

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 18, 1965.

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

### QUESTIONS

#### SEWERAGE REBATES.

Mrs. STEELE: My question refers to the provision of water and sewerage for housing in new subdivisions built on by the Housing Trust. The Minister of Works recently announced that in the case of private subdividers the rebates in respect of houses completed had been reduced to a total limit of £100 a house and the time limit for rebate rates from 5 years to 3 years. It is presumed that the previous policy, under which certain feeder and trunk mains were paid for by subdividers wholly or in part and were not subject to rebate, has been retained in relevant cases. Can the Minister say whether this change in policy for private subdividers is to apply wholly or in part to new areas built on by the Housing Trust and, if that is so, can the Minister give details of the new policy and of the increased cost to the Housing Trust?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think I could give the honourable member an answer now, but I prefer to give a considered reply early next week.

Mrs. STEELE: As we shall be considering the Housing Trust vote on the Loan Estimates shortly, will it be possible for the Minister to obtain a reply tomorrow, instead of next week?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In view of the sincere plea—

Mr. Jennings: And the charming way the honourable member put it!

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: — by the honourable member, I will make every endeavour to have a report by tomorrow.

#### PETERBOROUGH ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Mr. CASEY: Recently, several consumers of electricity in the district of Peterborough approached me about the new tariff reduction and asked how the new Government discount would affect the overall position in future. Has the Premier a report on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Corporation of Peterborough, which operates the electricity supply undertaking, has now reduced its tariffs. In consequence, the Government discount has also been reduced so that the net

tariffs payable by the consumers will be 10 per cent above the Electricity Trust's metropolitan rates. At the same time, the types of tariff used by the corporation have been brought more into line with those of the trust. The result of these changes is that practically all consumers will now pay less than they did before, and many of them (in particular domestic consumers) will enjoy tariffs within 10 per cent of those payable in Adelaide. However, a very small number of consumers will now pay slightly more than the net amount they paid previously. This is because, before the types of tariff were brought into line with those of the trust, the standard discount brought a limited range of use to net charges less than 10 per cent above Adelaide. With the change in type of tariff, these particular consumers will pay rates equal to Adelaide tariffs plus 10 per cent. This is, of course, a very satisfactory rate considering the method of generation of power at Peterborough. Mr. Speaker, as this is a lengthy report, I ask permission to have the remainder of it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### TARIFF CHARGES.

The honourable member for Frome has also inquired about tariff charges for Peterborough and has cited a particular case. He supplied figures of an account rendered before the recent change and an account afterwards. From these figures it appears that the consumer would be one of those who previously was enjoying a discounted tariff less than 10 per cent above metropolitan rates and hence with the recent adjustment, he will receive a slight increase. Further, it also appears from the figures supplied that the accounts rendered by the corporation are incorrect for two different reasons:

- (1) On the account rendered before the tariff change, the corporation rate was too low. The result was that for this particular account the consumer paid less than he would have paid in Adelaide for the corresponding electricity.
- (2) On the account rendered after the tariff change, the Government discount of 5 per cent which has been approved was not applied. This is because the corporation made a late application to the trust for approval of discounts following its tariff changes. Approval in this particular case was given after the account had been rendered.

In respect of the first case, it is intended to write to the corporation although as it is believed that there would only be three consumers affected, it will probably be undesirable to make a retrospective adjustment. In the second case, the corporation can, if it wishes, render an amended account.

#### MURRAY RIVER.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that a report, which received publicity today, stated that the quality of water in the Murray River had deteriorated seriously, that grave effects of salinity were feared, and that one pumping station had been instructed to close down on irrigation. Can the Minister of Works say whether this report is correct and, if it is, what action is being taken to alleviate the position?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful for this question because it was a matter that I discussed with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department (Mr. Dridan) this morning at some length. I assure the Leader that the present report is substantially correct. At the Chaffey pump there has been considerable trouble because of the salinity of the water, but the department has promptly taken every step to see whether relief can be given as quickly as is humanly possible.

Mr. CURREN: This morning I received a telegram which reads:

Due to the high salinity the first irrigation at Cooltong and Chaffey has been cancelled. Urgently need immediate measures to rectify also extensive investigation for permanent correction.

The telegram was signed by the Cooltong and Chaffey Settlers Association. I discussed this problem with the settlers on Monday, and yesterday I made representations to the Superintendent for Irrigation and the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage. Can the Minister of Irrigation say what steps have been taken to overcome the problem of salty water at this pumping station?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Both the Minister of Works, in charge of engineers, and I are interested in this matter. The honourable member for Chaffey spoke to me yesterday and I have since checked to see what has happened. I have been assured that those in charge are conscious of the situation and that engineers have been working on this problem. I have had later advice that the department is preparing to put a weir across the inlet to

the Chaffey pumping station to prevent the more saline water in the lower strata from reaching the pumping station.

#### WARREN RESERVOIR.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Can the Minister of Works indicate the present holding of the Warren reservoir? As there are many market gardeners in the Barossa Valley area of my district, can the Minister also say whether they will have an unrestricted supply of water for their normal vegetable-growing requirements during the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Warren reservoir has a capacity of 1,400,000,000gall. and the storage reached a minimum of 177,000,000gall. on July 6, 1965. Pumping into this reservoir from the Mannum-Adelaide main at the rate of 33,000,000gall. a week commenced on July 30, 1965, and the reservoir now holds 320,000,000gall. The department does not anticipate any difficulty in maintaining full supplies throughout the summer and autumn.

#### E.F.S. DRIVERS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier representing the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on August 5 concerning Emergency Fire Service drivers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: No objection is raised by the department to the request for Emergency Fire Service appliances to be included as "exempt" vehicles under section 40 (1) of the Road Traffic Act. However, in the event of the legislation being amended along these lines we would recommend including a proviso to the effect that the exemption only apply to "any vehicle registered for fire fighting purposes with the Registrar of Motor Vehicles by a fire fighting organization registered under the Bush Fires Act, 1960." This would ensure that only vehicles easily recognizable to other road users would be involved. Cabinet has not considered what result the necessary legislation would have if it were introduced.

#### CEDUNA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education seen letters in the press recently regarding transport of young children from Thevenard to the Ceduna school? If he has, should transport be provided by his department for children in the lower grades? I understand that the bus picks up Ceduna children for the lower grades and transports them to that school. Can the Minister comment on these letters?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have obtained a report on this matter generally, which states:

- (1) Thevenard and Ceduna townships are about 3 miles apart and the Ceduna Area School is situated about midway between the towns. The children involved in this application therefore reside no more than about one and a half miles from the school.
- (2) Until recently the children have been conveyed to and from school by a private bus operator from Ceduna who charged the children 3d. a trip, but the bus proprietor has discontinued operating the service. Apparently nobody is now prepared to operate the service.

These children all reside well under 3 miles from Ceduna Area School and children who reside under 3 miles from a school are not eligible for school bus transport organized by the Education Department. In fact, before a school bus service is established the department requires that the majority of the children involved shall reside five or more miles from the nearest school. Although it would be difficult to estimate, I consider that if the department accepted the responsibility of arranging bus transport for children residing under three miles from a school, then the cost to the State of school bus transport would be at least doubled. The parents of these children at Thevenard are in no different situation and in fact have some advantage because they are closely congregated and therefore have the advantage of organizing car transport for the children in groups on a roster system if necessary.

#### PORT VICTORIA JETTY.

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand that recently the operation of the flashing light at the end of Port Victoria jetty was discontinued. Can the Minister of Marine say whether the fishermen and local residents were consulted before this action was taken, and can he give reasons for the discontinuance of this warning light?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have to admit that I did not know the operation of the flashing light had been discontinued. Nevertheless, I will have investigations made and inform the honourable member, first, whether the light was discontinued by order or by accident and, secondly, whether the people he has mentioned were consulted.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER INFANTS SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: In the Loan Estimates, provision has been made for the erection of a new infants school at Mount Gambier Primary School. Can the Minister of Education say when tenders will be called for the erection of this school, and when the school will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to ascertain for the honourable member when tenders are likely to be called. It is hoped that the school will be ready for occupation early in 1967.

#### NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns the trade agreement recently made with New Zealand. Can the Minister of Forests say whether the Government made representations to the Commonwealth Government on this matter to safeguard the possible establishment of a pulp and paper industry in the South-East? Will the Minister make available to the House the nature of any representations he may have made so that they can be examined?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter was brought to the Forestry Council meeting at Bulolo, New Guinea, two weeks ago, and a representative of the Commonwealth Department of Trade attended to explain the situation regarding this agreement as it affected forestry departments. He informed the council that these negotiations were continuing negotiations from former talks between Mr. McEwen and Mr. Marshall. The Forestry Council viewed the new proposals with concern. Prior to this there had been suggestions that certain types of timber product would be brought in. However, further suggestions were that dressed timber, and timber for prefabricated houses and pulpwood would be included in the agreement if one were arranged. This was viewed with concern by the council, which considered that it would open up other spheres in this regard. A copy of a draft letter was presented to every member from the Forestry Standing Committee. The draft was accepted by all Ministers, and the letter was then sent to Mr. Fairbairn, the Minister in charge of our conference. I guess it was then placed before Mr. McEwen. We were rather surprised then to find that the negotiations had been completed and agreement reached. I understand that this is to be ratified by both the New Zealand Government and the Commonwealth Government. I think that probably more will be said on this matter. The question of pulpwood was not discussed at our Forestry Council, and it was with surprise that I read that this and also paper products had been included. I will have the matter further examined, and inform the House and the Leader at a later date.

## ROADS PROGRAMME.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question relates to a matter which I have raised in this House in previous sessions on a number of occasions, on at least one of which I was warmly supported by the present Attorney-General, and it is to the effect that this House does not have an opportunity to debate the roads programme, although it has the opportunity to debate every other major expenditure by the Government during the year. Therefore, can the Premier say whether the Government would be prepared to have laid on the table the annual roads programme financed out of the Highways Fund; not only to have it laid on the table but to move for its printing as a Parliamentary Paper to give to the House an opportunity at least to consider this important head of expenditure?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am willing to consider this but, if memory serves me correctly, I understand that a long submission was made earlier this year about the roads programme. There is no difference between what is happening now and what has occurred in the past. However, I will have the matter examined to see whether it is possible to do what the honourable member has asked.

## BOARDING ALLOWANCES.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about schoolchildren from the Far North of this State attending at the Alice Springs school and being denied an allowance?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Education Regulations provide for boarding allowances to be granted to parents who are domiciled in this State and whose children attend approved schools. The prescribed allowance is payable for primary pupils where the parents reside over 25 miles from the nearest departmental school or bus route, and for secondary pupils, where the parents reside five or more miles from the nearest departmental school or bus route. Parents residing in South Australia south of the Northern Territory border are eligible for boarding allowances, provided they meet those conditions.

## PENOLA COURTHOUSE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about a courthouse at Penola?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have a report from the magistrate in charge of the Country and Suburban Courts Department, in which he states that sketch plans and estimates for a courthouse at Penola have been prepared and

approval has been given for working drawings to be made. However, it cannot be said when they will be completed. The honourable member will have seen that there is no provision on this year's Loan Estimates for this building, but work is in hand, and maybe more useful things can be said about this project in next year's programme.

## PLASTIC TWINE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently, I have noticed in an American publication that there is a trend in that country to use plastic twine as a substitute for sisal baling twine. Does the Minister of Agriculture know anything about this, and if he does not, will he ask his department whether this plastic twine has been introduced into Australia and whether it will be cheaper to the producer?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This situation has not been presented to me but, the matter now having been raised, I will see what information I can get.

## BRIGHTON TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Provision has been made in this year's Loan Estimates for a new boys technical high school at Brighton. Can the Minister of Education say when tenders will be called for this building, and when the school will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain for the honourable member the date when tenders will be called, but it is expected, and hoped, that the school will be ready for occupation early in 1967.

## DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last week, in answer to a series of questions by members on this side of the House, the Premier promised that Cabinet would consider the dismissal of a public servant to see whether the reasons for the dismissal could be made available to the House. Can the Premier say whether this matter has been reconsidered and, if it has, with what result?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I assured the House that a complete re-examination of this matter would be made, and it is still receiving the fullest attention of Cabinet. I had hoped to be able to bring down a full report, as I had promised. I assure the Leader that the Government intends to give the fullest information on this matter when it is possible to do so.

## WARNING DEVICES.

Mr. BURDON: Many times I have raised the question of providing flashing warning

devices at railway crossings in Mount Gambier. I regret to report that another accident occurred at the railway crossing at Crouch Street, Mount Gambier, on Monday last. Fortunately, no-one was seriously injured. Because of this latest accident, will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport whether it is possible to expedite the provision of warning devices at railway crossings at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report and give it to the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### KIMBA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: On May 5 I received a letter from the Minister of Education stating that Arthur Hall, Ackson and Company had submitted a quote to construct amenities (such as tennis courts, etc.) at the Kimba school, but until yesterday morning this work had not been commenced. Can the Minister tell me when this work will begin?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am sorry that I cannot answer the question at the moment, but I will obtain that information for the honourable member and endeavour to see that the work is expedited.

#### MURRAY AREA SCHOOLS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: First, I should like to remind the Minister of Education of an item in the Treasurer's statement accompanying the Loan Estimates in relation to the Agincourt Bore school to be referred to the Public Works Committee. Can he say when that reference will be forwarded to the committee? Secondly, I believe that as the cost for the Paruna school will be less than £100,000, it will not be necessary to refer that particular project to the Public Works Committee. However, can the Minister say when work on both schools is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will get that information for the honourable member.

#### AGRICULTURAL ADVISER.

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand that recently the agricultural adviser who will now serve the counties of Fergusson and Daly has been transferred from Balaklava to Kadina. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the office established at Kadina has been purchased by the Agriculture Department, and whether this arrangement is to be permanent?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member is correct when he says the location of this office has been changed from Balaklava to Kadina. The Secretary of the

department states that the offices at present in use are rented. This is regarded as a temporary arrangement, as ultimately we hope to obtain permanent accommodation either by extending the existing Government buildings or by building separate offices for the department.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER BUILDINGS.

Mr. BURDON: In the past I have often endeavoured to push the cause of public buildings in Mount Gambier to house various Government departments, officers of which now work under difficult conditions. I understand that certain discussions have taken place between the Works Department and the Corporation of the City of Mount Gambier in relation to road widening and other matters. Can the Minister of Works say whether a decision has been reached as to the siting of (a) the new courthouse, and (b) the new public buildings?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The siting of the buildings referred to, and particularly of the public buildings, is being considered. As I am not sure whether a final decision has been reached, I shall check and inform the honourable member on the position as soon as possible.

#### LIBRARY FUNCTION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some concern has been expressed about invitations to attend the laying of the foundation stone of the new library. It has been reported to me that some members have received invitations to attend this ceremony while others have not, but that all Commonwealth members have received invitations. I should hasten to assure the House that I am not personally involved, because I have received an invitation. I believe all members are interested in this matter and, as His Excellency the Governor will be performing the function, many members would like the opportunity to attend. Can the Minister of Education say what was the basis on which invitations were first sent, and why Commonwealth members were invited to what appears to be a State function while some State members were not invited?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The list of invitations was not submitted to me as Minister, and the decision about who should be invited was left with the Libraries Board. My attention was drawn to the fact that certain members had not been invited and, on raising this matter with the Principal Librarian, I was informed that the number of invitations had been limited because only a certain number

of people could be accommodated at the function. I found out that the invitation list contained certain omissions that I thought should be rectified, and I raised this matter. I understand that subsequently invitations were sent to rectify these omissions, but these invitations certainly did not cover all members of both Houses. Regarding the invitations to Commonwealth members, I can say only that this list was not submitted to me. If it had been in the first instance, I should have said that I considered that members of both Houses should have been preferred to, say, Senators.

#### PROHIBITION OF PREFERENCE AND DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BILL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to prohibit preference and discrimination in employment by reference to membership or non-membership of certain associations, unions and other bodies or to certain other matters. Read a first time.

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 28. Page 737.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): This Bill, which was introduced by the honourable member for Ridley, is aimed at correcting a situation about which members of this House complained bitterly following the by-election in the Stirling District, and following the last general election. This is one of the matters with which the Government has been concerned. It has in course the preparation of a series of amendments to the Electoral Act to cure a number of anomalies that at present exist. This was one of the matters to be included in that general review of the Act. However, the honourable member has now moved this Bill, which is one with which we agree. We see no reason why the House should not accept it, and every reason why it should; I therefore support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This is a useful Bill and the Opposition has no objection to it. It will mean that by-elections can be concluded more expeditiously. I cannot see anything against the Bill. I think that the Government should also be prepared to support it.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

#### BETTING CONTROL BOARD RULES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the Betting Control Board Rules, in respect of payment of bets when a horse is withdrawn from a race after scratching time, made on May 31, 1965, under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1964, and laid on the table of this House on June 22, 1965, be disallowed. This amendment is not a very important one. However, on August 12, which was the final day for a motion for disallowance, no such move had been made here by the Subordinate Legislation Committee to cover the position, and therefore I felt it was necessary that the matter be looked at. These rules seek to make some amendments regarding betting odds where a horse is withdrawn. I was rather interested to hear today that the Subordinate Legislation Committee now recommends that the rules be disallowed. However, unless a notice of motion for disallowance had been put on the Notice Paper by August 12, it would have been just six days too late.

Mr. Shannon: It would have been a pity, wouldn't it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Two points arise in this matter. First, the Subordinate Legislation Committee should perhaps consider these matters somewhat more promptly. Obviously, a private member does not want to step in ahead of the committee if the committee has some official view upon the matter, but unless we have a report from the committee before the final date for disallowance a member is denied an opportunity of moving for the disallowance of regulations. I know the position is covered because the Legislative Council has not sat quite so frequently as we have and therefore the motion for disallowance can still be moved there, but I point out that there should be opportunities in either House to move such motions, and to allow the time to lapse while the matter is being considered by the committee is, in my opinion, something that should not happen.

The reason I moved to disallow these rules was that there appeared to be no explanation for the alteration. It is only a minor matter, certainly, but it is an alteration that is against the punter's interest, because under the proposal his odds are shortened when a horse is withdrawn. At present I think the scale goes up to a horse that is quoted at odds of 12/1. If such a horse is withdrawn a reduction in the odds on other horses is made to the extent of 1s. 6d. The amendment proposed in these rules would raise the scale to a horse at the odds of 16/1. I am not a betting

man and I have no personal interest in this matter, but I believe it would be very hard to determine that all of the bets on a winning horse should be reduced by 1s. merely because a 16/1 horse has been withdrawn.

Mr. Shannon: A horse at that price would not carry much money.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously, it would carry very little money. The point about it is that no explanation was available to my side of the House in this matter; the time in which to disallow these rules was expiring, and I covered the position by giving notice that I would move to have the rules disallowed. I am pleased to see that my instinct in this matter (and it was only instinct) was correct, as it has now been endorsed by the committee, somewhat belatedly. Six days after the final date for disallowance the committee brings in a recommendation that the rules be disallowed, so as we are now all of the one voice on this matter, I move this motion. I am quite sure my action will be supported officially by the committee, which is appointed to examine regulations that come before this House.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): The honourable the Leader will find that the motion for disallowance has already been moved in another place. I am somewhat surprised that the Leader decided to move for the disallowance of these rules, knowing full well that the matter was before the committee and that the committee was calling various witnesses. Of course, in order to do that it was necessary to have the time for moving a motion extended. In fact, the committee had a witness before it as recently as this morning. However, it is most unparliamentary of the Leader—

Mr. Casey: Unethical.

Mr. McKEE: —particularly for a man of such vast experience as the Leader.

Mr. Clark: Trying to frustrate the committee.

Mr. McKEE: In fact, it is a straightout case of playing politics, and it is most ungentlemanly. Honourable members know that this committee was set up to deal with certain matters and to submit its decisions to this Parliament. The Leader stated earlier this session that he was not very happy about the appointments to this committee. He was concerned because he never had a representative on the committee from the Opposition benches

in this House. Simply because he could not have his way regarding the appointment of the committee, he told this House that he would not respect the committee or pay any regard to it.

Mr. Hall: He did not say that at all.

Mr. McKEE: He said in this House that he would not recognize this committee. After all, it was a former Liberal Government that established this committee to consider matters such as this.

Mr. Lawn: The same blue guernsey.

Mr. McKEE: I can only say that the tactics he has used are unparliamentary and, in fact, rude, and viewed by members of the committee as being in bad taste.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not think we can let the remarks of the honourable member for Port Pirie go unchallenged. He will learn, after he has been in office as chairman of this committee a little longer, that he has to have a pretty thick skin. What has happened in this instance merely underlines the complaint of members on this side of the House that we were deprived of representation on the committee, and it means that we have no knowledge of what is going on.

Mr. Jennings: It is a non-political committee, and you have three members of this House on it. What are you complaining about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unfortunately, they do not talk to us about it.

Mr. Nankivell: Three Socialists!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but no Liberals. In that case, the committee has to expect members on this side to exercise their independent judgment. I am amazed that the chairman of the committee, a new chum—

Mr. McKee: Don't you think that everyone is entitled to be heard and to present a case?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One thing I learned during my term on that committee—and the honourable member for Port Pirie will find it out as he gets more experience—is that you have to be quick off the mark in these cases. It is no good letting the grass grow under your feet and the time for disallowance to pass.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: It is no good putting on the battery in the straight.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. Members on this side of the House are not represented on the committee, and it is our undoubted right to exercise our discretion as private members and as members of the Opposition to move a motion for disallowance on any by-law or regulation if we so desire. It is extraordinary

that the honourable member for Port Pirie, as chairman of the committee, should complain about the action of the Leader.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Doing his work for him!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Exactly, and doing what he wanted to do himself. I hope that as the honourable member gains experience (as I did in my term) he will be a little more tolerant and a little less jealous of his own position.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): The honourable member who has resumed his seat said that he had a little experience on the committee, but he has shown conclusively that he did not gain much from that experience. What he forgets is that no less a person than me has served for a long time with him on that committee. I assure the House that one of the boasts (and one which I think he was entitled to make some times) was that the committee was strictly non-political.

Mr. Millhouse: That has changed now.

Mr. JENNINGS: It is just too absurd for the Leader of the Opposition to say, with the bare-faced effrontery that we have come to expect from him over the years, that he has no opportunity to get in touch with members of this House who are members of that committee. Three members of this House are on the committee, and very good members, too.

