

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 26, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

AGENT-GENERAL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If my memory is correct, the term of the present Agent-General in London will expire soon. Has the Government considered the appointment of his successor, and, if it has, will the Premier make a statement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This morning Executive Council appointed as Agent-General Kenneth Lancelot Milne, J.P., of 14 Burlington Street, North Walkerville, who has a wife and three children. He served with the Royal Australian Air Force for five years, 3½ of which was on oversea service. He is a practising chartered accountant, and for two years was President of the State Council of that institute. He is an ex-Mayor of Walkerville, having served in that capacity for three years, and is still a member of the council. He is President of the Municipal Association, and is the author of *The Accountant in Public Practice*, a book published in England and used as a textbook throughout Australia. In making the recommendation Cabinet considered his many good qualities and his association with local government and his profession. The retiring Agent-General, known to me and to most members as George Pearce, was consulted by Cabinet and he informed me by letter that he did not desire to continue in the position of Agent-General in England. As a result, the Government had to consider filling the vacancy. It is expected that Mr. Pearce will return on the completion of his term in March, 1966.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier did not say (indeed, I think I failed to ask him) what would be the term of appointment of the new Agent-General. I presume it will be for the normal term of five years. Will the Premier say whether that is so?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Prior to the appointment being made, Mr. Milne was consulted, and he knows that the term is five years, as prescribed in the Act. I understand that in the past it has not been unusual for the term to be extended. As I indicated earlier, the present Agent-General was given the opportunity to elect to remain in the office for a further 12 months. I should not like to gaze into the crystal ball in order to

ascertain whether any circumstances could arise to shorten the term, but to the best of my knowledge the present appointment is for five years. The question of what is likely to happen after that period has not arisen.

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that applications for the position of secretary to the Agent-General in London are likely to close soon (if they have not closed already) and if Mr. Deane, who is the very able and capable secretary of the Public Works Committee, is to be appointed to that position, can the Premier say whether the Government will consider the desirability of replacing him with an officer who will have the opportunity of working with him for a sufficient time to enable him to become acquainted with the work and procedure of this important committee?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think that the present secretary to the Agent-General in London is expected to leave England in September. I know that Mr. Deane is an applicant for the position in London but, because an appointment has not been made to that position, we have not yet invited applications for the position of secretary to the Public Works Committee. However, I hasten to give an assurance that it is the desire of the Government, and mine in particular, that an appointment be made as soon as possible. Without showing any preference or giving any direction (and I would not attempt, at any rate, to give a direction to the Public Service Commissioner) I am prepared to say that, from the information I have received in regard to the applicants, it would appear that Mr. Deane is the candidate most likely to be appointed. I assure the House that, as soon as we know from the Public Service Commissioner what is the position and if it is necessary to advertise the position of secretary to the committee, the Government will do its utmost to have Mr. Deane's successor appointed and to meet the honourable member's request.

Mr. Shannon: I should like you to hurry it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If I can encourage the Public Service Commissioner to expedite the matter without embarrassing him in any way, I shall do it.

PORT ADELAIDE GIRLS SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: Can the Minister of Works say whether a tender has been accepted for the improvement of the heating system in temporary classrooms at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member

that tenders closed recently for the installation of wall-mounted gas radiant heaters in four classrooms at that school and that I have had pleasure in accepting the tender submitted by Mr. K. Allen for this work.

MURRAY RIVER.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Irrigation an answer to my question of August 18 regarding the salt problem at the inlet to the Chaffey pumping station?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have a fairly comprehensive report on the whole situation on the Murray River at the moment that was obtained from the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage today. This report states:

There is a little more water temporarily reaching Lock 9, which should reduce salinity in the river below that lock to 270-300 parts per million (19-21 grains a gallon). A flow of 10,000 cusecs at Lock 9 is anticipated in about a fortnight's time as a result of 3in. or thereabouts of rain in the Eastern States 10 days ago. Most of the additional water is coming via the Kiewa assisted by the Goulburn and Loddon Rivers. This rain, in the Hume catchment area, has also allowed storage to build up in the Hume weir, but there has been no additional release from the Hume. It is too early to assess the duration of the "freshet" moving down the river. The salinity at Berri is 270 parts per million at present (compared with 370 parts per million a week or so ago) and this improvement, which will gradually be reflected further downstream, should hold for a short time at least, depending on how long the "freshet" from further upstream is sustained.

The position at the Chaffey pumping station is that a weir across the inlet from Ral Ral Creek to the pumping station was completed on August 24; pumping took place for three hours on the afternoon of that day, the salinity of the water pumped being recorded at 300 parts per million; and there is a small pocket of more saline water just inside the weir, but this should disappear following further pumping. Outside the weir the salinity recorded yesterday was (a) at the bottom of the inlet, 6,800 parts per million; (b) 1ft. from the bottom, 370 parts per million; and 2ft. from the bottom, 300 parts per million. It would appear that not only has the water in the inlet freshened over the past week but the weir has been effective in minimizing the more saline water at depth reaching the pumping station.

NURIOOTPA TRAFFIC.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My question is best explained by my reading a part of a letter I have received from a resident of Nuriootpa relating to the proposed re-opening of the road from Tolley's corner, Nuriootpa, to Greenock Road. This resident states:

Some time ago I took up this matter with the Angaston council, the Highways Department and other bodies with a view to reducing

the traffic risks on the present Nuriootpa-Greenock Road, including the post office corner, the S-bend at Keller's corner, schoolchildren's crossings and other crests and bends. I pointed out that the opening of the old road would keep some of the very heavy cement trucks out of the Nuriootpa township at considerable savings of mileage and time to firms concerned. The idea was favourably considered by the Angaston council, which passed it on with its approval to the Highways Department. This department was favourably inclined and has made investigations.

Will the Minister of Lands take up this matter with his colleague with a view to ascertaining what action, if any, is proposed by the Highways Department in this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

BROKEN HILL ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked some time ago about the condition of the road east of Burra through to the New South Wales border?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the Acting Director and Engineer-in-Chief:

An investigation has revealed that, although the road in question is rubbled throughout, some grading is required. Unfortunately, the grader used on roadworks in this area broke down several weeks ago and another grader could not be spared for transfer to this work. Due to the serious nature of the trouble, it has only just been placed back in operation. Consequently, a back-lag of urgent grading work has built up, and present indications are that it will be six to eight weeks before the work required can be undertaken. However, the Regional Engineer has arranged for the department's Road Superintendent to carry out a more detailed inspection next week, and if it is considered warranted early attention will be given to this project.

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last Tuesday I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the investigations of a special committee set up to inquire into bulk handling. As the Minister replied that on July 6 he settled the terms of reference relating to that committee, can he make those terms of reference available to the House?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although I know the terms of reference, I should prefer to have them before me, so that I could state them accurately. I shall obtain this information for the honourable member by next Tuesday.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Tea Tree Gully council has requested me to raise the matter of an

area of land on the northern side of the Hope Valley reservoir with a frontage to the Grand Junction Road, known as the "borrow pit" (for the reason that material was removed from this area to construct the banks of the reservoir). Reference to the development plan of the metropolitan area, prepared by the Town Planning Committee, indicates that this area would be geographically suitable for a district oval. On February 3 a letter was forwarded to the Deputy Engineer-in-Chief requesting that portion of this land be vested in the council, so that it could be reclaimed and used for recreation purposes. A reply was received requesting a sketch of the location, which was duly supplied. Council intends to reclaim this area with surplus filling from sewerage works in the Holden Hill area, but is concerned that the opportunity will be lost to reclaim this area with the soil now available. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report and inform me of his department's intentions in respect of this area of land?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes.

FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. COUMBE: I noted with much interest this morning (as I am sure did the general public) the Premier's announcement of his approval and keen support for building a festival hall at North Adelaide. Will he give an undertaking that his Government will give all the necessary support to this project to enable it to be commenced as soon as possible and completed by the desired date, that is, for the 1968 Adelaide Festival of Arts?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Government will present no obstacles in the expedition of this work. However, I point out that further financial assistance, over and above what has already been agreed on, may be required, and that problem may have to be overcome. At present I am not sure of the exact cost of this project, but if it is to exceed present expectations, I am sure that we can rely on the charity of industry to assist in some way.

