we shall not have to refer to old numbers like that: we can be more contemporary in our thinking. I record my dismay that these Loan Estimates are so different from what we were told they would be. I do not say that every item in the Loan Estimates could be increased to satisfy everybody, but despite the fact that we were told there would be increases that has not happened, and we have not been given any reason why it is so. We are simply told that the Commonwealth Government did not give as much as it did last year. The Treasurer can point to about £3,000,000 that was not received, but I am sure the member for Glenelg will tell us where the money has gone. We shall quietly listen to his explanation. I support the adoption of the first line.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the first line and with others add my congratulations to the Treasurer for the fine job that he has done in presenting the Loan Estimates to us. The speech which has just been made by the member for Gouger, and it took about 40 minutes, and the speech that we heard yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition, which took about three hours, remind me of a story

told at a students' dinner that I attended. One of the students had to propose a toast to the staff. In so doing he mentioned two members of the staff, one of whom he said had perfected the art of giving a 50-minute lecture in 10 minutes, and the other who had perfected the art of giving a 10-minute lecture in 50 minutes. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on having perfected the art of giving half an hour's speech in three hours, and the member for Gouger on giving a 15-minute speech in 40 minutes.

Mr. Clark: A 5-minute speech.

Mr. HUDSON: I did not want to be rude about it. We have heard much from the member for Gouger and the Leader of the Opposition about the result of the Loan Council meeting, and about their dismay and scorn at the fact that the Loan Council allocation for the whole of Australia was increased by only £5,000,000. I have no doubt that if we had asked the present Leader of the Opposition before the last Loan Council meeting what the increased allocation of Loan money would be for the whole of Australia he would have said that we should be lucky to get any increase at all. He and the member for Gouger know that the current period is one of financial stringency. He and the member for Gouger know that we are in a period when the Commonwealth Government, as I shall explain in a moment, is subjected to limited policy weapons of its own, and is forced to try to control the things that it can control.

One of the things it can control is the States' Loan programmes. If, however, the Leader of the Opposition refuses to recognize this point in public, let us look at his own performance: in 1956, after the financial stringency imposed in March, 1956, the Loan Council allocation for the whole of Australia remained static at £190,000,000. It had been the same figure in the previous year. We must be grateful for the fact that we were represented this year at the Loan Council meeting by the present Treasurer, because otherwise the Loan allocation this year may not have been increased at all, as happened in 1956 when the Leader of the Opposition was the Treasurer.

Mr. Hurst: Do you think the present Leader of the Opposition would have repeated the previous performance?

Mr. HUDSON: It is interesting to quote from the speech made by the Leader when he introduced the Loan Estimates on that occasion. He made no mention at all of the difference between the Loan Council allocation

for that year and the allocations for previous years. In his other speeches when introducing the Loan Estimates (and I have gone to the painful task of looking up most of his speeches), whenever there had been an increase the Leader always proudly referred to the fact that the Loan allocation for the whole of Australia had been increased by £10,000,000, £18,000,000 or whatever the figure might have been. However, 1956 was a period of financial stringency: the Loan allocation did not go up, but no mention was made by the Leader of that fact. On that occasion he said:

The Estimates now presented have been prepared on the expectation that the full £190,000,000 will be available to the States for works and housing purposes.

At that time he did not even know whether the full £190,000,000 would be available, although it was exactly the same amount as had been allocated the previous year.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: How many times did he say he sat pat and forced the Commonwealth to make a certain allocation?

Mr. HUDSON: He said that he sat pat for three days and three nights. However, I should like to hear the full details of the story and what the other Treasurers did on that occasion I should like to know whether they were in support or whether they were running for cover.

The Leader also gave some details about the operations of the Loan Council. He said that the Commonwealth Government has two votes and each State one vote. I am not sure whether he said that the Commonwealth Government also has a casting vote in case the voting is four all. After giving that little bit of information, he said that decisions must be unanimous. Goodness gracious me! If a decision has to be unanimous, why bother about having votes at all? The fact that each State has one vote and the Commonwealth Government two votes does not matter a hoot—the decision must be unanimous. There is nothing in the constitution of the Loan Council that requires the decision to be unanimous. As the Leader of the Opposition well knows, the reason that decisions of the Loan Council are, in fact, unanimous is that the Commonwealth Government insists on it. It has been so since the days of Ben Chifley, because successive Commonwealth Prime Ministers and Treasurers have wanted to be able to say to any Premier who complained publicly about the Loan allocation, "Well, you voted for it." That is the reason for the insistence on unanimity. This was designed so that criticism by members of the Loan Council could be stifled.