Mr. Clark: Surely he is on speaking terms with his men in the Council.

Mr. JENNINGS: Is the division between the Lower and Upper House so great that the Leader of the Opposition in this House cannot speak to Liberal members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee in the other House?

Mr. Clark: You could hardly blame him if he didn't!

Mr. JENNINGS: I would not blame either of them for that. I remember (and if the honourable member for Mitcham's memory is good and his conscience clear he will admit this) that what was done this time has been done hundreds of times. It would be said that if time were running out in this House but the Upper House had not been sitting, the committee could safeguard itself if necessary, by moving, after hearing evidence, for the disallowance in the Upper House. I believe that we should show our confidence in the chairman and members of the committee in this House and, indeed, in members of the committee from another place.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I say a word of praise for my Leader, although he says that he might have had second thoughts about

this. It is obvious that his long political experience allowed him to see at once that there was a possible catch in the proposed new law for betting.

Mr. Jennings: Uncle Tom, the punter's friend.

Mr. SHANNON: I am sure that even the members of this committee, on reflection, would agree that, if the Leader saw a possible catch and put a motion on the Notice Paper, at least it would be a face saver in case the House wanted to do something about it. Being not inexperienced in committee work, I give my friend, the member for Port Pirie, some advice. When the committee investigates a special subject such as this is, there is no harm in putting a notice of motion for disallowance on the Notice Paper within the time specified by law and if, eventually, the committee discovers that the regulation should not be disallowed, the motion can be withdrawn. But, the committee is covered, and that is proper procedure. I deplore an element that has crept into this debate. I rely on this committee, whatever its personnel, to do my work for me in considering the voluminous regulations and by-laws laid on the table during a session. It would be physically impossible for the private member to thoroughly attend to them and still do his normal work. Many factors make it obligatory for private members to rely on this committee for guidance. I deplore the fact that there is no Opposition member on this committee; perhaps the Government will realize that non-party committees work admirably in the interests of all concerned. I trust the Subordinate Legislation Committee to do my work, whoever its members may be. I hope that private members, in exercising the prerogative (which every private member has of moving a motion for disallowance) will not be chastised for doing so. For the benefit of the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), and also of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse), who I know will not take exception to this, I point out that we do not always accept the recommendations of the Subordinate Legislation Committee: sometimes, despite the fact that the committee has moved for a disallowance, a regulation is allowed, and *vice versa*.

That is no criticism of the committee, but it is a prerogative that private members must always exercise, because it is their responsibility in the final analysis. If certain laws on the Statute Book which adversely affect the public are allowed to remain there, we cannot blame the Subordinate Legislation Committee for that; we must accept our own individual responsibility. With those remarks, I am



pleased to know that this little storm in the tea cup has blown over.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I do not wish to be caught up in this storm in the tea cup. However, for some years in South Australia when a horse is scratched, either at the barrier or as a result of a veterinary surgeon's opinion (if the animal has kicked at the barrier or has lost a shoe), and when the betting on it is 5/1 or 10/1, the Betting Control Board reduces the odds according to a previously established formula. The practice has been that when a horse in a particular race has reached the odds of 12/1, if it is scratched under the conditions I have outlined, no reduction takes place in the amount of the bets on a horse whose odds are over 12/1. In Victoria the rule has been altered so that instead of the odds being 12/1 in these circumstances, they are now 16/1.

The Betting Control Board saw fit to follow the Victorian rule, by accordingly altering the rule in this State, but I do not agree with the board's decision. I support the Leader's motion, principally because a vast difference exists between racing in Victoria and South Australia. Of course, we have heard all about this in previous debates before the House, and honourable members have read press articles from time to time, and know that the stakes in Victoria are considerably higher than they are here. This naturally attracts bigger fields and longer betting by the public in the respective rinks in Victoria. In a large classic race betting on a horse is often over 16/1 because of these better fields, bigger betting, better types of horse and so on, and the Victorians therefore consider that it would be fairer, that, when a sudden scratching occurs after the betting is open, no reduction should occur in respect of odds over 16/1, but that a reduction should apply to odds of 16/1 and under.

As I have said, our rule is for odds of 12/1, and this regulation would simply alter it to 16/1. I do not think the alteration is justified. In the past, where extensive betting with a bookmaker or on the totalizator has occurred and where a horse whose odds are over 12/1 has been scratched, the percentage has been infinitesimal. I think the board has acted a little hastily in this regard, and if the regulation were allowed it would be to the advantage of bookmakers more than to the average punter. That is, of course, one of the reasons why I am not happy about the regulation. I believe the motion to disallow this regulation is justified and that it should be supported

by the House. As the member for Onkaparinga has said, and as most honourable members know, we stand in this place to preserve at all times the right, irrespective of the Party to which we belong, to express our views.

Whether the Leader has usurped the functions of the Subordinate Legislation Committee or not, I do not know, but I support him in what he has said. I point out, however, that I, and all other honourable members, rely on that committee to consider the various references that come before it, for most of us do not have the time to watch out for every matter that is raised. It is impossible to keep abreast of the countless regulations that are considered by the committee, and we are fortunate in having such a committee to take evidence and to report its various findings to the House. Honourable members are always interested in the committee's respective decisions, and the last thing I should want to see would be the disbanding of that committee. I support the motion.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the remarks of the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) who is Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I consider that the Leader of the Opposition was rather hasty in moving this motion. He, himself, was responsible for establishing this committee, and it is the committee's duty to consider all regulations that come before it, and to take evidence from various people on such matters. No-one professes to be an authority on every matter that arises, although possibly the member for Mitcham would lead us to believe that he is an authority.

Mr. McKee: He has not lead us to believe that at all.

Mr. HURST: The Leader's action in this matter was frustrating and embarrassing even to his own colleagues in the Upper House, who are members of this committee and who are—

Mr. McKee: Concerned about his motion!

Mr. HURST: The committee investigated the matter and obtained evidence from a good cross-section of the people concerned. Every aspect was considered before a decision was made. With regard to the time for disallowance the committee took the necessary steps to permit these investigations to take place. That had already been done by the committee, which has on it representatives of both Parties. I believe the Leader of the Opposition was reflecting his views when he said, "I make it clear that we would not be in any way committed to the committee's decision." I believe the Leader

is deliberately trying to frustrate this committee, and I appeal to members of his Party to try to persuade him to carry out at least the standard that he said was necessary in these matters. It is no use a member's becoming frustrated and jumping into these matters willy nilly. All of us come up against matters at times on which we are likely to make hasty decisions, but we expect more of a person who has been head of the State for about 32 years; we expect better conduct from the Leader than he has shown in this matter.

Mr. Hudson: He needs to be more mature.

Mr. HURST: Yes, his attitude today shows that for 32 years we have had immature decisions being made. Today he has demonstrated practically his attitude towards these matters. In doing so, he is also clearly demonstrating to the people of South Australia his immaturity. I believe the member for Port Pirie was quite justified in making his objections in the manner in which this matter was carried out. While I am a member of this committee (together with other members of my Party) I do not intend to be frustrated by any actions of others, and I appeal to Opposition members to try to persuade their Leader to act in a more responsible and dignified manner. We do not want debates to be reduced to a low ebb. We should like to see matters dealt with on a high level of etiquette.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The debate has taken an almost lachrymatory turn, and I want to confirm the right of any member to move any motion that he is entitled to move under the Standing Orders without being called unparliamentary or rude. What are these committees? They are simply set up by the House for its advice. There is no other reason for them. The committee in question was established to advise the House. When advice is given, 99 times out of a 100 it is accepted. If a committee does not give the House advice then honourable members may elect to take action themselves. In any case, whether or not we take advice from a committee it is there simply in an advisory capacity. It is up to honourable members whether its advice will be taken, and there is not the slightest restriction on any private member's moving a disallowance of regulations and by-laws under the Standing Orders.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We would not have taken the committee's advice if we had waited for its advice.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is perfectly true. I notice that the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee behaved in

a manner that I consider to be inconsistent with the dignity one expects from a chairman. After all, this committee is for the service of this House and its chairman is bucking a little. I am not certain whether we should not do something about him; we might do so, if we are stirred up. If honourable members do not choose to take a committee's advice, that is all right; if they want to take their own measures under the Standing Orders, they are perfectly entitled to do so.

I was a member of the Subordinate Legislation Committee and never, on any occasion, was any silly point raised about the rights of private members to take action within the date allowed for the disallowance of regulations. While I was a member of the Government there were no petulant comments such as those made by the chairman of this committee this afternoon. I aver the right of any private member to do what he is entitled to do under Standing Orders, and I do not think it is right to call him unparliamentary or rude, or accuse him of being political for doing that. There is no harm in being political if a member wants to be, but the accusation makes it sound as though there is something wrong about it. I think it is most unfair and undignified to call a private member rude and unparliamentary for taking action. I hope the chairman of the committee will examine this debate afterwards and think about it again, because I do not think he has behaved in the way he should. I am not sure that his supporters helped him very much to come to a calm judgment on this debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have allowed much more latitude than I should have in this debate. I ask honourable members now to confine themselves to the context of the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I had intended to make some remarks about some of the allegations that the action of the Leader of the Opposition had been unparliamentary.

The SPEAKER: That would be fair enough because I have allowed others to do so; but I ask the honourable member not to develop this point.

Mr. HALL: One or two matters have alarmed me particularly this session. Today members have been accused of being unparliamentary, unfair and rude in making use of provisions expressly provided for members to represent their districts fully. These accusations add to my fear brought on in the early stages of the session when the Premier said that we were usurping the time of Parliament.

I hope this trend will not go further than it has today. We have been told that the Leader should have waited to move to disallow this regulation. The report from the committee came into this House six days too late, and yet we were supposed to wait for it.

Mr. Langley: That was handled.

Mr. HALL: Yes, because the Leader moved a disallowance in this House, and the committee brought in a report six days too late. With other members I have made use of the right to move for the disallowance of regulations and by-laws. I believe that as the Opposition in this House has no representative on that committee we must avail ourselves of our right on specific occasions. I agree that no-one can know all that is in the reports on regulations and by-laws that come before the committee, and we must rely upon that committee; but that does not mean that members here will not have their own specialities and know something in detail of the matters before the committee, and they should in such cases have every right to study closely those regulations and, if necessary, move to disallow them.

I remind the House that although this is a Parliamentary committee there is politics in subordinate legislation in the way it restricts personal freedoms and in the matter of conduct and life, law and order in this State. We on this side who have no representative on the committee and therefore no insight into the workings of the committee must reserve this right of private intervention if we so desire. I support the motion moved, happily in time, by my Leader.

Motion carried.

#### 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,

which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

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.

(Continued from August 11. Page 971.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Unless I am very much mistaken, the notice of this motion came as a great surprise to members of the Government. It may be that members on the Government side, both those on the front

bench and those who sit behind them, are consummate actors, but I doubt it, and if they were not acting then they were completely taken by surprise when one of their number, the honourable member for Frome, got up and gave notice of this motion concerning T.A.B.

Mr. Hudson: The Leader said he was not surprised. Do you disagree with him?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg is young and inexperienced. He likes to jump in on other members before they finish making their points, but he, too, will no doubt learn, like the member for Port Pirie who has just been dealt with in another debate. I intend to state my own views, whether they happen to be those of my Leader on this matter or not. As I say, I happened to be watching the members opposite, especially the member for Gawler, whose physiognomy is a good indicator of feelings on the Government side, and they were surprised and, I think, some were even appalled by this notice of motion. One can only imagine what has gone on in Caucus when the matter has been discussed. It is not to be wondered at that members opposite were surprised and flabbergasted. I think there were a few on this side of the House who felt the same thing, because a totalizator agency system of betting (and this motion dealing with T.A.B.) is one of the political hot potatoes in our State and in many other places as well, I suppose, and Parliament has up to the present skated around it and avoided full-scale debate on the matter, although it has been a matter of controversy in the community for some years now.

Mr. Clark: Why do you suggest it is a political hot potato?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought the member for Gawler was doing me the compliment of listening to what I said. I said it has been avoided because it is a political hot potato; I thought I made that clear.

Mr. Clark: What makes you think it is a political hot potato?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not prepared to go into that. If the honourable member for Gawler, with his vast experience in this House and other places, has not yet found out that this is a political hot potato, I am sorry for him and I am sorry for those he represents.

Mr. Clark: I thought I might talk you into committing yourself for once.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see. If the honourable member for Gawler and the honourable member for Glenelg would listen to me for a few minutes (I thought I would speak for only about 10 minutes, actually) they would know

where I stood. Having said that, and having paid, I suppose, the honourable member for Frome some sort of a compliment for having created a stir in the House, I must go on to say that I believe that since he gave notice of this motion its significance has been very greatly exaggerated, both amongst members in their private conversation (and indeed in the speeches which have been made so far) and in the general community. This motion in itself does not bring T.A.B. any closer in South Australia, nor does it take it further away, because—and I say this very deliberately—it is still up to the Government whether or not any legislation in this matter is introduced into the House. This motion, in my view, does not affect that responsibility of the Government one way or the other.

I have said that the significance of the motion has been very greatly exaggerated, and that has been evident by the number of people who have signed petitions and written letters and so on and spoken to members of Parliament (if the experience of other members is the same as mine) on this matter, asking members to vote either for or against the motion. I must say that in my case most of those who have been in touch with me have asked me to vote against it; they have been against T.A.B. I have had now (and I have kept a tally of it) a number of petitions from churches in my district, and others from churches not in my district. In fact, when I was looking through my file of petitions I found one addressed to Mr. Frank Walsh, the member for Edwardstown, which should have been directed to him by those members of the Eden Hills Methodist Church who live in his district. I have been trying to summon the courage to present it to the Premier, and he is welcome to that petition in due course. For myself, I have now had petitions carrying the names of 1,095 people in my district or attending churches in my district.

Mr. McKee: What sort of majority have you in your district?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think that is entirely irrelevant, and I do not intend to pursue that line. What I say is that I have dissected the denominations of the people from whom petitions have come, and I find that 771 of the signatures are those of members of Methodist churches in my district—11 different Methodist churches, although one of them (Clarence Park) is in the district of the honourable member for Unley. I have had 87 from members of the Blackwood Church of Christ, 185

from members of four Baptist churches in my district, and 52 from one Church of England parish (the parish of St. Columba at Hawthorn), all signing the same roneced petition and opposing T.A.B. As I say, I believe that these people, whose views I respect up to the hilt, have rather magnified the significance of this motion, for the reasons I have already given. The great virtue of the motion, as I see it, is that it brings this matter of contention in the community before Parliament, and in my view one of the three great functions of Parliament is to act as a forum for discussion on matters of contention in the community. Hitherto (and I confess this freely, and I must take my share of responsibility for it, I suppose) Parliament has shirked its responsibility in this matter because it is a political hot potato. It is a very difficult matter, I have found personally, on which to make up my mind. I confess, too, that I have rather changed my views on this matter in the last year or so since it first became a live topic. I began by being entirely opposed to the introduction of any system of off-course betting in South Australia, but that is not my strongly held view at present. The morality of gambling (and this is one facet of gambling) is a matter of dispute among people and certainly among Christians. The Church has never held that all gambling was wrong. The traditional attitude has been that gambling is not in itself wrong. It is a thing indifferent and must be judged by its effects. That is the view which personally I hold. In that way gambling is akin to alcohol. In itself, I believe there is nothing wrong in having an alcoholic drink, but in excess, and the effects of that excess, can be evil indeed. My view is that gambling and alcohol are much the same in that in themselves they are not either good or bad. Having said that, I must admit that my own feeling is against gambling. I do not say that I do not gamble, I do, but I do not gamble much.

Mr. Rodda: Have you ever won?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The only time I have been to the races, I spent a pleasant day with my wife at Victoria Park. It gave me a great thrill when we put 5s. or 10s. on a horse and the jolly thing came home and won.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: A case of mugs for luck.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I got excited and my wife got embarrassed, because everyone turned and looked at us. I sent her to the tote window to collect but gave her the wrong ticket.

She collected on the wrong ticket but we were called back to the window. It was all most embarrassing.

Mr. Jennings: Is that why you have not been back since?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Not quite. I am not a racing man but I enjoyed the day at the races, and I cannot believe that, in itself, there was anything wrong with that. Of course, there was not. My instinct is generally against gambling and against an extension of gambling in the community. Although that is my feeling and the one with which I began to view this question, there are two other considerations, which made me modify my position. First, all the evidence seems to be that where you have a legalized form of off-course betting the amount of illegal S.P. betting in the community decreases considerably and significantly. That seems to be an incontrovertible fact that I have been able to discover from other States and overseas. It cannot be denied that S.P. bookmaking in itself brings many evils in its train. It is illegal and is conducted under the most unsatisfactory and unsavoury conditions in hotel bars and lavatories, and I do not think I am wrong in that.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is where they keep the nit-keeper.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to say that the honourable member for Ridley would know more about it than I do. The S.P. bookmaker does not scruple as to who his clients are, whether they be under age, completely sober or intoxicated, and of course much money is lost by people who bet in this way. S.P. bookmaking in itself brings evil. Off-course legal bookmaking seems to be the most effective way to reduce the amount of S.P. bookmaking in the community. I do not believe it is possible to reduce S.P. bookmaking significantly, simply by police action and making it illegal. That has never been successfully done in any community. There is one powerful incentive in favour of legalizing off-course betting: it brings it to the surface where it can be controlled. There is another factor which weighs with me, and that is the more general factor of political principle—I suppose one could say—and that is, in a democracy how can one deny to people or to the majority of them, what they want to do if it is not intrinsically immoral or evil in itself. That is a difficult matter on which all honourable members must make up their minds, not only in this case but in all cases.

How far are we the leaders of people, and how far have we the right to tell them what

is good for them? Perhaps, unconsciously, that is what many of us are trying to do in this case. This is an important argument. How far are we entitled to impose on people our own views of morality? That is what I am canvassing now. No doubt a majority of people in the community are not opposed to legalized off-course betting. Most members see, from time to time, the Australian Gallup Poll. I apologize to the honourable members for Frome and Wallaroo, as I do not know whether they referred to this in their speeches. In the September-October (1964) issue of the poll sheet, there was a report of a poll taken, I think, in August, 1964, which showed a significant majority in South Australia, as in other States, in favour of off-course totalizators. The report stated:

In every State except perhaps Tasmania, off-course totalizators are approved by most people with opinions on the subject. One in three said they had no opinion about off-course totalizators, but those with opinions are more than two to one in favour.

Having given the figures for all States it quotes the figures for South Australia, which shows 46 per cent in favour, 23 per cent opposed, and 31 per cent with no opinion. These are significant figures: almost 50 per cent in favour of off-course totalizators. I do not say that the Gallup Poll is always 100 per cent accurate, but it shows a significant figure in favour. It is something that all members should consider when making their assessment of off-course betting. How far are we entitled to disregard what appears to be a majority desire in the community, and to say they cannot have it because we do not believe in it?

Mr. McKee: You are having a bob each way.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I am. I am waiting to hear where the honourable member for Port Pirie stands. I know he has peculiar difficulties of his own because of the betting shops in his district. That may well colour his thinking, and it will be interesting to see. I believe he is winding himself up to speak yet again on a matter—

Mr. Coumbe: I thought he was scratched!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He was almost scratched. As I say, I believe that powerful balancing arguments exist on each side. First, I personally would not care if there were no gambling or organized facilities for gambling in this State, for my instinct is against it. On the other hand, I have regard to the fact that it seems to be the only effective way of putting down S.P. bookmaking which has many evils of its own and which we must all avoid

if we can. I also believe that a substantial majority of people in the community would favour this legislation. I wonder whether we are entitled to say to them, "No, you cannot have it," because our own personal conviction may be against it? Having said that, I must obviously say—and the member for Port Pirie is expecting me to say it—that I am not prepared to come to a conclusion on T.A.B. simply on a blanket motion of this nature.

I do not believe it is competent for us, on a matter which has so many pros and cons and so many detailed points that have to be cleared up, to give a blank cheque to anybody, whether it be the Government or anybody else, to say, "Yes, I am in favour of T.A.B.," and then simply let the Government fill in the details. I do not believe that can be done, and I certainly am not prepared to vote in favour of a motion that would carry that implication with it. For myself, I am not prepared to say "Yea" or "Nay" to T.A.B. in this State without it being introduced into the House in a Bill, so that I can see the definite proposals that come before us, so that I can make up my mind on each one of them, and so that I shall know precisely what will be introduced in South Australia—what system is proposed in this State, and what its ramifications will be. For me, it is impossible to make up my mind *in vacuo*, as this motion would ask me to do.

We should have an opportunity to make up our minds on a Bill, so that we can say "Yea" or "Nay" to it when we know precisely what is intended. Therefore, a Bill ought to be introduced into the House for honourable members to consider. Coming to the motion itself, the member for Frome has been trying to find out my views on this matter for a few days now. I cannot support the motion as it stands, and I intend to move certain amendments to it that would make it acceptable to me. If those amendments (or something like them) were not agreed to by the House I would have to vote against the motion. I believe we should strike out the words "this session", for it is now obviously not possible for the Government to introduce during this session a matter which is so complicated and which would require a lengthy Bill and a great deal of detail and preparation.

Secondly, we should not be bound to support a scheme similar to the one functioning in Victoria. Much discussion on this matter in the community has centered around copying the Victorian scheme, but I do not know whether everything in that scheme is good,

whether only part of it is, or whether it is appropriate or not in South Australia. I want to emphasize that it is up to the Government to bring in a Bill on this matter, and it would then be for Parliament to consider whether it is in favour or whether it is against the details and proposals embodied in that Bill.

I emphasize that I do not regard myself bound one way or the other by a vague motion which, to give him credit, was the only thing the member for Frome could introduce in this House. In addition, I am not prepared to support the amendment moved by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) which is, in effect, to have a referendum, because, first, if my memory serves me right, in the old Parliament in the last session every honourable member on both sides—or certainly a large majority—was prepared to support the proposals introduced by the former Government for a 14-point plan. I think this was discussed on the last night of the session. To me, that was a firm—

Mr. Ryan: Where did you get that idea?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I personally intended to support it. I may be mistaken, but I thought a big majority of members intended to support it also. I do not remember what happened to that matter now, but as I intended to support it I have, to that extent, committed myself.

Mr. McKee: You support T.A.B.! At last, we have got it out of you!