Mr. Shannon: The Sydney Opera House people may be able to say what the cost will be.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I must say that I compliment the architects on the work they have already carried out on the project. The plan has been fully endorsed by a prominent and capable architect in the person of the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, who is outstanding in that profession. Plans and specifications for the building will be prepared; it will not be just a piece of paper with an imaginary

line on it in respect of a project ultimately costing unlimited millions of pounds, as is happening in another State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With other members, I looked with interest at the sketch of the proposed hall, and the plan that accompanied that sketch, in this morning's *Advertiser*. I noticed in the plan the word "bar", which led me to believe that alcoholic liquor would be served at the hall the same as it is served, in fact, in most theatres in Great Britain; and this is something with which I do not disagree. Can the Premier explain the significance of that word and say whether it is intended to provide, by legislation I presume, for the licensing of the Festival Hall?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Cabinet has not been requested to make any decisions about a liquor licence; it has not been consulted about this matter at all. Licensed premises are the subject of a local option poll. As this hall will be erected in the District of Torrens, the electors of the appropriate subdivision of that district will have to be consulted.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. McKEE: Because of our late sitting last Tuesday night, it was well after 1 a.m. when most honourable members of this House got to bed. For the first hour I found it impossible to sleep because of the heavy snoring of a certain honourable member. However, I soon organized him but, when he finished snoring, a barking dog took over, and it carried on for the remainder of the night. In the morning I made investigations and was told by the staff that this dog had been annoying them for several nights with its barking. The noise came from the direction of the railway station so, after breakfast, I walked down there and inquired. I met the little fellow responsible for making the noise, a small tan kelpie dog, penned up in a small cage. If this was not so serious, it would be laughable but, having inspected the dog and after inquiring, I learned that it had been there for three weeks after travelling from Mount Gambier. Its owner, travelling from Melbourne by car, was expected to pick it up today. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Minister of Transport to see whether heavy penalties cannot be imposed on people responsible for collecting animals when they do not collect them immediately they arrive at their destination?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Whilst I am prepared to take any additional matters to my colleague the Minister of Transport, I

know that he has already investigated this matter.

SOUTH AFRICAN DAISY.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on August 17 last about the control of South African daisy?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. The Crown land referred to by the honourable member includes a large infestation of South African daisy, much of which is on difficult terrain. The departments controlling this land have made progress in the control of the weed and every effort is being made to continue this work.

SOUTH HUMMOCKS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: When speaking on the lines of the Loan Estimates, I drew attention to the sum of £24,000 to be spent on a water supply for South Hummocks. Has the Treasurer the information he promised to obtain for me?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The £1,000 for Moonta is for minor repairs to the tank and the installation of pumping plant. The major portion of the £1,000 is for that permanent plant installation. The South Hummocks scheme is at present under construction. It is to supply from the Warren trunk main landholders in that area who have no supply at present.

MOUNT GAMBIER BUILDINGS.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of August 18 regarding the siting of certain public buildings in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that the siting of the new courthouse and government offices has been decided, taking into consideration the proposed widening of Margaret Street. The Government office block is to be sited on the corner of Margaret Street and Bay Road, and the courthouse is to be sited adjacent to the office block and facing Bay Road.

ROOFSAVERS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently it was brought to the notice of the Attorney-General that a painting firm was obtaining deposits and not going ahead with the work. The Minister issued a warning in this House, and that was followed by a statement in the press. That action was greatly appreciated. Apparently this practice has not ceased, for I have a letter here concerning the firm of "Roofsavers", of 59a Fullarton Road, Kent Town,

which is adopting similar methods in my district. A representative of that firm is going around from door to door, and in the case to which I am referring the firm has received £30 by way of deposit but has not appeared to go on with any work. I have written to the firm concerned but have received no answer. Will the Attorney-General investigate to see whether anything can be done to stop this practice of obtaining money from people who in most cases are in the older age group and therefore unable to do the work themselves?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall certainly have the matter investigated and see whether we can do something to cope with the honourable member's complaint.

PENOLA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. RODDA: On Tuesday last, during the debate on the Loan Estimates, I asked a question regarding the Penola water supply. Has the Treasurer a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Penola water scheme at present is operating satisfactorily from two of the three bores in the permanent scheme. The question of redesign mentioned can be answered by the fact that foundation conditions for a concrete elevated tank were unsuitable and steel tanks on a stand were substituted.

NETLEY TRANSPORT.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The developing district of Netley is at present not provided with an adequate bus service, and this, of course, creates considerable difficulties for the residents concerned. It would appear that the present Richmond bus service, which terminates at the corner of West Beach Road and Marion Road, could be extended to cover this area. Will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Transport, to refer this question to the Municipal Tramways Trust for a report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a report as soon as practicable.

STREAKY BAY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Treasurer a reply to a question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate regarding the Streaky Bay water supply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes; £6,000 of the £21,000 is for completion of the Mount Maria new tank which has already been approved, and £15,000 is for the commencement of a general reorganization of the existing water supply by main replacements.

QUESTION PRIORITY.

Mr. HEASLIP: I have several questions, but I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, a question. I think it would assist the House if you would detail the procedure for priority of questions. Previously, I have been missed altogether. Today, on several occasions, certain members have asked two questions while other members who came in after I did have also been called. Will you explain how questions are allocated to members?

The SPEAKER: The procedure I have attempted to follow in giving members the call at question time is, first, I see the Leader of the Opposition or, in his absence, his deputy. Then I see members alternately from each side of the House, except that I try to see that every member has been given the opportunity to ask one question before a second call is given. I freely admit that on a few occasions I have not noticed the signal of members who have desired to catch my eye. Some members are seated in places where other members obscure my view. I hope that I shall be able, as I gain experience, to improve, but if I have not been able to see a member for the reason I stated, I apologize. There is no conscious differentiation between members at question time. There would be no conceivable point in giving preference to any member. I have tried to give every member equal opportunities, and to exercise the discretion as impartially as possible. In addition, I have tried to apply a formula whereby, if a member is late in catching my eye on one day, I see to it that he gets an early call the following day. If that method can be improved, I shall be glad of advice or suggestions from any member. That is the procedure being followed to the best of my ability at present. If there has been a departure from it, I apologize.

MILK REFRIGERATION.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about refrigerated milk?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Officers of the Metropolitan Milk Board have made the following investigations into the bulk milk systems operating in New South Wales and Victoria. In December, 1958, the board's Chief Supervisor visited Victoria to investigate and report on the collection of milk from farms by road tankers. In July, 1962, the Chief Supervisor attended the bulk milk conference and the display of bulk handling equipment in Melbourne. The theme of this conference was "Aspects of the systems of bulk collection". In Decem-

ber, 1964, the Chief Supervisor, accompanied by a District Supervisor, visited Victoria to study refrigerated bulk collection of milk. These investigations were confined to the Goulburn Valley and the adjoining Murray Valley area. In March, 1965, the Chief Supervisor visited Victoria and New South Wales to obtain further information on tanker collection, particularly in respect to standards for farm milk tanks and quality control as related to milk handled by this method. Discussions were held with representatives of the Milk Boards of Victoria and New South Wales, officers of the Departments of Agriculture of Victoria and New South Wales, and Mr. H. G. Caddy of the State Electricity Commission of Victoria, the authority appointed to test bulk milk tanks in compliance with regulation ASN 46.

WARREN WATER DISTRICT.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: During the Loan Estimates debate I commented on the provision of £147,000 for the Warren water district and asked whether the £20,000 allocated for the Watervale water scheme would be sufficient to provide for laying the entire scheme. I also asked whether the Hansborough extension, which will serve a number of farming properties, and Anlaby station, is provided for in the £36,000 allocated for extension of services and minor works in the Warren water district. Has the Treasurer any information on those matters?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Watervale water supply depends upon the development and testing of the bore recently drilled by the Department of Mines. If this test proves satisfactory in quality and quantity of water a scheme will be considered for the Watervale and district areas. The £20,000 has been included in the Estimates to meet the cost of testing and preparation of design and plans, followed by commencement of work if the scheme proves acceptable. The allotment of £20,000 is not sufficient to complete the scheme.

In addition, the honourable member asked whether the provision of £36,000 for extension of services and minor works included an allocation for a small water extension scheme at Hansborough, and the answer is "Yes".

MENTAL HOSPITALS.