However, there was not one breath of criticism of the Commonwealth action in the Leader's remarks when he introduced the 1956 Loan Estimates, and he received no increase at all. In fact, he said that he was worried that the States might not get the full allocation because the amount was subject to review later in the year, as was then the case. Why is the Commonwealth Government able to insist on unanimity and, in fact, dictate terms to the Loan Council? Again, this is something which the Leader of the Opposition well knows. In almost every year since the Second World War the sum agreed on by the Loan Council has been in excess of what could be obtained on the Australian loan market and from overseas loans. It means that the difference must be made up by special Commonwealth subscriptions. In other words, the Commonwealth underwrites the Loan programme. The member for Mitcham realizes this, as I am sure any member of the Opposition does if he has done his homework. The Leader knows it only too well.

The fact that the Commonwealth Government underwrites the Loan programme means that it has a gun that it can point at the heads of the States. It can say to the States, "If you don't like it, try to raise more yourselves." It knows full well that the States cannot do that. So much for the completely fatuous remarks of the Leader of the Opposition on this subject. They cannot be taken as any criticism of the Treasurer or of the job he tried to do at the Loan Council meeting. The Treasurer, in introducing the Loan Estimates, pointed out that we were in a relatively worse position at the commencement of this financial year than the previous Government was in at the commencement of the financial year 1964-65.

He said that the outgoing Government, in preparing its Loan Budget for the previous year, was fortunate enough to have in hand at the commencement of the year unspent Loan funds of £1,698,000, and that it had overspent by £30,000 at the end of the year. In other words, it provided out of funds, plus the deficit of £30,000, an additional £1,728,000. As the previous Government had used all those funds, the Treasurer made the perfectly legitimate point that the present Government, in commencing the financial year and in presenting the Loan Estimates, was in a difficult position.

Mr. Millhouse: It is fair to make that point but it is not fair to make that complaint.

Mr. HUDSON: All he said was that the previous Government was fortunate. Doesn't the

honourable member agree that the previous Government was fortunate to be in that position?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, I do.

Mr. HUDSON: Doesn't the honourable member also agree that, relatively speaking, we are unfortunate not to be in that position?

Mr. Millhouse: No.

Mr. HUDSON: If one is relatively fortunate, the other is relatively unfortunate.

Mr. Millhouse: You won't let me speak. The implication is one of complaint. That has been so phrased as to imply a complaint.

Mr. HUDSON: Doesn't the honourable member agree that the funds were largely used up because it was an election year? Doesn't he think that the fact that the Engineering and Water Supply Department overspent had something to do with it?

Mr. Hurst: They had their eye on a few seats.

Mr. HUDSON: They had their eye on a few seats, as the honourable member for Semaphore says, but, unfortunately for them, it did not work.

Mr. McAnaney: You spent 40 per cent of that money. You were in power for five months.

Mr. HUDSON: We were not in power for five months; we were in power for three months and 24 days. As the honourable member for Stirling knows, in the first few months of the life of any Government many things are going on, and the new Government carries on what had been started by the previous Government. I should like to again refer to the 1956 example, because when I said that I congratulated the Treasurer on the job he had done in presenting these Loan Estimates I meant it. He has done a first-class job. In 1956 the then Treasurer (now the Leader of the Opposition) was forced to reduce the Loan programme from £29,126,000 to £28,135,000. At that time, he had to reduce his Loan programme by £1,000,000 but, despite the fact that because of the deficit we are £1,700,000 worse off this year than the Government was last year, the Treasurer has been able to avoid any reduction in the Loan programme. I think that is a remarkable performance. The present Leader of the Opposition was not capable of doing it in 1956; he had a reduction of £1,000,000 then, but there is no reduction this year.

I would appreciate it if when the member for Gouger compares figures from one year to the next he does not compare the gross payments of one year with the net payments

of the following year. He said there was a reduction for the Engineering and Water Supply Department of £3,000,000. The only possible way he could obtain that figure was to compare the gross payments actually made for 1964-65 with the net payments proposed for 1965-66. If that sort of mistake is made by members opposite it is a little difficult to place much reliance on anything they say.

Mr. Hurst: It is a convenient mistake if they can get away with it.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I said earlier that this current period is one of financial stringency, and I think we can expect more in the way of repressive measures from the Commonwealth Government. I think it is important that we in this place should register a protest at the kind of policies adopted by the Commonwealth Government. Because the Commonwealth Government has inadequate powers to control private expenditures in Australia, because it will do nothing to try to get adequate powers, and because it refuses to adopt reasonable policies in its approach to balance of payments problems, it is forced all the time to try to control those items of expenditure that it can control. One of the things it reckons it can control are the grants to the States and the Loan Council programme.