Mr. Jennings: I am glad you admitted before that you gambled a little, because you are certainly having a couple of bob each way now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is for other honourable members to make up their minds. I believe the House was prepared to support that plan, and I still think that if a vote had been taken it would have been in favour of it. Secondly, I do not, as a rule, think there is much in referenda. We are put here to represent our people in Parliament, and it is for us to take the responsibility of making up our minds on these things. The electors have their remedy at the next election, if they do not agree with what we have done. I say that as my general view of referenda. I do not like them, because I think it is a way of Parliamentarians shirking their responsibilities. I do not say that there are no exceptions to that; there may be, but this certainly is not one. I hope I have therefore made my stand clear. I move:

To strike out "this session", and to strike out all the words after "totalizers" and insert in lieu thereof "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament."

The motion, if those amendments were accepted, would then read:

That in the opinion of this House a Bill should be introduced by the Government to make provision for off-course betting on race-course totalizers so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Lawn): Are the amendments seconded?

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I second them.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham has moved to strike out the words "this session" and to strike out all the words after the word "totalizers" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament." The honourable member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I cannot see any point in the honourable member for Mitcham even rising to speak to this debate, because he has told the House nothing. He never indicated his true feeling towards the issue and he has said the matter is a political hot potato. The way he spoke I would agree with him. He would have made any juggler look like a babe in arms, and he did better than I thought he would. I do not think we should beat about the bush on this matter. I believe that every member who speaks on this issue should make up his mind on it, because the debate is for that purpose. I believe that it is the opinion of the people generally that some form of T.A.B. should be introduced in South Australia.

Mr. Hall: This is a particular form, not some form.

Mr. McKEE: Yes this is a form with which I do not agree, but some form should be introduced. Many reasons support the introduction of T.A.B.

Mr. Jennings: The motion is for a scheme similar to that operating in Victoria.

Mr. McKEE: It is not right that people who desire to have a bet should be forced to break the law. It is not always convenient for people to visit a racecourse, and because they like to have a bet they have a bet.

Mr. Casey: That would apply to metropolitan as well as country people.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, people who go to the football or spend their Saturdays in other ways do not find it convenient to go to the races; they like to have a bet, which they do, and in doing so they are forced to break the law. I believe all members will agree that that is so, and that fantastic sums are today passing into the hands of starting price bookmakers.

Of course, most people will agree that this form of betting is difficult to police. I am certain that S.P. bookmaking will continue until it is replaced by a better scheme.

Like most honourable members I have received numerous letters from various religious organizations explaining their opposition to the introduction of any form of T.A.B. It is hard to believe, but judging by their letters it seems that they are not aware that S.P. bookmaking is going on. They stress that they are certain that the introduction of T.A.B. would increase gambling, but I am convinced that that is not so. All that T.A.B. would do would be to make S.P. bookmaking (which is going on today) legal in a different form. It is no good our kidding ourselves by saying that S.P. bookmaking is not going on: it is going on in a big way and is big business. As I said previously, it is impossible to police. It could be said that this is a similar situation to that which applied in the days of prohibition in America. People there found that they could not enforce the law of prohibition so they realized that the only thing to do was to legalize the sale of liquor.

I believe (and so do most people) that the only sensible thing to do in this case is to legalize off-course betting. Any law that cannot be enforced is a bad law. It is most important that S.P. bookmaking be replaced with a scheme that is acceptable to the people. If a form of T.A.B. were introduced that was unsuitable S.P. bookmaking would continue, and no-one will convince me otherwise. As most honourable members know (and as has been referred to in most speeches made in this debate), I am the only member of the House who has legal betting shops in his district. Unfortunately the Speaker is not here, but I should like to remind him that he has one of those betting shops in his district.

Mr. Casey: Has any church organization moved to have them closed down?

Mr. McKEE: Not in my time. These shops are well managed and provide a service to the people. To my knowledge there has not been a complaint brought against these shops at any time. The service they provide to the betting public will be most difficult to replace by any form of T.A.B. The shops remain open whilst the race is in progress and as soon as correct weight is declared one can go to the South Australian or interstate counter, be paid, and continue to bet as the races proceed. These shops cater for small punters who go there with less than 5s. If one is fortunate enough to back a winner one can collect one's winnings

as soon as correct weight is declared and continue to bet as long as one's money continues.

If races were completely banned tomorrow it would not upset me greatly because I am only a moderate bettor. However, speaking on behalf of people in the State who like to have a bet, I believe they are entitled to enjoy the social facilities they desire to enjoy. Under the Victorian scheme of T.A.B. people cannot do what they are entitled to do at Port Pirie: they cannot collect after each race.

Mr. Rodda: Doesn't the honourable member agree that that is a good thing?

Mr. McKEE: The people of Port Pirie are used to this type of betting, and I am sure the Victorian system could not replace the Port Pirie facilities. I do not agree with sectional legislation, by which I mean legislation that would take away the livelihood of a certain section of the community, yet leave another section earning a similar livelihood. Therefore, if we are going to have T.A.B. and be genuine about it, I suggest we have total T.A.B. If the livelihood of betting shop proprietors (who are legal bookmakers and attend races at Port Pirie or elsewhere with their bags) is to be taken away by the introduction of some form of T.A.B., then let us have total T.A.B.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: That would eliminate the bookmaker.

Mr. Rodda: What is the honourable member's definition of T.A.B.

Mr. McKEE: If we are going to have T.A.B., then let us have total T.A.B. throughout the State with no bag men at all. This is done in New Zealand, Europe and in most parts of the world.

Mr. Shannon: Does the honourable member think this would overcome all S.P. betting?

Mr. McKEE: Of course not; it will never be cut out entirely.

Mr. Shannon: The member for Mitcham thought T.A.B. would eliminate all S.P. betting.

Mr. McKEE: Is the honourable member for Onkaparinga going to make a speech now, or am I?

Mr. Shannon: You're an expert. That is why I asked that question.

Mr. McKEE: I believe that total T.A.B. would be accepted by the majority of the betting public.

Mr. Ryan: Do you think it would improve the sport?

Mr. McKEE: It would be most beneficial to the racing industry, which is a big industry and an important one to the State.

Mr. Ryan: It would cut out the laying of odds before races, wouldn't it?

Mr. McKEE: Well, people back horses on Friday nights, or even on Thursday nights.

Mr. Ryan: And the punter who goes to the course has to suffer the consequences.

Mr. McKEE: He has to suffer the consequences of the betting done on the Thursday or Friday night.

Mr. Shannon: If you were the owner of a horse, how would you feel about that?

Mr. McKEE: It all depends on whether I own a good horse or not and, incidentally, the honourable member is flogging a dead one right now. The honourable member for Port Adelaide asked me whether the racing industry was important and whether T.A.B. would be beneficial. I claim that it would be beneficial, and I think all honourable members know that.

Mr. Ryan: Has the sport been improved in New Zealand by having total T.A.B. and no bookmakers?

Mr. McKEE: Any racehorse owner or any person associated with a racing club there will tell you what facilities have been provided as a result of the scheme. In the same way, the money derived from the T.A.B. system in Victoria is used to provide facilities for the people generally. Thousands of people are involved in the various aspects of the industry, from the breeding of horses until they are racing, and that makes racing important to the State. In addition, it is one of the most popular sports in the world and I do not think the honourable member for Mitcham would like to be responsible for introducing a ban on the Melbourne Cup, or something like that. I think that the only solution to the problem is the introduction of total T.A.B., which would be most beneficial to the racing industry and to the State generally. I have stated that if T.A.B. is introduced, the form of betting would have to be acceptable to the people. A law that is not acceptable to the people is extremely unwise legislation. As I see it, a number of factors are against the Victorian system and I consider that that system would not be acceptable to the public of South Australia. For instance, its major handicaps—

Mr. Nankivell: They don't exist at all!

Mr. McKEE: The major handicap is that winning bets are not paid until either Monday or the next business day after the races. We find that in Victoria and other places where T.A.B. has been introduced people known as scalpers and operating on a commission basis buy tickets from people who have backed winners but who are unable to collect their winnings because the T.A.B. office is not open.



In Victoria, the scheme does not provide for the shops to remain open while the races are in progress, so a person cannot collect winnings immediately. There is also the factor that bets have to be placed by a certain time. All these things add up against the Victorian system, and I am sure the honourable member for Frome would agree with that.

Mr. Casey: Any off-course totalizator system would have to provide a time factor in order that the information can be got to the course.

Mr. McKEE: I am saying that a system similar to that operating in Victoria would not replace S.P. betting in South Australia, because it would not offer the facilities and convenience to the people and, therefore, the people would still use the S.P. betting system.

Mr. Casey: Well, they don't in Victoria.

Mr. McKEE: I'll bet they do! Because these agencies close before the races, thousands of people who bet in a small way are prevented from placing their bets. The only ones privileged to bet are those who can afford to establish a credit with the agency prior to the race meeting. Even then, they have to telephone—

Mr. Casey: The minimum is £1.

Mr. McKEE: I suppose a person can establish as much credit as he likes, but the minimum is £1. Nevertheless, something should be done to rectify the anomaly that exists today and people should not be forced to break the law. That is the important thing.

Mr. Jennings: They are not forced to break it.

Mr. McKEE: Well, they do not like to break the law, but they are forcing themselves to break the law. Anyway, it is not good to have people breaking a law that is not good itself. Our racing industry in South Australia is in such a run-down state today that something will have to be done if it is to be put back on its feet. I know that most members will agree that at present most of our good horses, after being trained in South Australia, are taken to Melbourne as soon as they are ready to strike form. The owners cannot be blamed for this, because the prize money in Melbourne is higher than that paid here. However, the result is that a poorer class of horse is left in South Australia. This is proved by the motion that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon concerning Betting Control Board rules. The Bookmakers Association applied to have the 12/1 margin raised to 16/1 when a horse was scratched after having been placed in the hands of the starter. Of course, we can expect

this to happen when we have T.A.B. in every State except South Australia. Naturally, these other States can afford to pay bigger stakes, and, therefore, the process of taking our good horses to other States will continue.

Mr. Jennings: You can hardly blame the owners.

Mr. Ryan: It is only "horse sense."

Mr. McKEE: Of course it is only "horse sense", and it is good sense, because the prize money is high. Most of our horses do well in Victoria, but they do not win many races here before they go, so the punter in South Australia does not know whether to back them when they race in Victoria. It is true that some big punters may know, but many people, seeing that a horse has good breeding and has some credit for winning races, naturally back that horse, but they find that it does not win. When a horse is taken to Victoria, it receives a weight penalty.

Mr. Ryan: You are trying to say that the game is crook, aren't you?

Mr. McKEE: Well, to support my statements, I will read a letter signed by "Staunch Racegoer" that appeared in last weekend's *Sunday Mail*. He wrote:

I, and certainly thousands of racegoers, agree with "Observant" (*Sunday Mail*, August 7, 1965) that racing here needs a good clean-up. The trouble lies with horses just having "runs" before going interstate. Trials are conducted for this purpose, but the leading stables are the culprits, as evidence shows that when their horses have had two or three races here at any price, then they go to Melbourne, are backed, and win easily. Our stakes, of course, are to blame, but every horse in a race is supposed to be trying. At Gawler we saw one horse go out to 8/1 and in less than five minutes it was 5/2. Then we saw Gatum Gatum in a striking reversal of form. Years ago the then chairman of stewards took a very dim view of a horse which ran nowhere one week and won the next. There was always an inquiry. Stewards now are much too lenient and many racegoers stay away.

I believe it is generally thought that some form of off-course betting should be introduced if we want to save the racing industry or if we want it to continue in this State. I would not agree to the closing of the betting shops at Port Pirie unless total T.A.B. were introduced. The present system at Port Pirie is more acceptable than the Victorian type of T.A.B., and I would not agree with sectional legislation that took away the livelihood of certain people. I would not oppose the establishment of a T.A.B. agency at Port Pirie in competition with the betting shops, as I believe in competition. If the bookmakers who operate on the course there or on any

other course have to compete with T.A.B., it is only fair that the Port Pirie shops should have competition from a totalizator. I wish to make it clear that I do not support the closing of the shops at Port Pirie, as I do not agree with sectional legislation.

I should like now to mention the winnings bets tax. As this is all tied up with betting, I do not think I am out of order in referring to it. This is bad legislation that should be abolished as soon as possible, and I hope that if T.A.B. is introduced the tax will be removed. People are already taxed on their wages, and if they want to go to a racecourse in this State they are taxed a further sixpence in the pound. This is straight-out robbery, as they have already been taxed.

Mr. Ryan: If there is total T.A.B. that will automatically be finished.

Mr. McKEE: It will have to be, so that is another good argument for T.A.B. I have given T.A.B. much thought. I do not favour the Victorian scheme, as it does not give people the facilities at present provided in betting shops in my district.

Mr. Casey: Licensed bookmakers have not been done away with in Victoria, you know!

Mr. McKEE: I know, but there have been no betting shops in Victoria. When T.A.B. was introduced in Western Australia the betting shops at Kalgoorlie were allowed to remain. I do not know whether an agency was established there. However I think some form of T.A.B. should be introduced, as I do not think it is fair that people who cannot visit a racecourse must break the law to have a bet. People in country centres should have the right to bet if they wish without breaking the law. We claim to support freedom of thought and freedom to please ourselves; the biggest Parliament in Australia supports the idea that people should be able more or less to please themselves. I do not think it is right for certain people to try to control social activities in which ordinary people take pleasure. I think honourable members will agree that that is reasonable thinking. Apart from this, it is morally and democratically unjust to make people break the law if they do something that they do not consider wrong.

Mr. Ryan: Do you say there is no S.P. bookmaking in towns with betting shops?

Mr. McKEE: To my knowledge, there are no S.P. bookmakers in Port Pirie. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) said there was an S.P. bookmaker in every pub in the country, but he would get a shock if he came to Port Pirie, as that is not so there.

Mr. Hurst: Do you have hotels, not pubs, there?

Mr. McKEE: The S.P. bookmaking that is going on at present means that money is being channelled into unproductive avenues, which is just wasteful.

Mr. Quirke: It is like feeding oats to race-horses!

Mr. McKEE: That can be wasteful, too. I do not favour the Victorian scheme, although I believe that a form of T.A.B. should be introduced. I would rather have the Victorian scheme than the Leader's 14-point scheme. Whoever put it into the heads of the Leader and the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) that the scheme was thwarted by this House last year was having a pipe dream. Some way should be provided for people in country areas who cannot attend race meetings to have a bet.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): At this stage, to make it clear in the minds of members what we are talking about, I think I should read the motion, which is:

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.

To this motion, an amendment has been moved. At one time a motion was introduced into the House that began in much the same way—“That in the opinion of this House”, etc.—and it was amended so many times that it was finally passed with only the word “That” remaining. It appears that this motion will have the same fate. One is either of the opinion that something should be done or one is not, and that is all that this motion asks—that one says that one is of the opinion that a Bill should be introduced. All right; I favour its being introduced. There is no buck-shoving about that. Nobody will lose marks for giving his opinion and saying what he believes in. All this nonsense of qualifying a decision gets us nowhere. Something has been said about it affecting the dignity of the House. It does not. We have a motion before us: either we are for it or we are against it. The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) has moved an amendment to this effect:

To leave out all words after the word “House” and insert in lieu thereof the following words: “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.”

I asked the honourable member when he was moving his amendment whether, if the people wanted it, he would vote for T.A.B., and he said “No”.

Mr. Hughes: No, I did not. I said I would not oppose a Bill going through.

Mr. QUIRKE: What would you do?

Mr. Hughes: That would be up to me when the time came.

Mr. QUIRKE: If the honourable member would not oppose it, he would have to go outside and not vote for it; but that is not what we are here for. We have a motion before us. We can amend it out of existence if we want to but, if it is passed here, then the opinion of this House is that a Bill should be introduced here providing for a scheme similar to that operating in Victoria. From my knowledge gained from investigations when I was a member of the Government, I understand that it is not possible to introduce a scheme like the scheme operating in Victoria because of our far-flung population, but a similar scheme seems to be feasible and I have no great disagreement with that. It will be that or something similar to it.

I, too, have received petitions from earnest people belonging to churches and church organizations. They are perfectly entitled to ventilate their opinions and to know where I, as their member of Parliament, stand. Those I have not told I will tell and then, as their member for Parliament, I shall stand up to that decision at the next election. I have always done that. I have been in this place for 25 years and never once on a social question have I failed to give my decision on it, either for or against. It has never harmed me. Why should we not act in that way now? I do not believe there is any harm in betting, provided it is not carried to excess where the better harms somebody else. If he harms himself his blood is on his own head but, if he is a family man and bets to the extent of depriving his family of sustenance, he is wrong. It is the abuse of a thing that is wrong. It is the man who is wrong and not the idea of putting 2s. on a horse. This applies to alcohol and like things. Somebody referred to alcohol rather disparagingly in this debate, though not excessively so, but I will not have that. I have been drinking moderately since I was hip high to a grasshopper. I am a winemaker, a non-betting man and somebody who likes his slightly rare steak with a glass of burgundy or claret—and anybody who has not sampled such a pleasure has yet to learn what it is to live. I do not force it on people, but it is beautiful food and good living. However, if a man takes more drink than steak and gets into trouble through drinking excessively, it is the abuse of the thing that is wrong, not the fact that he has taken it.

I favour this motion, not because I think it is a very good motion because it has been put before the House as a sort of primer: would the Government be successful in putting this through? If the House is against it (and it looks as though the member for Frome will have to get a computer to assess his chances on that, judging by the previous speeches) and it fails, it is no use introducing such a Bill. That is the idea of this motion. I favour it and hope the House accepts it and, having accepted it, passes a Bill containing the provisions that I know so many people want.

We are told that S.P. bookmaking is an evil, that throughout the country the evils of S.P. bookmaking must be discernible everywhere; but the evil, if any, is very small in view of the number of transactions that those S.P. bookmakers make. I am almost convinced that the best way to handle this betting problem would be to register bookmakers, let them operate at home with a row of telephones and take no tax from them, so that the Government would get nothing and the racing clubs would get nothing either. How many people would favour that? The racecourse people would not.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Nor would the Government.

Mr. QUIRKE: I would not be concerned about the Government's getting revenue from it. It is not in the position of people saying "This is wrong" but it would not be proper to make a difference. A man has a drink, a smoke and a racecourse bet now and then, and he is the most heavily taxed man in the country. It may be advisable to tax Coca-Cola or something like that, to bring it under Customs and Excise. Nobody would favour that, either. People get so inextricably involved over these things when we say it is a curse. S.P. bookmaking is not a curse in the bush today. To say that S.P. bookmakers are rabid thieves and robbers is utterly wrong. I know plenty of them and they are decent citizens. The mere fact that they are there to take money from somebody wanting to bet with them makes some people say that it is illegal, and the only reason why it is not legal is that from those people the Government gets nothing. The whole thing is immoral when it concerns an S.P. bookmaker from whom the Government receives no money, but the same principle is entirely moral on the racecourses. I do not think that way at all. It is either right or wrong and, to my way of thinking, to have a bet is not wrong: to have a drink is not wrong—but to abuse either of those things is wrong on the part of the individual. It is his responsibility.

Mr. McKee: We all agree with that.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Not all.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am speaking my own convictions and ideas. I do not want to ram them down the throats of people who do not believe as I do; but, having to take the responsibility of voting according to my convictions, I am prepared to do so. Country people should have the same facilities for betting, without its being classed as illegal and immoral, as the city people who go to a racecourse, where the same thing is legal and moral. I am exercising this vote, and I am giving my opinion. I hope the member for Frome is successful in this matter. I say that not because I want to put the Government on the spot or anything like that; this is something that is outside of Parties, and because of that very fact it comes back to what the individual member thinks. I hope that every individual member will say exactly what he intends to do, for he is either in favour of S.P. bookmaking or he is not.

Mr. McKee: They will be in trouble if they are all like the member for Mitcham.

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Port Pirie supported T.A.B., provided the betting shops in Port Pirie were not affected.

Mr. McKee: I said I would support T.A.B. but that I would not agree to sectional legislation.

Mr. QUIRKE: Mr. Speaker, I think I have made myself clear. I wish the honourable member for Frome luck in this matter, but he will need all of it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I am rather grateful that the honourable member for Burra read the motion, because I have been somewhat of the opinion in listening to the debate today that we have been debating all the various refinements of T.A.B. or other forms of off-course betting rather than the motion before the Chair. My remarks were prepared after hearing the honourable member move the motion and after reading those parts of his speech I did not hear him give in the House, and, therefore, my comments relate to the motion as he introduced it. I should like to say, first, that the debate thus far (and following the example set by the honourable member for Frome) has been of a moderate and temperate character. I think every honourable member who has spoken has spoken for himself, and I want to make it perfectly clear that I speak for myself and for nobody else in this matter. I think each member who has spoken has expressed his own

point of view, and without undue feelings or animus, and I hope the debate continues in that way.

I compliment the member for Frome on the example he has set in introducing the motion. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with him (nor does he expect me to do so), and I propose to say why I do not agree with him. I hope to be able to adopt the same moderate and temperate approach to it that he did. I agree with the opinion expressed by the Leader of the Opposition in speaking to this matter last week. As soon as the honourable member for Frome gave notice of this motion, I formed the opinion at once that this was a kite stuck up into the air to see which way the wind was blowing. I think that was a fair assessment. There is nothing wrong with that, of course, from the point of view of tactics, but it seemed to me to express some very deep indecision on the part of the Government, and it seemed also to be resorting to perhaps some slight evasion of what is a normal responsibility of the Government in introducing measures that contain a financial factor. I believe that the Government, after having considered the matter (as I have no doubt it did), should have come to a conclusion, as we did last year. Whether the conclusion is one that satisfies members or the public is another matter. However, I think it was up to the Government to come to a conclusion, and I do not think, therefore, that it has earned many marks in the public estimate by approaching the subject in this way.

Having said that, I want to address myself to the points the honourable member made. I think he made, for the most part, three main points. He said that all people should have an equal right to bet, and I think we agree that that was his first main general premise. His second point was that T.A.B. was not intended to increase betting, and that it was not expected to do so. His third point was that gambling as such was not unduly a cause of crime. The honourable member nods his head in acceptance that they were his three main points. I know there were others, but I want to address myself to those three points. Regarding the first point, the honourable member said:

Licensed betting shops do operate at Port Pirie, and have been operating since before the Second World War, and, to my knowledge, no attempt has been made by any organization to have them closed; but for the remainder of this State off-course betting is illegal for the general public. This state of affairs in itself is altogether wrong, because if it is legal for the people to bet in one town in the State it

should follow that the people who so desire should be able to make a legal bet in any town in the State.