Mrs. STEELE: I have just received from the South Australian Association for Mental Health Inc. its third memorandum on South Australian mental health services. This body

has in recent years interested itself very much in mental hospitals and has prepared extremely valuable reports in the time it has been in existence. In the last report the organization commends what has been done at the various mental hospitals and speaks highly of the improvements that have been made. However, it mentions one point that I consider of great interest and I should like to base my question on it. In order to do that, I should like to read from the report, which says:

The hospital staff speak highly of the work already being done by the Public Buildings Department. However, there are many minor structural alterations to be done. At present, these must go through all the channels and decisions are made by people remote from the hospital who are not in a position to know latest requirements. This could be overcome by the appointment of a maintenance supervisor who could be responsible for minor works and who could be a liaison officer between the hospital and the Public Buildings Department. It is understood that there are maintenance supervisors at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether this request will be considered with a view to, perhaps, having maintenance supervisors appointed at Parkside and Hillcrest hospitals?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up this matter with the Minister of Health and as soon as a report is available I will bring it down.

NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Forests yet been able to get a copy of the draft agreement with New Zealand regarding the free trade area and, if he has, has he studied its implications in relation to our forest areas?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A request has been sent to the Commonwealth Government for this document but it has not yet arrived, so naturally I have not had an opportunity to look at it. As soon as I have done so, I will inform the Leader.

GLADSTONE RAILWAY SERVICE.

Mr. HEASLIP: I know it is the policy of the Government to give a service through the Railways Department to people using the railways, and I think the policy applies particularly to those who are far away. People living along the railway line to Gladstone depend on that line. A train takes goods from Mile End to Gladstone on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. This train carries part-

trucks of goods, as most people in this area do not have full truckloads. This train passes through Georgetown, Gulnare and Yacka, but the people at those places get deliveries on only two days a week out of the three. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Minister of Transport and ask him whether it will be possible to provide a service to these three towns on three days a week instead of their being by-passed one day a week?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up this matter with my colleague.

TIMBER.

Mr. CURREN: On August 12 I asked the Minister of Forests a question about the need for appointing a forestry officer to control forest reserves in the Upper Murray region, and I asked that a more active interest be taken in the regeneration and preservation of natural timber stands along the Murray. I understand that the Minister has a reply to that question. Will he give that reply now?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. The Government is prepared to investigate the appointment of a permanent officer in the Upper Murray area. The department is particularly interested in the successful establishment of eucalypt regeneration in the Woollenoke Bend Reserve, although only extensive rather than intensive control is possible at present. Grazing is departmentally controlled, sheep being excluded and cattle only being permitted to graze. Recently, 1,000 acres of a grazing lease from this area was resumed for another purpose, and this itself is sufficient to demonstrate whether the grazing permitted at present on the balance of the leases is detrimental to the growth of young trees. There is no doubt, however, that the eucalypt regeneration on the Woollenoke Bend has become established in much greater numbers since it was proclaimed a forest reserve.

BUS TIME TABLES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few weeks ago when I was in Sydney I noticed that at a number of bus stops where I waited to catch buses, time tables were displayed giving intending passengers at least an idea of when the next bus would be along, thus avoiding fruitless waiting for long periods when no bus appeared. It occurred to me that, because it seemed to work in Sydney, this would be an excellent idea to copy in South Australia. Indeed, I have often thought that. I had intended to raise this matter during the Loan Estimates,

but it became rather late, and I did not. However, will the Premier ask his colleague, the Minister of Transport, to investigate this matter, and to make representations to the Municipal Tramways Trust to see whether it is possible to introduce some such system here? I am sure that it would be appreciated, and as the avowed policy of the Government is to encourage the use of public transport, I think it would help in that respect, too.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take up with my colleague the question of whether it would be practicable to provide this facility. As soon as I have a reply, I shall be pleased to give it to the honourable member.

DARLINGTON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: In the Loan Estimates under "School buildings" provision is made for a major addition (which I understand is to be a new building for the infants school) at Darlington Primary School. Can the Minister of Education inform me when tenders will be called for this work, and when it is expected that the new classrooms will be available for occupation?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I regret that I am not able to give the honourable member the date when tenders will be called, as I have only just returned from Kangaroo Island. However, we expect that, provided no unforeseen problems arise, the accommodation should be available for the Darlington Infants School in February, 1967.

KIMBA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on August 18, concerning playing facilities at the Kimba school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director, Public Buildings Department, informs me that when the new school at Kimba was erected, certain amenities at the old school site, including tennis courts and practice cricket pitches, were purchased by the District Council of Kimba. A condition was that the Government was to provide similar facilities on the new school site. The school committee was asked to obtain prices to get this work done. It did obtain one price from Arthur Hall, Ackson and Company of Port Pirie. However, details regarding certain aspects of the quote were not very clear, and no allowance has been made for back-stops, etc.

At that time, the department had undertaken design for paving and drainage works at the school. It was considered desirable from the viewpoint of economy and supervision

to combine this work with the construction of the tennis courts and practice cricket pitches, etc., especially since the major part of the work is common to both. Funds have been approved and detailed plans and specifications are being prepared for the combined scheme. It is anticipated that tenders for the work will be called by mid-October, 1965.

PEAKE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. Ferguson, for Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question asked some time ago by the member for Albert about the Peake water supply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Approval has been given for this scheme, which is estimated to cost £10,600, comprising the erection of a tank, the laying of mains and the drilling of a bore. The Department of Mines has been asked to construct the bore, and drilling operations are expected to commence in about two weeks.

LAND GRANTS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There was laid on the table of the House last Tuesday by the Minister of Lands a return of surrenders declined for the year ended June, 1965, in terms of section 213 of the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1960. This return is given over the signature of the Director of Lands. In most cases the reasons for the declines are explained in the remarks column, but there are a number of applications here, all for land grants and, as far as I know, all for land grants for perpetual lease. The only reason given for the refusal in these six or seven cases is in the words "Government policy". Will the Minister of Lands explain the particular aspect of Government policy to which those reasons refer?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Soon after the State election I stated that no more perpetual leases in agricultural areas would be made freehold unless, of course, in certain specific cases where it was laid down, as in war service land settlement and where there was an agreement under the perpetual lease for purchase. There could be others but those two stand out. I made this statement as it was the Labor Party's policy to do just this. This is not unknown; it has been the policy in other States as well, and has certainly been the policy of our Party for many years. It has been stated frequently that this is the situation in respect of land grants. It has been made public; most people are aware of it. I sent out a statement to all stock firms and to people who, I thought, would be interested in this issue.

I understand that the Act states that the Minister "may" convert perpetual lease into freehold. That is the Minister's prerogative, which has been exercised.

PORT BROUGHTON AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education an answer to a question I asked on August 19 about a headmaster's residence at Port Broughton Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. Cabinet approval has been given for the erection of a solid construction house for the headmaster of the Port Broughton Area School. Arrangements will now be made with the Housing Trust to have this house erected as soon as possible.

COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. HUDSON: A recent report that I saw in the *Australian* indicates that some alarm has been expressed in Victoria at the high proportion of Commonwealth secondary school scholarships awarded to students at private schools. Can the Minister of Education obtain for me information about awards of secondary school scholarships in South Australia last year and, in particular, the number of students at high schools, technical high schools and area schools compared with the number of students at private secondary schools who were awarded these scholarships?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I saw this article in the press and I noticed, with interest, that about 40 per cent of the boys attending private schools sat for these scholarships for a second time. With regard to the honourable member's question, I shall endeavour to obtain this information but, of course, this will depend on whether all the comparable information can be obtained from the independent schools.

SHEARERS.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 12 regarding shearers in South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The problems of shearers are at present receiving very active consideration throughout Australia. A National Shearing Industry Committee is in existence and met recently in Sydney. It recommended that each State form its own committee to examine the local situation. A South Australian Shearing Committee has been set up with representation from grower organizations, wool brokers, shearing contractors, the Agriculture and Education Departments and the Australian Wool Board. This

committee, as it investigates the situation, will be rendered every assistance possible by the Agriculture Department. The problems of shearers are complex.

The situation in South Australia as my department sees it is this: one-third of the sheep population is shorn in the larger four-stand and over sheds by recognized contractors, who employ professional full-time itinerant shearers, who expect to work nine or 10 months of the year. The other two-thirds of the sheep are shorn in the smaller sheds by part-time local shearers who rarely move out of their districts. It is in this major sector of the industry that the department has been concentrating its efforts. It is expected that while the bulk of the young men passing through our shearing shed management courses will improve the standard of wool clip presentation from shearing to classing, a number would be of sufficient competence to take a learner's pen in a contractor's team.