Mr. Clark: And indeed it can.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and indeed that is what it does. As honourable members well know, in a period of some unemployment the Commonwealth Government will be more generous in its allocation of Loan Council money. In recent years we have had an increase of £22,000,000 in one year and £18,000,000 in another year, entirely related to the fact that unemployment existed in the economy.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope you are going to justify the criticism you have just made of the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HUDSON: What I am saying is that the Commonwealth Government gets worried about inflation and it feels that it must adopt a restrictive policy because it is so limited in its approach. Because it has refused at any stage to attempt to obtain adequate powers to control hire-purchase, for example, it is forced to control those items of expenditure in the community that are more necessary. It controls Government expenditure on public works carried out through the State Governments rather than attempting to control items of private expenditure that are less necessary from the point of view of the overall development of

the community. The movement in Loan Council funds in the last 15 years amply demonstrates that point. Whenever there is a period of financial stringency the Commonwealth Government puts the brakes on the States.

I would have been generous to the Leader of the Opposition over his performance in 1956 had he been generous to the present Treasurer. I would have said, "Well, in 1956 the Commonwealth was putting the reins on very hard indeed, and as a result of that there was no increase in the Loan Council allocation." But, if the Leader of the Opposition starts to unfairly criticize the Treasurer and compares the change this year with what happened last year, I come back and say, "Well, if this is the way you approach it, look what happened in 1956."

Some points have been made about what was said during the election campaign, and some criticism has been levelled already at what was said over television then. Let me make quite clear what was said over television during the campaign about money available through loans—and what was said was perfectly reasonable. First, I said that the money available through the Loan programme grew on average by about £1,000,000 a year, perhaps a little more. I did not go into detail on this or on the argument behind it, and the honourable member for Mitcham had better make a note of this. The Leader of the Opposition at one stage in his remarks said, "How they grow I do not know."

Mr. Jennings: At least it rhymes!

Mr. HUDSON: That is about all it does. The total of new money borrowed on behalf of South Australia has grown from £26,150,000 in 1955-56 to £40,460,000 in 1965-66; that is, a little over £14,000,000 in 11 years.

Mr. Millhouse: But there has been a change in the value of money.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, but over that period the price increase has not been anywhere near as great as it was before. If price changes are allowed for, the increase would still be about £11,000,000 in that 11-year period. If we use the figure of £1,000,000 a year, we are not far out on average, taking the good years with the bad years. Unfortunately, we are at present faced with financial stringency, but I hope that in the next two years the position will be rectified considerably.

A further point behind the argument presented is that each year certain projects are completed, which means that some of the money used up last year becomes available for discretionary use this year. The argument behind

the figure used on television was that over £2,000,000 a year became available as a result of the completion of existing projects. What this means is that if the Loan programme for 1964-65 was, say £30,000,000, the continuation of the previous decision associated with that Loan programme would result in expenditures of £28,000,000 the next year, £26,000,000 the next, and £24,000,000 the next, so that in the first year £2,000,000, in the second year £4,000,000, and in the third year £6,000,000 would be available for discretionary use—a total of £12,000,000 over the three years. On the growth side, the first year's figure would be £1,000,000 greater, the next year's £2,000,000 greater, and the next year's £3,000,000 greater—a total of £6,000,000 over the three years. We added the £6,000,000 and the £12,000,000, and made a round figure of £20,000,000, knowing when we presented the figure that it was conservative and that, if any member of the present Opposition did his homework, he would find no reasonable grounds for criticism.

As I have indicated, because of financial stringency the Commonwealth Government has imposed during the present year the position has not quite worked out in the first year, but I am confident that when things relax in subsequent years that deficiency in the first year will be more than made up. Clearly, the amount available for discretionary use in the first year of a new Government's period of office is much less than the amount available in the second year, and much less still than is available in the third year. Consequently, when one talks about the implementation of promises expressed in a policy speech, one must allow the full three-year period for the Government to carry them out.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think you made this as clear on television as you might have.

Mr. HUDSON: We had only five minutes to do it in. The detailed arguments at the back of it were perfectly sound. There was no time to present them, but only time to present the overall conclusions with the knowledge that, if any conclusions were grossly inflated or off-line, members of the Opposition would have been the first to pick them up. Did they? Of course they did not. There was no criticism at all and no mention of the subject. We knew there would not be, because we knew that we had been conservative and careful in working out the figures.

Mr. Millhouse: There seem to me to have been unfortunate omissions in view of the explanations now.

Mr. HUDSON: They are not unfortunate omissions at all. We came to an overall figure. One does not expect to be able to cover everything in five minutes, especially when one has to talk of the overall method of financing and the amounts available. One has five minutes in which to do it; one does not go into great detail or talk for five minutes on one point.

Mr. Millhouse: No, but you would have 500 words.

Mr. HUDSON: If the honourable member can demonstrate that that can be done, together with making the other points that have to be made, in five minutes, then I accept the criticism that he has made. If the honourable member cannot do it, he should tell me about it and withdraw the criticism. The Leader of the Opposition was, I think, either being an irresponsible ex-Treasurer and enjoying not being the Treasurer of this State so that he could, at last, say that this item should be increased and that item should be increased and some other item should be, or he cannot add up.