Now, Sir, it has rather intrigued me that the legislation under which betting shops are established at Port Pirie has not been availed of by people in other towns throughout the State. I do not know why that is so. There has been no alteration to the law, and the provisions under which betting shops are established are available to every other town in the State if they care to avail themselves of them; and, indeed, at some stage during the discussion on this matter the public was reminded of that fact.

Mr. McKee: Quite a few towns have applied.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know of any applications that have been made recently, although there may have been some.

Mr. McKee: There have been; I know.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If any have been made, then I presume that, exercising its responsibility in this matter, the Betting Control Board will have examined the applications or is examining them.

Mr. McKee: It did examine them, and it knocked them back.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be. I well recall that many years ago the board toured, I think, most of the towns in the State, certainly those towns that had applied for licensed betting shops, and I attended some of the hearings of the board. This was long before I became involved in politics. I remember attending some hearings in the district in which I reside. I was President of a cricket association at that time, and I believe that I was asked by the association to give evidence regarding the proposal. But, Sir, the principle upon which the board was to work at that time (and I imagine it still works on that principle) was that if it could be established that it was in the public interest to license a betting shop in a town the board would issue a licence.

I should imagine that the board, as a gauge of public interest, investigates as well as it is able to and calls evidence from people interested in betting and bookmaking in the town. As witnesses, those people are protected: they are not involved in legal proceedings through disclosing their figures to the board. Indeed, how else does any commission get evidence except from people in the game? Commissions, whether Royal or otherwise, get evidence from people involved in illegal betting, so the board adopts a similar method. If a

public demand for betting shops in the town cannot be established, and if the people who are interested in establishing licensed betting facilities in the town do not come forward with evidence to satisfy the board—

Mr. McKee: Do you think there would be insufficient evidence in a place like Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know. The honourable member knows that town better than I do.

Mr. McKee: There are 20,000 people there.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Is the honourable member suggesting that the board has not given proper credence to the evidence placed before it?

Mr. McKee: I do not know how it arrived at that decision.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Perhaps the people interested in betting do not come forward with evidence, or if they do they cannot substantiate it. I have confidence in the board and in its consideration of these matters. If the evidence was forthcoming and the demand existed, the board would have licensed betting shops in other towns. It is always argued—and I am one who does not like betting shops—that we do not want to return to the position that existed in this State when betting shops were numerous in every country town. It has been suggested that this would be a retrograde step. That may be, but I am yet to be satisfied that T.A.B. within 10 years of beginning operations will be much of an improvement on the betting shops of pre-war days. I have seen a limited part of Victoria, and have been to New Zealand and inquired about this matter. I went into a number of T.A.B. premises in New Zealand and I have been in a few in Victoria, and, although at present they are comparatively new and well kept, the evidence of depreciation is there.

Mr. McKee: In what way?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: They are beginning to get untidy. In New Zealand one thing I did not like was that they were operated, for the most part, on a commission basis, as in Victoria. I spoke to the proprietors of several places (some were women, particularly in the smaller towns), and they devoted themselves to enlarging the business. It would be natural and legitimate for people who depended on T.A.B. for their livelihood to enlarge the business. However, with the normal depreciation, through the effluxion of time, of any building or any system, there will be a tendency for T.A.B. agencies, particularly in country towns, to depart from the

early high standard of conduct and maintenance to something much less attractive and more cause for concern. About two years ago I inspected one or two premises in country towns in Western Australia and I was impressed by the way they operated. Betting in Western Australia has always been something of a serious problem. In one country town on a Sunday morning, the betting shop was wide open with people doing business, and this rather staggered me.

I was attending a reception tendered to me by officials of the town, and I inquired about the small crowd gathered around a building close to the Roads Board office. I was informed that it was the betting shop. We should not kid ourselves that T.A.B. premises, particularly in remote parts of the State, will be better than were pre-war betting shops. The honourable members said that facilities for off-course betting should be available to all people in the State. He knows that in spite of the tremendous increases in the number of premises and in the turnover in Victoria, large areas of that State cannot be served by T.A.B. agencies. The number is increasing, but to say that all people can have the facilities is expressing a hope that is quite impracticable. It has been proved impracticable in densely populated countries like New Zealand, which has a population of 2,500,000 people in a small area.

The provisions for establishing betting shops in larger centres of population are still on our Statute Book and have been for many years. The honourable member also said that T.A.B. is not intended to increase betting. I do not know what it is intended to do, but I know what it does: I am convinced that these are pious hopes. I would not say cynical, because that is not a fair term and we are trying to be honest in our views and give credence to other people's honesty. The pious hope expressed by protagonists of T.A.B. is erroneous. The honourable member quoted figures from the T.A.B. authority in Victoria about the growth of turnover in that State. The figures are illuminating and from my point of view they are extremely ominous. In 1960-61 the total money invested was £1,442,638. This was part of the first year when it was only a skeleton system. In 1961-62 the turnover was £13,209,359; in the next year it almost doubled to £25,567,859; and in the following year it increased by about £14,000,000 to £39,110,366. At that stage I think the chairman of the board commented in his report that, although the figure had increased beyond all

expectations, it could not be expected that they would continue to increase at the same rate in the next few years. Here again, his expectations were considerably exceeded, because in the estimates for this year's operations, which report is not yet available to me, the turnover figure has increased from £39,000,000 to £56,000,000. This represents the greatest increase for any year, in spite of the fact that the chairman forecast that the rate of increase would decline. What will it be next year?

Mr. Casey: Did the chairman of the board actually say that?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think I read that in his report for last year, or perhaps the year before, but at any rate, if I have not quoted his exact words I apologize to him. I think the purport of the statement is quite correct. Indeed, I should think it would be natural for him to say that, because surely nobody would have expected such an increase to occur.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The chairman was referring to the transferring of illegal betting into legal channels.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, he was not saying that; he was speaking of the operations of his own organization. I come to the conclusion that the establishment of a T.A.B. facility, rather than tend to reduce the volume of betting will obviously increase it, but I shall develop this argument a little later on. I think the provision of T.A.B. is the same as feeding red meat to a tiger; we cannot reduce any well-established practice, whether it be good, bad or indifferent, by feeding it, making its existence comfortable, or by providing facilities for it that would seem to make it respectable.

Portion of the increase, of course, is due to the increased facilities that have been provided. The report that I have shows that at the end of 1963 there were 140 agencies functioning, of which 57 had been established in that year. Of these, it is interesting to note that 84 were established in the metropolitan area, five in the city proper, and 79 in the suburbs. The total established in the country was only 56.

Mr. Casey: I do not think we can comment on the city of Melbourne, because it is vastly different from Adelaide.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept that Melbourne is a big metropolis, but that is not the point concerning me. I assume that the prime function of T.A.B. is to provide a service for people who cannot have access to betting in the normal way. However, of the first 140 agencies established in Victoria 84 were in the Melbourne metropolis.

Mr. Casey: Do you think all the people in Melbourne could get on to a racecourse?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, and they would not wish to. After all, what is the sport of racing? Is it the sport of watching horses compete, or the sport of gambling? I think I can achieve some semblance of unanimity on this point, at any rate.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It is no different from the stock exchange.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Despite what the member for Frome says, I suggest that many more people would be inclined to go to a racecourse if the facilities for placing bets were not readily available near their back door. I have looked up certain attendance figures at the racecourse, but as they are not conclusive I do not think they serve my argument or that of the member for Frome. Perhaps we should leave them alone. A requisite for the successful establishment of T.A.B. appears to be, first, that we provide facilities and draw the major strength from establishments in the metropolitan area. Adelaide, as the member for Frome has rightly made the point, is a small metropolis compared with Melbourne, but with our four metropolitan courses (including Gawler) we are better catered for in terms of racing facilities than are Melbourne people.

Mr. Casey: But are the people any different?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not know, but the honourable member has said—and the member for Port Pirie made this a major point in his argument—that people should not be compelled to break the law to have a bet. We have four metropolitan racecourses, and I suggest that they do not have to do this; they can go to the course if they wish.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: If they do not go to bowls!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If I go to bowls, I cannot watch the cricket, so I cannot have it both ways.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: Some people want it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not see it that way.

Mr. Casey: By saying that, you are getting back to a police State.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If, as the motion suggests, we have T.A.B. similar to the system in Victoria, we shall start off by having at least 60 per cent of our agencies within the metropolitan area. That is the proportion in Victoria, although it is spreading outwards to the country now. However, the board's report of its activities for the last year states that an additional 60 agencies will be established, and that the ultimate total will be 280, which will be double the 1963 figure.

I cannot see any substance in the argument that the provision of T.A.B. does not tend to increase the betting habit in people; the figures do not suggest that to me. All I can say is that T.A.B. in Victoria seems to be like the bankrupt's fire—it is a roaring success. Many people have spoken about this subject and there have been many commissions and statements on it. Judge Martin, reporting on the possibility of a T.A.B. system in Victoria, said:

The disadvantage I envisage is that probably more people will bet and gambling will increase.

Well, this was a prophetic statement, for I have before me the 1964 annual report of the Victorian Totalizer Agency Board. In this report the chairman said:

Off-course investments totalled £40,593,788, an increase of £14,210,180 over the previous year.

I have already quoted those figures. He said, "The increase in turnover in the third full year of operation has exceeded expectations." The Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting in Victoria put it this way:

We believe the extension of the board's operation to off-course betting is likely to result in attracting fresh bettors and lead to a spread of the betting habit.

It is important to note that the evidence from Victoria given to the New South Wales Royal Commission on T.A.B. was that, of the bettors, 20 per cent did not bet at all previously. The third point made by the honourable member for Frome was that gambling was not, on his finding, a significant contributor to crime. He said that several church organizations had written to him stating their concern at the possibility of increased crime. He said:

Several church organizations have written to me stating their concern at the possibility of increased crime if T.A.B. were introduced. I do not think for one moment that anybody can foresee the future on this score, but I do know that in other countries, where the association between crime and gambling has been investigated, the evidence did not suggest that gambling was an important cause of crime.

In my research I cannot find any evidence to lead me to the same conclusion as that reached by the honourable member. I have a publication, which has much to say on the matter, and it draws attention to the relationship in the various States in the United States.

Mr. Casey: From what publication does the honourable member intend to quote?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: *Money, Mania and Morals*, by Lycurgus M. Starkey. He draws attention to the rather significant relationship between gambling and crime in various States of the U.S.A. He has much to say

about the State of Nevada which, as honourable members know, is the home of organized gambling of every form. He says:

The exceptionally high crime rate in the State of Nevada is to be explained by this social consequence of wide-open gambling. A recent report from the Federal Bureau of Investigation shows that the gambling States have a generally higher crime rate. The national rate is 1,052.8 offences per 100,000 population; for non-gambling States, 906.7; for gambling States, 1,756.3. Nevada leads the percentages with a report of 1,993.1, and as a city Reno tops them all with 3,061.1 offences per 100,000 population. Las Vegas is the second highest city in the United States with a percentage of 2,760.8.

Mr. Burke: That place attracts all the spielers and no-goods.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, that is the point I am making. It cannot be denied that wide-open gambling facilities draw all spielers and no-goods. That is my point, and I think that a history of criminology throughout the world would show a close relationship between gambling and crime.

Mr. Freebairn: Gambling in Nevada pays all the State taxes, doesn't it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be. If I had time I would deal with this matter. Nevada has serious problems about its revenue. Therefore, the proceeds of gambling, luxurious though they may appear, are lower than the revenue required by the State for legitimate State purposes. Mr. Starkey concludes:

The presence of criminal elements and powerful syndicates in the background of Nevada gambling is not due to official laxity. The fault lies with the business itself. It has always attracted the underworld and past experience clearly reflects that the racketeering and criminal element will always be prominently identified with the gambling business. I believe the statement about crime and gambling made by the honourable member for Frome was one of his most astonishing statements because it seems to me that the proof is so overwhelming and the force of gravity (if one could use that figure of speech) automatically provides that where these facilities are available, there will go the more doubtful characters of society. Dr. Soper (whose views I do not always agree with) is a person well versed in sociology and social problems. He says:

There have been Royal Commissions or Parliamentary Commissions set up to inquire into gambling as a possible ingredient in the fiscal system, and they have, with one accord, most assuredly had one unanimous verdict, and that is that wherever you have gambling, you will have corruption.

Finally, I shall deal with the question raised by the member for Ridley by way of interjection. He queried my figures for the increased turnover in Victoria suggesting that these were, in fact, transfers from illegal to legal sources. Here again I believe this is open to grave doubt. After all, this is an assumption, but it is not an assumption that one should lightly ignore, and I have tried to look at it objectively in an endeavour to see whether, perhaps, my biased opinion has led me astray.

It was stated by the member for Frome that it was computed that the volume of S.P. betting prior to the introduction of T.A.B. was about £250,000,000 turnover a year. I find that figure very hard to accept. I do not know what is the Victoria population, but I should think about 3,000,000 would be a generous estimate. When we consider that probably only a small percentage of these 3,000,000 people are in the habit of wagering to any extent, we see that a colossal number patronize S.P. bookmakers. However, for the purpose of this point I accept the figures, and what do we find? After four years of operation of T.A.B., the turnover, as shown in the report, is £50,000,000. The estimated alleged S.P. turnover is £250,000,000, so, even assuming a total transfer from illegal betting to legal betting, only one-fifth of the total figure is accounted for. I have come to the conclusion that, although some of it may represent a transfer, in view of the evidence I produced earlier when all is said and done T.A.B. has reached only one-fifth of the reported figure for S.P. betting. The argument relied on heavily this afternoon by the honourable member for Mitcham, was that the introduction of T.A.B. would largely eliminate S.P. betting.

In view of the figures which the honourable member for Frome himself used and which I accept for the purpose of this argument, I think we have to re-think on that matter. I do not think the argument is sound. There is a discrepancy somewhere, and there is a lie. I am not suggesting that any honourable member of this House told an untruth, but there is such a vast discrepancy between the T.A.B. turnover in Victoria and the alleged S.P. turnover before T.A.B. was introduced that I could not accept it as a transfer. If it is, it only touches the fringe of the S.P. problem in Victoria. We have heard it said that S.P. betting has been eliminated in Victoria and we have also heard that there are virtually no S.P. bookmakers. I agree with one honourable



member's statement that it does not matter what sort of legalized betting there is, there will also be S.P. betting. It is much more attractive from a financial point of view to deal with someone who does not have to pay 12½ per cent or more to the State and, in addition, the relationship that exists takes a good deal of breaking down. I do not agree with those people who rely on the argument that the establishment of T.A.B. will eliminate or go a long way towards eliminating S.P. betting.

I now turn to the principle of State involvement in this sort of legislation. The honourable member for Frome said that, in his view, Mr. Smith or Mr. Jones up the street thinks he has a perfect right to bet if he wants to do so, but the honourable member also says that Mr. Smith could not care less whether his neighbour bets or whether he bets illegally. If that is so, it is a heavy indictment of public morality. However, I do not believe that it is true. I think that there is ample evidence in this community, as in every other, that most people have a substantial concern for the welfare of their fellow creatures. That is evident from the responses to all sorts of worthy causes and the willingness of vast sections of the community to give all help possible to their fellow man in time of need. This evidences the widespread concern of the community as a whole for every member of it and I do not accept the honourable member's statement that we could not care less about what our neighbours do.

Even if some people could not care less (and I suppose there are some), we in this Parliament cannot adopt that attitude. I do not think we can responsibly say that we could not care less, and I am sure that we do not say that. I said at the outset that I give full marks to every honourable member for adopting an honest point of view and I know that honourable members do not accept lightly their responsibility to the community. I heard and read some comments on this aspect delivered at Maughan Church by the Rev. Mr. Vogt, a gentleman of the highest order and one who is respected by every person in South Australia. To my knowledge he has never expressed a view of a political nature on any matter and he has devoted his lifetime to the service of his fellow man. He dealt with the question of State involvement in these terms:

Now, there are two pressures upon the Government in this matter. One is the somewhat vocal pressure of public demand—although

for the most part the agitation is coming largely from those who through the racing game have a vested interest in the rake-off from proceeds for their respective clubs. The other rather specious attraction to Government is, of course, the potential of T.A.B. as a State revenue collector. Let's have a swift look at these two pressures. Short of a referendum it would be impossible to assess the measure of public demand for this proposed Bill. But, even if we presuppose a general public demand, a Government should measure such demand by the moral prerogatives of its charter to govern. It is true, of course, that a Government cannot reform the nation by act of Parliament—but it is equally true that no Government should count itself free to introduce legislation which legalizes what is ethically, and in this case, also economically, unsound.

We are also told that charities benefit from some of the profits from the systems and that other money is made available for Government projects and other purposes. Again, I refer to what the reverend gentleman said:

In the final analysis gambling produces no wealth. It merely distributes it from the hands of the many into the hands of the few—

Then he goes on to make the only statement I have known him to make on a political subject—

and I would remind our Government in the plainest terms that this is a violation of the fundamental principle and philosophy of the Labor Party. Gambling is private enterprise in a parasitic industry. It has about it all the accents of capitalism at its worst. State-controlled gambling is a repudiation of the basic principles of Socialism.

That is the Rev. Mr. Vogt's statement, not mine.

Mr. Shannon: It is a very fair assessment, nevertheless.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I said, I have known this gentleman for a long time and in that time, although I have heard and read what he has said, I have never known him to make a statement that indicated any political bias whatsoever. I think he would be the last person to want to introduce that aspect of it into the discussion. He concluded his statement in these words:

Gambling is a vested interest. It represents an ingredient in the community which is concerned not with the benefactions it can produce—or even with the service it can render—but with the profits it can make. What a paradox it would be for political historians to discuss if a Liberal Government, committed to private enterprise, refused this legislation—as indeed was the case—and a Labor Government, committed to the welfare society and the rejection of capitalism, were to introduce the T.A.B. Bill.

Mr. Casey: How does that explain that so many other States of Australia and so many

countries in the world favour a legalized form of off-course betting?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was quoting the reverend gentleman fairly fully.

Mr. Casey: But I am asking you to comment on his reasoning.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was dealing with the point that many people rationalize their attitude on this matter by adopting the view that they are assisting charity in some form.

Mr. Casey: That is only a small item.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is the reverend gentleman's approach to the argument, and I quote it for that purpose.

Mr. Casey: Do you agree with it entirely?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Not entirely but substantially. I believe this is an attempt on the part of certain vested interests to promote an evil in the guise of a public good in so far as it purports to remedy an illegal activity. It has been said to me a few times that I am guilty of rather a wowseryish approach to this matter as I have quoted extensively from church leaders, but, by sharp contrast with the promoters of gambling generally and T.A.B. particularly, church people have no vested interest in opposing it. On the contrary, they voluntarily, unselfishly and devotedly, because of the teachings and ideals that inspire them, try to pick up and rescue the derelicts of society, and they give their time, talents, energy, money and emotional energy for no reason other than the application of religious principles.

I am prepared to try to maintain in this community some of the standards that I believe have been largely responsible for the growth and development of this State over many years. We are greatly and constantly concerned to maintain and improve our standards of physical, dental, and mental health. We get all worked up (and rightly so) about a smelly drain or an unhygienic situation because we are so concerned not to expose ourselves or our children to the risk of attack or infection by diseases of the body. We take care to prevent accidents, and get worked up about the road toll, and so we should, but should we take no action to protect ourselves and our children from attack by moral disease? If I supported this motion I would feel guilty of deliberately exposing the community to a serious moral and social risk. Indeed, I would find myself guilty of assisting an attack on moral standards by giving this form of gambling the imprimatur of legality. Legality in this matter is not morality, and by giving organized gambling

the imprimatur of legality does not, in my view, alter its character. I believe the very respectability with which it can be clothed is a trap for the unwary.

This matter cannot be argued in isolation from the large issues involved. History is a record of nations that rose on high ideals and fell because of decay from within. We who in common with a vast majority of other citizens devote our time, energy and thought to promoting the welfare and development of the community dare not, by design or mere acquiescence, lend support to a proposal which has such a potential for moral decadence and which bequeaths such problems to our children and our grandchildren. We cannot afford that our most strenuous efforts to advance the public good in the material, medical, educational and international fields should be brought to nothing by reason of a lack of internal, corporate and individual self-discipline and that there should be consequent contemporary moral decay. This is not a matter for the day and it is not a matter for expediency; it is a matter for history. I hope the House will so regard it.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ELECTRICITY.

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

(For wording of motion, see page 717.)

(Continued from August 4. Page 823.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support this motion, the purpose of which is to ensure for South Australia in the future adequate supplies of fuel for our industries and our power-generating stations and at the same time see that our sources of power supplies are of such an economic nature and structure that we can compete favourably with other States in offering power to our industries at competitive rates. This matter is of such paramount importance that the Opposition is seeking a Royal Commission in the terms of this motion to inquire into all its aspects. The motion was put forward deliberately in a genuine and sincere attempt to safeguard and provide for our future development, employment and expansion.

This is a more serious matter than appears at first glance. Since 1954 the quantity of electricity generated in this State has increased by about 200 per cent. This is a staggering increase, and at this rate probably about 15 per cent more electricity will be generated each year. This means that year after year we shall be using more and more coal from Leigh

Creek for the Port Augusta power station, where about 42,000 tons of coal is being burned a week. This is no small quantity, and it will continue to rise year by year. In addition, the Osborne No. 1 and No. 2 stations are burning New South Wales coal and some oil, and the quantities used there will keep rising each year. I shall deal now with the Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta, with which you, Mr. Speaker, are so intimately connected, and I shall give details from the Electricity Trust's report of June 30, 1964, which is the latest available. The commissioning of the sixth boiler in October, 1963, and of the fourth 60,000-kilowatt turbine in March, 1964, have meant that the station has reached its full design capacity of 330,000 kilowatts. This means a terrific output at this station. Its total energy output was 15.7 per cent greater in 1964 than it was in the previous year, amounting to some three-quarters of the total requirements for the whole system. So it indicates the important part that the Thomas Playford Power Station at Port Augusta plays in the generating and reticulation system of the power supplies for South Australia and how vital it is to ensure that this station receives adequate supplies for the future, in addition to all the other generating capacity we have in other parts of the State, principally at Osborne.