Despite the current concern about the shortage of shearers, there are limited opportunities for learners to obtain employment. The Australian Wool Board has embarked on a programme of Talli-Hi shearing instruction both in coaching professional shearers, and in conducting improver courses in which improvers, who already can shear 50 to 90 sheep a day, are paid award rates while being coached. In line with the Australian Wool Board's policy, the Agriculture Department is prepared to conduct a sufficient number of improver courses under the same conditions as the board's courses, provided the necessary support is forthcoming from both the woolgrowers and the contractors. The onus, then, is on the growers and the contractors to provide not only training facilities and to nominate trainees, but also to guarantee them satisfactory employment.

HENLEY AND GRANGE SEWERAGE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question relates to the proposed sewerage project that will affect the Henley and Grange area. I know that I have no need to remind the Minister of Works of the great interest residents of this area have in this project. In addition to alleviating the personal inconvenience now suffered, the project will have an important bearing on the development of this area. Can the Minister of Works obtain a report on the likely commencement and completion dates of the project together with advice on what areas are likely to be connected first?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I discussed this matter with the Acting Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Murrell) early this week. I was informed that, at the present, surveys for the establishment of sewerage facilities in this area are being made, and that work is expected to commence early in the new year, during January. The first area to be sewerd will be Seaton South, and work in the Henley and Grange area is expected to commence before the middle of next year. As each section is completed, it will be connected for service.

SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. COUMBE: On June 15 last (over two months ago) I asked the Premier for information regarding the financial assistance the Government would give for the construction of a swimming pool in the north park lands section of my district which was to be the headquarters of swimming in South Australia. Although the three councils concerned (the Adelaide City Council and the Prospect and Walkerville councils) have intimated that they are prepared to give financial assistance for this project, their combined effort will not reach the two-thirds required following the suggestion by the Premier that the Government was prepared to meet one-third of the cost. As this whole project could collapse through lack of finance, will the Premier consider increasing the Government's assistance over and above the one-third of the total cost that he promised earlier?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to consider the matter further, but because of the knowledge I have of certain other matters I should not hold out very much hope this year.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL.

Mr. BURDON: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I asked the Treasurer if he could give me a break-up of the figure of £25,000 provided for the Mount Gambier Hospital. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The £25,000 for Mount Gambier is for: (1) excavation down the side slope of the Blue Lake in which to place the rising main and skipway. This work is portion of a comprehensive scheme for Mount Gambier and surrounding areas; and (2) balance of payments to contractors for portion of the scheme involving tunnel and lift.

HARBORS BOARD.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My attention has been drawn to a report in the stop press of

the mid-day edition of the *News* which, under the heading "Harbors Board could disband", states:

The South Australian Harbors Board may be disbanded early next year. The Works Minister (Mr. Hutchens) said today the decision on the board's future would not be made until then. For the time being the board would continue to function as it had in the past. It is understood the doubt over the board's future emanates from concern that the structure of South Australian harbours administration may be unwieldy in an age of big fast ships and increasing overseas trade.

As the Harbors Board was constituted early in the history of this State and has performed its function, I think, with great value to the State's development over past years, I am wondering whether it would be timely to abolish it. I do not want to debate this matter, but I draw attention to the services the board has given over the years. I know, too, that the members of the present board (which has just been reconstituted following the retirement of the previous Chairman and Mr. Commissioner Meyer) are extremely estimable and capable gentlemen. Over the years, I had representations made to me not that the board should be contracted in respect of its functions or its size but that it should be enlarged. I therefore consider that the Minister of Marine may desire to amplify the statement which he is credited with making. Has the Minister any further comment to make on this rather revolutionary proposal at this time?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am glad of the question, because it gives me an opportunity to do something that I should like to have done publicly before this. The honourable member for Flinders, as a former Minister, appreciates that when I took office the board consisted of Commissioners Crawford, Meyer and Verec. On the retirement of Messrs. Crawford and Meyer I wrote to them expressing my sincere appreciation of their work. I join with the honourable member in saying that not only did they do a good job as commissioners, but they went far beyond their duties in the interests of South Australia and served well and loyally. On the expiration of the period of service of Mr. Crawford and Mr. Meyer, Mr. Verec, the remaining member, was appointed chairman and Sir William Bishop and Mr. Pounsett (the ex-Public Service Commissioner) were appointed deputy commissioners.

These appointments caused much speculation about why we did not appoint permanent members. The honourable member said that

he had representations made to him to enlarge the board. I was not in office long before representations were made to me for the same purpose. The Government was asked to appoint to the board representatives of the shipping companies and of the employees of the Harbours Board. Suggestions were made that the time had arrived when the board should be not a controlling body but an advisory one. It was suggested that the board might be disbanded and become a department under the control of a Minister. These suggestions led me to appoint two deputy commissioners, and, fearful lest I might act in haste and live to regret my action, I appointed the deputy commissioners to report on the representations that had been made to me. Questioned about this, I said that I had not made a final decision and did not expect to make one until early next year. I think that that is wise. The board as constituted is carrying out its duties faithfully and well. The honourable member, in asking the question, said that the board was appointed many years ago. Since then, however, shipping and cargo handling have become more competitive, and we are competing with other parts of the world. I am concerned that something should be done about the constitution of the board and its functioning so that decisions may be made more quickly than they are today, but that matter will have to be determined. I assure the honourable member and the House that no decision has been made at this stage and that the matter will be investigated before a decision is made. I am deeply grateful to Sir William Bishop and Mr. Poussett for having accepted the positions of deputy commissioner to conduct this investigation.

CIRCUIT COURTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about the possibility of a circuit court being held at Port Lincoln?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I had this matter investigated, and I regret that I must tell the honourable member at this stage that, as figures stand, they do not seem to justify the holding of a circuit session at Port Lincoln. Civil and matrimonial business emanating from Port Lincoln is not substantial, nor is there any significant amount of criminal business. No doubt the honourable member for Flinders will be glad to hear that his district is so law-abiding. Prisoners committed for trial or sentence at Port Lincoln and the neighbouring towns are arraigned at the criminal sittings

in Adelaide. The numbers of prisoners so committed for trial in Adelaide are as follows: in 1962, 14; in 1963, 10; in 1964, 6; and to July 31, 1965, 26. The last figure includes eight prisoners jointly charged on one information. As the honourable member knows, this is unusual.

On the other hand, there is ordinarily a substantial volume of civil, matrimonial and criminal business for the circuit sessions of the court at Port Augusta. Committals for trial or sentence at the Port Augusta sessions in 1962 numbered 75; in 1963, 63; in 1964, 77; and to July 31, 1965, 54. It seems that civil, matrimonial and criminal business arising at or near Whyalla and dealt with at the Port Augusta circuit sessions is increasing, and it would seem that it would be justified to hold certain of the sittings of the Port Augusta circuit sessions in due course in Whyalla as well as in Port Augusta. That would be a useful service for Whyalla.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Attorney-General kindly gave my colleague information regarding the establishment of circuit courts, and I noticed the comment made regarding the possibility of establishing such courts at Port Lincoln. For many years I have been making representations on behalf of constituents on this matter and the reply has always been in similar terms. Of course, I do not doubt the figures given. However, when a case must be heard in Adelaide, all parties to the case have to travel to the city and find accommodation. In some cases, the expense to litigants amounts to a large sum, such as when the parties involved and witnesses have to travel from places like Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Lincoln. Will the Attorney-General, before making a final decision on the establishment of circuit courts, give due weight and full consideration to the expense to litigants?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, most certainly it will be given full weight and consideration. Indeed, the expense to litigants in having to come to a central court for the hearing of cases in the superior courts is one of the things that weigh most heavily in favour of the establishment of circuit courts, but something else affects the litigants themselves, and that is that justice should be reasonably speedy. The establishment of circuit courts can only be useful if there is a sufficient volume of work to make it possible to hold a circuit court in a town reasonably frequently, so that people are not too long delayed in having the cases heard with which they are concerned.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Unfortunately, there is some delay in Adelaide.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member will find that some action will be taken about that fairly rapidly.

PORT PIRIE TRADE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the automotive workshop at the Port Pirie Trade School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The department has tried several times to get tenders, but without success. Finally, the specification was altered somewhat and approval was given to invite private offers, which closed yesterday. If a satisfactory offer is received, a recommendation will be made as early as possible.

WIRRABARA ROAD.

Mr. HEASLIP: Although the road from Wirrabara to Wirrabara forest is not a long one, it carries much heavy traffic with timber from the forest. It is in a high rainfall area and deteriorates rapidly. As only a small section of road has been bituminized, will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Local Government whether the sealing of this road is to be completed?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

UPPER MURRAY HOUSING.