Mr. Hurst: Do you really think he can?

Mr. HUDSON: The Leader can add up, and my view is that he was being irresponsible and playing politics as hard as he could, with the knowledge that his speech would be reported in the *Advertiser* the following day. He said in all sorts of ways that the Government was not spending enough; not enough on housing, on loans to producers, on drainage schemes, on the Renmark Irrigation Trust, and on railway accommodation. The Leader said that in respect of all these matters the sum to be spent was inadequate, but, on the other hand, he criticized the Treasurer on some of the ways in which he proposed to raise finance. He criticized the Treasurer on what he called the "raid on the Roads Fund", saying that it was utterly improper for the Government to raid the Roads Fund in this way. He also read from the speech of Sir Cecil Hincks when the legislation was introduced in 1955:

The money so advanced will be repaid from the Highways Fund to the Loan Fund at convenient times to be decided in future by the Treasury.

The whole reason, as the Leader of the Opposition explained, for that provision being made to the Highways Fund relates to a technical point brought up by the Commonwealth Grants Commission which, so far as South Australia is concerned, is no longer relevant because we are no longer a claimant State, so the reason for that provision being made to the Highways Fund has disappeared.

It was legitimate and proper for the Treasurer to require that the money so advanced be repaid. But the Leader of the Opposition was saying—and he was telling us at the same time that we should be spending more on some projects—that we should provide £620,000 less in order to finance that expenditure. Furthermore, he criticized the Treasurer because the allocation to the Electricity Trust required it to rely to an increased extent on its own internal funds. His remarks there were so extraordinary, in view of the experience that has applied to the Electricity Trust in recent years, that I think it may be worth quoting them.

He is pointing out that the provision to the Electricity Trust this year is £3,000,000, the same as it was last year; that the Treasurer last year gave the Electricity Trust the right to borrow £3,250,000, and the same provision is to be made this year. The programme of the trust last year was £10,750,000, and this year it is to be increased to £12,000,000. So the whole of the extra £1,250,000 in the Electricity Trust's programme must be met from its internal sources. Then he makes his howler:

This means that the trust will have to draw on its reserves to the extent of £1,250,000 and that the sum of £674,000 held by the trust on June 30 will all be used and another £600,000 will be needed.

This is not necessarily the case at all. If the Electricity Trust is able to make increased provisions for depreciation this financial year compared with past years, then automatically this extra £1,250,000 will be financed through depreciation. The Leader of the Opposition thinks that this involves drawing on reserves and that it should be creating reserves. He seems not to realize that it is normal business practice to finance expansion out of depreciation funds, that they are normally used in this way. Of course, he does realize this because, when we check previous Electricity Trust programmes, we find that in recent years the allocation in the Loan Estimates has been considerably below what it was, say, 10 years ago, the reason being that, in order to ensure that development took place, the Electricity Trust must have been requested at some stage (and it certainly acted in this way) to reduce its reliance on the Loan Fund and to increase its use of its own internal funds, which is what has happened over the years.

For example, in 1955-56 the Loan programme of the Electricity Trust was £8,600,000, and £5,000,000 of that came out of the Loan Fund. The remainder of that £8,600,000 was

partly borrowing by the trust, from the public and partly internal funds, but there was hardly any reliance on internal funds by the Electricity Trust in that particular year. In the year 1956-57, which was the Leader of the Opposition's very bad year with his Loan Estimates, £5,500,000 was paid out of the Loan Fund to the Electricity Trust, and its total programme in that year was £9,300,000. It must have been the experience of that bad year in 1956-57 that caused the Leader of the Opposition to request the Electricity Trust to reverse its procedures and finance more of its capital works programme out of internal funds, because that year marks the dividing line between the years when the trust placed the greater part of its reliance on the Loan Fund to finance its capital works programmes and the years when it placed more and more reliance on internal funds for this purpose. In the next year the then Treasurer provided only £3,800,000 from the Loan Fund. He reduced the allocation by £1,700,000, and the capital works programme of the trust was £8,800,000. In the following year (1958-59) a further reduction occurred in the allocation from the Loan Fund, and £2,000,000 was provided for the Electricity Trust. Therefore, in the space of two years the then Treasurer reduced payments to the trust from the Loan Fund from £5,500,000 to £2,000,000 and forced the trust to place increased reliance on its own internal funds. This has been the continuous trend since that time.

Mr. Quirke: It is advisable if it can be done.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and the member for Flinders admitted this. We agree with that, but the Leader of the Opposition tried to criticize us for it, and I think that is where his criticism is completely out of order and off the line. I ask that progress be reported. Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PISTOL LICENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.51 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 12, at 2 p.m.