The quantity of Leigh Creek coal used at the Port Augusta power stations has increased tremendously. In 1954, for instance, 332,365 tons of coal was burnt there in a year; in 1964, the last year for which figures are available, some 1,566,986 tons was burnt there. I cite these figures to illustrate as pointedly as I can the enormous increase in coal being burnt at Port Augusta, and the great amount of coal being taken out of the Leigh Creek coalfield. In my reckoning, this indicates that the reserves at Leigh Creek (which are extensive, I will admit) are being used up more and more rapidly year by year, and resources are naturally being depleted. We in this Parliament and people generally in South Australia are morally bound, I assert, to look for alternative sources of fuel to replace the present ones that are rapidly being run down. They will not last for ever, although we know that there are ample resources at the moment. The increasing consumption of coal year by year means that sooner or later our reserves will run down and we shall not be able to take sufficient quantities out of the Leigh Creek coalfield. There is an obligation upon this Parliament and the Government—in fact, upon

each honourable member of this House—to see that every avenue of providing an alternative and economic fuel source for our power stations is investigated. Of course, we have the opportunity of using more and more expensive imported coals and fuel oils, which could increase our power generating costs, or we can set up a commission to inquire into all aspects of supplies of fuel in this State. We can do either of these things: we can inquire not only into all sources now available but also into the new discoveries of natural gas that have been made in the north of this State. The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking on this motion a week or so ago, outlined the case fully. He highlighted capably the significance of recent developments and just what the position in South Australia could be in the near future. He reviewed the existing position, both in capacity of generating ability and in the sources of fuel, and he expounded at some length the possibilities of new fuel sources. So it was with considerable interest that we on this side of the House awaited the reply given by the Premier just two weeks ago. Frankly, we were a little disappointed at the reply because the very last sentence contained these words, which are particularly significant:

A Royal Commission will not be appointed as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition. That is significant and a direct negation of our plea on this side that a Royal Commission be set up. He left no doubt in our minds that the Government would not accede to the request that had been put forward sincerely by the Opposition. We believe it would be in the interest of South Australia. I only hope that this is not the Premier's last word upon this important subject.

Amongst other matters, the Premier stated in his obviously prepared statement that little or nothing had been done by the previous Government to attract natural gas to South Australia. That is not correct; in fact, it is far from the truth. I should like to put the record straight as far as I understand the position. The Premier on this occasion displayed an appalling lack of memory of just what did take place last year, because a great wealth of detail in a general way is contained in *Hansard*, both in statements to the House by the former Premier and in replies to many questions from honourable members on both sides of the House last year, including a number of questions from the then Leader of the Opposition. So the present Premier, having asked those questions, now displays an appalling lack of memory when he says that nothing was done last year. I

hope he will change his mind in this regard and that his statement that nothing was done last year does not indicate a lack of understanding of what really went on then or what is going on now.

The true position is that the previous Government took a close interest in the drilling at the Gidgealpa field. The then Premier and the then Minister of Mines paid several visits to the field. The Mines Department officers and the Director of Mines, for whom I have a high regard, co-operated closely with and followed the work of the Delhi-Taylor-Santos group, which was drilling on that field. Several conferences were held by the Government of the day with the company, and, furthermore, the previous Government managed to get an expert from Alberta in Canada to come to this State to advise it. This is stated in some detail in the *Hansard* reports of last year. His task was to look at the field and advise our Mines Department on the latest developments in oil and gas exploration, drilling work and the handling methods involved. These statements were made in the House and the information can be obtained from *Hansard* if any honourable member wishes to take the trouble to look it up.

Further, a feasibility survey was made last year, and early this year, and a market survey was undertaken. The Government saw these reports. In other words, all the preliminary work has been undertaken. In fact, discussions were held by Sir Thomas Playford and the Minister with the Delhi-Santos group, which was doing the drilling, and interested users. They were people who would be interested in using this product. There were also discussions with several international companies and bankers who were interested in the construction of a pipeline. Discussions were held on the best means of constructing a pipeline and the various means of financing such a undertaking. To suggest that little or nothing was done by the previous Government is completely misleading. I myself went to Gidgealpa, as other members did last year. I flew over two alternative proposed pipeline routes from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. I say all this to emphasize that much work had been undertaken by the companies concerned, with the co-operation of the former Minister of Mines and the Mines Department. Those two routes were set out to see, as an exercise, which would be the most economic and the most efficient to follow if gas were to come from the north of South Australia to Adelaide and places on the way.

I personally met some of the gentlemen who came from overseas. For instance, I met an oil expert, Mr. Otto Wetzels, who had been brought here from the United States of America by the drilling companies to conduct market researches and pipeline feasibility surveys. These have all been done, and the Government of the day was advised. The Electricity Trust of South Australia knew all of this, and it co-operated fully. Large industrial users in this State also were aware of it, and these matters were discussed with them. Yet, the present Premier says nothing about what was done. I regret that this statement was made by him, because it gives a completely false picture of the position as it existed up to the March election. What does appear to have happened, of course (and I regret to say this), is that the Leader of the Opposition gave notice of this motion on June 17 last, almost exactly two months ago and before the last adjournment of the House, and since then the present Government appears to have got very busy indeed and has initiated certain investigational undertakings. This is the first anybody else has heard of the investigations that are now going on. As I say, the Government seems to have busied itself on these investigations in order to get something done before this debate proceeded further. At least, the motion before us today has had a beneficial effect in that it has spurred the Government to take action.

I and other members on this side of the House will await with considerable interest the outcome of the recommendations of the experts that have been brought here to make this survey. All I want to say on the Premier's speech in this regard is that I thought the Leader of the Opposition very effectively corrected the Premier when we got on to the question of the mileage of pipelines. I do not want to delve into that matter now, but there was some controversy; the Leader of the Opposition gave one figure and the Premier disagreed with that, but the Leader in a subsequent debate (not on this subject but, I believe, on the Loan Estimates), quoted a world-wide authority to show that his figures were correct. The discovery of natural gas in the north of South Australia and in the Alice Springs area of the Northern Territory could benefit South Australia as a whole, for it would be invaluable to our future industries and would help raise the standard of living of our people. As I say, it is an alternate source of fuel, and this in itself is really important. It could relieve our utter

dependence in the future on imported fuels, which are New South Wales coal and overseas oil. Oil is either imported direct or it comes to this country in crude form and is treated here for re-use. The important point to consider is that natural gas is an alternate source of fuel. It is an extremely high quality fuel, being 1,000 British thermal unit strength, which is twice as high as that required by Statute in the metropolitan area today. Therefore, it is a very strong and rich gas. Also, it means that many industrial undertakings which today rely on imported fuels would have available to them an alternate source of cheap, economic fuel, which would allow expansion to occur and probably attract to this State industries that otherwise would not come here.

We must bear in mind that natural gas is being found in other parts of Australia, and industries will be attracted to the States that are making the effort to develop the resources for the benefit of the people there. We do not want to be caught napping. We do not want to be the last State to get it. We want to get in early so that we can attract industries here while we can. This product has a wide attraction and a wide use. In fact, it has a world-wide application, and it is being sought in many parts of the world outside Australia. It is recognized throughout the world (and I can quote authorities on this) as a very economical fuel indeed. In fact, 16 per cent of the world's energy consumption is supplied today by natural gas. In the U.S.A. alone some 31,000,000 homes and 100,000 industrial plants are powered, heated, or cooled by natural gas. It is an extremely strong competitor on economic grounds for coal and oil and furnace oil. In addition (and I know that the Minister of Works will appreciate this, seeing that he is a strong advocate for clean air), there is no smog with this product, and it is used in California for that very reason. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 7.30 p.m.*]

#### LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1074.)

Grand total, £36,964,000.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support the first line and, incidentally, every other line. One thing intrigues me about these debates on the Loan Estimates. We have a piece of cake in the form of the Loan Estimates, and however it is divided it must all come out of the one piece of cake.

Mr. Shannon: What about metwurst?

Mr. QUIRKE: It could be metwurst, and that would be more palatable to me than cake.

Mr. Jennings: It could be Farmers' Union cheese!

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes: apparently honourable members are getting the point. The total amount cannot be altered, but we can argue about which should be devoted to this, that or to something else. I know the difficulties associated with Loan Estimates and, therefore, I conclude that the Government has done its best in this matter. I have had a few crumbs from the cake or minute slices of the metwurst in the form of sufficient money to complete the Booborowie water supply, some to start the Burra water supply, and an amount to commence the drawings and so on for the new high school at Clare. I am satisfied with the share that has been given to my district. The people of Booborowie are grateful for the water supply, as they will receive Murray water from the Whyalla main. It will be a short time before that service is completed, but when it is, work will be transferred to Burra. This town has a reticulated water supply today, pumped from the old Bon Accord mine, but it is heavily mineralized. The atomic energy commission has overlooked the possibility of getting cheap heavy processed water from this source, as I am sure they could find some use for it.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: Like the Callington mine?

Mr. QUIRKE: These are mineral mines and the water is extremely hard. The Burra dry cleaning industry has to replace completely the service pipes, because of the electrolysis action between the copper and galvanized piping. After 12 months a 1in. pipe has a bore not exceeding  $\frac{1}{2}$ in. The people of Burra are delighted to know that they will get Murray water. The first proposal was to make a shandy of it with a mixture of Bon Accord and Murray waters, but I set my face against this, because the installation would be almost as expensive as it would be for Murray water. To debase the water supply in that way was not warranted. The Engineering and Water Supply Department appreciated my argument, and now a 10in. main is to be laid in the direction of Burra, to supply people *en route*. They are just two items on the Loan Estimates! The new high school is badly needed at Clare, but, frankly, I have told my constituents that I have not persisted with this project because, whilst the conditions in the primary school at Clare are difficult, the school

itself can cope with the situation with the out-buildings surrounding the original solid construction high school.

When the high school was built it was of solid construction and beautifully dressed stone, but we have never been able to afford such materials since, and wooden structures are now situated around that building. Although they are satisfactory from the point of view of educational facilities, they are unfortunately overcrowded. Most of the overcrowding has occurred in the primary school, but residents have accepted this position because, when the new high school is built, it is intended to use the existing high school for higher primary school grades and to accommodate the junior grades in the existing primary school building. The new two-storey high school will be of solid construction, and from the plans I have seen it will indeed be a fine building that will be greatly appreciated by people in the Clare district.

At one stage we could not even contemplate building a high school in Clare, because the necessary 25 acres of level land could not be obtained, land at Clare in the early stages having been heaped up considerably. However, I was instrumental in finding a suitable 25 acres of land, and the school will now be erected just out of the town on the road that runs to Blyth at a point easily accessible from the Main North Road, Blyth and other centres. This will ease congestion and create a minimum of traffic problems. I am indeed content with these lines on the Estimates.

It is regrettable, however, that intrusions have been made into this debate, such as the one made by the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan). I notice he is looking over towards me but I shall not say too much about him, except to mention a point that requires some elaboration. He complained that the Government was unable to undertake the full programme of works it had previously announced because it had received a certain legacy from the previous Government. However, he admits himself that every item of that legacy is worth while proceeding with.

Indeed, I should say that no Government had ever taken over from a previous Government with greater advantages than those accruing to the present Government. I think everybody will admit that. Nobody could complain about the conditions of the affairs of the State as they were handed over to the existing Government. The items mentioned by the member for Port Adelaide are necessary, important, and must be completed. The Attorney-General laid the blame for the lack of court

facilities at Salisbury on the previous Government. I believe this was quite unfair because many courthouses had been built and much money had been spent on the erection of courthouses, but Salisbury's turn had not arrived. But what caused the need for a courthouse in Salisbury? It was the rapid development of Salisbury, and that was part and parcel of the machinery of development initiated by the previous Government. That development is important to South Australia, and I do not think it is fair to say when contingencies, such as those I have mentioned, arise: blame the previous Government for it. If everything we have been blamed for not doing had been done, then something else would not have been done. Again, this is a matter of how you carve the cake.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: By the same token would the honourable member agree with the criticism that has come from his side?

Mr. QUIRKE: We are the Opposition and one of our duties is to oppose, and oppose fairly.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why do Opposition members jump up and blame me for the present situation at Salisbury when my predecessor had had a whole series of deputations about it and refused to make a decision?

Mr. QUIRKE: The Attorney-General was the first to introduce this grating sound when he blamed the previous Government for not building a courthouse there.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. QUIRKE: Words have no meaning if the Attorney-General did not say he blamed the Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The honourable member should quote my words instead of assigning to me something I did not say.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not want to misquote him, but the Attorney-General did lay the blame for lack of facilities on the previous Government.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I cannot be blamed for the lack of facilities and this is what Opposition members have been doing.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Attorney-General introduced the grating sound, and put sand in the bearings, as it were.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Opposition members blame me for there being no courthouse facilities at Salisbury.

Mr. QUIRKE: To my knowledge no member blames the Attorney-General for the lack of these facilities. How could anybody reasonably say that the Attorney-General is to blame

because there is no courthouse at Salisbury? The Attorney-General has not had time to do anything about it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Of course, they could not reasonably blame me, but they did.

Mr. QUIRKE: I cannot say that I have heard any member blame the Attorney-General for this.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Read the report of remarks made in the Upper House.

Mr. QUIRKE: Reading what happens in this House is a big enough task for me. The Attorney-General introduced the first criticism and any following criticism is consequential upon his.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense!

Mr. QUIRKE: The Attorney-General can call it nonsense but it is factual. I have no complaint about anything the Government is doing in the Loan Estimates. However, if honourable members on this side of the House think, in their wisdom, that more money should have been devoted to one work than to another then they are quite justified in saying so.

Mr. Clark: Have honourable members been serious when they said this?

Mr. QUIRKE: I hope so; I hope that every honourable member, when he makes a criticism, is serious. I say again that when this Government took over the affairs of the State they were in good condition in every particular.

Mr. Hudson: Apart from the fact of the deficit.

Mr. QUIRKE: That leads me to make an infallible forecast: that when the Government has been in office for 12 months, the debt charges of this State will be increased by £25,000,000 and the dead weight of debt charges will have increased by about £1,250,000, because that is the position in the order of things as they are today. We cannot escape that; it is inevitable.

Mr. Hudson: What is the solution?

Mr. QUIRKE: You are not going to catch me on that one, brother. I beg pardon that I called the honourable member a brother, but brotherly love and charity are things that I give away freely and I should like to say that the honourable member for Glenelg is my friend, but I have been seriously disappointed in the gentleman. He spoke on these Loan Estimates, and was as dry as dust. One could smell the old vellum from the university when he was talking—that musty, old, dry-as-dust smell. I am not criticizing his figures. They are as he has given them, but he never gave any solution to anything. Now he asks me for a solution and in all good time, God

willing, I shall give it to him, but I have yet to hear him make one statement that represented a solution. When we look at the position, we see that the former Government was in office for 25 years and, although they did not do certain things, they did achieve a lot.

When I was a Minister, I had a map prepared showing the reticulated water supply of South Australia. That map looked like a closely-drawn road map because of the number of mains shown on it. For instance, River Murray water is being taken to Woomera and it will be taken from Taillem Bend to Keith. Further, there is the duplication of the main to Whyalla. That main will still be under construction two years from now, but the project was initiated by the previous Government. The Keith main will bring into production some millions of acres of land that otherwise cannot carry permanent stocking because of the condition of the underground water supply. That main is under construction at present. The work is necessary and the present Government cannot cavil at that expenditure (and I do not say it has) without causing vast areas of land to be kept permanently out of production. Soon, one will be able to travel 800 miles by bitumen road from Ceduna to Mount Gambier. This ought to please the honourable member for Mount Gambier, because tourists from Eyre Peninsula will be able to travel in comfort to his city.

A network of bitumen roads crosses South Australia from north to south and east to west, covering thousands of miles, and that was achieved in the lifetime of the previous Government. What an easy win the present Government has! It does not have to construct these roads. Of course, it will have to complete lateral roads, like those between Auburn and Eudunda and between Burra and Clare, but the main arterial roads have been completed. Murray River water can be taken north or south to practically any watering point in this State. When the previous Government was in office the Myponga dam and the South Para reservoir were built. The latter has been altered to hold more water, and the capacity of the Mount Bold reservoir has been vastly increased. As the Government knows, a tunnel is being bored so as to take Murray water to the Happy Valley reservoir. This will be a bigger main than the one from Mannum to Adelaide. Had the Mannum-Adelaide main not been built, one can imagine the difficulty that Adelaide, with its population growth, would have been experiencing. If the other project is not

completed by 1970 there will still be difficulty. However, plans have been made and estimates prepared, and the work should be finished by 1970.

The number of public works completed in this State in the last 25 years is an achievement without parallel in Australia. When one looks in retrospect at this State 25 or 30 years ago, one sees that it was a primary producing area, and that engineering and all other types of industry were negligible. To provide for the expected growth, the long-range thinking was that power and water should be provided so that industries could operate. Water was taken to Whyalla, and now that low-grade ore is being treated there, which necessitates the use of vast quantities of water, another main is being built. Whyalla is expanding and will become a city of some magnitude. It is based upon a tremendous secondary industry of immense value not only to South Australia but to the whole of Australia.

All these things are the result of long-term planning, and the present Government will be carrying to fruition many projects which are still not completed but which were thought of years ago and commenced by the previous Government. Time and time again over the next three years or more Ministers will attend the opening of projects and will rub their hands and acclaim themselves. I may be mistaken, but I do not think any of the present Ministers when opening a project originated by the previous Government has said one word in recognition of the fact that it was started by the previous Government. Probably a Minister will open the Kangaroo Creek reservoir. The road there has been built, but unfortunately the rock faulting was such that the dam had to be re-designed and moved. However, the work, which is necessary for the State, will go on. The previous Government did all these things, and the present Government is extremely fortunate because of what was done.

Mr. Ryan: Your statement shows that you think this Government will be in office for many years.

Mr. QUIRKE: I said "three years".

Mr. Ryan: You said "or more".

Mr. QUIRKE: That may be so; I do not know. If the whisperings down the wind today in some quarters indicate what is going to happen, then three years may be the full length of the term of office of the present Government.

Mr. Ryan: Oh, no!

Mr. QUIRKE: That is right. After all, the people most concerned never hear criticism,

but somebody else does. I was never guilty of Party criticism. I am prepared to give honourable members opposite full credit for any worthwhile contribution to the economy of this State that they may make, but they will end their three-year term of office in exactly the same position as the previous Government ended its term. Over recent years there has been an addition of £25,000,000 (in round figures) to our public debt, and our debt charges have increased proportionately right through. We cannot alter that without heavily taxing the people. This is not entirely in the hands of the Government but, if it is going to increase taxation, it has already stripped about £1,000,000 from the users of water. In that respect, somebody asked the other day—and it keeps intruding itself upon us—"How much is for the worker?" From whom is the Government getting the £1,000,000 for the use of water? Some people have developed the habit of drinking water. One can become addicted to these things.

Mr. Shannon: There is no accounting for tastes.

Mr. QUIRKE: No, there is not, and there are other people who put water on gardens, and things like that. For the most part, the workers at Elizabeth will pay more for their water, and every time toilet facilities on LeFevre Peninsula are used people will pay more. I hope they do not start sparing the water in that direction. There are other things, too. In the policy or some other speech made by the Treasurer, he said he was going to get another £1,000,000 for the railways. There is only one way to do that. Last year the Railways Department was subsidized to the extent of £3,500,000.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: £4,000,000.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: No, £4,250,000.

The CHAIRMAN: Any advance on £4,250,000?

Mr. QUIRKE: The only way to get that amount down by £1,000,000 is by increasing freight rates and putting more freight on to the railways. If there is some mystic way of getting it down without taxation or without attacking road transport and diverting goods to the railways, what is it? An increase in freight rates directly hits the people who meet practically the full cost of railway traffic—the people in the country. How much of the £14,000,000 or so that the Railways Department gets in receipts is subscribed by city dwellers?

Mr. Jennings: But the £4,250,000 subsidy is almost exclusively for the country.



Mr. QUIRKE: It equalizes out. People in the city contribute and pay their share of the \$4,250,000.

Mr. Jennings: So long as you remember both sides.

Mr. QUIRKE: I do. I am always fair. If honourable members opposite tamper with the matter of freights on the railways, they will have to be careful how they tackle the problem. If they are not careful and they tamper with road transport in this State they will get into grievous trouble. In fact, if they go bull-headed into that problem I would be a bit surprised if they were in Government in three years' time. I mention a few items like this so that the members of the Government will be under no misapprehension as to where I think they stand.

I pose a problem for the honourable member for Glenelg and ask him to come up with an answer. Money has to be provided for housing. The question on which the honourable member could exercise his talents is: why is it necessary for a house on which an advance of £3,000 is made, repayable over 40 years, to cost £6,000? At the end of the 40 years the owner has a worn-out house for which he has paid £6,000, or more or less according to the amount of the deposit. He has a worn-out asset and I think that is severe.

Mr. Hudson: It is not necessarily true that he has a worn-out asset; it is more likely that the land has appreciated in value.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have some doubts about that. In a purely housing area, such as Elizabeth, the asset value would be the land value and not much more after 40 years.

Mr. Jennings: We will have to go to Alberta to get the answer.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member would not have to go there; a little mental exercise on his part would help. I remember the day when he came here and plaintively said, "Enfield town is falling down."

Mr. Jennings: It was, too.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and it will continue to fall down in some respects. I do not believe that houses for the family unit should be built like battle cruisers or fortresses and last for ever, because now the changing ideas in relation to houses will have rendered that sort of house obsolete long before 40 years. We should devise something for the people to meet that contingency. Members opposite like to call them "workers". That word is always a sort of mystic word to me, and, quite frankly, I do not know to whom members opposite refer when they use it.

Mr. Jennings: Everyone who works.

Mr. QUIRKE: A worker can be a man who gets £5,000 a year and who gets an ulcer when he is 35 because of the amount of work he does. A doctor is a worker, and so is a lawyer. Everyone who works is a worker.

Mr. Jennings: We have always said that.

