

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 29, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

GAS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question concerns the investigation being carried out by the Government into the feasibility of a gas main from the northern parts of the State. Will the Premier make available to honourable members a copy of the terms of reference of this investigation? Also, can he say whether those terms include the financing of the project, because this would obviously have an important bearing on its ultimate economics?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: From memory, I believe the company concerned is investigating the feasibility of having a gas main from Gidgealpa. I believe it is considering the cost involved and the route the main would take. I cannot recall whether it is considering any other matters but I will obtain a report from my colleague, the Minister of Mines.

AFFORESTATION.

Mr. BURDON: About 14 days ago Mr. K. McGrath, Senior Lecturer in Forestry at the Australian National University, Canberra, made a statement about Australian forestry, and included an inventory with regard to State forests and Australian native forests. He referred particularly to the South-East of South Australia, stating that the centre of our forests was 300 miles from the main markets of Adelaide and Melbourne. He also said that mistakes had probably been made in the past where land settlement had taken place around cities where possibly forests would have been better suited. Afforestation in the South-East is a matter of great importance, and I believe that much of the growth in the Lower South-East is concerned with forestry. Therefore, any ideas that people may have about lessening the importance of forestry causes concern to me and others in the South-East. Will the Minister of Forests comment on Mr. McGrath's statement?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I noticed the report to which the honourable member refers and, although I do not consider myself an authority as is the gentleman mentioned, my opinion is that the State owes a debt of gratitude to our forefathers for initiating the

move for forests in the South-East. I consider that these forests have proved to be one of our major industries and am sure every honourable member would agree with me on that. They have done much towards decentralization and this, together with the fact that Mount Gambier and other towns in the South-East are largely reliant on these forests, amply justifies the present situation. I do not wish to become involved in controversy with the gentleman concerned but consider that the South-East forests are a definite asset to the State. I shall ask the Conservator of Forests to comment on the statement and shall obtain a reply for the honourable member.

BARLEY.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday the Minister of Agriculture was good enough to bring down a full report on a question I asked earlier in regard to the receipt of barley in South Australia during the coming harvest. The Minister said that the moisture content of barley would be determined by the use of crushed kernels and my question today is on that point. Many growers have meters that register the moisture content of whole grain when they are inserted in a bag or heap of wheat, as the case may be. In addition, some growers (not many) have Marconi meters. Crushed grain cannot be tested with a spiked type of meter, because such meters require a considerable quantity of grain in order to be effective. There is also the point that a Marconi meter, although it will take a small quantity of crushed grain, creates difficulties in regard to the degree of crushing. However, I understand that there is a fairly fixed relationship between the moisture content of whole grain and that of crushed grain and growers would be greatly assisted if this relationship could be made known by somebody well versed in the matter. Will the Minister of Agriculture refer this matter to the Chairman of the Barley Board and ascertain whether the chairman would be prepared to make a statement on the relationship between the moisture content of whole grain and of crushed grain that could be used, not as a final determination, but as a guide to growers unable to test crushed grain, on when it is and is not feasible to reap?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the honourable member's remarks. Unfortunately, the Chairman of the board, Mr. Strickland, is overseas at present but I am sure that the Acting Chairman, Mr. Honner, would be only too happy to furnish a report, and I shall take the matter up with him.

LIFESAVERS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I know that the Premier is well acquainted with the activities of the Surf Lifesaving Association. The members of this association (a voluntary organization) patrol the beaches and over the years have effected thousands of rescues, saving many lives. These people are providing a type of community service similar to that provided by volunteer fire fighters. In 1949 this Parliament passed legislation setting up the Volunteer Fire Fighters Fund to insure fire fighters, and that legislation has worked extremely well. It provided for negotiations with the insurance companies and for contributions from both the Government and the companies up to a certain limit, after which I believe the contributions from all sources were only to keep the fund at a certain level. That fund has provided compensation to many volunteer fire fighters. I should like the Premier to investigate the possibility of introducing legislation to provide for insurance of surf lifesavers whilst on duty or in training. These lifesavers would not suffer as many accidents as do fire fighters, but I know of at least one fatality that has occurred. Will the Premier consider negotiating with the insurance companies in order to arrange for this type of insurance for surf lifesavers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take the matter to Cabinet and see how far the Government is prepared to go in this matter, and I will then advise the honourable member.

DARLINGTON SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the calling and closing of tenders for the new Darlington Infants School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The correct answer to the question which the honourable member asked me yesterday is that tenders were called on August 10 and closed on September 28.

EGGS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A newspaper article a few days ago stated that there was a severe shortage of eggs and egg products in New Zealand. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up with the Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board the question whether the board can take advantage of the situation in New Zealand?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY.

Mr. HUGHES: In the press recently it was reported that two motor car manufacturing firms—the Rootes Group of England and Chrysler Australia Limited—were amalgamating. As Wallaroo is recognized as a major deep-sea port in South Australia and it is close to Port Pirie, which is on a direct rail link across the continent from Perth to Sydney, will the Premier discuss with the company the possibility of establishing a section of its industry at Wallaroo? The firm could transport parts by rail from any of its manufacturing plants in the metropolitan area direct to Wallaroo for assembly and send its products by rail through Port Pirie to either Sydney or Perth.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to discuss the possibilities with the company.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On September 23 I asked the Premier what would be the result of the merger between these two companies in relation to expansion in this State and he said that he would make an investigation. Has he been able to reach any conclusions in the matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yesterday afternoon I conferred with executives of Chrysler Australia Limited concerning the effect of the merger between that company and Rootes (Australia) Limited. As a result of that discussion I am pleased to inform the House that arrangements that will arise from the merger will be extremely beneficial to South Australia. Honourable members will recall that I mentioned the Dodge Phoenix car in my earlier reply. It appears that it will be necessary to transfer the assembly of that motor vehicle to another State, but the extra space provided will enable the expansion of production of other vehicles to take place at Tonsley Park and, as already mentioned, the merger will prove most satisfactory to South Australia. I assure the Leader that it is a very good deal.

VICTORIA SQUARE.

Mr. COUMBE: The Adelaide City Council's proposal to close portion of Victoria Square and divert traffic and rearrange roadways in that square was referred in accordance with legislation to the Minister of Lands for decision. I understand that the six months provided in the Act will soon elapse. Has the Minister yet arrived at a decision? If he has, can he make the decision public, or, if he has not, when is he likely to do so?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The application came to me on May 31 and has to be decided by the end of November, so I still have two months to arrive at a decision. I have given the matter much thought. At this stage I have certain fixed thoughts in my mind but, as I have had several other things on my mind, I have not yet reached finality. However, this will be done soon.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked yesterday about the date of completion of the teaching block at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Royal Adelaide Hospital redevelopment programme Stage I, of which the teaching block is a part, is scheduled to be completed at the end of this year.

MARREE CATTLE YARDS.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Agriculture and I recently toured the Far North and, while there, investigated the cattle yards at Marree. The Minister may recall that the yards needed repairs, particularly the race from the main yards into the cattle trucks. Can the Minister say whether he has applied to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner to have these repairs done, and, if he has, has he a report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The last time we were in Marree the matter was discussed, and I said that I had made approaches through the Acting Director of Agriculture for this work to be done. The yards were originally built by the South Australian Government, through the Department of Agriculture, on behalf of the Commonwealth Government, and for some time this was a joint arrangement between the two Governments. However, it became unwieldy, and control of maintenance was handed over to the Commonwealth Government. Representations were made to that Government, and I have been informed that the Commonwealth Railways Department has agreed with the Department of Territories for each to pay half the cost. It has been agreed that the Commonwealth Railways Department shall do the work and the Railways Commissioner has been asked when the work will be started.

WATER SUPPLIES.

Mr. HALL: A statement in this morning's *Advertiser* forecast the possible use of nuclear power in this State within a few years. The article stated:

Adelaide and its surrounding areas face a water shortage in the next 10 years or so, and the local authority has suggested that requirements thereafter may need to be supplied by desalination.

It may be that desalination has a particular use in the next few years, but I understand that the building of the Chowilla dam and the attention that this and the previous Government has given to mains from the Murray River will ensure that there is no water shortage here. Can the Minister of Works comment on the press statement?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There is no justification for such a statement. Following the completion of the Chowilla dam (a dam which we take no credit for initiating and which we are anxious to build as soon as possible), we consider that, with reasonable development, we shall have a sufficient water supply for about 20 years. This does not mean that we will not prepare other storages when Chowilla dam is completed. On the contrary, we will then commence preparing other storages because we are hopeful and confident that South Australia will continue to develop, and that we will require more water to meet the needs of that development. All evidence up to the present concerning desalination by atomic power leads us to believe that this cannot be done economically by a station of the size that would be warranted for South Australia. It takes a large station to produce and supply electricity economically. Even with such a station, it is doubtful whether we could produce desalinated water economically for South Australia.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 15 about the future pumping programme for the Mannum-Adelaide main, whether the programme is up-to-date or whether we are lagging in the formula used over the years?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that I have no answer to the Leader's question yet but, now that he has reminded me of it, I will do my best to get a reply for him by tomorrow or Tuesday.

SOUTH-EASTERN ELECTRICITY.

Mr. RODDA: Following a question I asked the Minister of Works on September 22, I now have a further question about the repeater station at The Gap, in connection with the substation to be erected at Keith. I understand that the repeater station at The Gap and the one at Coonawarra are meeting difficulties. The voltage drop at

The Gap, which is fed from Tailem Bend, is reducing its effectiveness, and the cycle of the source of supply from Penola is not sufficient for the effective working of the station at Coonawarra. Can the Minister say whether these two stations have to make an auxiliary supply of their own power to enable them to function properly by the starting date, which I understand is next month?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: First, I regret that this part of the honourable member's question did not receive my attention in the reply I gave yesterday, but I will take up the matter and obtain an early reply for him. I think that these repeater stations do have to provide an auxiliary power plant to meet emergencies. I am only guessing that this is the normal procedure but I am sure that the Electricity Trust will be anxious to assist in this important work. Accordingly, I shall have an investigation made and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

HOSPITAL FEE.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, there has been brought to my notice a case in my area where an elderly person in a private hospital has no means of support. Naturally, she receives Commonwealth benefit but, after this is taken into consideration, she is a few pounds short of the hospital fee. In her case (and there may be several others like it) a person was paying the extra money but is now receiving a pension and cannot help. In these circumstances, can the Premier ask his colleague the Minister of Health to help in the matter or can appropriate legislation be introduced to relieve necessitous cases?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to take this up with my colleague and get a report.

RESERVES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In the hundreds of Billiatt and Auld, in the north-west of the District of Albert, there was a partial subdivision of some perimeter land. The rest of it was then resumed as fauna and flora reserves. Is it proposed by the department of the Minister of Lands to continue with further subdivision of this area or has it been proclaimed as a wild life reserve, under the National Parks Commissioners?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Recently, an area has been declared under the National Parks Commissioners. I am not sure of its

exact location but I will speak to the honourable member privately and see whether we can get the information he desires.

TIMBER CLASSROOMS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education tell me the number of timber classrooms at primary schools both inside and outside the metropolitan area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The total number of timber classrooms is 1,965, of which 1,298 are in metropolitan schools and 667 in schools outside the metropolitan area. These are classrooms only, and do not include timber classrooms used as libraries, staff rooms or headmasters' offices.

BULK HANDLING.

Mr. FERGUSON: During this session questions have been asked concerning progress made by the committee set up to inquire into bulk handling facilities and terminal silos. As many of my constituents (and I am sure the constituents of other honourable members) are interested in this matter, and eager to have some information as to the committee's progress, has the Minister of Agriculture anything further to report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: A week or two ago, in replying to the member for Flinders, I said that this committee would receive evidence in writing from interested parties, and that it would endeavour to assist honourable members as much as possible. I have now received a report from the Chairman (Mr. Sainsbury), who informs me that not only will evidence be accepted in writing but that the committee has decided to visit three country towns in which people will be able to give evidence in person. In each town the committee will hear evidence between 7 p.m. and 10 p.m. It will be at the Cleve town hall on October 25, at the Streaky Bay town hall on October 26, and at the Yorketown town hall on November 3. People desiring to give evidence to the committee may do so at those places on those dates, but they will still retain the right to submit written evidence if they so desire. The closing date for receiving evidence will be November 30, 1965.

BLACKWOOD ROADS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have referred previously in the House to the reconstruction and widening of Shepherds Hill Road and Cliff Street at Blackwood in my district. This work has been under way for a long time, and progress has been extremely slow. This morning

the owner of a property abutting the road in question telephoned me to say that at the junction of Cliff and Melton Streets the pavement is to be too narrow, and he believed this was because of difficulty in acquiring land on either side of the road, thus not allowing of widening to the same width of roadway at that point as the road further west. Although I do not know that that is the reason, will the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, ascertain as soon as possible whether the roadway at that point will be narrower than it is further to the west? If it will be, will he ascertain the reason for the narrowing of the roadway at that point?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information for the honourable member.

MOTOR CAR INSURANCE.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 24 regarding comprehensive insurance on motor vehicles?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have received a report from the Prices Commissioner concerning inquiries made by him into increased comprehensive insurance premiums operative from October 1, 1965. The report indicates that with the single exception of Western Australia's metropolitan rates, which are slightly lower than South Australia's, the new rates for this State for both metropolitan and country areas are well below those operative in the other States. The Commissioner has reported that to establish whether the increases are justified or not, a number of factors must be taken into account. One of the most significant is the ratio of claims paid to premiums received, known as the "loss ratio". The loss ratio has risen in South Australia from 58.3 per cent in 1961 to 68.3 per cent in 1964.

Although insurance companies have introduced measures designed to reduce claims, namely, (1) a £25 excess imposed in Novem-

ber, 1964, on drivers under 25 years of age; and (2) a 40 per cent no-claims bonus granted in November, 1964, to drivers with a three-year no-claims record, the situation has shown little sign of improvement. Another factor which has a direct bearing on the level of insurance premiums is the cost of claims made. The average insurance claim in South Australia has risen from £55 18s. in 1961 to £67 10s. in 1964.

The Commissioner has reported that in view of the deteriorating position revealed by the rising loss ratio and increasing costs of average claims, an increase in insurance premiums appears warranted. The extent of the increase is difficult to assess because of, first, the unavoidable delay in collating the relevant statistics; secondly, the difficulties of assessing full current liability under outstanding claims; and, thirdly, the gradual introduction of the new rates because of the varying periods which will elapse before individual policies become due for renewal. It is possible that the 20 per cent increase could prove to be somewhat higher than necessary at this juncture, and the Prices Commissioner therefore proposes to keep the matter under review, and obtain statistics for the year ending December 31, 1965, as soon as available, and subsequently for the six-monthly periods ending June 30 and December 31, 1966.