Mr. CURREN: I have received the following letter from D. H. Crocker, Secretary of the Upper Murray Local Government Association:

Re Rental Homes, Upper Murray.

Yesterday's annual general meeting unanimously resolved that the S.A. Housing Trust was not building enough rental homes and instructed me to seek your help in emphasizing this to the trust. Will you help?

Will the Minister of Housing obtain a report from the Housing Trust on the future policy in regard to the erection of rental homes in Renmark, Barmera, Berri, Loxton and Waikerie, all of which towns are represented by the association?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, I shall be pleased to make representations to the General Manager of the Housing Trust and obtain information in reply to the question.

EGGS.

Mr. HALL: I have received a letter from a constituent concerning the application of the hen levy. I have not heard the Minister on this particular aspect, though I may have missed any statement he has made. This constituent

and his wife are each landowners in their individual rights. They are trading in joint names and have more than 20 fowls. Apparently, under present legislation, they are unable to divide that flock into two of not more than 20 each. They pay tax on the flock jointly. The gentleman points out (and I know that this is not a State matter) that in regard to the proposed voting on the wool plan, if 10 bales of wool (which is the qualifying figure to obtain a vote) are grown by joint owners, a vote is not allowed, because, for the calculation of voting rights, those bales would be halved and each owner would be apportioned five bales. In the legislation the number is held in aggregate, not halved. Can the Minister say whether that is the case in relation to the hen levy and whether it is expected to remain so?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not intend to comment on the proposed wool levy. I do not think that is analogous to this particular case.

Mr. Hall: It deals with joint ownership.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think we had better keep to one particular matter, the hen levy, which, as the honourable member knows, is dealt with by Commonwealth legislation. That legislation states that, on a property, 20 birds is the number, regardless of whether they are owned by a man and wife in joint ownership or not. If in this case the people concerned can prove that they are not selling the eggs or bartering eggs, then it will not apply to them.

TAILEM BEND TO KEITH WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works reconsidered my request that information be provided to the Central Water Scheme Committee concerning the provision of subsidiary mains from the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, I had a discussion with the Acting Director and Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. Murrell, and he has suggested that the honourable member for Albert and the Minister of Lands might confer, arrange a date suitable to themselves and make an appointment to go to his office with three representatives of the committee, when they will be shown plans and given all information possible in regard to the scheme and subsidiary mains. All I desire to repeat is that the subsidiary mains are only lines on the map at the moment and will be subject to much variation and alteration, possibly, as

the scheme develops. However, if the honourable member will confer with the Minister of Lands, we shall be happy to assist him in his desire to obtain further particulars.

NARRUNG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For many years, concern has been expressed by people in the Narrung area who obtain their irrigation water by pumping out of Lake Albert over the fact that the water level in the lake fluctuates considerably. The lake is shallow and a small alteration in level at the barrages considerably affects the height of water around the perimeter of the lake. Last year, by some arrangement or by coincidence, the levels were maintained slightly above the normal pool level and no dissatisfaction was expressed by these people. However, they have approached me again, asking that serious consideration be given to this matter now because this is the time that controlling the lake level must be considered. Can the Minister of Works say whether consideration will be given to endeavouring to maintain the level at the barrages as far above pool level as can be done, in order to keep the level in Lake Albert as high as it was during the last season?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I fully appreciate the problems of these people, and I will take up this matter with the department and inform the honourable member what can be done. I assure him that an endeavour will be made to do something, although I do not know whether there are any engineering problems. I will give a reply early next week.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SUBSIDY BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1286.)

Clauses 2 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Certificates."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Through the courtesy of the Government I have at least had an opportunity to read through the clauses of this Bill since last night. My point on this clause is a small one. In subclause (5) we have an example—admittedly a mild one—of the onus of proof being shifted. Later in the Bill there are several undesirable elements of this nature. Has the Attorney-General, who I understand has been dealing with this matter, considered whether it is possible to do without this subclause?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I did consider this, but I considered that subclause (5) was, in effect, simply saying that a document purporting to be a certificate would be *prima facie* proof that it was a certificate and was properly given. It is only *prima facie*, after all. I think the shifting of onus of proof is so slight as not to cause worry.

Mr. Millhouse: I have raised the matter because I know the Attorney-General is so much against the principle.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Normally that is true, but I thought this was not such a great departure as would cause one to say to the Commonwealth Government, this being mirroring legislation, that we could not accept it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Powers with regard to stock-taking, inspection of accounts, etc., and production of documents, etc."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I draw attention to this clause because it contains powers of entry and inspection, and these powers could be undesirable. In his second reading explanation the Premier bracketed this with the preceding clauses, and merely said that they were clauses usual in this sort of Bill. That may be so; I have not known a Bill quite like this before but I am prepared to accept the statement. However, this clause (and subclause (1) in particular) gives an authorized officer the right at all reasonable times to enter premises, to inspect, to take samples, to inspect accounts, and so on. Subclause (4) provides that anyone who obstructs, interferes with or hinders an officer in the exercise of the powers under the clause shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of £50. This is an example of bureaucracy. It may be unavoidable, but it is certainly undesirable. Even if we have to put up with it, I point this out to the Committee, because I think it should not be passed over lightly. I was sure that the Attorney-General, in view of his record in the 10 years I have been in this House, would not have passed lightly over a clause of this nature. I should be glad to have his assurance that nothing else could have been done in the circumstances.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This clause and the next represent the best compromise we could obtain with the Commonwealth Government. It was basically a Commonwealth Government proposal, and that Government was able to persuade—it could be spelled

“persuade”—and we had to put up a fight to have cut out provisions that I thought would be plainly obnoxious to members of this Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: Clause 13 (3) is another example.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that. This clause and the next were compromises. From this measure two clauses were cut out which went much further than these clauses go and which are in the legislation of other States. It was only at the last moment that I got the assistance of the Commonwealth Attorney-General through representations to his colleague so that we could obtain this compromise. We considered that in the circumstances we had done well and that as these provisions for search, inspection, and the obtaining of records were for the limited and specific purposes of this legislation (and it would admittedly be difficult to administer it without powers of inspection and search because of the past record of people involved in this matter) they were acceptable.

Mr. Shannon: Especially as they are after large sums of money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. As real benefits will accrue to them, it should not be too much to expect them to put up with the inspection of the records from which they will obtain benefits.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 17) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): First, I express my appreciation at the ready courtesy of the Premier last night in not pushing this measure through all stages. You, Mr. Speaker, may remember that I said I did not think that ought to be done with a measure such as this. I think that even the few clauses discussed in Committee today show that this was not a Bill to be passed without scrutiny. The whole question of suspending Standing Orders is a vexed one, and I am against suspending them.

I am sure that you, too, Sir, as the Speaker of the House, would agree that such measures should not be treated as lightly as they often have been in my experience as a member. With respect to my Leader, I must say that the previous Government was frequently a bit

naughty (and I must not put it any more strongly than that) about this. As a rule, we should not suspend Standing Orders to take a Bill more than one stage at a time. That is what we have done in this case, and I am prepared to accept what the Premier said, namely, that this was a matter of urgency. However, I notice that early in his speech he said it was hoped that the scheme would operate on October 1, and that later on the date of operation was said to be September 1, which is very soon indeed. Last evening we had another example of the practice to which I refer, when the Juries Act Amendment Bill was pushed through the third reading for no reason at all.

Coming back to this Bill, I support its general principle, now that I have had an opportunity, brief though it be, to look at it more closely. This measure has come as the result of a promise, made by the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party coalition prior to, I think, the 1963 House of Representatives election, to ensure that the price of petrol in country areas would not be more than 4d. a gallon above the price ruling in the various Australian cities. As the Leader said last night (although I do not entirely agree with his description of it as a rash promise) it has been found much more difficult to work out the details of the scheme than was expected originally. My point, however, is that this is the last election promise made at that time to be put into effect (and that perhaps is a lesson that could be taken to heart by the present Government), difficult though it may have turned out to be. Nevertheless, it has been done, and I trust that other promises heard in other election campaigns since then will also be put into effect.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a debate on the third reading of a Bill, and the honourable member's remarks should be restricted to the Bill as it leaves Committee. This stage does not give the same scope as does the second reading stage.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have finished, Sir. I guessed you would say that sooner or later, and I am grateful that you did so later rather than sooner. I support the third reading.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): The member for Mitcham has thanked the Government for so generously allowing honourable members the opportunity overnight to peruse the second reading speeches on the Bill, but I cannot be as kind as he was, because I think that, as members of this House, it is our right and

privilege to be able to examine such measures as this.