Mr. QUIRKE: There seems to be a line of demarcation somewhere. When it is suggested here that houses be built in a certain place, someone asks, "How many will be for the workers?" Quite frankly I do not understand it. Why don't members opposite say whom they mean? Are they afraid of discrimination among the people they supposedly represent? It is an unfortunate word, and it is completely outmoded, although there was a time when it could be aptly applied to sections of society. I refer to the times of hobnailed boots and bowyangs. In these days of car parking difficulties, when the worker goes to work in a Holden car (and so he should), the term "worker" has changed, because now everyone is a worker. If a man is not a worker, then he is unemployable. It was stated in the press that there is a grave and almost dangerous shortage of nurses in country hospitals. On one occasion in the 32-bed hospital at Clare, which has an extremely high bed rate, were 31 patients, including mid cases and only one certificated sister, who was the matron. Volunteer workers are engaged in country hospitals, but they work only when it suits them, as they have to care for their own families.

To arrange a roster of work is difficult, but the Clare hospital would not be able to continue without that aid. Country hospitals employ probationer nurses who do two years of training and then leave to complete their training in a city hospital. That is all right but it means that inexperienced nurses are being used in country hospitals. As one leaves after two years a probationer takes her place, and this process continues. After completing their training the nurses do not return to the country. If the Government carries out its hospital building programme, without considering the staff problem, the buildings will become untenanted edifices. The time has come for us to commence the training of male nurses. It is done in other countries, and it is an admirable scheme. We retain the idea that only the female can be a nurse, which is entirely wrong. If 100 or 200 male nurses were properly trained they could ease the present position. It is obvious that it will always

be difficult to obtain a sufficient supply of female nurses. Male nurses can carry out any of the hospital duties for male patients as well as a female nurse can. Male nurses play a prominent part on the staff of hospitals throughout the world, so why should not we have them here?

Mr. Freebairn: Do you think the term "male nurse" discourages men from entering the profession?

Mr. QUIRKE: No. We have heard much about the red-blooded Australian he-man being criticized by a British viscount. It would be an honourable avocation. Why not encourage male nurses?

Mr. McKee: They did a good job during the war.

Mr. QUIRKE: Look at the magnificent work they did behind the lines! They even performed blood transfusions. This aspect should be seriously considered, and if I am off-side on the matter, I should like to know why. I see no other answer to the existing problem of shortage of nurses, particularly in relation to country hospitals. I do not think this next matter is *sub judice*, but a Royal Commission is now investigating the problem of wine grape prices. What I have to say will not impinge on the functioning of the Commission. Fermentation processes, such as the fermentation of sugar into alcohol in winemaking, are going ahead in leaps and bounds all over the world. Although we have only one small branch performing this type of research at the university, I think the time has arrived when we can make greater use of this process, and we should undertake further research in this field.

I shall read to members achievements that have occurred in other parts of the world, as well as some information on how they have come about. We know that one of the greatest food deficiencies in the world today is brought about by lack of protein. Protein is a necessary constituent for human existence, and indeed, I think the very meaning of the word is "first". Protein consists of many amino acids, and the different forms of protein consist of different qualities of amino acids. Part of the information I have here states:

The soy plant produces protein 100 times as fast as a bullock, and the torulopsis yeast (in commercial fermentation plants) produces protein 100 times as fast as the soy plant.

That theory was advanced by Professors Rainbow and Rose (Academic Press, 1965 *Developments in Industrial Biochemistry*).

Mr. Hudson: What line are you on now?

Mr. QUIRKE: Agriculture. I want honourable members to listen to this, because it is an answer to a big problem that exists in the world today. A bullock to the acre is, we think, the capacity of an average portion of land in the North and more so in the South-East, where lush pastures exist. Some applications of fermentation in industrial processes are the manufacture of foodstuffs, cheese, pickles and vinegar, and in food that is fermented there are plenty of yeast products. Honourable members know the importance of industrial acids such as citric, tartaric, lactic, fumaric, oxalic and so on. Then there are beverages such as wines, beers and spirits. There are solvents almost innumerable producing vitamins C and B<sub>12</sub>. There are antibiotics such as penicillin and tetra cyclins and fodder yeasts with high protein food supplements. Nearly all these things are made out of what are now waste products; enzymes, steroids and other industrial waste is utilized. For instance, there was publicity recently that one ton of black spent engine oil from the sump of cars will produce one ton of edible protein.

There are dietary supplements, such as algae, supplements which are now coming under increasing investigation. For example, from 3,000 lb. of starch, Abbott Laboratories in America produced just over 4½ tons of edible algae. The French Petrol Institute developed an industrial fermentation process for converting reduced paraffinic crudes into good quality protein. The Russian Institute of Spirit Production has given details for the use of sugar manufacturing residues to produce alcohol. Details have been given from Lithuania, Brazil and Japan, and other countries are taking it up where there is a close population density. *Developments in Industrial Microbiology No. 3* of 1962 states that to meet the calorific needs of the total world population in the form of potatoes (at the 1950 U.S.A. production/acre figures) would require only 600,000,000 acres planted to potatoes. This is 3 per cent of the estimated total of world arable land of 21 billion acres. Planting another 0.1 per cent of the world's arable land to extra potatoes and using fermentation processes this starch could be converted into enough protein to meet the world's theoretical protein requirements.

Those are interesting and startling figures and I want to apply them to the wine industry, which produces alcohol that has uses. The economy of it is as yet obscure and may be extremely difficult, but so is the position in the

wine industry today. Any process that will take surpluses in any form and convert them into useful products should be investigated even if the resultant product is a little uneconomic. In producing something like this and with no waste we could reclaim something which otherwise could be a surplus, and is now an extra charge on the Government in handling it. I think these matters can be looked at and they will assist in the re-orientation of our ideas in relation to primary production. That is because it does not matter how much we applaud our secondary industries (and they are worthy of the highest praise), we still get down to the fundamental facts that people must eat, must be clothed and must be housed. The products of primary production are used in these matters, and without an adequate supply of primary products, the whole thing falls flat on its face. Any increase in production, no matter how it is achieved from the various processes that could now be available, would be an added advantage to our internal economy, and we have to guard that in preference to any other influence on the economy.

We have an enormous imbalance of trade with America at present. Some people say that America takes up her dues by internal capitalization in Australia and that when she does, she enters our industries. Do not think that I am opposing that in its entirety; it is good, but I do not believe in giving the great weight of our production to American interests. I think we should always have a controlling interest to help us to avoid these bad balances that we have at present. I support the first line. There is no line that I see as yet with which I am in complete disagreement. Of course, like other honourable members, I think adjustments could have been made on some items, allocating a little more there and a little less here, but that is in the hands of the Government and if I was in the Government, I would want to handle my own destiny in my own way. However, the Government must not cavil at Opposition criticism of the lines, and I hope we have heard the last of that. I am afraid I am talking to the wind on that matter, but progress is not made on criticism alone, no matter from what side it comes. I hope that there has been some substance in my remarks. If there has been, I am grateful for any recognition Government members will give to the substance.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the first line of the Estimates. I might say that I am not too dissatisfied at all with the amount of Loan funds to be spent in my district this

year; in fact, I go further and say that I am very well satisfied. I find that the irrigation system at Cadell is to be completely renovated. This job has been outstanding for several years and I know that the decision will give much satisfaction to all settlers at Cadell.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Government has helped there.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and I am grateful for the help the Minister has given. I understand that he had to defer the work at Cadell for what was more urgent work at Renmark, but I am pleased the work at Cadell is now to be carried out. The new school at Saddleworth is almost completed and I look with pleasure to its opening, which, if it is not next month, I expect will certainly be in October. This is one of the new type of modular construction asbestos buildings, and is fully air-conditioned. Early in this debate the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) said that it was necessary in his climate to have solid construction buildings, but I think that this low-cost modern type of prefabricated structure with air-conditioning would do the job very well in his district just as well as in mine. I have inspected the school, which I think is of functional design, and I am sure the parents, teachers, and students will be satisfied with it. I believe this type of school is only at the experimental stage and that two or three others of this type are about to be built.

I was pleased that £20,000 had been allocated towards the construction of the Watervale water reticulation scheme. Like the project at Cadell, this scheme has been on the cards for several years. I know it has not been the fault of the Engineering and Water Supply Department or the previous Minister that the work has not been done; it has been due to the particular difficulties that have existed there. After several attempts to find a suitable bore site, a site about three or four miles from the town has now been established as the site for a satisfactory permanent bore. I understand that the salt content is reasonably low and although the output is not as great as the Minister would perhaps like I hope the bore will serve the township and the immediate district very well indeed.

I should like now to refer to a brief comment made by the Commonwealth Treasurer last night when he referred to State finances. I think this is relevant, as it indicates some of the problems we have to endure under the Commonwealth-States financial arrangement.

Mr. Holt said:

Payments to or for the States make up the largest item in the Budget. We estimate that this year they will reach £549,640,000—and this does not include anything for the support we may have to provide for Loan Council borrowing programmes. It amounts to an increase of £61,402,000 or 12.6 per cent over the payments made last year.

When we relate this to the Loan borrowings of about £295,000,000, we can see that the restrictions suffered in the State field no doubt force the States to be much more restrictive of public works expenditure than they would like to be. Although South Australia's share (£40,446,000) is only 13.71 per cent of the Commonwealth total, I think it speaks well for the efforts the previous Treasurer made in Canberra that we have been given this percentage when this State's population is only about 9 per cent or 10 per cent of the Commonwealth's total.

Mr. Hudson: It was reduced from 13.81 per cent a few years ago.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I want to continue and comment on a matter that I trust the Government will give careful attention to in the near future—the provision of a better type of railcar on country runs. I am anxious that a good country rail service be provided and, even though it may not get the patronage from the public that we should like it to, it is the duty of the Government to provide it. I am thinking in particular of a rail service in my own district, the Kapunda to Eudunda run. I was interested earlier in this debate to hear the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) comment on the Mount Gambier rail service. He believed that air-conditioning was not essential in railcars. I cannot agree that one can get adequate comfort in a sleeping car by tucking up a blanket about one's ears. A better type of railcar is necessary on some country runs. I recall a cold trip that I made to Mount Gambier several years ago in a sleeping car, which made an indelible impression on my mind; it certainly was cold. This sort of thing does not help our railway services to attract greater patronage.

Earlier this evening, by interjection, the Treasurer commented on future plans to lower the Railways Department's deficit. I suggest that the provision of better type railcars may help in reducing this deficit. I know that a new type of passenger rolling stock is envisaged by the Chief Mechanical Engineer but I understand that his present plans are that this improved type of railcar will not commence to be manufactured for some two or three

years. On the Kapunda-Eudunda-Freeling run, a very old type 75 car leaves Eudunda at 6.23 each morning and takes more than two hours to complete the run to Adelaide. The same train leaves Adelaide at 5.21 p.m. for the return journey. Certainly there is a Bluebird car on the Eudunda line, but it runs the wrong way and at the wrong time. It is a left-over from the co-ordinated service that we had to Morgan. It arrives at Eudunda about mid-morning and leaves for Adelaide at about noon—quite contrary to the type of rail service required on that run.

Some two months ago the Minister of Transport was good enough to receive a deputation introduced by myself and made up of representatives of the Eudunda, Kapunda and Freeling councils. Although the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne), who represents the district of Freeling, could not be present, she sent her apology and good wishes for the success of the deputation, the purpose of which was to ask for a better type of air-conditioned railcar service from Eudunda to Adelaide each morning, to return in the evening. The Minister of Transport said that his department proposed in the fullness of time to build a new type of car, not unlike the present type of 400 car now in use on suburban lines but with provision for longer country running, including toilets, luggage, accommodation, etc. The big fault with this new type of car, a fault that I think is unrealistic in present times, is that it will not have air-conditioning. I would suggest that air-conditioning nowadays has become relatively inexpensive and the Chief Mechanical Engineer and his staff at Islington would do very well to consider installing some form of low-cost air-conditioning in these cars, because I maintain that if air-conditioning is not provided these railcars will be obsolete as soon as they are put on the country runs. I hope that the member for Mount Gambier will give me some support in this matter.

Mr. Hall: Less money is available to the railways this year.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am cognizant of that, and I am sorry that is so. I hope the Treasurer, who has a special interest in the department, will give close attention to this matter of providing a better type railcar on country runs.

Mr. Hughes: Quite a substantial amount of that allocation is going to country services.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That may be so, but it is not going to provide this particular type of

railcar that I am so keen should be provided. I do not like to harp on this matter.

Mr. BURDON: You are not trying to steal a march on me in this matter, are you?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I realize that the Mount Gambier service needs to be improved. My colleague, the member for Victoria, has complained several times about the draughty train in which he has to travel twice a week. I understand that at the township of Hampden, one of the towns on the Eudunda-Adelaide run, the elevation above sea level of the railway station is only just below the level of Mount Lofty station, so the extremes of temperature endured by the passengers on that run can be very well imagined.

Mr. BURDON: You were not referring earlier to the Bluebird service to the South-East?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I accept that that service is a first-class one. I must say that we have a first-class Bluebird service from Hamley Bridge to Adelaide; I use it frequently myself, and I know just how luxurious and how excellent it is.

Mr. BURDON: We are complaining about the night service to the South-East; we think there should be an improved service, with air-conditioned carriages.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I agree most heartily.

Mr. BURDON: The sleepers are not too bad, if you pull a blanket up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I think perhaps the member for Mount Gambier is a much hardier soul than I am. The type of car I envisage is one that is perhaps not quite as luxurious as our outstandingly good Bluebird cars that I know so well, but it is essential that these new cars should be air-conditioned, fast and comfortable. I do not think that luxury as such is really required.

Mr. HALL: You won't get the passengers without air-conditioning.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Of course not. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased indeed to support the first line.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Mr. Chairman, everyone on this side of the Chamber was very happy with the change of Government and also with the work done by the Treasurer when he went along to the Loan Council meeting. I think the people of South Australia also are very happy with the efforts of the Treasurer and also the public servants who put together these Loan Estimates, which will be of great benefit to the people of South Australia. I consider that I have not been as fortunate as some honourable members in the allocation of the money available. I

heard the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) say that only £20,000 was to be spent in his area. I have had a good look through the Estimates and all I can find is something that I used to make often at cricket—an all-round score. I cannot find anything just at the moment that goes specifically to the district of Unley. I shall refer to a couple of matters that I hope will be favourably considered.

Mr. Freebairn: You should try being nice to the Treasurer.

Mr. LANGLEY: I hope I am, as we live near each other.

Mr. Hughes: In spite of what has been said by members opposite, it proves that money is being spent in country areas, doesn't it?

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, and our policy is to help as many people as we can. The member for Port Adelaide said that we could not go as far as we would like to go, but no doubt there will be improvements in the future. Members of the Opposition have been premature in their accusations, and in some of the things they have said. The Government has been in office for about five months and apparently is expected to do wonders, although the Opposition held office for about 30 years. I am sure that next time the Loan Estimates are introduced the Opposition will be able to criticize them fairly, whereas in the present circumstances they have not been able to do that. No matter what Government is elected, it takes some time for it to get accustomed to what is required. It is not easy when there is a change of Government, and it seems to me that the Opposition has carelessly criticized the Government.

I am sure that the next Loan Estimates will cover the works programme formulated by this Government. At present, the Government has had to continue work that has already been started and will soon be completed, but next time there will be new works introduced. I hope that, with this considerable programme of works to be carried out, residents of Unley will receive benefits not only for the next 12 months but for many years to come. This is part and parcel of our policy and will be carried out to the full. The honourable member for West Torrens referred to the £100,000 that the State Bank will be lending on old houses. Under this scheme, about 25 to 35 old houses in the Unley district could be purchased. They are fine dwellings, but the older people have moved out or have passed on and a younger brigade is gradually coming into the area. I am sure that any applicants in the Unley area for

assistance under this scheme will be favourably considered by the Treasurer.

Another progressive move, although outside my district, is the building of the Electrical and Radio Trades School, which will be of great benefit to the State. For many years the buildings in which these young men learned their trades have been below the required standard. These trainees have had to travel long distances, but the new building will be of great benefit to those learning these trades. This project has been mooted, and I am sure that it will be carried out as soon as possible. It will eventually provide more licensed electricians than we have had in the past, and the electrical trades will benefit greatly as a result. The radio and electrical field has not been severely affected by automation; all undertakings are not the same, and, in a State such as South Australia, which will rapidly develop in years to come, we shall need as many specialist tradesmen as we can get. The Attorney-General and I have often discussed in the House drainage problems affecting our districts.

I was pleased to see that £175,000 is provided for drainage work, apart from what is to be spent in connection with the south-western suburbs drainage scheme. Naturally, many metropolitan members are faced with similar drainage problems, because of water they receive from higher areas. In addition, I notice that £714,000 is provided for the Public Buildings Department in regard to "minor alterations, additions, grading and paving, fencing, drains and roadways". In view of the sum provided. I suppose many areas will not benefit by this provision, but I hope the Minister of Works will see fit to apportion some of it for work in the Unley district.

I know that the Unley City Council undertook about 12 months ago to commit itself on a pound-for-pound basis with the Government for certain work. Indeed, I should think most councils in the metropolitan area would be pleased to co-operate as much as possible in this regard. Drainage is always a major undertaking, but lack of it imposes a hardship on many people throughout the metropolitan area. Even Seacombe Gardens and surrounding areas are severely affected by water drainage from other areas. I hope that a start will be made this year to remedy some of the existing problems, especially those at North Unley, where people are in dire straits when heavy rains occur.

Mr. Hughes: They are on the receiving end!

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes, they are subjected to water that drains from Burnside, Beaumont, St. Georges and other elevated areas. Other areas may be as badly off as Unley, but conditions should improve now that councils have mutually formulated a plan to combat this problem. A futuristic view should be taken in these matters. Whilst dealing with the "Miscellaneous" line I should like to mention the old-established schools such as exist in my district, which need much maintenance work. Of course, those schools are not of the standard that has been set in schools in newer suburbs. However, Unley consists of a cosmopolitan section of the community, and many young people when first attending the school speak little English. These schools should receive the maintenance that is required, so that those students may have the best education possible. I am interested in the Parkside school, where 40 to 50 per cent of the students come from other countries. They have been well looked after by the Education Department. However, the drains, yard, and playing sections of the school are in a rather poor state, and in times of heavy rain parts of school grounds are covered with water. At present, water from the street drains runs into the school yard. This shows how much repair work is required. I hope work will be started at the school during this year to bring conditions to the required standard. It is great to see young Australians mixing with youngsters from other countries and the best way for them to mix is to play together, but this is curtailed at present because the school grounds are not up to standard.

I seem to be gradually losing schools from my district, but I am happy to say that as from the end of the present term the new Mitcham Girls Technical High School will take in students from the Unley Girls Technical School. This is a brand new school built on the site of the former Unley High School; it will be of value to the girls and give them a new lease of life. The Education Department has seen fit to send the teachers with the students. There is enough room for two schools to run at the same time and having the same teachers for the girls will be a great benefit. It will be helpful when examination time comes. Our inner suburban schools do not always have good ovals and playing fields, and the joining of these two schools will provide a golden opportunity for students to enjoy the physical culture and outdoor sport they require. I am sure we will hear much about these young ladies in the sporting field. It will be a great

benefit to them to have good facilities because there is nothing like playing the game, win or lose. If we have good areas in which to play we do not have an excuse if we lose. Like other members of the Government Party, and after having been in Opposition for three years, I am happy to support the first line.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): When the people of South Australia voted the Labor Party into office as the Government of this State in March of this year they did so, I am sure, in the expectation that the policy enunciated by the Treasurer in his election speech would enable South Australia's forward march to be continued, if not to increase the State's prosperity. I do not think the Loan programme indicates this, and nothing members on the other side have so far said to justify this claim alters the fact that in almost every item there is a reduction for the current financial year. The money appropriated for service pay introduced by the present Government had to come from somewhere, and I suggest there need not have been a deficit for 1964-65 if it had not been for this pay. I want to make it quite clear that I was not opposed to service pay or to the promise the Treasurer made in his policy speech. In fact, quite a few anomalies were brought forward by members on this side of the House which the Government undertook, during the debate on the service pay issue, to remedy later. Something had to go and some public works had to suffer. I suggest that is one of the contributory causes of the reduction in the funds available for these purposes in the Estimates. It is not a very imaginative document and it certainly does not encourage one to view the future with anticipation that we are in the hands of a "vigorous and dynamic Party" that for years, whilst in Opposition, told us what it would do once it was in office. In this debate other honourable members have dealt with many things that concern their districts. Before I do that I want to make one or two comments on a topic that is general to everyone.

I refer to the Railways Department. I am speaking of that neglected and forgotten public building, the Adelaide Railway Station. At some time or other all of us have to travel on or meet trains, or see people off, and provided we are not in too much of a hurry, we have the opportunity to look around and see the neglect that is so evident on what was once South Australia's most expensive public building. That was the position when it was erected during the time of Mr. Commissioner Webb—I think in the middle 1920's. I go to

the railway station from time to time and look with great regret at the way it is falling into neglect. One notices that the ceiling is badly in need of a decent spring clean, and that the place smells musty and dirty. I think it is a bad introduction to people visiting South Australia or passing through. People have to pass through Adelaide when they travel either to the east or west, or journey to the Northern Territory. If we wish to encourage people to travel we should overcome this extremely bad introduction to Adelaide.

I also wonder whether something can be done on the lower concourse to make it less draughty. Perhaps some kind of sliding door could be provided in order to keep out the cold winds that sweep through. There is literally no shelter from the wind in that portion of the station. Like all railway stations, the platforms are cold and windswept in winter, and fairly hot in summer, and I think that some ingenious person might be able to devise some form of door that could close off the lower concourse from the strong winds that blow in from the northern side.

I was recently at the railway station with someone making a booking and I was most impressed with the new Commonwealth and Western Australian booking offices. They are in the portion formerly occupied by the post office that has been transferred to Miller Anderson's arcade. This booking section is a most attractive place. It has been decorated in a contemporary manner and is air-conditioned and well-lighted. I am not sure if it is carpeted; I think it has one of the new type vinyl floorings, which are extremely good and most suitable for such a place. The Eastern States booking office is in keeping with the rest of the railway station. I suggest that something be done to bring it more into line with the booking offices that serve the Northern Territory and the Western Australian lines. The member for Torrens just suggested to me that this would be a good field for public relations. I was going to mention that, as we are trying to attract people to use our railways. We want to make them pay, and I think it would be in the interests of the department if a public relations officer were appointed to handle the whole matter of attracting the general public to the railways. I think it would be much more appropriate to have a public relations officer for this department than to have the officer appointed to the Ministry of Social Welfare. I make this suggestion to the Government because I

think it would pay off, as a properly trained public relations officer could do much to encourage more people to travel by rail.