I have figures which show that for an insurance cover of £200 there will be an increase of £3 14s., and for a £500 cover the new rate will be £32 6s., which represents an increase of £5 8s. For a cover of £1,000, the new rate will be £42 2s., an increase of £7. However, I ask permission to have incorporated in *Hansard*, without my reading it, a schedule setting out a series of figures covering the metropolitan and country areas of the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia.

Leave granted.

MOTOR VEHICLE COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE PREMIUMS.

	£200 cover.				£500 cover.				£1,000 cover.			
	New rate.		Increase.		New rate.		Increase.		New rate.		Increase.	
Metropolitan:	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
New South Wales	33	6 0	(5 11 0)		44	6 0	(7 8 0)		51	5 0	(8 11 0)	
Victoria	28	14 0	(4 16 0)		37	11 0	(6 5 0)		44	8 0	(7 8 0)	
Western Australia	22	2 0	(3 14 0)		30	0 0	(5 0 0)		36	12 0	(6 2 0)	
South Australia .	22	2 0	(3 14 0)		32	6 0	(5 8 0)		42	2 0	(7 0 0)	
Country:												
New South Wales	22	16 0	(3 16 0)		34	6 0	(5 14 0)		39	2 0	(6 10 0)	
Victoria	19	18 0	(3 6 0)		27	5 0	(4 11 0)		37	8 0	(6 4 0)	
Western Australia	24	10 0	(4 2 0)		32	8 0	(5 8 0)		39	12 0	(6 12 0)	
South Australia .	15	10 0	(2 12 0)		22	4 0	(3 14 0)		28	6 0	(4 14 0)	

Rates for non-tariff companies are generally lower than the rates set out above.

PRICES BRANCH.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday, during the consideration of the Estimates, the Treasurer promised to obtain a report regarding the staffing of the Prices Branch. Has he been able to get that information?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The following report has been furnished by the Public Service Commissioner:

Following on instructions that an investigation was to be undertaken by the Prices Branch to enable a staff establishment to be determined, my investigating officer carefully examined the situation in conjunction with Mr. L. H. Baker and his senior officers. As a result, it was agreed with Mr. Baker that a satisfactory staff establishment for the present work load of the office was 34 male and four female officers. When a recent male appointee takes up duty there will be the full staff of 38 employed. There are five officers on the staff over the normal retiring age and it is proposed to progressively retire them. Action is in hand to select suitable replacements. The administration of the Prices Branch has been reorganized into three major sections, each of which will function under the immediate control of a senior investigations officer directly responsible to the S.A. Prices Commissioner. An assessment cannot yet be made of what additional staff, if any, will be required in connection with conversion to decimal currency. The Prices Commissioner is watching the position closely and will seek temporary additional assistance should the demands made on him exceed the capacity of his existing staff.

ARTERIOSCLEROSIS.

Mr. LAWN: Last Thursday the Attorney-General gave me the following information in reply to a question I asked:

Following the receipt of a report from Professor Jepson, the Minister of Health has given approval to the board of management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital for an investigational project to proceed to re-assess intra-arterial oxygen at a clinical level by scientific methods now available.

Can the Attorney-General say when this treatment is likely to be commenced at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will realize that at this stage this is an investigational project, but I understand that a likely date is about June of next year.

HOUSING TRUST RENTALS.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Premier able to reply to a question I asked last week about the adjustment of Housing Trust rentals, following his conference with the officers of the Hous-

ing Trust, or is he about to make an announcement on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that I should be in a position to supply information on this matter tomorrow.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HUGHES: In view of the rumour that some subsidy payments have been suspended, can the Minister of Education say whether many accounts for such payments are outstanding?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have some information on this matter from the Accountant of the department. The position regarding subsidies is as follows: estimated amount spent to September 28 this year, £61,800; actually committed but not spent, £67,500. The vouchers have been prepared and subsidies are ready for immediate payment (payment for these will be made in the first week in October) of £4,843. The only ones that have not been processed for payment so far are three claims from primary schools, £186, and two claims from high schools, £274. Apart from these, all claims for subsidy payments have been processed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the honourable member's question probably arose out of a question I asked on September 16 about an apparent hold-up in the payment of subsidies. The Minister, on that occasion, denied that any direction had been given by him. Today he has informed the House (if I understand him correctly) that only two or three subsidy payments are now outstanding. I ask him, first, whether at the time I asked the question there were a number outstanding that have been cleaned up since, and, secondly, I refer to his own reference in answering my question then that Cabinet had made a decision on the question of the list of items that could be subsidized. At that time he said he preferred not to disclose Cabinet's decision. Is he now prepared to tell the House what decision Cabinet did come to in this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Regarding the first part of the question, I cannot say precisely that the second amount I referred to in reply to the honourable member for Wallaroo as committed but not spent was actually processed. I imagine there may have been some delay with that amount, but I have not the date when the amounts were actually processed. The honourable member will notice that the total amount involved in subsidies paid out and processed is £129,000.

Regarding the other part of the question, I think I told the honourable member previously

that we were concerned about, and were considering a policy in relation to, large subsidies to certain schools. Our policy will be one of ensuring that available funds are equitably allocated. This matter has been submitted to Cabinet in a general way but no firm decision has been reached. However, I consider that any school that contemplates expenditure involving a subsidy of more than £1,000 should give notice of its intention to enable the department to budget for its subsidy expenditure in an equitable manner. One of the problems we are facing is that we are getting applications for subsidies for large sums about which we have had no previous indication, and the policy in the past has been roughly one of first come first served. This has meant that the schools wishing to spend the largest amounts have been getting the largest amounts of the subsidy money available. I consider that we should endeavour to allocate our subsidy money equitably to all schools, and we may have to introduce this policy to ensure that all schools get equitable sums from the available subsidy money.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that definite subsidy amounts have been paid to new schools to give them the opportunity to buy necessary things for the schools. I assume that the Minister's reply does not mean that this policy is likely to be altered for new schools. Is that the position?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member's assumption is correct. There will be no alteration to the provisions made in respect of new schools. These schools are assisted by special subsidy provisions because, obviously, at the outset they do not have funds available.

BAROSSA CANNERIES.

Mr. CURREN: On September 16 I asked the Premier a question about future payments by Brookers (Australia) Limited for fruit supplied in the 1958 season, and his reply indicated that it was most unlikely that any payment would be made to growers for that year's fruit. I believe that growers who supplied fruit to Barossa Canneries in the 1958 season have not yet been paid in full. Will the Premier have this firm investigated with a view to having the debts to these growers established as bad debts for taxation purposes?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared first to take up this matter to ascertain the position and secondly, if necessary, to

communicate with the Deputy Commissioner of Taxation in this State to see what can be done.

WOLSELEY STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some time ago on behalf of the Tatiara District Council I wrote to the Railways Commissioner asking that some provision be made at Wolseley for schoolchildren to have better access to the school. The school is on one side of the railway line, the principal part of the town is on the other, and in between is a major marshalling yard. A request was made for an overway to be provided. This was done because it was reported (and I have that report in writing) that children were climbing under stationary trains in the yard in order to get from their homes to school because there was no way around, the crossings being blocked by trains standing over them. I received a reply from the Railways Commissioner and handed it to the district council, which has now asked me to take up the matter again. This time it asked that the Commissioner ensure that the regulations be enforced so that a train at the crossings could be broken between 8.30 and 9.30 a.m., 12.30 and 1.30 p.m., and 3.15 and 4.30 p.m. to enable children to move from one part of the town to the other without having to take the risk of climbing under the train as they had been doing. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport to ensure that these regulations are enforced?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall certainly take the matter up with the Minister of Transport. I am perturbed that such things are occurring, and I am sure it would not meet with the approval of the Government, or even the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I don't like the word "even"!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There is an odd man out in everything, but I have no doubt that most Opposition members would agree that this practice should not continue. On consideration, I am sure the odd man out would think so, too.

URRBRAE AGRICULTURAL HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent inquiry about the work programme at the Urrbrae Agricultural High School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been awaiting further details, but provision was made on the Loan programme for a workshop

block at Urrbrae Agricultural High School at an estimated cost of £33,000. It is expected that this accommodation will be available in June, 1966. To my knowledge, no alteration has been made to that programme, but I was awaiting further details in order to give the Leader the latest information.

JUDGES' ASSOCIATES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last night the Attorney-General and I were at the annual dinner of the Law Society of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You were in bad company!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We were a fair distance apart because the Attorney-General was at the top table, and I was a paying guest. Although we were separated by a great gulf, we both listened to the speech made by Mr. J. F. Astley, Q.C., in proposing a toast. One point made by Mr. Astley was that Their Honours the Judges have difficulty in obtaining the services of judges' associates because the amount paid to them is substantially less than young practitioners can get in other places. Mr. Astley suggested that this was bad and that the remedy was to increase substantially the remuneration of associates. This is a matter, of course, in which the Government will have to take part. Does that suggestion appeal to the Attorney-General? If so, is he prepared to recommend to Cabinet some action along the lines suggested by Mr. Astley?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that I intend to investigate this matter and have some discussion with Their Honours about it and then with the Public Service Commissioner. I think I should not express an opinion at this stage until I have done that.

OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Casey:

That in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria, which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum,

and which Mr. Millhouse had also moved to amend by leaving out the words "this session" and by leaving out all the words after the word "totalizators" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament".

(Continued from August 25. Page 1279.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Some weeks (or was it months?) ago, I listened with great interest (indeed, with rapt attention) to the member for Frome when he moved this motion that this House should express its opinion on the issue of off-course betting, and that legislation should be introduced this session for a totalizator agency board system to operate in South Australia similar to that operating in Victoria. I listened with just as much interest to the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). I think he made quite a good speech—

Mr. Hughes: Thank you!

Mr. RODDA: —even if I did not agree with the text of it. I was, however, somewhat surprised when he moved his amendment, because at no time during his speech did I get the impression that he thought much of betting and I thought he had a bob each way.

Mr. Hughes: No.

Mr. RODDA: That is the way I see it. I accept the honourable member's denial but, if the motion is carried, he has asked that we have a referendum on this question.

Mr. Shannon: I think the honourable member agreed to abide by a referendum.

Mr. RODDA: Who wouldn't? To my mind, the key words in the motion are "similar to Victoria". It need not be chapter and verse cast in the same pattern, and I thought the honourable member qualified this when he said, "Winning bets are not paid out until the first business day after the racing day." This system gives a measure of protection to the punter who is tempted to chase his losses.

Mr. McKee: What about the punter wanting to catch up with his winnings?

Mr. RODDA: This question is indeed a controversial and important social issue. It has exercised the minds of South Australians over the years, and we are the only State of the Commonwealth (as the honourable member correctly pointed out) that has not legalized off-course betting, with the exception of a series of licensed betting shops in Port Pirie. I have received a number of petitions, some being similar stereotyped forms to the ones received from the churches. I point out, too, that I have a great respect for the stand taken by the churches on this issue. However, I have

also received counter-petitions, one such petition from people in my district stating:

The undersigned have noted with pleasure your support in Parliament of the implementation of T.A.B. in South Australia. Judging on the success of this scheme in other States, we are all sure that it would be a great advantage to South Australia, as the figures of enclosed cutting illustrate.

The petitioners have enclosed figures that were quoted in the House relating to what has transpired in Victoria. The petition concludes:

Assuring you of our support in this matter and wishing you well in the execution of your Parliamentary duties.

Mr. Hughes: How could they say that when you had not spoken about it?

Mr. RODDA: I have looked at this subject with an open mind, and endeavoured to put an impartial interpretation on the issues involved. I do not bet or indulge in punting myself, but I occasionally attend a race meeting, and I have always been a horse lover and interested in the breeding of blood stock. I believe that if a citizen of this State wishes to have a bet he should have that right, without having to break the law to do so, but to bet at present he either has to attend a race meeting or has to make a trip to the salubrious regions of Port Pirie. An important moral issue is involved in this question, and I know that several honourable members have definite opinions on gambling and betting. I respect them for the views they so firmly hold, and when I say I do not believe it is sinful or immoral to buy a raffle ticket, or to make a bet within one's financial capacity, I am not reflecting on those members who may think differently from me.

I believe that South Australians generally are a mature and responsible people who know right from wrong and who, in actual fact, indulge in their pastimes and pleasures with moderation. Of course, there is the habitual gambler who causes us all some concern when we look at the question of legalizing off-course betting. It is no secret that much illegal starting price bookmaking is being conducted in South Australia, and this must concern every member of the House. It has been said many times that, if a law is being continually flouted, it is a bad law that should be changed, and I agree with this contention. I do not wish to cast aspersions on our Police Force when I speak about illegal bookmakers. Indeed, I believe the police have taken a sensible view of this question. It has been my experience that when one illegal bookmaker has been apprehended another always seems to show up to

take his place, with all the guile and hard-to-catch camouflage and careful planning they use. The illegal South Australian bookmaker is a shrewd operator, and is actually a parasite on the community, working under cover like a termite in the dark and making no contribution whatsoever to the coffers of the State.

Mr. Freebairn: Or to the racing clubs.

Mr. RODDA: That is true. The weak-willed individual is easy prey for these fellows and, with their out-of-sight methods and credit-giving when their clients' funds blow up, it is little wonder that trouble and misery enter family circles. It is this type of punter that causes our churches so much concern, and I have been confronted with a couple of such cases in the short time I have been a member of the House.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Didn't they pay up?

Mr. RODDA: They are in trouble paying anybody. The world has not changed much since I was an officer of the Lands Department about 10 years ago. We had a large staff and I had some first-hand experience in seeing the vigour of unbridled gambling unleash itself detrimentally amongst some of the families who came within the ambit of the department's administration. Every investigation revealed an illegal S.P. bookmaker lurking in the background. Yet no matter how hard we searched, the punter always covered up for his source of pleasure. This type of punter is in the minority when we consider the volume of bettors generally, and I do believe we should consider the great body of decent and sober people who have a wager within their means on a horse of their fancy.

Similarly the racing industry is a big and valuable undertaking which provides much employment and is worth many hundreds of thousands of pounds to the State. In my district there are many studs, which are quite valuable concerns. A balanced view should be taken of the situation and some orderly system to control betting in this State should be instituted. I firmly and sincerely believe this while having respect for the churches and kindred organizations which have expressed their concern to me and other members of the House on the question of the probable introduction of T.A.B. into South Australia.

It is difficult to assess the extent of the illegal S.P. betting that takes place in this State, and I doubt if a correct assessment of the volume could be made. People have told me they know that a certain town in the

South-East has £10,000 wagered weekly within its confines, yet I can find no actual basis for that figure, although I do know betting is going on in a big way in my district. However, on consideration, where else can people go to bet except across the border?