Mr. Jennings: Well, why don't you do that?

Mr. HEASLIP: Because I have not had the time. That is why I objected last night to having this Bill rushed through without our being able to examine it more closely. I appreciate the Premier's difficulty, in that a time limit existed in relation to this matter, but I did not appreciate his remark concerning my desire to delay the Bill. He said that even if a delay occurred, and even if I had an opportunity to peruse the Bill, I would not understand it. That was not a charitable statement; nor was it decent or fair.

Mr. Jennings: But I still think it was truthful.

Mr. HEASLIP: I should appreciate it if the honourable member would keep quiet, because I am speaking about the Premier. I am sure that, as a man off the land—

Mr. McKee: You are well off the land, and you have been for a long time.

Mr. HEASLIP: As one who will benefit by this Bill (and people in the country will certainly benefit by it), I believe I know more about its effect than the Premier himself knows. Last night, when he was giving the second reading explanation, the Premier's voice, through no fault of his own, was not clear. Indeed, his remarks were difficult to understand, and on this side of the House we just could not understand what he was saying. All I asked for (and all the member for Mitcham asked for) was time to look at the provisions of the Bill. Having had that opportunity (which, I repeat, is our right and privilege), I now support the Bill, because it will assist people in far-flung areas who at present are paying high prices for petrol and who, because of this Bill and because of the assistance of the Commonwealth Government, will receive a subsidy in this respect. This Bill will automatically reduce their production costs and, in so doing, will enable them to offer their goods on the world market at competitive prices. I support the Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1280.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): So that I shall be in no way misunderstood, let me at the

outset say that the Premier this afternoon told me that, if I desired to secure the adjournment of this debate, he would be happy to allow it as the second reading explanation of this Bill was given only last evening. I mention this for two reasons: first, because it shows how urgent the Government regards this legislation; and, secondly, because, if my remarks are somewhat disjointed, the reason is that, although I have clear convictions on this matter, I was away this morning at a function and have not had time to marshal my thoughts properly.

This matter appears to me to resolve itself into certain questions. The first is the question of what is desirable for the people of South Australia. Is a lottery desirable? I claim that that is a proper question to be debated on this Bill. It is right that in this debate we should not be confined to debating merely the clauses of this Bill, whether or not there should be a referendum: we should be able to debate whether or not a lottery is in the best interests of the people, because obviously, if it is not, a referendum should not be held. We should hold a referendum only in this House and authorize a general referendum only if we are satisfied that the question to be put before the people is one from which they can gain advantage. One does not put poison into the hands of children. We have the right to debate the question of the referendum, the machinery set up here and what is behind it.

I oppose this Bill for two reasons: First, it is inimical to the interests of the people of South Australia—and I shall deal with that more generally later this afternoon. Secondly, it is not fair to the people; it is not a proper Bill; it does not present a referendum to them fairly.

Mr. McKee: You say it would be poison in the hands of children. Do you say that South Australians can't be trusted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I always listen to the honourable member with courtesy and, if he will listen to me, I hope he will be instructed. If the Bill was passed and a referendum approved, it still would not further the interests of our people. The Bill does not give them a fair opportunity to express their views on this matter. I reject completely the statement made last evening by the Premier that there was much controversy and that there were many public expressions about this matter. In fact, at the moment that he was making that statement, although there had been some publicity that this topic

would be debated, there was not even one person in the public gallery. Even our friend the police constable who is usually in the Strangers Gallery was not on duty. For some reason, he discovered it was not necessary to guard merely the empty benches there.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. The second reading explanation states that the Bill follows closely the Commonwealth legislation for taking a referendum. The Premier said:

Clause 7, which is modelled on the lines of the Commonwealth Act relating to Constitutional alteration referenda and other similar Statutes . . .

In other words, this Bill is supposed to assure us that this proceeding is well established. The reference to clause 7 is nice mild syrup but, looking at the Commonwealth Constitution, we see that the procedure laid down under this Bill is not followed at all: we are asked to take a referendum on a loose question without any detail of what is to be done and then, having taken it, we bring the matter back to Parliament to see whether Parliament will approve it. That is what this Bill provides. I knew this legislation would provide for that. Before it ever came into this House I knew that the Government would attempt to do that but, on reading the method of any proposed alteration of the Commonwealth Constitution, we come up against an entirely different set of circumstances. We find that the proposed alteration has to be carried in both Houses of Parliament by a constitutional majority and then, after Parliament has set out the terms and conditions in precise language, the question is submitted to the people. But even then it is submitted to them only with the full implications of it also set out so that they shall know what they are asked to approve or reject. The part of the Commonwealth Constitution which has to do with clause 7 of the Bill reads:

This Constitution shall not be altered except in the following manner:

The proposed law for the alteration thereof must be passed by an absolute majority of each House of the Parliament, and not less than two nor more than six months after its passage through both Houses the proposed law shall be submitted in each State to the electors qualified to vote for the election of the members of the House of Representatives.

As far as I can ascertain from my research in the Parliamentary Library this is the procedure used in every country that alters its laws by referendum. First, the law has to be approved in precise terms by the Parliament, after which it is submitted to the people, and a

clause in the Bill usually states that it shall not be submitted for ratification until it has been submitted to a referendum and passed. That is the proper way of conducting a referendum if it is wished to get the voice of the people.

Although I am not in favour of a lottery, if I were, that is the way I would be prepared to consider the matter. However, I say quite definitely that I am not prepared to consider it when there is to be a loose question put to the people. No-one should be prepared to consider it under these terms. The words that are to be submitted to the people could lead to any one of a number of results, and no-one would know what might arise from the referendum. I do not believe this matter is being fairly presented to the people of South Australia. Why is it being done at this time in this way? What is the reason for submitting this question in a loose fashion and in a most unfair manner? Later, I shall point out the reasons why it is unfair. I read the Premier's explanation carefully to see if it contained any clues about why the Bill was submitted in this way. The official statement did not contain any clues, but a clue was given in the remarks the Premier added to the official statement. The Premier does not make observations that have no significance. The observation he made as a parting shot was not made to Opposition members but to members of the Government Party. The Premier said:

The overall effect of the Bill is to provide for the application to the referendum of such of the machinery provisions of the Electoral Act as will be required.

I do not think there is any doubt about that. He continued:

The policy of the Labor Party is to hold a referendum for a lottery.

That was an instruction.

Mr. Ryan: Is that unfair?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I could not quite understand the next part of the Premier's statement and I shall be pleased if, later in this debate, some elucidation could be given. The Premier said:

If the referendum is submitted to the people of South Australia and defeated, the Government will accept the decision of the electors.

I understand that. However, the Premier continued:

If the referendum is successful, the Government will introduce another Bill to establish a lottery.

I want some amplification of that—

Mr. Lawn: The people understood it and voted for it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: —after members have considered the implications in it. The rules of the Labor Party state that its members shall be free to vote on social questions as they think fit.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Didn't I say last night that this was a social question?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not suggesting that the Premier did not. However, my understanding of the Labor Party rules is that individual members have the right to vote on social matters as they see fit. I want to know whether this means that if the referendum is carried the Labor Party, as a Party, is then committed to carrying the referendum into effect, and whether Ministers and other members of the Party are bound to vote for it.

Mr. Lawn: On the member for Frome's motion the Leader said he knew all about our rules.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I want to know the implications behind the words the Premier used. I understand the part about this being the policy of the Labor Party, but not the other part. If the Labor Government is to provide for a lottery the proper procedure is for it to bring a Bill into this House and let honourable members debate it. If the Bill is passed to the stage where I can do so (and I hope it is not) I shall be happy to move as a safeguard that its provisions should go to the people before going to the Government. The people should have a right to know for what they are voting, yet under this Bill they certainly do not have the right.

Mr. McKee: The Leader is insulting their intelligence now.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall read the question to go before the people and ask honourable members opposite what are the implications behind it.

Mr. Ryan: The vote is "Yes" or "No".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The question is:

Are you in favour of the promotion and conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?

Does that mean that the Government itself will conduct the lottery, or does it mean the Government will hand it over to some other group to conduct it? Does it mean that the profits from the lottery will go into somebody's private pocket, or does it mean they will go into the Government's pocket? Will they go to charity, or will they go to the Labor Party?