In speaking of matters that relate to my district, I want to mention some public works recently completed or in the course of construction. I make a plea that in the smaller public buildings a more attractive style of architecture be used. The architects of our Public Buildings Department have designed some delightful buildings; some of our schools are amongst the finest public buildings in the State. However, a building in which I am personally interested (not because I have anything to do with the police but because it happens to be handy to my home) is the Burnside police station. It is situated in a very lovely part where there are beautiful gum trees and where for many years there was a combined residence and police station on the corner of Greenhill Road and what is now called Glynburn Road. The new police station completed there in the last 12 or 18 months was long-overdue and badly needed. The building is one of the ugliest I have ever seen the Public Buildings Department erect; it looks like a police cell block. The whole building looks for all the world as though it were such a block. It is poor designing, as the building should have been designed to fit into the landscape and be a thing of beauty. Unfortunately two beautiful trees were removed from the front of the police station, and there it stands stark and unlovely on one of our main district roads. I mention this because I think some of these smaller buildings, although functional and utilitarian, are certainly not beautiful.

Other buildings in the same category are in the group of houses being erected for the staff of the Boys' Training School at Magill, which fronts Glen Stuart Road. These are of rather an uninteresting concrete brick, and it is necessary to go through the garage to get to the front door. Although these may be utilitarian and serve the purpose for which they were built, I think they will not improve with age, and they are not the type of building that will make their occupants feel proud of them. Although, as I said earlier, I admire some of the fine schools and other buildings that have been erected, I think the smaller buildings leave much to be desired.

The other day the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) asked a question about the Adelaide women's gaol. I realize that the criminal element in the female sex is slight, and it is probably the reason why it has not

been considered really necessary to proceed with great haste with the building of a new women's gaol, but I remember that for some years now the land has been purchased and set aside for such a gaol. I know the inside of that gaol, but only as a visitor I hasten to add.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: The honourable member added that very quickly.

Mrs. STEELE: I did not want to give the wrong impression. But really the antiquity of the gaol has to be seen to be believed.

Mr. Shannon: I think that "antiquity" is rather too polite a word.

Mrs. STEELE: That may be so. When one sees the odd-shaped buildings with their arches, obviously not designed for the purpose for which they are being used, one realizes that women are being housed in poor conditions. I make the plea that the day may not be too far distant when our women prisoners, few though they may be, are housed in better conditions than at present. In these days when emphasis is placed on the rehabilitation of prisoners, I do not know how on earth one can ever expect to do a good job in rehabilitating women prisoners when it is done in the environs of the present women's gaol in Adelaide.

I want now to refer, as some other honourable members have referred, to our mental hospitals. As honourable members know, the Parkside Mental Hospital is within my electoral district. I have come to know it well over the years; in fact, I am a fairly frequent visitor there. The last occasion on which I visited it was some weeks ago when one of the Lions Clubs was holding a barbecue there. In passing, may I say what a magnificent job this organization, new to South Australia, is doing in the community in all sorts of ways. It is helping in a real way the many charitable organizations that function so well in our community. On this occasion I went to the opening of a barbecue given by one of the Lions Clubs—quite a new development in the rehabilitation of mental patients. The barbecue itself was in the form of a cross and could serve a tremendous number of patients. I forget how many dozen chops and sausages they told me could be cooked on this barbecue, but it was an outstanding structure set in a lovely area of the Parkside hospital. It was ringed with trees. The Lions Club had gone to the trouble of paving the area around it and many of the patients were there to enjoy the pleasures of the day, and they were getting real pleasure and deriving great benefit from associating with



visitors to the hospital. That was evident by the pleasure with which they greeted people. This attempt at rehabilitation work is playing a great part in bringing our mental patients back to normal health.

I noticed that a great many improvements had been effected at Parkside. On this year's Estimates is provision for a new kitchen to serve the hospital. I know that this is greatly overdue, because it has been pointed out to me on a number of previous occasions what a tremendous difference a central, properly planned kitchen could make for the hospital.

In passing, may I mention how delighted I am (and I know that many people who are interested in mental health and in people suffering from mental disabilities are also very pleased) that Dr. Shea, who was previously at Parkside, is returning to South Australia in January of next year to become the new Director of Mental Health. I had a letter from Dr. Shea yesterday in answer to one of mine that I had written congratulating him on his appointment and saying how much the people would look forward to his coming back. In his letter he said how delighted he was to have received the appointment and how fortunate he felt he was to continue in the footsteps of Professor Cramond and to build further on the wonderful foundations the professor had laid.

Mr. Chairman, I am fortunate, I feel, in respect to the Loan Estimates in the sum that is being spent on schools in the Burnside District. As honourable members know, it is one part of the metropolitan area that is growing very rapidly. The necessity for schools being very real, it is being met by the department in a practical manner. The new school at Athelstone is now occupied, and the work has commenced already on what is known as the Newton school. At this stage I want to point out something to the Government in the hope that it will make a correction. This new school, which has a frontage on to Montacute Road, is shown in the Loan Estimates as being the Newton school, but for the benefit of the Government and for those members who do not know this part of the metropolitan area very well, I want to point out that it is not in Newton and should never be called the Newton school. Indeed, it is in Hectorville North. Last Friday I was one of a group of people taken on an inspection of the Campbelltown municipality by the Mayor and his Councillors. We went around and saw all the recent developments that were taking place in this area, and on the second part of our programme

we went along to see the area that is being developed for the purpose of constructing this Newton school. The Town Clerk pointed out to me that this was wrong, that this was not Newton at all but Hectorville North. For the benefit of the Minister sitting opposite, I just want to point this out, because the people of the district who know it well are concerned that the department is giving it a wrong name, and they asked me to bring this to the notice of the Government so that it might be altered.

Mr. Shannon: Don't you think single names are more appropriate?

Mrs. STEELE: Yes, but the school is not in Newton.

Mr. Shannon: I don't think the name is very important, as long as we don't get to names like "Colonel Light Gardens Extension West", which you may remember.

Mrs. STEELE: I am pointing this out because I was asked to do so by the Mayor and Councillors of Campbelltown, who feel that it is a misnomer. Probably the member for Onkaparinga will recall that land was purchased for the building of a boys' home for the Children's Welfare Department, and that this was said to be at Hectorville. I think it is a case of Government officers perhaps getting the localities mixed up, because where the home for the Children's Welfare Department is to be located is actually Newton, and where the school is to be (which is known in departmental circles as Newton) is in fact Hectorville North. I suggest that this is something that could be looked at, because the people of the district think it is a bit of a joke that the Government departments are getting these various localities mixed up. Newton is an old part of the metropolitan area and was one of the earliest settled districts. Hectorville was named after one of the early residents. Perhaps the officers of the Education Department could rectify the situation to the satisfaction of the municipality of Campbelltown. I noticed that the new infants school at Stradbroke is to be proceeded with. This will be a great boon, as, in common with many schools, this school has had to seek extra timber frame classrooms. The parents committee is proud of the fine new school on the banks of Fourth Creek, and is anxious that the buildings shall be permanent so that it can develop the school to its fullest extent when the new infants school is completed.

A new wing is to be added to the Campbelltown High School at a cost of £90,000. One of the most rapidly expanding schools in the

metropolitan area, it is a fine school. It is situated in Playford Road so that its being a good school goes without saying. A triple-unit craft block is to be erected at the Norwood Boys Technical High School. This school is a most gracious building on Kensington Road, with a lovely background of magnificent gums, and has developed into a fine school indeed. Among its characteristics is a fine library, which some years ago was opened by Sir Shirley Jeffries, the Minister of Education when this land was purchased as a site for the Norwood Boys Technical High School. On speech night, when the school is open to visitors, it is always a great pleasure and most enlightening to visit the craft section, where adult education classes function, and to see the magnificent work carried out by various crafts under the skilled departmental instructors. I am proud to have this school within my district.

As did the honourable member for Light, I thank the Government for allocating these funds for use in the District of Burnside, because much money is being spent on schools and several public buildings. I am pleased that this is happening, because this is a rapidly expanding part of the eastern suburbs, and one that really needs all the public buildings that have been mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the current year. I support the first line.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I, too, support the first line, and, in doing so, I do not intend to abuse other honourable members who have said something about it. I listened with great interest last night to the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) when he was lauding the Government's generosity to the primary producers of this State. However, I am not so sure that the honourable member would be a particularly good judge in this respect. I do not know whether the honourable member realizes just what sum would be necessary as evidence of the Government's generosity, but—

Mr. Rodda: What kind of farmer is he?

Mr. FERGUSON: A Rundle Street farmer. I am aware the Government has a great responsibility in respect of land development, and the previous Government was always aware of this responsibility. If we are to keep up with the needs of this State in regard to primary production, we must pay more attention to further land development. We often hear comments to the effect that not much suitable land exists in South Australia that is not already developed, but I do not agree with that view. However,

I admit that better types of land are being developed and brought into production. We only have to travel through the State, particularly through the southern portion, to realize that much virgin scrub requires to be developed, particularly in the South-East. I believe, too, that an area of possibly 750,000 acres between Lameroo and Bordertown will eventually come into production.

Mr. Hall: There is an underground water supply there, too.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, good underground water supplies exist in the South-East, and we know that wherever we desire greater production, one essential is a good water supply. The southern part of Yorke Peninsula could well come into production, too, and the appropriate provision on the Loan Estimates would have greatly assisted development in that area.

Mr. Casey: How many acres there are you referring to?

Mr. FERGUSON: About 250,000 acres. The establishment of loading facilities at Giles Point would have greatly assisted development of this land. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon), when debating the the first line, mentioned "some port", but if the previous Government had remained in power I know that the project to which I have referred would certainly have come into existence. I am disappointed that no provision is made on the Estimates for this undertaking. I refer now to an article that was headlined in the *Advertiser* on December 15, 1964. It read:

New harbour to be made. A deep-water port is to be established on southern Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. Burdon: They said that about the the South-East once.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FERGUSON: The statement continues:

A State Government decision was announced yesterday by the Minister of Marine, Mr. Pearson.

That was on December 14, 1964. It went on to say:

The Public Works Committee recommended the proposal, estimated to cost in the vicinity of £844,000.

Mr. Casey: Would that have helped to develop that land on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula?

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. I have heard honourable members on this side refer to the many promises made by this Government, and members of the Government have always replied that they have not yet had time to

give effect to the promises prior to the last election. I remind the Government that here was one promise it could have honoured immediately. Once again, I remind the Government that it promised to establish deep-sea loading facilities at Giles Point, and I think that in case reference is not made again to what the Treasurer said in his policy speech, I ought to mention it tonight. He said:

The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost £100,000 or more must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee. Any that are already recommended will be proceeded with.

I think that if he had spoken the truth, he would have said, "One that is already recommended will be deferred." However, he assured the people of South Australia (and, thus, the people of southern Yorke Peninsula) that anything that had been recommended by the Public Works Committee would be proceeded with. If I understand the meaning of the word "proceeded", he meant that works would be put into effect. So, here was a ready-made proposition, one that had already been investigated by the Public Works Committee, and I am disappointed that some provision has not been made on the Loan Estimates at least to commence this project. I know that the Government will remind me that it has deferred this matter. It is continually doing that, but the project had the approval of the Government on December 14, 1964, and the Harbors Board was instructed to go ahead with working plans. This is what was said on December 14, 1964:

The Minister of Marine announced today that he had advised Mr. J. R. Ferguson the member for Yorke Peninsula, of the Public Works Committee's recommendation that bulk loading facilities should be constructed at Giles Point at an estimated cost of £844,000. In accordance with the Government's undertaking, steps will now be taken to give effect to the recommendation.

Mr. Hudson: Are you pleased with the new area school for Maitland?

Mr. FERGUSON: I will come to that in a moment. I heard the Leader of the Opposition say in this debate that he was concerned that it was necessary for further inspection in respect of another matter mentioned in these Loan Estimates. I am concerned that this Giles Point project has been deferred. The Minister of Agriculture informed me in conversation that the Government had been advised to defer providing these deep-sea facilities, and I could only infer that one of the interested parties would advise the Government in the

matter. I think all the interested parties gave evidence before the Public Works Committee, and it is hard for me to understand that although all the evidence given before that committee favoured establishing the port the project has had to be deferred. If there was some reason why it had to be deferred, why was it not produced in evidence before the Public Works Committee? This was a ready-made proposal that was promised not only by the previous Government but by this Government, and I, like the people of southern Yorke Peninsula, am disappointed that no provision is made for it in this year's Loan Estimates.

The only fishing haven for which provision is made this year is that to be provided at Edithburgh. I remind the Government that this was mentioned in the Loan Estimates last year. During the year I was informed by the Treasurer that Executive Council had provided for spending a certain sum of money on a jetty at Edithburgh for fishermen.

Mr. Burdon: Why was the money not spent if it appeared in the Loan Estimates?

Mr. FERGUSON: I will deal with that in my remarks about the new area school for Maitland. I am glad that provision is again made this year for that school. On several occasions I asked when tenders would be called. In the first instance I was advised that they would be called last April, and the second time I was advised that they would be called at the end of July or the beginning of August. However, the latest report is that the Public Buildings Department has advised that it will be ready for tenders to be called in October but that tenders will be called according to priority and the availability of funds.

Mr. Heaslip: Has that been deferred too?

Mr. FERGUSON: We will see about that later. I shall refer now to priorities. When I was first elected to this Parliament the construction of an area school at Maitland was to be investigated by the Public Works Committee. When I asked what priority it would have, I was assured that it would have a high priority. I trust that calling tenders for the school will not be delayed. Knowing that the priority is high but not knowing anything about the availability of funds, I hope that provision will be made this year for the work to commence.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I listened a little while ago to the remarks of the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) when he expressed his appreciation to the Government for treating him and his district so

magnanimously in the Loan Estimates. I fear that I am not able to say anything similar because, looking through the Loan Estimates, I find that my own electoral district is very poorly treated. Indeed, the only lines that I can find of interest to my own electoral district are one providing £40,000 under "Warren Water District" for the improvement of the Angaston water supply, and one dealing with a courthouse to be built at Tanunda. Both these items had been looked into by the previous Government, to which I had made representations, and I had been assured that this work would be proceeded with during this financial year.

However, I draw the Treasurer's attention to his sins of omission in the Loan Estimates and shall deal with two or three matters that concern my electoral district. I trust that the matters to which I shall refer will receive favourable consideration in next year's Loan Estimates. I have already mentioned an item of £40,000, appearing under "Warren Water District", for the improvement of the Angaston water supply where the pressures have been poor, particularly in the summer months, for some years past. It is well known by country members that a large part of my electoral district depends entirely on the Warren reservoir for its water supply. This reservoir was completed in 1916 and is probably the highest reservoir in this State, being 1,273ft. above sea level and therefore having a commanding position. Its water can, of course, gravitate far and wide and into two other reservoirs at a lower level—the South Para and the Barossa reservoirs, which meet the requirements of a thickly populated area close to the metropolitan area—the district of Elizabeth. So at various times in the past, if the supply in the other two reservoirs to which I have referred was insufficient to meet the requirements of those thickly populated areas and if there was sufficient water in the Warren reservoir, some of that water was used to meet the requirements of the areas served by the Barossa and South Para reservoirs.

In 1926 the wall of the Warren reservoir was raised 4ft. 6in., so that its capacity was increased from 1,049,000,000 gallons to 1,401,000,000 gallons. In 1946 I advocated in this Chamber that its height be raised a further 10ft., as a result of which the capacity would have been doubled; but since then the South Para reservoir, at a lower elevation than the Warren, has been constructed and the overflow from the Warren now goes into the South Para reservoir.

By 1953 a total of 115 miles of main extended from the Warren reservoir through the Barossa Valley right through to the Paskeville or Upper Wakefield service reservoir, and in that year when the investigation was made by the Public Works Committee into the advisability of enlarging the trunk main from the Warren reservoir and of linking it up with the Mannum-Adelaide main, and also as to whether the Upper Wakefield service reservoir should be enlarged from 10,000,000 to 40,000,000gall. capacity, the recommendations which the committee made were favourable for these works to be undertaken.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that my constituents, particularly in the Barossa Valley, were jubilant when the recommendations were made and when the previous Government gave effect to those recommendations. The main was enlarged and the Warren reservoir was connected by main with the Mannum-Adelaide main, enabling water to be diverted from the Mannum-Adelaide main into the Warren reservoir, particularly in those months of the year when it was badly wanted and when there was a meagre supply in the reservoir itself. This linking of the Warren reservoir with the Mannum-Adelaide main and the enlarging of the Warren main has saved the situation in the Barossa Valley on many occasions since about 1961 when the work was completed. Water restrictions were no longer necessary, there being a plentiful supply for householders, residents and also market gardeners.

Now, Sir, what I want to refer to briefly is the necessity for the supplies to the district which I represent to be further safeguarded in the future, because the population of the area is increasing, particularly in the Barossa Valley. The three major towns of Nuriootpa, Angaston and Tanunda are gradually merging into one another, and the increase in population there and in the areas further north will necessitate increased supplies of water in the next few years, particularly after the year 1969 when it is felt that additional supplies will be required. I have figures to show that consumption of Warren water has been increasing rapidly since the new main was completed in 1961. In 1931-32 the consumption of water from the Warren reservoir was 158,591,000gall.; in the year 1949-50 it had risen to 373,015,000gall.; in 1961-62 it was 1,288,000,000gall.; and for the year 1963-64 it had increased to 1,501,000,000gall. If this rate of consumption increases, additional supplies will be required in the future.

In the policy speech by Sir Thomas Playford in February of this year, he stated that his Government, if returned, would provide a new main from Swan Reach on the Murray River to Warren, to be commenced early in 1966 and completed in 1969. He stated that this main would serve the northern end of the Murray Plains and relieve the Mannum-Adelaide trunk main of the need to augment the Warren system. My constituents were jubilant when they heard this reference, and expected that if the then Government was returned, the work would start in 1966 and be completed by 1969. For that to be done, however, some reference would have had to be made in this year's Loan Estimates. I am mindful that, prior to the last election, the Labor Party in print and by word of mouth stated on many occasions that what the Liberal Party could do, the Labor Party could do better. Therefore, I suggest that if the former Liberal Government could provide this scheme as outlined in the then Premier's speech, the present Government should give favourable consideration to putting it into effect.

Mr. Jennings: What main is that?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: From the River Murray at Swan Reach to Warren. Perhaps the Government may consider this project and make some provision for it in next year's Loan Estimates, as nothing is provided this year.

Mr. Hudson: This is to the Warren reservoir, which is about 1,200ft. above sea level?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yes. I am not certain whether it was intended that the main was to be connected with the Warren main in the Barossa Valley, or go direct to the Warren reservoir, but it was a link-up with the Warren system.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was actually both.

Mr. Hudson: What would be the additional cost of pumping the water with the extra height of the reservoir?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that the project was to cost £4,000,000.

Mr. Hudson: What about the running costs of pumping every day?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The point I wish to make is that the project, while beneficial to the Barossa Valley and the country districts to which I have referred, would serve a dual purpose. It would have been a tremendous advantage to the metropolitan area, as it would have obviated the need to divert water from the Mannum-Adelaide main into the Warren reservoir, which has taken place for some years. As the

Minister of Works said today, in reply to my question, since the end of July 33,000,000 gallons weekly have been pumped into the Warren reservoir from the Mannum-Adelaide main. This has happened in the past few years, particularly when we have had a dry summer or a dry autumn, and it became necessary to pump larger quantities of water into the Warren reservoir. If this scheme were implemented, a greater quantity of water would be available from the Mannum-Adelaide main. In fact, all the water pumped through that main could be used in the metropolitan area, and the requirements of the areas served by the Warren reservoir could be met by the water flowing into the reservoir from its watershed, and by the water that would be pumped into the Warren mains from Swan Reach.

The Warren reservoir has for many years served not only the Barossa Valley and areas north of it but it also serves Yorke Peninsula from the Upper Wakefield service reservoir. Water can be reticulated right down to Edithburgh, so that the length and breadth of the peninsula can benefit. As I mentioned earlier, with the increasing population in all those districts greater supplies will be required after 1969. I understand that the metropolitan supplies will be fairly adequate until that year, when further supplies will have to be sought. Last year, I think, mention was made that a main would be necessary some time in the future from Murray Bridge to Hahndorf to meet the additional requirements of the metropolitan area after 1969. It was mentioned, too, that such a scheme would cost about £12,000,000.

Assuming that the Swan Reach to Warren reservoir project were implemented without delay, the Murray Bridge to Hahndorf project considered by the previous Government (and no doubt it will be considered by the present Government) could be delayed for a number of years. This in itself would effect a saving in interest payments of about £600,000 a year. In the meantime, of course, once the main from Swan Reach to the Warren reservoir were constructed the water at present being diverted from the Mannum-Adelaide main could be used solely for the metropolitan area's requirements. For some years past both the present Minister of Agriculture and I have advocated a scheme to meet requirements of the Murray Plains, particularly in the Sedan and Cambrai areas in my district. Certain plans were considered by the previous Minister of Works, but, unfortunately, the scheme required by the districts

concerned was rather ambitious and involved a prohibitive cost. I understand that there has been some pruning of the scheme by the councils at Sedan, Marne and Mannum. A revised scheme was considered by the previous Minister and is now being considered by the present Minister. I understand that revenue statements are being prepared to see whether this revised scheme can be submitted to the Public Works Committee in due course for its recommendations.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I think the honourable member will agree that the Swan Reach to Warren main must come within the foreseeable future, in any case.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As I said, I think it is necessary in the interests of the areas to which I have referred. I do not know from what other source they will be able to draw supplies in future. The Murray Plains areas, which have been asking for supplies for some years past, could have drawn their supplies from the Swan Reach to Warren main, because it would have traversed the northern portions of that area.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: What about the people around Milendella?