Mr. Hughes: Would you support the suggestion of the member for Port Pirie for total T.A.B.?

Mr. RODDA: Does the honourable member mean that we should do away with book-makers?

Mr. Hughes: Yes.

Mr. RODDA: Not on racecourses. I was interested to read what Mr. Justice Kinsella, the New South Wales Royal Commissioner, had to say on page 19 of his report with regard to people who wagered off-course in New South Wales. The learned judge said:

I assess the number of persons who bet with the off-course bookmakers to be about 500,000. In doing so I may well be erring on the conservative side. It is important to bear in mind that although these persons break the law by betting off-the-course they, or the great majority of them, are decent, respectable citizens, law abiding in all other respects.

On page 22 of this report the Commissioner said:

On the question of the extent and volume of off-the-course betting in N.S.W. the best assessment I can make is that there are about 6,000 bookmakers engaged in illegal off-the-course betting, that the number of persons who "more than seldom" bet with them is of the order of 500,000, and that the annual turnover of off-the-course betting is of the order of £275,000,000 a year (£520 per head, which equals £10 a week).

It was estimated that £165,000,000 was wagered illegally in Victoria prior to the introduction of off-course betting, and figures there show an annual increase in betting placed on the tote, although it does not approach the estimated figure given to the Royal Commission prior to the introduction of T.A.B. It would be difficult to assess what is the actual extent of illegal off-course betting taking place in South Australia now, but I do not believe a person in South Australia who likes to have a bet (and, provided it is within his means, I believe he has a perfect right to do so) would be any different from the people referred to in the reports of New South Wales and Victoria. Illegal bookmaking does go on here under our very noses, and I was interested to note what the Hon. Anne Press said in the New South Wales Legislative Council as recorded in *Hansard* of March 4, 1964, at page 7497. She said:

When I was in Adelaide in October I went into a T.A.B. betting place and saw women in there with their prams and shopping baskets, having a few shillings each way on the races. I thought that I would see whether the starting-price bookie was still operating, so I went back to the hotel where I was staying. The manageress there was a knowledgeable woman, and I said to her: "I have not been able to get my money on today. Do you think there is any chance of getting £1 on for me?" She said, "Yes, I will fix it for you." I ask you! I gave her the £1, and later went back and collected my winnings. I did this just to see whether it could happen.

Later in her speech she continued:

I have known a starting-price bookmaker there for many years and his wife still wears as many furs as ever; her standard of living is no lower than when I first knew her 10 years ago.

From the foregoing it can be seen that South Australians are no more virtuous than people in other parts of the world. The honourable member for Frome quoted many authorities on gambling, and I was indebted to him for supplying me with a copy of the report of Robert F. Wagner and Abraham D. Beame of New York. These gentlemen have not spared themselves in looking at the question of gambling and betting on racehorses in Australia, New Zealand, England and France. I was interested in what they had to say about England.

It appears to me, looking at this question objectively, that if we were going to stop betting on horse racing, we would have to ban racecourses and horse races. No person in the modern world would sensibly suggest doing this.

The other side of the question is very real: we will never stop people from betting. We must be realists and face this issue quite fairly and squarely. The churches have strongly expressed their opinion on this issue, and I do not think we should dismiss their petitions or suggestions lightly. I believe that any system of off-course betting that will provide a service should be placed so that it does not offend the non-betting public and is not situated close to churches, schools or hotels. People from the off-course totalizator committee in South Australia have approached me and have stressed this point strongly: they do not desire to offend the non-betting public in this regard.

Our not having an orderly system of betting, which a great many of our respectable and responsible citizens desire, only tends to foster this already rife and illegal behind-the-scenes practice, enabling it to make bigger inroads into our society. The legalizing of off-course betting is justified if it represents a genuine attempt to clear up a situation in which people

have constant contempt for the law. Where the law is treated with contempt, I believe it is the duty of the Government of the day to review such legislation. In this it should have the backing of Parliament. It does not matter how one looks at this situation one always comes back to the existence of this illegal practice with all its evils.

Another reason (and I do not think we should encourage anybody to bet for this reason) is that the harnessing of betting under an orderly system will bring considerable revenue to the Government. With the existing system, the illegal operations contribute nothing to the Treasury. If it is going to continue to foist its parasitic pressure on to the racing industry, I believe it quite rightly should contribute its share of taxation to the revenue of the State. The member for Frome specifically mentioned "similar to Victoria" in his motion, and we have to have some idea of what sort of system we would institute in legislation to make off-course betting legal in South Australia. The honourable member explained his reasons for this and I agree that a system where a bettor cannot collect his winnings until the subsequent working day has a most sobering influence on the person who desires to "play up" his winnings.

I will not support the system operating in New South Wales or Western Australia, where pay-outs are made immediately after the race or broadcasts are made. I have seen the Victorian system work and it is most orderly. There are no broadcasts, no seating accommodation and the tote generally only provides for a person to place his bet. All betting ceases 40 minutes before the start of the race. I was indebted to the agent at one of the Victorian centres who, when he knew I was a member of Parliament from South Australia, invited me to go behind the scenes and see the staff at work. I thought it was a touch of irony that the first investor I saw come to the window should be a parson. Nevertheless, it was his perfect right to make a legal wager. There was no loitering; people came and conducted their transactions and left immediately. One thing that did interest me was that a number of phoned bets came in from South Australia, and were being placed against arranged credits. It is of interest to note that credit accounts are arranged from South Australia at the following centres: Edenhope, 46 persons registered; Casterton, 64; Nhill, 23; Horsham, 8; and Mildura, 5.

Mr. Casey: Are they the numbers of South Australians registered?

Mr. RODDA: Yes. A prominent South Australian churchman was recently quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying the T.A.B. Bill was the thin edge of the wedge, and that there was agitation in other places for broadcasts and immediate pay-outs at the conclusion of races. First, there is no Bill before the House and we are merely expressing our opinions on the merits and demerits of a highly controversial subject. I agree with the honourable member for Mitcham that Parliament should not shrink from doing this; that is why we are here.

I give this reverend gentleman my assurance here and now that I will not have a bar of broadcasts of odds, immediate pay-outs after races, seating accommodation to be provided at T.A.B. premises, or anything that resembles betting shops, as they were known in days gone by. He can also be assured that I will not have a bar of poker machines at any price. I have not seen the betting shops operating at Port Pirie, but I am completely nonplussed as to how they ever came into existence.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: If T.A.B. comes in, will the betting shops go out?

Mr. RODDA: I do not know but, with great respect to the honourable member for Port Pirie, the betting shops do not appeal to me as being the correct media through which to bet.

Mr. McKee: It is better than having people break the law and you have already admitted that your constituents are doing that.

Mr. RODDA: They have no option. A person wrote to the editor of the *Advertiser* accusing me of being, I think, disloyal to a great leader. Although I agree with the reference to a great leader, I take umbrage concerning the alleged disloyalty, because during my campaign I was asked on many platforms what would be my attitude to lotteries, T.A.B. and many other things.

Mr. Hughes: Getting back to Port Pirie, do you think that the betting shops there should be closed?

Mr. RODDA: I think they will be. I also consider (and Mr. Justice Kinsella referred to this in his report on New South Wales) that, if a T.A.B. system is introduced in South Australia, there should be heavy penalties for illegal bookmaking. I am also of opinion that, if it is introduced, it will be "goodbye" to the betting shops at Port Pirie. The Royal Commission in New South Wales, in recommending increased penalties, said that in respect of the first offence for illegal operations the minimum fine should be £200 and

the maximum £500, that for the second offence there should be a minimum sentence of three months' gaol and a maximum of six months' gaol, and that for third and subsequent offences, the penalty should be 12 months' gaol without option.

If we are going to agree to an off-course betting facility, we must see that the law is enforced, and such an approach should give some comfort to the churches and other bodies that are concerned with the social evils of widespread betting and with the problem of the habitual gambler who seeks out the illicit means of placing bets against a legally controlled system requiring cash or established credit. It is desirable that, if a legal off-course betting system is instituted, it be conducted in such a way that it is not detrimental to the public interest or offensive to the non-betting public.

One cannot consider this matter without concern for young people, and sound home training and education will ensure that a child is not contaminated by the evils of gambling. A wise parent rears his children with instruction to withstand temptation when the testing time comes and they are exposed to the vices of the world. To shut our community away from these problems is to turn our backs on reality. Our people are responsible, industrious and hard-working citizens and those who want the facilities to have a legal bet should not be denied those facilities, whether they are in the country or in the city. I have tried to look at this situation impartially, considering the wishes of everyone, and I am of the opinion that the only way to put betting on horse racing on a sound basis is by the implementation of a T.A.B. system in this State. The Victorian system, with its limitation on payouts of winnings to the following racing day—

Mr. Freebairn: Business day.

Mr. RODDA: Well, yes. That system, with no broadcasts or racing information, seems to be what would be a suitable arrangement for this State. I am not happy about the commission agent in the Victorian system. However, I think things like that could be ironed out when a Bill was before the House. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I rise to speak to this motion and to allay any doubts in honourable members' minds as to my attitude. I declare straight out that I support the motion as moved by the honourable member for Frome.

Mr. Hughes: You have altered your opinion since last year!

Mr. LAWN: No, I have not altered it at all. In fact, I had no opinion until I listened to some members address themselves to this motion. What the honourable member is referring to is what I said last year on a Government Bill to increase the tax on book-makers. I said (at page 1645 of *Hansard* of last year):

I shall not do anything to encourage gambling . . . but at the same time I recognize a person's right to choose to gamble or not to gamble.

Mr. Clark: Anyhow, that was purely a sectional tax.

Mr. LAWN: I have quoted what I said last year, and that is what I say today. I would not encourage anyone to gamble; I would not encourage anyone to smoke; I would not encourage anyone to drink; and I would not encourage anyone to swear. However, I admit the right of the individual to do any of those things if he so desires. The honourable member for Victoria referred to poker machines, and, while it is not fair to condemn or praise something that one has not seen, from everything I have heard about them I would not be a party to their establishment in South Australia. As I said last year, I recognize the individual's right to do certain things, so long as it does not interfere with the rights of other members of the public. I listened with interest to the remarks of the member for Frome. I say unhesitatingly that this House is indebted to the honourable member for his honest and reasoned speech and for the research that went into its preparation.

Mr. Shannon: It is surprising he did not use his influence in Caucus. I thought he would be just as effective there.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member is becoming political. This matter was not discussed in Caucus.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We wouldn't know that.

Mr. LAWN: I am not concerned whether or not the honourable member knows anything. The fact is that the member for Onkaparinga, like his Leader, is trying to create the impression that we have a Party policy on this matter and that this motion was discussed and framed in Caucus, which is entirely untrue.

Mr. McKee: And it is not the first time the member for Onkaparinga has been wrong.

Mr. Shannon: Not the first time he has had a pretty shrewd guess, though.

Mr. LAWN: It is a lie to say that this matter is the result of any Caucus discussion or decision, and I give that the lie direct.

Mr. Shannon: I don't think I said that.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member for Frome gave this House the benefit of his research, which concerned prominent people, including ministers of religion, and their study of and their views on T.A.B. in Western Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales. He also gave us the benefit of the reports he had studied on betting in New Zealand, in America, and in European countries. I shall be saying more regarding bookmakers later.

Mr. McKee: Would you support total T.A.B.?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I would. I will come to that in my own time. Having a stubborn and impartial mind—

Mr. Quirke: That is a queer mixture.

Mr. Clark: I think perhaps "persistent" might be better than "stubborn".

Mr. LAWN: —as honourable members know, and after having heard the honourable member for Frome (who I thought did a good job in presenting his side of the case), I looked forward with interest to hearing other members of this House to whom I thought (because of their position and their years of experience) I could in all sincerity look for guidance. The next speaker was the Leader of the Opposition, and politically the Leader and I are as far apart as the two poles. Over the years since I have been here I have learned to know the Leader and to respect him as a man. He does not smoke, drink, gamble, or swear.

Mr. Ryan: He isn't a puritan, is he?

Mr. LAWN: One might say that he is. However, I have the greatest admiration and respect for him as a man.

Mr. Jennings: How about the gerrymander; you did not like that, did you?

Mr. LAWN: That is becoming political. I could not truthfully say I hated anyone, but I detest the Leader's politics. I do not want to indulge in politics this afternoon, but unfortunately the honourable member to whom I was looking for guidance did exactly that. The whole of his speech on this matter was either political or cynical.

Mr. Ryan: You were greatly disappointed in him?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, I was. The Leader on August 11 (and that is a significant date, seeing that today is September 29) said:

We are told that the member for Frome is prepared to accept amendments. For instance, we are told that, although the words "similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria" are included, he is willing to settle for something less than that. The only thing that we on this side of the House understand—and when I say "we" I am speaking for myself and, I hope, for some of my colleagues— . . . This is a social question, and the Labor Party believes that social questions should be submitted to the people by way of a referendum. Do honourable members opposite say that that is not a correct interpretation of Labor's policy on this matter? Of course they do not. In fact, I could quote the rule on it.

The Leader was the only member who said he had heard that the member for Frome was prepared to accept something less than his motion. I had lunch today with the member for Frome, and at that stage he was not prepared to accept any amendments to his motion, and he still is not—unless he has changed his mind since 1.30 p.m. At no stage did the Leader have any authority for his statement; it was just something he threw in to try to belittle the motion. He said this was a social question, and so it is. He went on to say that the Labor Party believed that a social question should be submitted to the people by way of a referendum. That is not correct; I believe the Leader knows that and that he was deliberately attempting to cloud the issue. This came from a member to whom I was looking for guidance. He said:

Do honourable members opposite say that that is not a correct interpretation of Labor's policy on this matter? Of course they do not. In fact, I could quote the rule on it.

There is no such rule on the question and, since the Leader has spoken, he has heard one of our members—the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes)—move an amendment to the motion calling for a referendum. If there were a rule of the Party we would all be obliged to support a referendum, but there is no such rule. The only social question on which our Party has made a declaration is that a State lottery should be submitted to the people by way of a referendum on a compulsory vote, but every Labor member of this place is still free to vote according to his own conscience for or against the Bill when it comes before the House.

Mr. Clark: That is right.

Mr. LAWN: We have no policy that T.A.B. should go to a referendum. The matter of liquor hours, which is another social question, is left to the conscience of the individual member. We have no rule that all social matters must be submitted to the people by way of

referendum. The honourable member was cynical also in suggesting, as the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) did this afternoon, that this was a Party matter that had been discussed in Caucus and that it was put up on behalf of the Government.

Mr. Shannon: The honourable member is entirely wrong. I did not say that; I said, "Why didn't the member for Frome convince Caucus?"