Mr. Ryan: That would be a good idea.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I were a betting man I would be game to take

a shade of odds that the Liberal Party would not get any. Secondly, what does the term "promotion" mean? Does it mean that the Government is going to set about advertising and developing gambling to the fullest extent? I think that is probably the meaning of it. We see some queer sorts of advertising with lotteries. As a result of this, will we have a dirty little lottery shop on every street corner?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: "Lucky Fred"!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A former member of the glorious 27th Battalion went to another State and became an agent for lottery tickets, and I can tell honourable members that he is now the wealthiest ex-member of that battalion in Australia. Is the so-called "promoting" going to result in all sorts of lotteries, or will it be restricted? No-one knows, and no-one can know. Every person can put his own interpretation upon it.

Mr. Ryan: This is not a Bill for a lottery, and you know it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I emphasize that if the Labor Party wants to have a referendum submitted to the people on a lottery it should pass a Bill setting out the terms of the lottery and then seek the concurrence of the people of South Australia after they know what they are voting for.

Mr. Ryan: That can be in another Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is not a lottery—

Mr. Ryan: What is it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is a swindle. I want to make it quite clear that two things arise in relation to this question. The first is that there is no public demand for this.

Mr. Ryan: How would you know?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will tell the honourable member. I go to election meetings week in and week out, and I never get a request for a public lottery. When the Premier was introducing the Bill the galleries were empty, which shows how much interest there is in this.

Mr. Ryan: It was one o'clock in the morning.

Mr. Hurst: Wait and see the results.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member opposite knows that the Premier can usually get a fair gallery to listen to him, but he could not do so on this occasion.

Mr. Ryan: Your galleries are getting less and less.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I want to say something about my own view of lotteries in general and the establishment of

a lottery in South Australia in particular. This question has been raised quite prominently in South Australia during the period since I have been in Parliament. Indeed, a previous Government appointed a Royal Commission.

Mr. Ryan: When?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In 1936, and it brought down its recommendations. That Commission was established to go into the question of a lottery in South Australia.

Mr. Ryan: A lot of people today were not born then. Let's get up to date for a change.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Parliamentary Paper containing the Commission's report is available for members to see. The terms of reference were a little more circumscribed than what we have in this Bill: they were not open terms of reference. Nevertheless, they were fairly analogous to what we are discussing here. Those terms of reference were:

To inquire into and report upon the question whether it is desirable to authorize by law the holding of lotteries, for the purpose of raising funds to assist in the finance of hospitals and other charitable institutions, and to make recommendations thereon.

The question was tied down a little to whether a lottery should be held for charitable purposes. The members of the Commission went into every State where a lottery was being held; they took information wherever they could get it, and they made specific recommendations upon whether or not a lottery should be held in South Australia. On that Royal Commission there were four members of Parliament. Mr. H. B. Piper, who later became the Chief Judge of the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, was the Chairman. Mr. Piper was a man of great ability and integrity. The other members were Mr. Frank Condon, who for many years was a member of the Labor Party and the Leader of that Party in the Legislative Council; Mr. (now Sir Collier) Cudmore; Mr. Jim Beerworth, a member of the Labor Party from the district that you, Mr. Speaker, now have the honour to represent, and also a man of great integrity; and Mr. Horace Hogben, who was a member of the Liberal Party in this House. Therefore, there were two Labor members and two Liberal members. The Commission went into this matter most thoroughly and presented a report.

Mr. Ryan: Unanimous?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

Mr. Ryan: In 1936 anything could happen.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know the honourable member will never learn from history.

Mr. Ryan: How far back do you want to go into history?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I quote this not for the benefit of the honourable member but for the benefit of other members of the House who know the value of experience. The report (on page 6) states:

We are indebted to the English Royal Commission on Lotteries and Betting for most of the information concerning lotteries in England and Ireland. The first recorded lottery in England, under State auspices, was projected in 1566, and drawn in 1569. Proceeds were to be "converted towards the reparation of the havens and the strength of the Realme and towards such other publique good workes". The magnitude of the scheme, and the absence of any suggestion of novelty in the notices of it make it probable that lotteries were not unknown in England by that date. During the next hundred years many lotteries were promoted for public or semi-public purposes, viz., in aid of the English plantations in Virginia in 1612, to finance schemes for bringing fresh water to London (1627 and 1631), to repair the damage done to the fishing fleet by the Spaniards (1640), for the ransom of English slaves held in Tunis, and for poor and maimed soldiers (1660). Until 1698 there was no statutory prohibition of private lotteries. The basis of State control in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries appears to have been that lotteries were a form of monopoly to be granted by the King or King-in-Council by letters patent; all the early lotteries of which there is a record appear to have been licensed in this way. The first English State lottery promoted for the direct assistance of the Exchequer was the lottery loan of 1694. This lottery, the first promoted by Act of Parliament had more in common with "premium bonds" than with the State lotteries of later years. A loan of £1,000,000 was raised in a hundred thousand shares of £10 each, and the element of lottery lay in an arrangement whereby one-fortieth of the shares received interest at a much higher rate than the remaining shares.

During the next 50 years lotteries were frequently authorized by Parliament, generally as a means of finding money for the general needs of the State. In the first half of the eighteenth century, about twenty lotteries were authorized by Parliament to aid the Exchequer, and by 1755 lotteries had become virtually an annual event. Even at that early period, share selling of tickets was a regular practice, resulting in large profits to brokers. Between 1786 and 1792 the annual net profit to the Government from lotteries rose from £150,000 to £300,000. In 1802 it amounted to £520,000 but then commenced to fall, only £175,000 being received in 1821. Opposition to State lotteries began to gather force towards the end of the eighteenth century. In 1773 the City of London petitioned the House of Commons against the authorization of lotteries as highly

injurious to the commerce of the Kingdom, and to the welfare and prosperity of the people. In 1803, a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed "to enquire how far the evils attending lotteries have been remedied by the laws passed respecting the same, and to report their observations thereupon, and upon such further measures as may be necessary for the remedy thereof." At that time, it was a frequent practice for the public to bet by way of insurance against certain numbers being drawn on certain days, and this outside gambling was more profitable to participants than the lottery itself, the State received nothing from it. This was one of the main evils inquired into. The final conclusion of the Committee was that the evils of the system could only be done away with by the suppression of the system itself. The lottery system continued for a few more years, despite strong opposition, but in 1823 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that the lottery to be held that year would be the last, and State lotteries ceased in 1826. Since that date lotteries have been illegal in England.

I know that the honourable member does not learn by rules but by intuition.

Mr. Jennings: I didn't interject, but I wonder what is the relevance of all this?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not address my remarks to the honourable member. All I did was look at him.

Mr. Jennings: That is something you should do more often.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is what the Royal Commission found in connection with Western Australia:

In Western Australia the lottery is extensively advertised and advertisements are exhibited outside the agents' shops and stalls. The agent who does the most advertising sells by far the greatest number of tickets and earns approximately £5,000 gross a year in commission. One advertisement published by him in the *Daily News*, Perth, on May 6, 1936, is reproduced hereunder:

What is home without a mother?

What is mother without a home?

Mothers' Day reminds us all that here is where the rest of us come in. After buying Ma a box of chocolates, a new coat or dress, and a few other things, speculate 2s. 6d. for Mother to win £2,500, £1,000, £500, or £100, where there's always a chance at Whitty's for winners, next G.P.O., Perth.

Wise mothers nowadays will also buy one for themselves.

Is this what the Treasurer will give us? Is this to be permitted under an Act of Parliament? Are we to have wise mothers?

Mr. Shannon: And the Whitty winners?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Obviously the word "promotion" in the question to be submitted to the people is an unhappy choice. I believe that any Government setting out to promote gambling is doing

the public an injury, and I say that advisedly. I now quote some questions asked and answers obtained by the Royal Commission in other States. This is what the report says:

Upon being asked "Would an advertising campaign be warranted if it were found that the proceeds from the lotteries were insufficient to relieve the councils from the present rates?", he said: Yes. We should bring a South Australian lottery under the notice of the people who subscribe to lotteries, equally as much as the lotteries in the other States do.

Mr. Noble, the Manager of the Golden Casket gave the following evidence:

Q. Has it been necessary to liven up interest in the Golden Casket in any way?—

We advertise our caskets; we have to keep the public interest going.

Q. Would you sell the same number of tickets without the agents and advertising?—I do not think so.

Q. In 1934, advertising cost you a little more than £5,000 and last year a little more than £7,000. Will the advertising cost keep increasing?— If an art union lags it may be necessary to assist it by advertising.