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: They are in close proximity to the Mannum-Adelaide main and, no doubt a small scheme could be evolved to meet their requirements. However, it was envisaged that the large areas like Cambrai and Sedan would be supplied from the Swan Reach main.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That is what the Milendella people wanted in the first place, but they were compelled to come in on the larger scheme, and have been penalized ever since.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I am sorry that progress has not been made with the scheme up to now. I would have been pleased to see a line on the Estimates, because that would have assured a supply to people in my district. I sincerely ask the Minister of Works to look at this matter to see whether effect can be given to the Swan Reach-Warren scheme. It has to come sooner or later, and the sooner the better for the districts concerned. I greatly appreciate the extensions made since the Warren link up with the Adelaide-Mannum main, and since the enlargement of the Warren trunk main. A number of valuable extensions have been made in the rural areas of my district. However, further requests have been made and it will be impossible to meet them unless supplies of water to the Warren are increased from one source or another.

I refer now to the Nuriootpa High School. I am sorry that the Minister of Education is not in the House but I have discussed the matter with him. This school was completed in 1937. At the time the School attendance was slightly over 100. The building was a fine edifice of stone of which the people in the district were extremely proud. It was situated at that time on 10 acres of land. The number of students has increased over the years until at present the attendance is about 750. It is expected that by next year the number will be 800. Since 1937 numerous timber structures have been erected on the school grounds to provide additional classrooms, in spite of the fact that since the beginning of the Second World War the school council was frequently told that a solid construction building would be erected to replace the numerous wooden classrooms.

At present the school consists of 20 classrooms, of which two are of solid construction and 18 of timber. Three laboratories, one commercial room, two art rooms, two craft rooms, and a library are of timber construction. I understand that another classroom is being built and that it is also a timber structure. I am a member of the school council and understand that the headmaster has made a request for four or five additional classrooms to meet the position likely to arise next year. That is because of the present overcrowding and the expected increases in the number of scholars.

The residents of my district consider that the temporary wooden buildings are not in keeping with the general standard of the residential areas adjoining the school. At one time the parents and friends association, the school council, the staff and the pupils were exceptionally proud of their school. However, with more and more temporary timber classrooms being erected they now consider their school is not in harmony with the solid construction buildings of the district. I point out that a few years ago the organizations mentioned were responsible for the building of a solid construction assembly hall at a cost of about £10,000. With the exception of the ablution block in that building, the entire cost was met by the organizations mentioned. They did a tremendous job. The previous Minister of Education (the Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson), who was asked to declare the assembly hall open in 1961, pointed out that a solid construction building, meaning a high school, would be a great asset and stated that plans for such a building were under consideration. That is borne out by the fact that Appendix I of the Loan Estimates for 1960-61 referred to

additions to the high school at an estimated cost of £75,000, to be designed during 1960-61. On October 3, 1962, I asked a question in this Chamber (reported at page 1222 of *Hansard*) in which I referred to the need for additional accommodation and a solid construction building. The then Minister replied that a report had been received from the Minister of Education that stated:

The Secretary of the Public Buildings Department reports that preliminary sketch plans for this work were prepared in June, 1961. As it is considered that these additions are not as urgent as many others, no further work has been done on these sketch plans. It is not possible at this stage to say when the buildings will be erected. The claims of this school will be considered with those of all other schools when the next building programme is being further considered.

Following that, I introduced a deputation to the then Minister of Education on January 24, 1963. On March 1, 1963, the secretary of the high school council wrote a letter to the Minister in which he said:

We feel it is most necessary that the building at the school be treated as urgent, and ask for this venture to be put on the Estimates for Cabinet, for at least the year 1964-65, or preferably this year. Failing your department not seeing fit to be able to construct the whole building as originally thought of on the Estimates, may we suggest that part of, say accommodation for 200 scholars plus amenities, be put on the Estimates for this year. We fully realise the growing necessity for new schools, but too feel that older schools, which have grown beyond all proportion, should not be neglected when it comes to erection of permanent buildings. This council regards our submission as extremely urgent, and looks forward to a favourable reply.

The Minister's reply to me on March 28 was:

I refer to the deputation concerning permanent additions for the Nuriootpa High School which you introduced to me on January 24, 1963, and to a letter dated March 1, 1963, on the same subject which I received from the secretary of the high school council. I have given this matter my careful consideration after receiving a report from the Deputy Director of Education, and have to advise that a decision on this request for inclusion in the 1963-64 Loan works programme will depend on the availability of funds after the much more urgent needs of a number of other schools have been met. Details of the programme, of course, will be announced in due course in Parliament.

A second deputation was introduced by me to the then Minister of Education on January 23, 1964, but the deputation did not get much further and the Minister did not indicate anything definite about the building programme. A third deputation was introduced by me on March 17, 1964, to the then Premier (Sir

Thomas Playford), who indicated that he would confer with the Minister of Education. On September 2, 1964, I asked another question in this Chamber about the matter. I received the following reply from the then Minister of Education:

The honourable member introduced two deputations to me and I understand he has also approached the Premier on this matter. As a result, Cabinet has authorized the preparation of sketch plans and estimates of costs for new solid construction buildings for the Nuriootpa High School in accordance with a schedule of requirements drawn up by the Education Department. When these plans and estimates have been completed the proposed work will be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee for investigation and report. . . . It is proposed that the new solid construction buildings should be of two or three storeys of compact design to accommodate about 750 students. This will enable the removal and replacement of the wooden buildings and thus greatly increase the recreation space and make for greater efficiency in the functioning of the school.

I again took the matter up with the then Minister of Education in February, 1965, and on February 22, 1965, I received a letter from the Minister, which quoted a report received by him from the Deputy Director of Education, portion of which reads as follows:

Because of the rapidly rising costs of construction of new schools of all types which has been estimated at approximately 15 per cent in the last 18 months, and because of your direction that the cost of new secondary schools should be kept below £500,000, I requested the Director, Public Buildings Department, some months ago to prepare preliminary sketch plans and estimates of the cost of a series of new high schools on the basis of a schedule of requirements submitted by this department with the object of determining whether, by adopting different methods of construction, the cost could be kept below £500,000. Murray Bridge High School was chosen as a prototype because it was the most representative. The design of the other schools in the group would be based on that of the prototype. . . . As soon as the design of a standard prototype is agreed upon, work can go ahead on this and other similar projects.

It is clear from the information that I have placed before the Committee that the previous Minister of Education had indicated that he was prepared to go ahead with the replacing of the wooden classrooms on the Nuriootpa High School grounds by a solid construction building. When there was a change of Government in March of this year, I considered it desirable to acquaint the present Minister of Education with what had been going on in the past years as regards the proposal for a new solid construction building at the school.

I arranged for a deputation to meet him on August 4 of this year—only a few weeks ago—and I am pleased to be able to say that, in answer to a question that was directed to him only last week, the Minister was able to inform me that plans for the new additions in solid construction were approaching completion. I add that I sincerely hope that the plans, having reached this stage of nearing completion, will be given effect to soon and that we shall see in next year's Loan Estimates a line dealing with a new solid construction building on the Nuriootpa High School grounds, because for many years past the people in that district have been waiting for such a building to be erected. I earnestly hope that if it becomes necessary to submit the proposal to the Public Works Committee no time will be lost in so referring it, with a view to a favourable recommendation, and that the school will be built as soon as possible.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I refer to another matter concerning the Education Department, and this time it relates to the Nuriootpa Primary School. On May 20 of this year I directed a question to the Minister of Education, pointing out that the Nuriootpa Primary School was situated on about 2½ acres of land, that it was hemmed in, and that there was no room for expansion. The 331 scholars there have insufficient playing area. I also pointed out that about 15 years ago the department acquired about seven or eight acres at another locality in Nuriootpa on which to build a new primary school at some future time. I know that contact has been made by the school committee with the Director of Education. A letter was forwarded on April 12 this year by the secretary of the school committee to the Director, and the relevant part states:

The classrooms, administrative rooms and amenities are a series of separate units of diverse construction, making for considerable inconvenience to the staff and complicating the administration of the school as a unit. The only assembly area at present is an outside bituminized area. There is no covered area nor assembly hall where indoor assemblies can be held. The amenities for the staff are primitive, with the staff room an old stone classroom with little comfort or convenience. The headmaster's office is reached through a galvanized iron porch, and the office itself is scarcely satisfactory, since only a thin wooden partition divides it from a makeshift store-room, features which impress neither parents nor visitors. The toilet blocks are widely separated from the classrooms, an important consideration, especially in winter time. In short, the present primary school at Nuriootpa is a hotch potch of buildings spread over a relatively small area in such a way as to minimize the space available as play ground.

If scholars wish to play sport on an area more roomy than their own playing area they have to go to the oval situated on the Nuriootpa recreation park, over half a mile away. Also, a traffic hazard is attached to this because to get there is it necessary to cross the Sturt Highway.

The land acquired by the department 15 years ago is adjacent to a swimming pool and close to the Nuriootpa park, which has an oval, six tennis courts and two basketball courts. I consider that the time has arrived when favourable consideration should be given by the Minister of Education to the erection of a new primary school on more commodious grounds than the present area, and that this should be on the land that was acquired 15 years ago. In contrast to the present Nuriootpa Primary School is the one at Evanston that was inspected recently by the school committee. This school has an enrolment of about 330, almost the same as at the Nuriootpa Primary School, but the oval at Evanston has a greater area than the entire playing ground and all the school buildings at the Nuriootpa school. I trust that favourable consideration will be given by the Minister of Education to both my requests relating to the Nuriootpa High School and the Nuriootpa Primary School. I should like to refer to several other matters about my district, but at this hour I content myself with supporting the first line of the Loan Estimates.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I address myself briefly to the first line, which I support. The honourable member for Gawler suggested that I should say something about what I saw as an observer at the Loan Council meeting. Before doing so, I am reminded that the honourable member for Flinders said that we in this Chamber were playing different roles on this occasion. The people who had spoken so many times for the Government were now speaking as the Opposition, and *vice versa*, and we were all seeing the picture differently. I am deeply grateful for the fair and reasonable way that the honourable member for Flinders has dealt with the subject matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the departments under my control. He has been most helpful and encouraging since I have been in the Ministry. The honourable member for Burra was reasonable, as were other members who have spoken. He referred to the cutting up of the cake. No-one regrets more than I do what has to be done. Cabinet endorses my regret that more money is not available for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. We realize that the allocation for this year is about



£1,500,000 less than could be spent during the current year. This will make it difficult for the department to carry out essential works. The comments made about the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department, and the Harbors Board will be examined, and I assure the Committee that honest endeavours will be made to put an effective programme into operation. It was an unfortunate suggestion that the Treasurer had not done his best at the Loan Council meeting. In relating what I saw as an observer, I emphasize my admiration for the Treasurer's fighting spirit shown at his first Loan Council meeting, because he fought all the way. At the Loan Council meeting in Canberra last June the Commonwealth Government announced that it would underwrite the State Loan borrowing programme only if it were limited to £295,000,000 or to an increase of £5,000,000, and only if the States limited their semi-governmental borrowing to about £124,000,000, similar to last year.

Without the Commonwealth under-writing that borrowing, it was obvious that the States would have little prospect of securing even as much as £295,000,000. I must say that all Treasurers prevailed on the Commonwealth Government to increase the borrowings, and I make no issue about certain Treasurers trying and others not trying. However, the Commonwealth was adamant. The South Australian Treasurer held out longer than any of the other Treasurers for a better total provision, but after all other States had signified agreement, no alternative was left to him. The Treasurer, however, succeeded in preserving for the State a good proportionate allocation. It would do well for the Committee to note that while our population is about 9.4 per cent of the population of all States combined, we received 13.7 per cent of the allocation of Government borrowings, and 11.3 per cent of the combined Government and semi-governmental borrowings. Anyone who had been at the Loan Council would agree with me that, while the Treasurers concerned did their utmost to show the Commonwealth Government that they needed more money—and it was strongly argued that the development of a State was important to that extent—

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The Minister will agree that the percentages he quoted have been in operation for some time?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not denying that. These are the quotas, and they could have been worse, bearing in mind the stringent circumstances. I acknowledge that

fact, and the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) acknowledged it the other night. However, I assure the Committee that nobody could have fought longer and harder in the circumstances than did our Treasurer, and we must give him credit for that, and not try to decry his efforts, as some have done.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall put each item *seriatim*.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I understand the debate on the first line has now concluded, and we are now to debate the individual lines. In those circumstances, may I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we report progress?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I think we should understand each other on this matter. It is reasonable to expect the first line to be passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I was about to put the first line when the Leader of the Opposition raised his question. It has not been put to the Committee yet.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understand that the general debate has now been concluded, and that being so I shall confine my remarks, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to the first line on the Estimates. I should like to ask the Treasurer questions in respect of two matters, with which I shall deal separately. Under "Loans to Producers" the Treasurer has provided £600,000 this year, actual payments last year under this line having been £548,000. On the official Loan programme, an increase in the amount provided by the Government this year over that provided last year is shown, but that is not actually the position if one looks at the total amount available under this heading, because it will be seen on page 2 that, in addition to the amount provided by the Government, £100,000 is provided by semi-governmental allotment to the State Bank in connection with this matter; therefore, the total amount for loans to producers this year is £700,000, not £600,000.

Last year, £548,000 was actually provided by the Government and there was, in addition to that, £300,000 in respect of semi-governmental loans. That is shown on page 4 of the Loan Estimates of last year, when the amount provided for the loans to producers was actually £848,000. That was the amount spent, not the amount provided in the first instance. The Treasurer had to make amounts available to meet a crisis in one industry and I do not criticize him for that. I ask the Treasurer whether an estimate has been made of the amounts necessary under this Act this

year, as it appears on paper that the bank would have approximately £150,000 less in total than it had last year.

The Hon. Sir FRANK WALSH: I have not before me the figures for last year concerning the loans to producers and the aggregate. All I have is the what is printed on page 3 of this year's document. The Leader referred to the emergency co-operative that was formed in the grape industry. However, there is another factor that we have to face up to on this occasion. The figures for this year show that £600,000 is to be provided from a Loan account and that £100,000 will be raised by way of semi-governmental loans. The factor associated with the loans to producers on this occasion is not itemized, but my information discloses that the canning industry in Berri, because of the increases in productivity in the area, will need £100,000 for further equipment. The industry has been informed that it will be responsible for the raising of £25,000 of that amount.

I am not in a position to give the exact details or reasons concerning the semi-governmental loans, but I can assure the Leader that so far as the Loan programme generally and this item are concerned, there will probably be certain other drawings that could not be foreseen, and I mention again the emergency co-operative. Another matter that will receive the consideration of the Government—and it comes within the ambit of Loans to Producers—concerns the Renmark Irrigation Trust, and that proposal has already been announced. The trust has accepted the propositions put forward and I have already given that information to Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Does it not come under this heading?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There has to be an amendment to the Act before we can go on with it. Whether that will need a special appropriation or not I am not in a position to say at this stage, because I do not know how the trust itself will be able to measure up to its quota. The point I want to make is that from the information I have tonight I am satisfied that the allocation to this line on the Estimates was the best that could be expected in view of the Loan money that is available. I think members will agree that some attempt has been made by the Government to increase loans to producers.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Treasurer for his explanation, but the item I wanted him to deal with was not dealt with. I believe that he is using his

good offices with the Commonwealth Bank to obtain finance for a cannery in the metropolitan area that serves the lower part of the River Murray areas and all of the Adelaide Hills. The up-river cannery has fulfilled a necessary role in providing an outlet for most of the fruit grown in that area but it has not covered all of the fruit grown there. As the Treasurer knows, over a long period attempts were made by the Government to get a company to operate successfully a large cannery serving the lower end of the River Murray, the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and the associated fruitgrowing areas. I ask the Treasurer whether his approaches to the Commonwealth Bank have been successful in connection with that particular project or whether it will have to share in some of the money provided under this Act.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: That matter is entirely separate; that is, if the Leader is referring to the Croydon firm. The last information that I gave to the manager was that an arrangement had been made whereby the State would guarantee the overdraft through the Reserve Bank. These people made further representations for a sum so that they could pay for some early deliveries. As a result of a further discussion, we have informed them that in view of the guarantee and the additional guarantee by the State Bank we are not prepared to go any further than the Commonwealth Government is prepared to go through the Reserve Bank. None of this money will be going to this purpose.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This year £350,000 is provided for Advances for Homes compared with actual payments last year of £299,999. The provision this year appears to be £50,000 more than was provided last year, but from the £350,000 will be subtracted £100,000 for old houses, so that the sum provided for the building programme of the State Bank will be £50,000 less than last year. On the other hand, because of advances previously made there will be repayments in this account of £1,000,000, so on housing the Government will have a credit of £650,000 because of the return of funds previously advanced. In other words, instead of having to provide money for this activity, it will have a net return of money previously provided of £650,000. Will the Treasurer take this into consideration later and, if the funds of other Loan accounts provide an opportunity, will he restore this sum to that which was provided last year, forgetting about the older type houses that do not create any new asset in the community?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not agree with the last remark by the Leader that because £100,000 is to be made available to purchase existing houses no extra equity will be created for the State. Houses in some of the inner suburban areas have got beyond their owners, who have reached the stage of being Darby and Joan. The houses are too large for the wife to keep in the condition she would like, and the land on which they are built is too large in most cases for retired people to maintain. As soon as the sale of some of these houses can be effected, an asset will be created for those owners who desire to buy smaller units. Even with the expenditure of this £100,000, in respect of which I still disagree with the Leader of the Opposition although I understand his viewpoint, we are still obliged to consider those people associated with the building industry. When a house that has been lived in for many years is sold, it often needs redecorating, and this affords opportunities for those people engaged in the building and allied industries. In 1965-66 the bank is likely to have available for lending for housing £5,800,000, which will enable the bank to assist in the construction of about 1,800 houses during the year. That is in addition to the £100,000 already mentioned. If it is possible under the financial proposals of this Loan programme to give people further opportunities for purchasing houses, everything possible will be done to that end. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement a creditable house-building programme has been established in this State. That will be continued. I shall do nothing to alter it. It seems fashionable in the other States to have co-operative building societies operating rather than State instrumentalities, but the fact remains that this State is further advanced than other States in house-building.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I am pleased to hear that.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not deny what has already been accomplished in South Australia. I doubt whether these things could have been accomplished if it had not been for the sanity of the people elected to this Parliament from time to time, irrespective of Party. Further, I pay a tribute to an ex-member of this Parliament who sat on the Opposition benches for many years—A. V. Thompson, better known as Albert Thompson in this place. He was the member for Semaphore and a joint member for Port Adelaide for many years, and he then became a Commonwealth Parliament member.

While he was here he was selected by this State to make representations on housing matters. Without wishing to take kudos away from anyone, and without any concern for politics, I can say that Mr. Thompson was a man who was considered capable of doing the job in the interests of the State, and I do not think any member would say other than "Good luck to you, Bert, you did a splendid job in that direction." We are going to stick to the programme of doing the best we can in the interests of the house builder in this State.

Mr. SHANNON: I understood from the Leader's remarks that this £100,000 or some portion of it might conceivably be used for the purchase, for example, of an older house on a large block, with a view either to its extension or modification in order that it might house more than the two people now being housed. At present substantial houses are being demolished on those larger blocks, and home units and flats are taking their place, with sometimes 15 or 20 units occupying what was originally a site for one large house. Such a movement has some desirable features, for it will give a greater density of population and probably reduce some of our present traffic problems by bringing more people closer to the city. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government intends to assist this movement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think that in a broad way I should say "No". However, when some of these older houses that are in good condition are sold under the terms of this proposed arrangement there will be an opportunity for some of the land to be reserved for the erection of a smaller unit. I am informed by the Housing Trust that under the Building Act a lesser area can be used for this purpose.

Mr. Shannon: These large houses are sometimes on deep blocks, which can be divided.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes. When an older house is sold it is permissible to retain a small portion of the land on which to erect a smaller unit. I do not think anyone will find fault with that. However, I can say that if it were a question of a person purchasing such a house under the advance that we propose and then wishing to borrow further money to build more units, we would not be interested, because it would then become an investment for profit.

Mr. HALL: It seems that money will be available to purchase about 30 houses under this scheme, and no doubt there will be many applicants for houses that are only two or three years old. Does the Government intend to define clearly the houses that will come

under this scheme? Will the scheme be limited to houses on land that can be divided, and will it also apply to relatively new second-hand houses?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The £100,000 is to be allocated to the State Bank and that bank will be responsible for advancing the necessary funds for this purpose. The bank has a competent staff, able to consider the question of values and the condition of houses. The bank's staff has had long experience in these problems, and will consider all circumstances before arriving at a decision. These people have administered this type of scheme for many years, but the bank has recently been restricted in its normal practice by lack of finance. The State Bank will receive £100,000 to continue its present policy in this regard. I have already said that the Savings Bank of South Australia will advance loans on existing houses, as also will the Superannuation Fund.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Building societies also?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe so. I have sufficient confidence in the State Bank in respect of this provision.

Mr. Shannon: Would the bank have any instruction in regard to the upper limit to which it may lend money on an old house?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think I can give the honourable member that information tomorrow or the next day.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement provides that the Commonwealth Minister for Housing must approve moneys to be lent on house-purchase schemes. Has the Treasurer yet received the Commonwealth Minister's consent in respect of the proposed allocation of £4,600,000 to the Housing Trust, £4,904,000 to the State Bank, and £446,000 to the building societies?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, although I am not sure of the figures, we had to increase our commitment slightly to satisfy

the Minister. I point out, however, that the Minister himself may know little about South Australia's methods in this regard (which, incidentally, may well be the best in the Commonwealth).

Mr. NANKIVELL: Under "Advances to State Bank", £500,000 is provided, and it has been said that money from this source will be made available for grants under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. Will the Treasurer say what the sum to finance this scheme is likely to be? Is it intended to retain the £15,000 upper limit at present imposed by the State Bank? Has he any ideas as to how other banks may be persuaded in the future to bear some portion of loans made under this scheme?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understand the honourable member's question concerns recommendations made by the Land Settlement Committee, of which he is Chairman. No further upper limit will be provided, for as soon as we attempt to increase such a limit it may adversely affect certain other applicants. I assure the honourable member that, when his committee recommends a sum that exceeds this limit, the Government will do all it can to obtain some assistance from the Commonwealth Government. However, at this stage I have not heard of a case in which we have not been able to honour our obligations.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I raise this question of the upper limit with the Treasurer because experience has shown that the 25 per cent of the properties that have been purchased in excess of the £15,000 limit have unquestionably been the best financial propositions put to the committee, and I think that the limit that was necessarily imposed by the State Bank towards the end of last financial year is, perhaps, an inhibiting factor in the operation of the Act.

First line—State Bank £1,700,000—passed.  
Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 19, at 2 p.m.