Mr. LAWN: If I misunderstood the honourable member, I apologize, but this matter was not discussed in Caucus, as he should know.

Mr. Shannon: I am wondering why the member for Frome did not use his persuasive powers in Caucus rather than here.

Mr. Casey: It is not a Party matter.

Mr. LAWN: He did not do so because it is not a Party matter. It was not discussed in Caucus, and no decision was made.

Mr. Shannon: I did not say it was.

Mr. LAWN: I apologize to the honourable member if I misunderstood him, and I withdraw the remarks I made. The Leader conveyed the impression that it was a Party matter. He said:

If a vote is taken this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, you will see the surprising position of the Premier voting in favour of this resolution, which in effect says, "Please Frank, will you bring in T.A.B.?" and Frank will vote for a request for himself to bring in T.A.B.

Mr. Clark: How do they know how he will vote?

Mr. LAWN: I emphasize that he was being cynical and joocular, because he knows, as everyone does, that we should not refer to honourable members in this House by other than their position—Premier or Leader of the Opposition—or the district they represent. He tried to ridicule this Party, the motion and the Premier by using the Premier's Christian name.

The last thing I want to say about whether the matter was pre-discussed by the Party is that the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that he had seen the surprise on the faces of members when the member for Frome got up and gave notice of his motion. I was outside the House at the time and when I came in I was told that he had given the notice of motion. On June 23, the day afterwards, the *Advertiser* said:

Some surprise was evident on both sides of the House when Mr. Casey made his announcement. Not all Government members would support the referendum, and it is expected that a considerable section of the Opposition would vote against it.

Obviously, the press reporters also saw the surprise on the faces of honourable members that the honourable member for Mitcham said he saw. I refer now to the remarks of the member for Mitcham, not because I looked to him for guidance but because I think it was the best effort he has made since he has been a member of this House. It was completely honest and free of politics. I listened to him with interest, and think I heard practically every word of his speech. He said:

Unless I am very much mistaken, the notice of this motion came as a great surprise to members of the Government. It may be that members on the Government side, both those on the front bench and those who sit behind them, are consummate actors, but I doubt it, and if they were not acting then they were completely taken by surprise when one of their number, the honourable member for Frome, got up and gave notice of this motion concerning T.A.B. . . . As I say, I happened to be watching the members opposite.

Another member to whom I looked for some help in making up my mind about what I should do in relation to this motion was the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson), who is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but I am afraid he disappointed me. Among other things, he said:

If I supported this motion I would feel guilty of deliberately exposing the community to a serious moral and social risk. Indeed, I would find myself guilty of assisting an attack on moral standards by giving this form of gambling the imprimatur of legality. Legality in this matter is not morality, and by giving organized gambling the imprimatur of legality does not, in my view, alter its character. I believe the very respectability with which it can be clothed is a trap for the unwary.

I was surprised when I heard that. It came from a member who last year was a member of the Cabinet. According to a statement by the then Premier, Cabinet had made an offer to the racing clubs to introduce a Bill to give effect to T.A.B. I think it was called "the 14-point plan." The honourable member for Flinders was a member of that Cabinet, which offered T.A.B. to the people of South Australia, yet he says now that T.A.B. is immoral.

Mr. McKee: Things were different then. They were the Government.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member may argue that way, but I cannot see how things are different. This is a social question and T.A.B. is either moral or immoral, and whichever Party is in Government cannot alter the fact that betting, gambling or T.A.B. is moral or immoral. As the honourable member raised this question of morality, I invite him to

examine his conscience—regarding his support for many years of the gerrymander: if anything was immoral, that was. The member for Flinders criticized legalized gambling in this State, but the previous Government made no effort to restrict or abolish it. The honourable member said:

Legality in this matter is not morality, and by giving organized gambling the imprimatur of legality does not, in my view, alter its character.

That means that he is opposed to legalized gambling because it is immoral. The Government, of which he was a member for years, continued legalized gambling and made no effort to abolish it. That Government was prepared to submit a 14-point plan to this House for ratification. The honourable member for Mitcham was sincere, and he convinced me more than did either the Leader or Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He said:

The church has never held that all gambling was wrong. The traditional attitude has been that gambling is not in itself wrong. It is a thing indifferent and must be judged by its effects. That is the view which personally I hold. In that way gambling is akin to alcohol. In itself, I believe there is nothing wrong in having an alcoholic drink, but in excess, and the effects of that excess, can be evil indeed. My view is that gambling and alcohol are much the same in that in themselves they are not either good or bad. Having said that, I must admit that my own feeling is against gambling. I do not say that I do not gamble, I do, but I do not gamble much . . . I am not a racing man but I enjoyed the day at the races, and I cannot believe that, in itself, there was anything wrong with that. Of course, there was not. My instinct is generally against gambling and against an extension of gambling in the community. Although that is my feeling and the one with which I began to view this question, there are two other considerations, which made me modify my position. First, all the evidence seems to be that where you have a legalized form of off-course betting the amount of illegal S.P. betting in the community decreases considerably and significantly. That seems to be an incontrovertible fact that I have been able to discover from other States and overseas. It cannot be denied that S.P. bookmaking in itself brings many evils in its train. It is illegal and is conducted under the most unsatisfactory and unsavoury conditions in hotel bars and lavatories, and I do not think I am wrong in that. I thought that was a reasoned summing up of the matter. Life is a gamble. Every time I walk from my house to the shops on Marion Road I gamble. I have written to the Minister about conditions on this road because when we try to cross it we gamble our lives. When crossing from Parliament House to the Gresham Hotel one has to dodge cars, because

drivers will not give way to pedestrians. Dealing on the Stock Exchange is a gamble. Surely all forms of gambling are not sinful.

Mr. Jennings: Politics is a gamble.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. A person does not know whether he will be returned at the next election, and he may already have given up his previous employment. If he is not returned after one term he may not get his former job back. I agree with the member for Mitcham that degree is the thing to be analysed: the amount of alcohol consumed and of gambling, and the excess. Excessive gambling and drinking is wrong. The honourable member used the word "evils". I think it is not in the interests of the person or his family if he spends too much money on drinking and gambling. The actual gambling (and of having a bet) is not, in my opinion, wrong, nor is it a sin. The member for Mitcham said that he and his wife had a day's enjoyment at the races at Victoria Park. I could visualize exactly what was in his mind, because there are two courses that my wife likes to visit on public holidays, Victoria Park and Morphettville.

Mr. Ryan: The lucky courses?

Mr. LAWN: No, but the surroundings are lovely.

Mr. Ryan: On the flat at Victoria Park!

Mr. LAWN: No, in the grandstand or derby enclosure at Victoria Park or Morphettville people can enjoy themselves even though they do not bet. I visit those courses, and other courses also, and have a feeling of complete relaxation. I can throw away all my worries. Putting the money on is exciting. However, apart from betting, just to go down to these two beautiful courses with their lovely surroundings of trees and green is very pleasant. I cannot express in words my exact feeling. I know that my wife enjoys the same feeling. She likes to go to these two courses on public holidays. She gets tremendous enjoyment from just going there without betting; so do I. Shall we say to people, "It is all right to have your other sports; you can go to your football, cricket or swimming, but it is wrong to go to the racecourse and wrong to have a bet"?

Mr. Ryan: It is the first time I have ever heard the honourable member totally agree with the member for Mitcham.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but this is not a political question. The honourable member never brought politics into it, and neither have I. He was sincere, and I can appreciate what he said. On those courses one gets a feeling of

complete relaxation and peacefulness. We do get some excitement by making a bet, I admit, but we do not have to bet. I come now to another reference by the Leader of the Opposition, who said—and don't forget that all through his speech he criticized the motion and was opposed to it:

I favour providing limited opportunities to bet for persons living in the country who at present cannot have a bet. I use the word "limited" because I believe that facilities should be provided and designed, as far as possible, not to encourage or permit gambling. I stress the words, "I favour providing limited opportunities to bet for persons living in the country." I am sincere when I say that I believe in decentralization. I have argued from the opposite side of the House for some years that, whilst we cannot give the people in the country all the amenities that people in the metropolitan area enjoy, we should give them what we can. For instance, we cannot give them the ocean to bathe in or the sands for them to sit on and their children to play on.

Mr. Jennings: Or a deep sea port at Oodnadatta!

Mr. LAWN: There are many things that we cannot give them. I believe in giving them electric light and power, at no higher cost than to people in the metropolitan area. I have supported motions on at least two occasions to that effect from the opposite side of the House. The people in the country are entitled to what we have in the metropolitan area. Because I am in the city, I can go to a racecourse and have a bet. People in Port Pirie can bet by going to a betting shop, but the people in Frome cannot have a legal bet. They cannot go to the racecourse and see races.

Mr. Ryan: How about people in Gawler?

Mr. LAWN: They can see the races when they are held there and, if they like to travel 25 to 30 miles, they can come to Morphettville or other metropolitan courses; but the people further away have no hope whatever of enjoying watching races. Also, they cannot enjoy a legal bet—they have to do it on the sly. I do not agree with that. If we want to encourage people to go to the country, we have to do the best we can to give them amenities.

Mr. McKee: Bad laws should not be forced on the people.

Mr. LAWN: These are not bad laws. I have not heard the honourable member move any motion to abolish bookmakers.

Mr. McKee: The law is bad at the moment, with S.P. bookmakers forcing people to break the law.

Mr. LAWN: I agree. We should alter bad law in respect of country people and give them the right to have a legal bet.

Mr. McKee: That is right.

Mr. LAWN: I still cannot understand this statement of the Leader of the Opposition, though I have already read it at least a dozen times. He said earlier that he believed in giving limited opportunities to country people to have a bet. Then he said:

I use the word "limited" because I believe that facilities should be provided and designed, as far as possible, not to encourage or permit gambling.

There may be some reason why the buildings should be provided and designed not to encourage betting. For instance, I believe they should be a certain distance from a hotel, that they should be away on their own somewhere so that they are not buildings that people would pass going to or from a hotel. Put them in an out-of-the-way place, but, if we are to provide buildings for the purposes of T.A.B. or a bookmaker, is not that facilitating gambling? The Leader said, "The buildings should not permit gambling." I think the Leader of the Opposition was so much concerned—

Mr. Jennings: He was having a bob each way himself!

Mr. LAWN: —with being political and cynical and treating us with contempt—no, not with "contempt"; I withdraw that word—treating it as a joke or a Party matter that he opened his trap and made a statement that makes no sense at all.

I come now to the question: should Parliament legislate in a matter of this description or not? I say "Yes". A democratic Government should legislate for the people—"Government of the people by the people for the people": that is what I believe in. If the people want certain laws, it is the duty of Parliament to give them those laws. For instance, total abolition of alcoholic liquor was tried in some countries, and the people demanded that they should have liquor. The Parliaments concerned had to break down and give them the right to drink alcoholic liquor. The same applies here. People demand that they should have the right to drink and other rights. I hold the opinion that a democratic Parliament is here to give effect to the wishes of the people and to make good laws for them. The Leader of the Opposition supports that contention of mine when it suits him.

Mr. Langley: In most parts of the world they have sane drinking laws.

Mr. LAWN: In 1953 the Leader of the Opposition, in supporting an amendment to the Early Closing Act to exempt certain goods, said:

From my experience abroad I know that these commodities are sold freely at almost any hour. In Western Australia, New South Wales and Queensland, cigarettes and tobacco are considered essential and exempt goods. When the matter first came before me, the Victorian Parliament was considering it also. The action we contemplate has already been taken in at least three States and contemplated in another. If the Bill is passed many people will be inconvenienced. Although there may be some opposition from people who are not anxious to trade during the later hours, I think that in a very short time the amendment will be considered a good one, and people will find themselves able to live more comfortably within the laws of the State.

That was stated by the Leader of the Opposition when, as Premier, he introduced a Bill to amend the Early Closing Act by exempting certain goods. The Leader said that at least three other States had similar legislation. In the case of T.A.B., Western Australia, Victoria, New South Wales, and, I think, Tasmania (I am not sure about Queensland) provide this facility. I point out that, in line with what the Premier said in 1953, many people in this State will be inconvenienced if T.A.B. is introduced. Instead of having to bet on the sly in hotel bars, lavatories and other places that I shall mention later, people will be able to bet openly and legally. The member for Frome (Mr. Casey) has already proved to the House that certain reverend gentlemen and others who opposed T.A.B. on specific grounds have admitted that since it has functioned in other States their fears have not materialized. This also applies to the Bill introduced by the Premier in 1953, for I repeat that he said:

. . . people will find themselves able to live more comfortably within the laws of the State. Wherever T.A.B. exists (whether it be in the metropolitan area or in the country) people will be able to enjoy a bet on the races legally, and to live comfortably within the laws of the State.

Mr. Jennings: What about the Leader's 14-point plan?

Mr. LAWN: I mentioned that earlier, and what I said applies not only to the Leader but to every former Cabinet Minister. The public was told last year (and the racing clubs were informed of this in a letter to them) that the previous Government offered a 14-point plan

on T.A.B. That occurred 12 months ago, so why do we see this sudden stubborn opposition to T.A.B.? Why has it now become immoral? I fail to understand the opposition to this motion that has been expressed by the other side. That is why I say that, having an open mind when this debate commenced, I was looking to those members for guidance, but they have failed to convince me that there is anything immoral or wrong in the motion of the member for Frome.

I, too, have received a number of petitions, including one from the Salvation Army at Congress Hall in the city signed by 216 people (some living in my district, but not all of them). I have also received a petition from the Salvation Army's Thebarton organization, containing 14 signatures; one from the Cowandilla Church of Christ, containing 44 signatures of petitioners (some living in my district and some in the district of West Torrens); one from the Adelaide Church of Christ, containing 54 signatures; and one from a Methodist Church, containing 109 signatures (including six names without addresses). I have also received petitions from the Flinders Street Baptist Church, containing 134 signatures, and from the Richmond Baptist Church, containing 33 signatures. That gives a total of 634 petitioners that have asked me to oppose the motion of the member for Frome.

An article in the *News* of Thursday, August 12, is headed, "5,600 Favour T.A.B.—Poll. No Canvassing," and it states:

A two-day survey had produced 5,600 signatures from people favouring off-course betting in South Australia, a spokesman for the Off-Course Totalizator Agency Committee said today. The spokesman said the survey had been conducted on Friday and Saturday. The purpose was not to collect a large number of names, he said. "Many thousands more could have been obtained. The survey demonstrated how easily this could have been done." On Friday factories and offices were visited, and three tables were set up at Victoria Park on Saturday afternoon. "About half the signatures came from racegoers, but they had to find us and line up. There was no canvassing," the spokesman said.