Q. What form would that advertising take?—Newspaper advertising principally.

Then the report says:

We consider that in order to make a lottery even moderately successful, South Australia would have to advertise it extensively, and some of the objectionable features of such advertising would be unavoidable.

I will quote other portions of the report, which I commend to all honourable members, even if they have made up their minds, because it is significant. At page 27 the report says:

In our opinion, there is a real difference in principle between a Government, on the one hand taxing private betting or other private activities of the people, and on the other hand introducing a lottery for the purpose of raising money for one of its essential social services. In the former case, the Government takes no part in the promotion of the activities upon which a tax is levied. In the case of a lottery, Parliament, either directly or through a department established by it, promotes the lottery for the purpose of profit and takes an active part in inducing people to subscribe to it. No Australian Government actively urges people to bet on race horses in order that more revenue may be obtained from betting or to go to the pictures so that the amusement tax revenue may be increased, but where there are lotteries, the public are definitely urged by advertisement to participate.

I think that if the Treasurer had thought about the word "promotion" he would have studiously avoided it. That word is in the question to be referred to the people in a referendum, if we ever get one, and I hope we don't. Dealing with the social and political effects of a lottery the report says:

A lottery being the easiest form of gambling, and calling for no skill or thought on the part of the gambler, is therefore one of the most pernicious forms.

This statement was made by the Commission, and the Hon. Frank Condon and Mr. Jim Beerworth subscribed to it. Continuing, the report says:

The attraction is most strong where there is a large prize, and the appeal is mostly to those in poor circumstances. The result is that large numbers of people who cannot really afford the price of a ticket yield to the temptation, particularly when their appetites are whetted by insidious advertisements. Such people are incapable of calculating the enormous odds against them of ever winning a big prize, and no steps are taken to inform them of this fact, or of any other reasons why they should not take tickets. The whole lottery business is organized to attract subscriptions, and naturally those who are most gullible are most likely to yield. To this extent the lottery may properly be called an exploitation of the people, and attention is again drawn to evidence quoted on page 19.

This is what the Government is promoting, and I hope these words from the report will not fall upon deaf ears. The report goes on:

Paragraph 75 contains a table as to the odds against winning any cash prize in the various Australian lotteries and the following facts are a further example of what the investing public does not know and is not told:—45 sq. in. of space is occupied in the *Sydney Morning Herald* in the publication of the 814 prize-winning numbers in a New South Wales State lottery. With similar display, 5,490 sq. in. of space would be required to publish the numbers of tickets allotted to contributors who failed to secure a prize. Tattersall's £12,000 consultation is even more striking. 112 sq. in. of space in the *Hobart Mercury* is taken to publish 1,550 numbers allotted a cash prize; 14,336 sq. in. would be required with similar display to publish all the numbers of contributors' tickets to which no cash prize is allotted.

Witnesses in Sydney and Brisbane, including some who supported the lottery, agreed that subscribers to lotteries were often not able to afford the money and deprived themselves or their children, of food and clothing in order to purchase lottery tickets.

A lottery is particularly harmful as regards young people, and gives rise to a belief that all gambling, if legal, is morally right. Young people are given facilities for gambling before they are able to properly understand what they are doing, and this with the sanction of the State. Further, the tendency is for young people to regard the lottery and not thrift and hard endeavour as their hope of financial success. A Government, when giving its sanction to a lottery, must realize that by so doing it is not protecting citizens, but is allowing them to be exploited.

Could we get anything stronger than this? This report was presented by members of Parliament who were held in the highest esteem

by both Parties. Mr. Hogben and the Hon. C. R. Cudmore were highly respected on our side of the House, and I am sure that the Hon. F. J. Condon and Mr. J. M. Beerworth were as highly regarded by their Party. This Bill is condemned on two grounds. First, it is condemned because the question should not be submitted as proposed. If the Premier and his Party are anxious to deal with this matter, the Government should draw up a Bill, let it come before the House with members having a free vote upon it, and include in it a clause saying that it shall not come into effect until approved by a referendum of the people.

That is the proper and honest way to do it. Such a Bill could set out the limitations on advertising and the number of agencies; who would control the lottery (and whether they would be reputable people); and whether it would be a type of lottery designed, not to promote gambling, but rather to suppress it (not that I feel the Bill could possibly do that). A lottery is undesirable, and the Bill is even more so, if that is possible.

There is another matter I want to raise, but I have not been able to consult Dr. Wynes about it. At present it is not legal to advertise a lottery or sell lottery tickets in this State, as lotteries are forbidden. No doubt some members will tell me that tickets are purchased in this State. I know they are, and I know that the prohibition does not apply to the post office. I know that a substantial number of people buy tickets in interstate lotteries, but if we legalize a lottery in this State I do not think we can prohibit lotteries from other States from openly setting up agencies here, advertising, and selling tickets. Section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution has already been invoked in this connection in another State.

I believe that if we take away the prohibition on lotteries we will automatically be giving the opportunity to lotteries of other States to open branches here. I believe that at present lottery tickets are sold openly in some States and that the only restriction on other States selling tickets is an arrangement made between one Government and another to this effect: "We will keep our horse from roaming in your paddock if you will keep your horse home." If we remove the prohibition, I believe very much more money will go to other States than now goes there, as interstate lotteries are larger than ours would be, and it has been proved time and time again that the lotteries that have a fatal attraction to the investor—if I can call him an investor—is the large lottery.

The frequency of lotteries is another attraction. Although Tattersall had been established for a long time in Tasmania, when a larger lottery was set up in Victoria Tattersall became unprofitable and all the money from Tasmania went to Melbourne. It may be that the Premier has already negotiated a deal with Mr. Bolte. I hope he has not but, if he has, I hope it is better than his experience when he last met Mr. Bolte. If he has made a deal with Mr. Bolte, it is a financial deal that Mr. Bolte will not be ashamed of! However, I hope it will not come to that, as I hope this Bill will be defeated. I hope that members will vote according to their convictions; if they do, I have no fear that the Bill will be defeated. I oppose it for two reasons: first, because the lottery is wholly undesirable; and secondly, because the legislation before the House does not give the people who will be voting any indication of what they are voting for.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): This measure is a bitter pill to the ex-Premier, because he knows this subject was the cause of his defeat at the last election. That is why he has so vigorously opposed the measure. I support the Bill because it is the most democratic way to find out the feeling of the people. The recent election result proved definitely that the people of this State were completely opposed to minority rule. The Leader has said that this is like putting poison in the hands of children, so I take it that he was referring to the people of this State as children. By doing so, he insulted their intelligence.

I cannot see how a referendum will be detrimental to the people. It seems to me that it is the only way, and the obvious way, to find out how they feel about this issue, which is a big issue. We know that many thousands of pounds leave this State each year to go to lotteries in other States.

Mr. Hughes: Do you take a ticket in the lottery?

Mr. McKEE: Of course I do, and I know many other members who also take them. The remarks of the ex-Premier indicate the true position that existed during his long term of office.

Mr. Ryan: Now we know why he is the ex-Premier.

Mr. McKEE: He used this minority rule under the gerrymander to suppress the people of this State over three decades, and he treated the people as children. He used the gerrymander to enforce regimentation on the people—and he mentioned this himself in this House—in a way comparable with anything done in the days of the Pharaohs. I warn members opposite that they should give careful thought to this matter.

Mr. Shannon: We are doing so.

Mr. McKEE: I suggest that members opposite should, as some of them may not be here after the next election. This matter involves public opinion, and I do not think they have given it much thought. I do not think anyone with common sense will oppose something as democratic as this, as this measure provides a way to find out whether the people want a lottery. The people should have an opportunity to decide on social legislation themselves. We cannot continue to suppress them and keep them backward socially.

Mr. Hall: But you are not asking them to vote on legislation.

Mr. McKEE: We are asking them to indicate whether they want the legislation. Members opposite know very well what this Bill does: it provides for a referendum to indicate the feeling of the people on whether they desire a lottery.

Mr. Clark: And if the people do not want it they have no reason to know what it is about.

Mr. McKEE: I am afraid I cannot answer that. The people know what it is about.

Mr. Millhouse: How do they?

Mr. Hudson: They have more common sense than you have.

Mr. McKEE: I give them credit for having more common sense, too. I support this Bill, and warn members that they should support it if they want to remain here.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.50 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 31, at 2 p.m.