The voluminous petition that has been forwarded to me is, in fact, addressed to every honourable member in the House, although I notice that on the front page it has been signed by some of my constituents. It states:

We, the undersigned petitioners, request all members of the South Australian Parliament to legislate for the establishment of a T.A.B. system of off-course betting in this State, similar to that operating in Victoria.

I have examined the petition, and I have counted 5,610 signatures, which is more than the figure reported in the *News*, although that may have been only a round figure. I have examined the petition also to ascertain the districts of the various petitioners, and they are as follows: Port Pirie, Nairne, Lobethal, Kanmantoo, Mount Barker, Callington, Bridgewater, Brukunga, Willaston, Woodside, Murray Bridge, Harrogate, Jamestown, Terowie, Peterborough, Caltowie, Laura, Gladstone, Crystal Brook, Port Augusta, Belalie East, Hallett, Belalie Belt, Bundaleer, Mannanarie, Redhill, Georgetown, Wirrabara, Iron Knob, Whyalla, Clare, and Kimba.

I think the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that he had received a petition, containing 1,000 signatures, in opposition to the system. Other honourable members have referred to petitions they, too, have received. I have already referred to petitions that I have received, asking me to vote against the motion, but here is a petition asking all honourable members to vote in favour of the motion. A total of 5,600-odd names was obtained in a period of 48 hours, whereas we know that signatures on other petitions were obtained, in some cases, over a span of three weekends. Those who have asked me to vote against the motion approached me soon after the notice of motion was given, and I replied that I would consider and judge the matter on its merits, and vote accordingly when the time arrived. However, I said I would not support a return to the betting shop days as I knew them. Having inspected the T.A.B. agencies in Western Australia, I believe that if that system were adopted here it would constitute a return to the betting shop days. In Western Australia people can go to the agency, have a bet, listen to the race broadcast, and collect their winnings, if any, as soon as the "all clear" is given. There would be no difference between that system and the old betting shop system.

In the letters I wrote to interested people I pointed out that the motion of the member for Frome referred to a system similar to that operating in Victoria. I also pointed out that in Victoria no pay-out is authorized until the next business day after the race day. I believe the closing time for bets at the Victorian agencies is 40 minutes before the race. I have inspected T.A.B. agencies in Victoria where I have seen men and women place their bets for Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide meetings and then leave the premises. There is no reason for them to remain because they

cannot listen to the race broadcast or collect their winnings until the following Monday if the meeting is on a Saturday. Therefore, there is no reason for them to loiter around the agency.

Mr. Jennings: There is no inducement.

Mr. LAWN: That is correct. Total T.A.B., which has been referred to earlier, would mean the end of bookmakers. So long as I am Chairman of Committees, I will not have the opportunity to speak or move amendments during the Committee stage of a Bill. Therefore, I take this opportunity to ask the Government, if this motion is carried, to provide in a Bill that there be no pay-out on the day a race is run, and that a clause be inserted to provide that all present licensed bookmakers be permitted to continue operating until their licences expire, that there be no renewal of those licences, and that no new licences be issued. In time, this would mean that there would be total T.A.B. During his speech, the member for Frome said that there were no bookmakers in New Zealand, America or France; yet racing is thriving in those countries. Every year New Zealand horses win the best races in Australia. I believe that the huge betting with bookmakers is harmful to racing.

Mr. Jennings: Do you always use the tote when you go to the races?

Mr. LAWN: I bet with bookmakers and with the totalizator. The honourable member for Mitcham and his wife used the totalizator when they went to the races, and my wife bets with the tote. I will declare my attitude on this question: I believe that many races are "crook", and that pre-post betting has made them "crook". If betting were done with the totalizator there would be no incentive for big bettors to put thousands of pounds on horses, because they would be cutting down their own odds. Now they get the odds by betting S.P. on a Friday night. That is another reason why this motion should be carried. One can look at the betting in the *News* on a Friday night and then see that the odds have shortened in the betting shown in the *Advertiser* on Saturday morning.

Mr. Ryan: Is the publishing of odds in the papers illegal?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know. However, prices change overnight and this could not happen without bets being made. Those in the know can get the odds on Friday night for races to be run on the Saturday. We should cut out bets with bookmakers, and let the people have the right to enjoy betting with

the totalizator. If this were done I believe that racing would be much better off. This has been proved in countries where they have done away with bookmakers. In regard to Port Pirie, I say that the same should apply: let the present licences continue until they expire, and let there be no renewals and no new licences issued. I also suggest that another Bill be introduced, concurrently with the Bill to provide for the establishment of T.A.B., to abolish the winnings bets tax until such time as there is no betting with bookmakers.

Having listened to the debate, I have reached the conclusion that a form of T.A.B. would be of overall benefit to the people of South Australia. The question now arises whether I should support the member for Frome or the member for Mitcham. I believe I have made clear the reasons why I lean towards a system similar to that which operates in Victoria. I do not suggest, nor does the motion suggest, that our system should be exactly the same as that which operates in Victoria.

Mr. Ryan: But basically similar?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Our system should provide for no broadcast of the races in the agency and no pay-out of dividends until the next business day after the race meeting. That is why I support the motion.

Mr. McKee: That will support S.P. bookmaking in a big way.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member could not have listened to the member for Frome, because he produced evidence that showed that where T.A.B. has been introduced S.P. betting has been considerably reduced. Many members have said how they have been telephoned and told how easy it is to have an S.P. bet. In fact, a bookmaker came to see me the other day but when he saw my dog he left, and I still do not know why he came to see me. People have telephoned members and said that their butcher, grocer, chemist or delicatessen owner is their S.P. bookmaker. People have even complained to the honourable member for Victoria about the fact that these S.P. bookmakers do not pay a tax to the Government. First, it is easy to have an S.P. bet now. In addition to the S.P. bookmakers that have been suggested in telephone calls, one can go into a hotel and place one's bets there. Secondly, no revenue is derived by the Government from S.P. bookmaking.

Mr. Ryan: It is costing a lot to stamp it out.

Mr. LAWN: It is costing the Police Force much money to try to prevent illegal betting, but the member for Frome has convinced many honourable members that where T.A.B. has been introduced S.P. betting has declined. These people who told me that they have the butcher or grocer as their S.P. bookmaker have complained that no tax is paid to the Government by such operators. Another point is that people do not want to have to go to the races in order to make a bet. For example, many people who will be going to see Sturt beat Port Adelaide on Saturday would be happy if they could have a bet before they go to enjoy the football. Why should they have to go to the butcher, the chemist or to some hotel and bet on the sly?

We are men with experience and know what is going on in other parts of the world. In my opinion, either the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham or the motion moved by the member for Frome should be carried. I prefer the motion, because, as I said, I do not favour broadcasting in the agency or paying out winnings earlier than the day after the races. I support the motion moved by the member for Frome and hope that it will be carried.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I am fortunate in following the member for Adelaide in the debate, because I have the benefit of his review of speeches that have been made so far. I congratulate the member for Frome on his speech and agree with much that he said; the few additions I make will indicate the way in which I shall vote. When I first offered myself for election to Parliament, I claimed that I had had a fairly wide experience, that I had been a unionist, a leader of a primary producers' union, an employer and an employee, and that that experience would enable me to have the interests of the people at heart. I recall having said that I was an elected representative of a church organization and was also a member of a racing club. At that stage I was told sharply that, because of that, I would not know how to make up my mind on this subject.

However, as a member of Parliament elected to carry out the wishes of the people, I know that the liberty of the subject should be taken into account, particularly by a member of a Party whose political philosophy provides for the creation of conditions under which private enterprise can exist with a minimum of interference with the rights of the individual. Gallup polls must be taken into

account in matters such as this and the poll taken in relation to T.A.B. has revealed that in South Australia 46 per cent were in favour and 23 per cent were against. What has influenced me even more is that 34 per cent of those who said they did not bet on races were in favour of the introduction of T.A.B. and 24 per cent of these people were against it. That reflects my principles on this matter.

An individual should have the right to conduct his life as he thinks fit. I have asked people in various walks of life about their attitude on this matter and the most common answer was, "I do not bet but I think people should have the right to bet if they want to," and those statements and the type of person making them have guided me more than has anything else. I oppose holding a referendum on this matter. We are elected to govern on all types of question, and an expenditure of £50,000 makes a referendum an expensive luxury.

The S.P. bookmakers would be the leaders in opposition to the introduction of T.A.B., because they are making no contribution to State taxation at present. If there is to be a referendum on a social question, I think that one on capital punishment would be much more effective than one on T.A.B. Capital punishment is a different type of thing and it affects the conscience of every person in the State. It is something on which I cannot make up my mind and is more the type of question that should be put to the people by way of referendum. Even if there was a referendum on T.A.B. at which 51 per cent of the people said they were in favour and 49 per cent were against, would that small majority be entitled to overrule the 49 per cent? I do not think there is any immorality in T.A.B. betting. A percentage of the people already indulges in S.P. betting and, as I have said, the S.P. bookmaker makes no contribution by way of tax, while the person who goes to the races meets his obligations. I think it is bad for the moral outlook of people in a State, in which a certain percentage of the people do not think it is immoral to bet, for those people to indulge in S.P. bookmaking and, in doing so, to evade tax.

Such a state of affairs is not good for the State. It has been said that we should give a good example to young people by abstaining from doing certain things, but I consider that it is only doing certain things to excess that is harmful. In reality, a glass of wine or sherry before dinner is not necessarily harmful and even strychnine is good medicine if taken in small quantities; it is only an excessive dose

that is fatal. In order to be a force in a community, one must have a sense of fair play and must not interfere unduly with what other people are doing.

Moderation pays dividends in all things. Moderate habits give good example but some of the best virtues in life cease to be good if carried to excess. Even possessive love of a child by a parent can be harmful. It has been said that the main fault of gambling is that it gives a benefit to one person by taking away a benefit from another, but nobody is compelled to bet and nobody is so naive as to think that a person bets on races in order to win. In fact, a person puts a certain sum in his pocket before he goes to the races and expects to lose that amount.

To do otherwise is to give oneself a big shock and I do not think that it is the urge to win money that makes people invest a few shillings. It is just the same as the desire some people have for a cigarette. It is something from which he derives a certain pleasure, and I think that is more his reason for doing it than any strong desire to become wealthy. I do not think that gambling is a good thing for the community, and I could make a strong speech against it. However, I have put up a case why I think it should be allowed.

What is the terrific loss that will be incurred through gambling, taking it on a competitive basis? In 1963-64 the amount spent on drink was £341,000,000, and in the same year the amount spent on tobacco was £174,000,000. I do not smoke, but I cannot see any reason why other people should not do so. Taking the comparison further, the amount invested on T.A.B. in Victoria is £55,000,000, and it is estimated that it might increase to £80,000,000. On a *pro rata* basis over the Australian population, the total amount invested on T.A.B. would be £270,000,000. However, 87 per cent of that is returned to the bettor, and 13 per cent is retained. This latter amount is £35,000,000, which is quite a small amount compared with the smoking bill of £174,000,000. Of that £35,000,000, a total of £13,000,000 will go to the Government and the other £22,000,000 to the cost of running the T.A.B. and to the racing clubs.

Mr. Clark: Who supplies all this money?

Mr. McANANEY: The punter, of course; he goes along of his own free will and invests £270,000,000, and he gets 87 per cent of it back. This £35,000,000 is a big loss to the community. However, I am only making a comparison with the chap who smokes. As I said, the Government will get £13,000,000,

and the other—£22,000,000 will go towards running expenses and the benefit of clubs. The figures in South Australia would be £3,500,000, so proportionately the Government would get £1,300,000 and £2,200,000 would be applied in the way I have mentioned. My personal opinion is that racing clubs will get quite a shock, for the cost of running T.A.B. will be high, much higher than in Victoria where the population is greater and where there are bigger cities. Our racing clubs maintain that they must have this system in order to compete with Victoria, but I do not think the profits will be on a competitive basis with Victoria. Melbourne is three times as big as Adelaide, so my conclusion is that the profit here will not be very great.

I support the amendment moved by the honourable member for Mitcham. If a Bill is brought before the House, I will definitely oppose any suggestion that T.A.B. agents work on a commission basis. I think the personal element should be removed from it completely. I prefer to support a total T.A.B., which the honourable member for Adelaide and several other members have mentioned. I consider it would be much better run on an impersonal basis. I also strongly oppose broadcasting, the provision of seating accommodation, and also the immediate pay-out at the conclusion of each race. I think one of the advantages of the T.A.B. system (if it could be adequately policed) would be that one would only be able to make an investment on the Saturday and would have to wait until the Monday to collect winnings. Unfortunately, some of the evils of gambling now are caused because people can bet with the S.P. man on credit. I think that is something that would be eliminated under this proposal. I do not think we can have a fifty-fifty scheme, that is, agencies in the country and not in the city. I do not think we should discriminate in that way. People in Adelaide may want to have a small bet on the way to football, for instance. They do not want to be forced to go to the races to have a small bet. It was said that some of the smaller towns could not have the facility if they did not have a commission agent. However, I point out that the office need be open only two or three days a week, and some retired person could run the service under those conditions. I support the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham and possibly also the motion of the member for Frome, subject, of course, to the reservation that if a Bill is brought before the House we will have the right to vote on it.

I will definitely vote against any of the provisions to which I am opposed.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I do not desire at this stage to rehash what has already been said in this debate. We have had many speeches on this matter, some of them fairly lengthy, and I think they adequately cover the position both for and against the introduction of T.A.B. in South Australia. One thing I think we must realize is that South Australians are no different from the citizens of the other States, and South Australia is at present the only State that does not have a system of T.A.B. in some form or another.

I think honourable members will gather from those remarks that I support the motion. Like all members of Parliament, I was elected to support what I think is in the best interests of the people of this State. It is necessary that we make up our minds on various matters. I have received many petitions (with 387 signatures in all) from churches in my district and from various other centres in the South-East opposing T.A.B. I have also received other petitions (not only from Mount Gambier but from other parts of the South-East) with 1,250 signatories in favour of T.A.B. I acknowledge the right of the churches to conduct their own campaigns in opposition to T.A.B., for they are intimately connected with the people and they are involved in much social welfare work. Their work takes them into many homes where difficulties have been caused by various social problems, and I believe that as a result of doing social work they consider a system of T.A.B. or betting is detrimental to the interests of the people. I do not believe that we can by legislation prevent people from drinking or betting; I believe it is inherent in people to do these things. It is desirable that at all times people should be encouraged to be moderate in drinking, betting or eating, but I do not believe legislation will in any way diminish gambling.

Much has been said by some members about the evils of S.P. bookmakers, but I believe they have provided a service to the large number of people who desire to bet. There is no doubt that one can get an S.P. bet anywhere in the State if one so desires. I am not a racing or gambling man, but I know that many people wish to bet. Although at one time it may have been a stigma to be arrested for being an S.P. bookmaker, I know there is a fair amount of sympathy in the country for such people, as they provide a

service. I believe it is in the interests of the State and the community to have legislation to legalise betting. It is far better for betting to be legal than for people to continue to break the law, as they must do if they wish to have a bet in country parts of the State.

I live close to the Victorian border, and I know that Victorian clubs in towns only a quarter of the size of Mount Gambier can provide stakes about three times higher than the stakes at Mount Gambier. It is, therefore, common for owners and trainers to take their horses over the border in preference to racing in this State. Something is lacking when towns of between 3,000 and 4,000 people in another State can provide a better racing service than is provided in this State. Although South Australia's population is only one quarter of Victoria's and we do not have the large provincial centres Victoria has, I believe the introduction of T.A.B. will assist the finances of country and metropolitan clubs and so enable them to compete better with clubs in Victoria.

I have seen the T.A.B. systems operating in most other States. I will never support anything that will bring back betting shops similar to those that existed here in the early 1930's; I am totally opposed to that type of shop. Having seen the systems that operate in most of the other States, I firmly believe that a system closely resembling that in Victoria should be adopted here. In some other States betting shops are open in the afternoons and some immediately pay back the winnings. This encourages betting, and I will not countenance any such encouragement. I believe that is happening in some of the other States. The Victorian system gives a service but does not encourage betting.

I will not repeat what other members have said, but I wish to mention the 14-point plan suggested by the previous Government. As that Government intended to introduce the plan last year, obviously it had the approval of Cabinet, yet some members of that Cabinet have opposed this motion. I would have expected them to support it. The overall objective of the totalizator board should be to control, not stimulate, betting, and to conduct off-course betting in a manner that is not detrimental to the public interest or offensive to the churches, which betting shops were. If it is done in this manner, a tight rein is kept on it, and it is not allowed to degenerate into something approximating betting shops, I will support T.A.B.

Although I do not intend to comment on amendments to the motion, I cannot agree with the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes). However, I give him full marks for standing up in this House and opposing the establishment of T.A.B. If T.A.B. is established, this State will be placed on a basis comparable with other States, and, if the system is similar to that in Victoria, I think South Australia will be on a better basis than some of the other States.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I shall comment on this motion moved by the member for Frome, and in particular on the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham. If the amendment has the blessing of the House, the substantive motion will read:

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

Twelve months ago I had the impression that the people of South Australia had a general desire for some form of legal off-course betting. The Gallup poll published in the September-October issue of the Australian Gallup Poll publication indicated that the support in South Australia for some form of legal off-course betting was substantial. A section of the report reads:

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

The report quoted the figures for the various States, and those for South Australia showed 46 per cent in favour, 23 per cent opposed, and 31 per cent had no opinion. It seems that nearly half of our people at that time approved of some form of legal off-course betting. Acting on this information, and not being a racing or a gambling man, I thought it best that I should go to Victoria to see the system operating there and, in company with the member for Gouger, I went to Melbourne for two days. I express my appreciation to the Chief Secretary of Victoria (Mr. Rylah), who gave us every support in our investigation by placing a car and one of his senior officers at our disposal. I thank the executive of the Totalizator Agency Board in Victoria, who co-operated and did their best to acquaint us with all facets of T.A.B. there.

The impressions I gained of T.A.B. in Victoria were that some objectionable features, which we had been led to believe existed in that system, did not exist. We were in

Melbourne on a Friday and Saturday, and spent Friday visiting various T.A.B. offices in the industrial and residential suburbs. We inspected the telephone system in operation, and I was impressed with it. It seemed to me that this system is the one that would best suit South Australia. I appreciate that Victoria with a small area is densely populated whereas South Australia has about one-third of its population and three or four times its area. If a T.A.B. system were introduced here, a form of telephone agency would be the type best suited to this State. Generally, I found that the offices in Melbourne were of a high standard.

From boyhood memory, I recall the unsavoury betting shop in Owen, not many miles from my home, in a galvanized iron shed, with a radio blaring loudly, with people (not of the best type either) hanging around all Saturday afternoon when their time could have been better spent either playing sport or gardening at home. I hope the T.A.B. offices in Melbourne will never deteriorate to the standard of the old-fashioned betting shops that we have heard so much about. Some offices in Melbourne are showing signs of depreciating, although they were new when the system started, but I realize that it is difficult to maintain a high standard. When I was in Western Australia in 1962 I visited T.A.B. offices in Perth and, from memory, their standard was not as high as those I saw in Melbourne. I understand the system in Western Australia is that winnings can be drawn on the same day as the race. One interesting aspect in Victoria was that as the agencies do not pay out on the same day as the race, but on the following business day, businesses in shopping centres adjacent to the offices have appreciated the boom on Monday following a Saturday race meeting.

Mr. Casey: I take it that you favour the Victorian system?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. The telephone system is the one that would best suit South Australia, if we must have an off-course betting system.

Mr. Hudson: South Australia is sparsely populated in the country areas, but has a great concentration of people in the towns.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am taking that into account. I was impressed by the type of executive personnel the T.A.B. authority is employing in Victoria. I know that if an organization is prepared to pay for brains it will get them, and I believe the success of the Victorian system has been due largely to the high calibre of executive officers employed by the authority.

In many centres, especially in industrial areas of Melbourne, the T.A.B. has appointed the former S.P. bookmaker as manager of the office. One of the T.A.B. offices we visited was run by an entertaining character called Tony the Greek, who claimed that he had had the biggest S.P. business in Victoria; and, of course, when he took up the T.A.B. agency, his old clientele came to his agency to support him. I am told that Tony the Greek was instrumental in getting two or three underworld characters arrested, because he was able to watch through one-way glass the people who came into his T.A.B. agency. What impresses me about T.A.B. in Melbourne is that it is not the young people in our society who bet by T.A.B. It appears to me that people under 30 years of age are relative rarities in T.A.B. offices; that, in fact, people under 40 do not patronize T.A.B. very much. It is the older persons in our society who are patronizing that system. Perhaps the younger people are more educated and their interests are better attuned to our modern society—I do not know. However, they are not patronizing T.A.B.

The claim made by the anti-T.A.B. people that T.A.B. will corrupt the young does not appear to be valid. Although it is 12 months since the Gallup poll statement was published, which gave the impression that South Australians were inclined to support some system of off-course betting, I have been forced in recent months to change my mind a little because, since this motion now before us was introduced, I have had some 300 or 400 signatures on petitions and letters from my constituents, who have voiced their opposition to any form of off-course betting. I have had no more than one or two letters from my constituents supporting some form of T.A.B., and perhaps not more than a dozen people in all have spoken to me in support of it. So what is a member of Parliament to do? Can he rely only on the opinions expressed to him on the question, or whether the Gallup poll taken in August last year is really a valid indication of what South Australia thinks about T.A.B. While I accept that most of the signatures on the petitions and letters I received came from people associated with the Methodist churches, there was a fair proportion of other denominations, too.

While referring to the attitude of the churches towards T.A.B., I shall quote part of a letter I received from the

South Australian Off-course Totalizator Committee, dated July 18, 1963, in which the then president of the committee made some rather unfortunate statements about the influence of churches in South Australia. The letter is addressed to me at Parliament House, and reads:

Enclosed is a booklet describing the T.A.B. system of off-course betting—and a copy of a letter which is being sent with the booklet to all ministers of religion in South Australia. I may say that the letter enclosed that was sent to the ministers of religion in South Australia was rather different from the letter written to me. This letter continues:

The purpose is to publicise the facts about T.A.B., which is now successfully operating without fuss and bother in other States and New Zealand. In these places, T.A.B. has had the following effects: Off-course betting has been transferred from illegal to legal channels and proceeds are being used to benefit the whole community. People wishing to bet can do so without breaking the law. Far from encouraging gambling, the "forbidden fruit" aspects have been removed. Country folk are not being discriminated against. S.P. operators are being rapidly wiped out.

Some of those points may be so, but the letter continues:

S.P. bookmakers and some church leaders have been the chief opponents of the proposed system. We can ignore the S.P. men who would lose their present "Robin Hood" type public prestige with the advent of T.A.B. and concentrate on the churches. There is evidence which suggests that the power of churches to influence voters on moral questions is far less than most politicians believe.

In passing I note that we do not even rate the courtesy title of "members of Parliament"; we are called "politicians". The letter continues:

The latest Gallup poll on church attendances showed that only 27 per cent of all people attended church every week, 48 per cent attended only occasionally, and 25 per cent never go . . . It can be seen that comparatively few are directly influenced by any church.

I think that last section of the letter from the Off-course Totalizator Committee is most unfortunate and reflects great discredit on the committee for adopting that approach to the influence of the churches in South Australia. It should be stressed that the churches and the church people themselves adopt a selfless attitude, very different from the selfish commercial approach that this committee is adopting.

To continue and to cease sitting on the fence in this matter, I declare my own views on T.A.B. I suggest that the 14-point plan proposed by the Playford administration last year

(although I was happy to support it at the time) goes farther than a T.A.B. system needs to go. I quite understand that there are economic difficulties here and that, unless some cash offices are provided, a T.A.B. system may not be a financial possibility. My point is that I think the telephone system is the one best suited to South Australia. It will least offend the church people, yet will allow the country people especially (and the metropolitan people, too) who want to bet legally a convenient and easy way to do so.

Mr. Quirke: Under the telephone system, one has to establish credit.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes; that is so, but it is the same way of establishing credit that obtains in the ordinary cash office, too. One has to establish credit by paying in money before he can bet.

Mr. Shannon: Under telephone betting the winnings, if any, can be played up.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That is not my understanding. We were told in Melbourne that the physical difficulties of crediting every punter with his winnings after each race on race days made betting with those credits difficult. I can accept that.

Mr. Casey: They do it in New South Wales.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If that is so, I must apologize, because I did not know that. I find it difficult, though, to understand how that can be done, when one considers the time lag that must occur between each race for the incoming telephone calls to be made from distant places and the bets laid.

Mr. Casey: A competent staff does this.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. I have told my constituents that I am prepared, if a Bill is introduced, to support it (in so far as it provided the minimum facilities necessary to allow people to bet legally), without in any way encouraging unnecessary gambling. I believe the correct course for the House to follow is to support the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Casey: Why?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The responsibility for introducing a financial Bill must rest on the elected Government of the State, because only the Government has the privilege and responsibility of introducing a financial Bill. I am pleased to support the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham, and I commend it to members.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

— M.T.T. FARES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

That the by-law of the Municipal Tramways Trust, in respect of increases of fares, made on August 11, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on August 24, 1965, be disallowed. (Continued from September 22. Page 1680.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): Although I hate to disappoint the member for Torrens, I oppose his motion.

Mr. Coumbe: That doesn't surprise me!

Mr. JENNINGS: I assure the House that the Government, too, will oppose the motion. I do not for one moment deny the right of the honourable member to move this motion. Far from it, indeed! However, it smacks a little too much to me of political hypocrisy, cant and humbug to merit the support of the House. I believe that no self-respecting Government could accept such a motion. I believe, too, that the member for Torrens, even though he was within his rights in moving for the disallowance, acted ill-advisedly, and I have no doubt whatsoever that he did it for purely political purposes. I know that that is a tremendous and terrible accusation to make about a member of this House, but nevertheless I make it, and it seems to me that the honourable member would probably not, in the final analysis, deny it. I find it much more difficult, however, to understand the attitude of the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) on this question.

Mr. McKee: That's understandable!

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Mitcham was for a long period a distinguished Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. Let me hasten to add, though, that we now have an even more distinguished Chairman of that committee. Let me also say that for three years I was a member of the committee—

Mr. Coumbe: Even more distinguished!

Mr. JENNINGS: —under the chairmanship of the member for Mitcham, and it was an acknowledged practice, never departed from in all that time, that, when anything concerning an increase of fees or charges made by any Government department came before that committee, a motion for disallowance was never moved by the committee. In every instance a motion was moved that no action be taken. We always said (and the Chairman of the committee was quite in accord with this view—in fact, I think he may have advanced it himself on many occasions) that increased fees or costs by a Government department, semi-Government department, or

Government instrumentality were not matters for a committee that was subordinate to this House. I carefully kept the minutes of meetings of that committee during the time that I was a member of it, and examples are as follows: “364, Justices Act—rules to increase court fees; no action on the motion of the Hon. R. R. Wilson”; “354, Criminal Law Consolidation Act—regulation scale of payments to witnesses; no action on the motion of the Hon. C. R. Story.”

Mr. Quirke: Did you vote for it?

Mr. JENNINGS: Of course I did. As I say, we took the view that the increase of fees was a matter for the Government, and that if any action were to be taken it should be taken directly in this House.

Mr. Quirke: The whole committee held that view?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes.

Mr. Millhouse: That's precisely what we are doing now.

Mr. JENNINGS: I said that I did not for a moment deny the right of the member for Torrens to do what he is doing.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, what is the relevance of all this?

Mr. JENNINGS: I am trying to point out the honourable member's blatant inconsistency.

Mr. Millhouse: Not really! You will never succeed in doing that.

Mr. JENNINGS: Further examples of minutes are: “355, Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science regulation—fees; no action on the motion of the Hon. C. R. Story”; “Fees Regulation Act—Motor Vehicles Department fees; no action on the motion of Mr. Bockelberg”; “325, Electrical Articles and Materials Act—fees; no action on the motion of the Hon. A. J. Shard”; “345, Electoral Act Regulations—fees for returning officers; no action on the motion of the Hon. R. R. Wilson”; “297, Hospitals Act Regulation—fees at Queen Elizabeth Hospital; no action on the motion of the Hon. C. R. Story”; “Harbors Act Regulation—wharfage charges on motor vehicles; no action on the motion of Mr. Bockelberg.” I could continue almost *ad infinitum* and probably *ad nauseam* on this matter. However, I merely introduced these examples to show the completely different attitude of the member for Mitcham on this occasion from that which he adopted as Chairman of the committee.

Mr. Clark: Could that have anything to do with the fact that a different Government was then in office?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that has everything to do with it.

Mr. Millhouse: That might have something to do with it, but I do not really follow your line of argument.

Mr. JENNINGS: I am not responsible for the honourable member's lack of understanding. With my usual perspicacity and assiduity, I have taken the trouble to investigate the position in regard to Tramways Trust costs and fares. I believe the financial affairs of the Tramways Trust must be explained to some extent before honourable members vote on the motion. About 12 years ago the trust's annual deficit was about £800,000, and in subsequent years this has been steadily reduced to only £53,000 in 1964-65. These figures alone show the trust's increased efficiency in recent years, and this is clearly to the public benefit when it is understood that the trust's financial losses must be subsidized by the Government. Increased costs to the trust as a result of service pay⁹ and increased margins awarded by the Arbitration Commission are estimated to represent £187,000 this financial year. Estimated recovery from the fare increase for the same period is £172,000. In addition, customs duty on fuel and consequential rises in prices of materials will cost an estimated £17,500, making a total increased cost to the trust for this financial year of £204,500. For a full financial year the total cost and the fare increase recovery are estimated to be £220,000 and £204,000 respectively.

I believe honourable members should understand that the fares now increased have not been altered since 1959, since when there have been increased costs arising from basic wage adjustments, increases granted under industrial awards, service pay, and other cost increases. There was an adjustment of fares in 1964 but this was in respect of section fares other than those now increased. Of course, the fares increased in 1964 were submitted to the Subordinate Legislation Committee, of which the honourable member for Mitcham was then Chairman, and no action was recommended to the House in regard to the increases.

Mr. Millhouse: The difference there was that those could be justified and these cannot.

Mr. JENNINGS: A study of the schedule of fare increases since 1929 shows that only one sectional fare for adults has increased by four times the 1929 fare. The remaining 11 sectional fares have increased by less than four times, some by as little as 2½ times. Over the same period the basic wage has increased from £4 5s. 6d. to £15 3s. a week; that is, it is

almost four times as much now as it was in 1929. On relative money values the present figures are comparable with those existing in 1929. I consulted with the Premier on this matter (in fact, I believe he will take part in this debate) and he assured me that Cabinet deeply and earnestly considered these increased fares. Actually, even though Parliament can disallow the increase, the Government could not do so except by weight of its numbers in this House.

After effectively disposing of the points raised by supporters of the motion, I now say that it is regrettable that these fares had to be raised. No-one regrets this more than the Government or I do but, as can be seen, there is good reason for the increase. Even though it is not fair for me to reflect on members of the trust in such a debate as this, I believe that, at some time during this Parliament, legislation will be introduced to bring the Tramways Trust directly under the control of the Minister of Transport so that this Parliament will then have much closer liaison with the trust.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I agree with the member for Enfield that it is regrettable that the fares have to be increased. I am sure the Premier also agrees that it is regrettable, for several reasons. A few months ago he said, "Increased fares are not the answer". He said that in reference to solving the problems of the public transport system in the metropolitan area. He went on to talk about encouraging people to travel by bus. Therefore, I am sure that he considers the increases to be regrettable for more reasons than those stated by the member for Enfield. In fact, very few reasons could be found in the honourable member's speech. I thought he was labouring greatly to try to justify the increases.

My interest in the matter does not stem from any service rendered to my district by the M.T.T. However, a service to the metropolitan area is rendered by a private firm and another firm provides an intra-district service in my electoral district. Therefore, the people in the southern end of my district are greatly concerned with any Tramways Trust policy that impinges on general transport for the metropolitan area. A comparison of costs between these services is not favourable to the trust. The trust's fare to a six-section terminus is 1s. 6d. under the existing fare rate, whereas it will be 2s. under the proposed fare rate. The private transport service operating in my district extends two

or three miles further than the nearest trust terminus for a fare of 2s. This service has no inner patronage in the metropolitan area and does not have the advantage received by the trust for short-haul high-cost fares. The trust receives 1s. now for two sections and, under the proposed figures, will receive 1s. 6d. for three sections, if this motion is unsuccessful. A charge of 1s. 6d. for three miles must work in favour of an organization like the trust, which has many short-haul passengers. The Para Hills service provided by a private operator does not enjoy this high-profit haulage, and yet it charges only 2s. for transport to Adelaide; in fact, the weekly fare works out at 1s. 6d. a trip. Despite anything else that may be said, why does the trust claim that it is uneconomic, after huge injections of finance from the public purse year after year, to provide a service for at least the same rate of fare as private enterprise can supply? This has not been justified in this debate and the people in my district have been alarmed to find that the area north to Salisbury will be under M.T.T. control from the beginning of next month.

Many residents thought at first that the private operators would be removed from the district and that the M.T.T. would be providing a service. They were worried that they would consequently be paying higher fares. However, they soon learned that it was only control, co-ordination and approval of the fares that would be the responsibility of the M.T.T. The Premier, in reply to a question I asked on September 14, gave me an answer this week that allayed my fears and those of the people in the district that the M.T.T. would force up fares in the Para Hills area.

I understand that one of the owners of the bus service announced publicly that pressure was being put on him to increase fares. I do not know the source of his information but I am pleased to find that that is not so and that the fares will remain as they are. However, I do not doubt that the M.T.T. has a red face as a result of approving fares for several miles farther than that at the same figure. That must be embarrassing. Why cannot the trust give a comparable service for the same money, after these huge injections of public money to which I have referred? It is unfair to make a complete comparison on the basis of public money, because the conversion from the trams to buses involved a big financial burden, although I take it that the capital cost of the buses has been met and that we are now subsidizing only the running costs. That

is being done even in the Budget now before the House, but we have not had justification for the increase in fares and I hope that the M.T.T. will not interfere with the extremely good service provided for my district at present. I support the motion.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the motion and have listened with much interest to what has been said, most of which was from this side of the House. I desire to look at this matter from a rather different angle, because I consider that the increases we are considering are the type that must inevitably occur more frequently in future as the metropolitan area continues to expand. They will undoubtedly hit hardest the young people in the community who, to an increasing extent, will have to go farther out in order to secure land on which to build their homes and, in consequence, they will have to pay more in fares to and from the city.

I suggest that this will make all honourable members much more sensitive to increases in fares in future and I shall be surprised if honourable members opposite do not become acutely aware of this in the years immediately ahead. First, I desire to make the point that the increases in fares that have been announced and the increases in the cost of other services, such as water and sewerage, are caused basically by the need to extend these public services to an over-extended populated area. I can probably describe this better as the suburban sprawl of the city of Adelaide.

The public debt in South Australia is increasing each year and attention was drawn to this by the Auditor-General, Mr. Jeffrey. This is a direct manifestation of this little-recognized evil. Private speculators can cash in on the sprawl but the Government, with an infinite variety of services to provide, cannot do that. For instance, although electricity distribution makes a working profit after interest and depreciation charges are taken out, it is uneconomically over-extended.

However, it is public transport that is the Cinderella of the services, for its changed role since the end of the last war is not sufficiently well understood; it is no longer useful unless it is fully effective and it cannot be fully effective unless it is heavily subsidized, free of debt charges, in the same way as its competitor, the roads of the motorist. Thus, the service pay awards granted to M.T.T. employees should have been met by other means than by increasing fares to increase the trust's own revenue to meet the cost of service pay.

We know that it will cost £187,000 in this financial year to meet service pay and increased margins and we are told that this amount is to be almost recouped, because the estimated revenue from increased fares is £172,000. In a full year, the cost of customs duty on fuel and increased prices of materials will be £220,000.

The Municipal Tramways Trust incurred a loss of £53,300 in 1964-65, which is extremely creditable, as it is £65,300 less than the loss in the previous year. This loss compares with one of £800,000 in 1954-55, which is 11 years ago. I think this point should be made at this stage. In recent years we have seen increasing improvements in the trust's position. However, we ought to realize that this improvement cannot continue indefinitely, because of the necessity to replace buses, in particular, that have not the life that the trams had. The trams are non-existent now, except on one route. The Auditor-General's Report shows that last year there was no addition to rolling stock and I also point out that the life of a diesel bus is not as long as that of a tramcar. In addition, the cost of fuel for diesel buses is high. The cost of replacement was not high this year because there was no increase in the number of vehicles held by the trust. However, this state of affairs will not continue much longer and it will be necessary to give consideration to augmenting the fleet of diesel buses, simply because of the effluxion of time and because their life is not as long as that of the trams that they have replaced.

Because of these particular factors, the M.T.T. is penalized because it is a revenue-earning body. Public transport is no longer a profitable industry and should now be regarded as a service industry. Some real and useful improvements may then be able to be afforded; that is, capital works, costs and related interest charges would be met other than from revenue.

Another point that I do not think has been touched on by other speakers is the matter of the increases in fares being made in such a way that the fares can be adjusted to decimal currency next year. I consider that in this respect the trust deserves criticism for persisting with altered fare charges in multiples of 6d. This type of rationalization is the type of thing feared most by the public, with the impending introduction of decimal currency. Every service and every form of industry will cash in on the fact that we are having to adjust prices to the nearest decimal coin. However, the public cannot do this, and I think

they will be penalized in this and many other ways, particularly as regards the increases in fares.

Several cities in Australia have public transport which still charges fares in terms of pennies. Therefore, those fares have a close affinity to the new decimal coins, and when the time comes for the introduction of decimal coins the fares can be easily adjusted to fit in with the new type of coin. I think that in this regard it is too late to change now, but I suggest that perhaps after February, 1966, the trust should make any future alteration in fare charges more equitable, say to the nearest decimal coin in 2-cent differences. In the meantime, of course, it is the public that is penalized and has to bear the brunt of increased costs which inevitably follow increases in wages, court adjustments of awards, and any additional costs of material.

Because I represent a district where new subdivisions are taking place farther and farther from the centre of the city, these increased fares concern me, as they do my two colleagues sitting beside me. In fact, they should concern equally as much members on the other side who represent metropolitan districts. As I said earlier, I think they will become acutely aware as time goes by that the people they represent who are living in the outlying areas of their districts will be very much affected, and I think as a result members themselves will become much more sensitive and much more outspoken about the reasons which lead to increases in fares on the Municipal Tramways Trust system.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

(Sitting suspended from 5.56 to 7.30 p.m.)

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 26 (clause 7): Leave out the figures "99".

No. 2. Page 4, line 27 (clause 12): After "doorkeepers" insert "and authorized scrutineers (if any)".

No. 3. Pages 4 to 7: Leave out clause 14.

No. 4. Page 7, line 16 (clause 15): Insert the following proviso:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other section of this Act a ballot-paper shall not be informal for any reason other than the reasons specified in this section, but shall be given effect to according to the voter's intention so far as his intention is clear."

No. 5. Page—7, line 21 (clause 16): After “clerk” insert “and of any authorized scrutineers who attend.”

No. 6. Page 9, line 25 (clause 16): After “rights” insert “, duties”.

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask the Committee to accept these two amendments. The first is consequential on the amendment moved in this place relating to scrutineers, and the second provides for scrutineers to operate in the same way as in an election.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be disagreed to.

The Government is not prepared to agree to this amendment. It provides that there shall not be compulsory voting at the referendum. Before the Bill left this Chamber there was a division on this question, but I shall not refer to what took place. However, it is Government policy to provide, as is normally done in most elections, for the House of Assembly roll to be used for this referendum and for compulsory voting to apply. By “compulsory voting” we mean that the electors enrolled and entitled to vote shall present themselves for the purpose of voting.

Further, it was part of the Labor Party's policy that in the event of its being elected as the Government it would give the electors the opportunity to vote on a referendum by a compulsory vote. The referendum is sufficiently important to warrant the adoption of the compulsory vote provision. Apparently there was some division of opinion in another place about voting rights, but that place voted against the voting provisions contained in the Bill when it left this Chamber. As it is the Government's policy to have a compulsory vote, I ask the Committee to reject this amendment so that the people will vote under the normal conditions associated with an election. In the first instance we should hold a referendum to consider whether it is desirable to have a lottery in this State, so that the people can decide by voting whether they desire the Government to provide a lottery or not. I advocate compulsory voting on this occasion as we normally have it at elections.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I am sorry that the Premier has decided that his Party will oppose this amendment. If anybody takes the

trouble to look at the Constitution of South Australia, he will see that it does not provide anywhere for matters to be decided by referendum. Nor will this issue if it goes to the people be decided by referendum. If the issue goes to the people and a vote is taken upon it, it will still be for the Government to decide what action it will take in connection with it; so this is a matter quite outside the normal legislative procedure in this State. Indeed, the Bill before us proves that, because special provision has to be made for taking this referendum. The Premier, in stating the position, said it was the policy of his Party that a referendum should be taken upon a lottery, but I have here a copy of his policy speech at the last election. At no time in his policy speech did the Premier say that this poll would be taken, though he did on some subsequent occasion. However, at no time did he say it was going to be a compulsory poll. And the Labor Party rules do not provide for a compulsory poll.

What is the position with regard to this Bill? It is designed by the Treasurer (I say “Treasurer” this time in preference to “Premier”, because this is a Treasury matter, as was clearly indicated in the course of the debate) to have a lottery, but he does not want the responsibility of introducing a lottery; he wants the people of South Australia to take over that responsibility for him. I have always maintained (and I maintain here tonight) that it is the responsibility of members of Parliament to decide what legislation shall be passed in this Chamber. It is our responsibility—we are paid for that. On another occasion in the very near future a similar type of thing will have to be decided, and the Opposition will not be talking about a compulsory referendum: it will be voting against any referendum at all.

Mr. McKee: That has always been your policy.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is the position. So, to relieve the Treasurer and members opposite of the obligation of standing up in their places and either supporting or opposing legislation and taking the responsibility for it, as they are paid to, we are to have a referendum. I made no secret of the fact that I did not desire a referendum, and I was prepared to vote on that issue without having to fortify my convictions by seeking the public's opinion. However, people are to be compelled to vote, and it does not matter how inconvenient it is, or how many miles they must travel to the polling booths. It was interesting to note that two or three sections

of the community did not have to vote; for instance, if a person is dead he is officially relieved of that obligation. Clause 14 (4) provides:

. . . the said returning officer need not send notification in any case where he is satisfied that the elector is dead.

What is the reason for compulsory voting in this matter? It is that there is not sufficient public interest in this Bill, and that unless voting were compulsory the Government could not get a poll that would relieve it of its obligation. If voting were not compulsory, relatively few people would vote. Members are indebted to the member for Burra for forcibly bringing this matter before the attention of honourable members. We do not find compulsory voting in oversea countries. The great Prime Minister of Great Britain does not subscribe to it. Compulsory voting in Australia is not something that has been wished on the people by the people; it has been wished on the people by the political Parties' managers. I believe that both parties are equally responsible for this, and that each one finds it easier for organization purposes if compulsory voting exists. If we were to be so democratic as to put the question of compulsory voting to the people, we should soon see what they thought about it.

Mr. Coumbe: It would be a different story.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My friends opposite have not put that question to the public.

Mr. Jennings: Have you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In this case many people will have to travel long distances to vote for something in respect of which, by the very terms of the Bill, they will have no information. We will oppose to the utmost the provision for a compulsory vote because there is no justification for it. I heard one member say that he was opposed to lotteries but that, if the referendum were carried by a vote of the people, he would probably vote for a lottery or not vote at all.

Mr. Hughes: Who said that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A member in this Chamber, and I can produce the statement in *Hansard*. All members know that several members who do not want a lottery are being enticed into supporting it in that they will support a referendum. We do not believe this is in the interests of the people or in accordance with the procedures maintained in this place where, previously, members took the responsibility for what they said and for

the vote they cast. I oppose the motion for disagreement.

Mr. SHANNON: The Premier said that this was an important matter but I do not think it is as important as all that. There are matters on the Notice Paper which have not been reached or on which only the second reading explanation has been given that are much more important than this Bill. The Premier suggested that this subject was alive in the minds of the people.

Mr. Curren: You'll find that it is.

Mr. SHANNON: If it were a live topic, there would be no need for a compulsory vote.

Mr. Hudson: Why not say you don't want a referendum at all? That is what you believe.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member knows full well that there is only one reason for compulsion: the apathy amongst many people about this matter. If there were not this apathy, there would be no need to debate this question. What the Leader said about our Constitution is well known to both sides of the House and, in my opinion, the application to the holding of a referendum of conditions beyond those that apply for the taking of a poll for the election of members of Parliament is of minor importance. However, it appears to me that the Government is attempting to require a compulsory vote because it fears that a voluntary vote would disclose the lack of interest that the people have in this matter. Another point is that a small vote would cast the responsibility for a decision on the establishment of a lottery back where it belongs—on this Parliament.

Mr. QUIRKE: As I said earlier, I am implacably opposed to a compulsory vote on this matter. Honourable members opposite are not honest in their intention here.

Mr. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member for Burra has impugned my sincerity, and I take exception to his remark.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Port Pirie has taken exception to certain remarks, and I ask the honourable member for Burra whether he desires to withdraw them.

Mr. QUIRKE: I had not really finished the sentence, Mr. Chairman, when the member for Port Pirie jumped to his feet, as I knew he would. If the honourable member takes exception to my remarks, then I withdraw what I have said, as I always do, and substitute something else. Honourable members opposite are not genuine—

Mr. McKEE: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member cannot merely replace the words "not honest" with "not genuine".

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order unless he is raising a point of order.

Mr. McKEE: I am raising a point of order, Mr. Chairman; I take exception to the remarks of the member for Burra.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Port Pirie has taken exception to certain remarks; does the member for Burra withdraw them?

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. There are about 600,000 words in the English language, and I could use many of them. However, I do not want to tire the honourable member for Port Pirie. I withdraw the remarks, without explaining the difference in the meaning of the two words. We might substitute the really original Australian expression "not dinkum".

Mr. McKee: I think we might accept that one.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have a reason for saying that. Government members are forcing people to vote on something that is a social matter. It is not a matter of national service in the protection of the country or anything to do with protection of the individual, for which some reason may exist for asking people to compulsorily register their vote. This is purely a social matter, a question of whether or not there should be a lottery. If a referendum vote indicates that the majority favours a lottery, the Government can introduce a Bill, and there are members opposite who will vote against that Bill. The Government is forcing people to vote on something, and if the people record an affirmative vote some of the Government's own members will not support it. That is why I say that honourable members opposite are not dinkum. Another reason why compulsory voting is utterly wrong is that there is an ever-increasing idea that a free people must be compelled to do things. I know that some restrictions are necessary, but members opposite would like complete compulsion and one Party. Only two countries—Russia and China—have that idea, but we are getting closer to it. There are three sections of people in this matter—those in favour, those against, and those who do not care two hoots whether there is a lottery. The latter group comprises the biggest proportion of the people. I do not agree that an 80 per cent majority opinion expressed at a Gallup poll of 1,000 people is a true reflection of the opinion of all people of this State, as that has been proved wrong

before. It is wrong to compel the disinterested section to vote.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Your Party has used compulsory voting under a loaded electoral system for years.

Mr. QUIRKE: I oppose compulsory voting at elections, as it has brought about devastating effects, not because it finally succeeded in the Labor Party being elected (although that may be devastating enough), but because in 1940 or 1941, before compulsory voting, there was interest in every part of the State in an election. However, this is not so now.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We have radio and television now.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is not the reason; it is that there are two tickets—a blue ticket and a white ticket. Thousands of electors today do not know the man they are voting for until they see his name on a ticket. Compulsory voting for the House of Assembly has destroyed public interest in elections. In the United States of America and the United Kingdom there is enormous interest in the elections without compulsion. I voted for compulsory voting when I was a member of the Labor Party as one was forced to do things then, the same as that Party's members have to do today. There is an offence against human principles in compulsion. Some Government members wish to force people to vote for something, which if it comes to fruition, they are not going to vote for themselves. In order to save their political skins they want to go to the people, so that they cannot be blamed by people who do not want a lottery and are rigidly opposed to one. If people are compelled to go to the poll the Government thinks that lets it out, but it does not. The people are being compelled to vote "Yea" or "Nay" for a lottery, not knowing what its conditions are. Is that true or false?

Then, a person must vote or be fined. Under pain of penalty he is compelled to vote when he does not want to. Thousands of people in this State will be dragooned or bludgeoned into voting because of this penalty. That is wrong. Is there or is there not in this Bill a penalty for not voting? We know there is. The principle involved is so vital to free people that no language in defence of it can be too extravagant.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: We are indebted to the Leader of the Opposition and others who have spoken for putting this matter in its proper perspective. This Bill is a departure from normal practice. I know of no other social question on which a referendum

has been taken and in respect of which voting has been made compulsory. There is no compulsion in local option polls. I am concerned not so much with the general principle of compulsory voting at Parliamentary elections as with the principle involved in this Bill on this occasion and with this question. The member for Onkaparinga could not have expressed it better when he said that people are being compelled to vote on this question not knowing what they are voting for or what they will get if and when they get it. The nebulosity of the question could not be better illustrated than in those terms. I object to people being compelled to vote when they do not know what they are voting on. The Minister of Lands has referred to another place, but if we are going to consider that aspect, it is obvious that Parliament, as a whole, has turned down this question of compulsory voting. I think that demonstrates the good sense, if I may say so, of Parliament. I object to the way in which this provision has been inserted in the Bill. The drafting of the Bill has had to include about two pages of special matters in order to drag in those sections of the Electoral Act relating to compulsory voting which, of course, would not normally be inserted in a Bill of this kind. The amendment made in another place deletes the whole of clause 14. I oppose the motion for disagreement, and I suggest to the Treasurer that it would be wise to give a second thought to what I have said about the Parliament of this State being obviously opposed to compulsory voting.

Mr. Ryan: This was the House elected to consider the Bill—not the other place.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The member for Port Adelaide does not credit honourable members of another place with much intelligence.

Mr. Ryan: The public was told that this Bill was putting poison in the hands of children.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That statement is taken completely out of its context, and it suits the honourable member to peddle it around the countryside, knowing in his own mind that he is misconstruing what was actually said.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I oppose the motion.

Mr. McKEE: Of course, I completely support the Bill as it is. I consider that, for the member for Flinders to say that the people do

not know what they are voting on, is a definite insult to their intelligence.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The people are rather more discerning than you think.

Mr. McKEE: The Liberal Party does not believe in referenda. About two or three years ago, when I asked the Leader about holding a referendum, he said that it was not in his policy to hold a referendum. We went to the people last March and told them that we would give them a democratic way in which to make their own decision about social legislation, and they gave us a mandate to go ahead with this Bill. Another reason why the Liberal Party did not agree with referenda was that it had the people suppressed by a gerrymander which afforded them no opportunity to say "Yes" or "No". The people were completely dictated to; even honourable members who sat behind the ex-Premier did not know what was taking place and, on numerous occasions, they had to watch television to find out.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did the honourable member know that Housing Trust rents were going up?

Mr. McKEE: That was not on television. I assure honourable members opposite that they are not going to bulldoze the Government into taking away the democratic rights of the people.

Mr. SHANNON: If ever I have heard of a bulldozing attitude of any Party in any Parliament, this is bulldozing the elector because he is to be forced to vote. I shall quote what the Attorney-General said: we are inviting the electors to walk the plank blindfold.

The CHAIRMAN: The Premier has moved, "That amendment No. 3 of the Legislative Council be disagreed to". Those in favour say "Aye"—

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Have you put the question the correct way? It should be put in the affirmative.

The CHAIRMAN: I put it in the affirmative. I will put the question again. The question before the Chair, moved by the Premier, is, "That amendment No. 3 of the Legislative Council be disagreed to".

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Nankivell, Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Millhouse.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus disagreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee to accept this amendment. A person may put the number 1 in one square without putting the number 2 in the other square, but in that event the intention of the voter is clear and therefore his vote is valid.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not oppose the amendment. The Bill as introduced provided for voting by figures and for only one figure to be put on the ballot-paper, and if the elector voted as he normally votes at an ordinary election he would be casting an invalid vote. I think it is clear that the returning officer now has to accept the vote if the intention is clear. In other words, the position now is that if an elector votes 1 for "Yes" and 2 for "No" it will be a valid vote. Perhaps the Attorney-General can confirm this. If that is the position, I am entirely in favour of it. The provisions of the Bill as introduced were completely different from those in the Electoral Act, under which a voter has to vote in all squares.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): Under the Electoral Act, if the voter's intention is clear the formalities can be overlooked so long as he has not done any of the things specifically prohibited. If he clearly indicates his intention his vote is valid, and it was intended that that position should obtain here. The directions in the Schedule are that the voter is to place the number 1 in the square opposite his choice. The point was raised that he might write the numbers 1 and 2, and as usually a voter is urged to put a number in every square (although it has been held that if he puts a number in every square except one his intention is clear and the vote is formal) this can be confusing. The amendment clears up the position, as it provides that if the elector indicates his intention the vote will be valid. I think it is a wise amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: This goes further than the Attorney-General suggests. Obviously if the elector puts a tick alongside "Yes" or "No"

he has indicated his intention, and because of the wording of this amendment that vote would have to be accepted. Any mark indicating the voter's intention would be a formal vote. This proviso overrides the Schedule, so it overrides every section of the Electoral Act. If I were a scrutineer and the electoral officer declared invalid a vote marked by any means, I would challenge him.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: These amendments are acceptable to the Government, and I recommend their acceptance by the Committee.

Amendments agreed to.

The following reason for disagreement with Amendment No. 3 was adopted:

Because clause 14 is an essential provision of the Bill.

THE ESTIMATES.

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1798.)

MINISTER OF LANDS AND MINISTER OF
REPATRIATION.

Lands Department, £822,156.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I note that the total vote for the Lands Department has been reduced this year by £104,000. Why this enormous reduction in the vote for one of the great development departments of the State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Lands): If the Leader of the Opposition will turn to the Premier's Department, he will find an amount of £38,600 proposed for "Government Motor Garage", which on other occasions has been included under the Lands Department vote. That accounts for some of the overall decrease in this year's vote for that department. This in no way indicates a lessening of interest in this important department. It may be necessary to increase the vote in another year. If the Leader will also look at war service land settlement repayments, he will find that this year the amount is only £50,000 compared with £200,000 last year; so that accounts for £150,000. The amount on this line has been diminishing ever since the war. Under the War Service Land Settlement Agreement, the State has agreed to contribute two-fifths and the Commonwealth three-fifths of the cost of developing land.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thought that was the explanation. The Minister is correct when he says that the State is

responsible for two-fifths and the Commonwealth three-fifths of certain losses. We have been providing a substantial amount over many years for meeting these items. These losses are really adjustments in war service land settlement rents to make them something that the settler can pay. It becomes a matter of repayment by the State Government to the Commonwealth. Does this mean that, in future, land settlement will not enjoy the benign policy of adjustments being made where necessary? Does the Minister intend to make no further concessions in respect of Loxton and zone 5 in the South-East?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think the position relating to zone 5 is unresolved at this stage, but it will be considered on its merits when the time comes. The Government is aware of the difficulties that exist at Loxton, Cooltong and Loveday, but there has in no way been a lessening of benign action on our part. The department considered that £50,000 was required for this line, and that is what, in fact, has been provided.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Government would do well to consider carefully the soldier settlement problems. I know that the Minister is probably awaiting the report of the inquiry committee on this matter, but we already know that soldier settlers approached the previous Government in respect of their problems. That Government referred them to the Commonwealth Government, but they are still not satisfied that the matter is being handled properly. The Commonwealth Government refers the soldier settlers to the State Governments, and vice versa. As I, too, do not believe that the Commonwealth Government is handling the matter properly, will the Minister take the matter up with that Government? Many soldier settlers have unfortunately obtained wrong budded stock, and in some cases water tables have been encountered where previously they did not exist. Trees have suffered from a rise in salt content, and much replanting has been effected, but, of course, it takes much time to uproot trees and bring the land back into production. A drop in prices occurred last year in Valencias and navel. Settlers have had to repay some of their commitments (water and other charges) to the Lands Department, despite low prices and high costs of production. They are not in a position to do this. They need a further postponement of their liabilities to the Commonwealth and State Governments. Consequently this must be pursued vigorously in order to make the Commonwealth Government realize the seriousness of the problem. I

know it is entirely beyond the financial resources of a State Government to alleviate the problem of soldier settlers. Many of them are becoming worried and others are becoming fed up.

I strongly support the Government for raising this matter with the Commonwealth. However, it has been raised before. There is also the question of living allowances. The cost of living is increasing and these men are finding £800 inadequate to live on. Will the Minister endeavour to get a greater living allowance for soldier settlers in the Loxton area? They are finding that in some cases the Commonwealth grant is being withdrawn, and some are annoyed about this. I should be glad to assist the Minister in any way that I can to have this problem overcome.

Mr. RODDA: At most functions I attend in my district I am surrounded by settlers in zone 5 who want to know what progress the Government is making in their case. Can the Minister tell me when this matter is likely to be resolved?

Mr. QUIRKE: The problem raised by the member for Ridley is well known to me, and forceful action was taken while I was Minister in an effort to alleviate the conditions obtaining in Loxton and, to a lesser extent, in Cooltong. We did not get very far with the Commonwealth Government on the main question because enormous sums of money were needed. The Loxton area is different from areas on the other side of the river. The Berri, Barmera and Waikerie areas were taken up as virgin country and planted as such; the scrub was taken off and the land was planted. Much of it was comparatively shallow clay, which rendered it ideal for the purpose for which it was used. For many years, the Loxton area was mallee farming land and it had been subjected to drift over the years. When it was surveyed and levelled for irrigation, the sand at depth was merely wind-blown sand and, consequently, the land was infertile. My sympathy is with the settlers because of the sterility of the soil and while there will always be some failures among settlers, the failures in the Loxton area are, in the main, through no fault of the settlers.

The physical conditions of the blocks are such that the settlers have no resources of their own with which to carry out necessary work. Because of this, the War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act should be operative in relation to them, although the Commonwealth has been lagging to a certain extent in regard to assistance under that Act. One of the great

difficulties resulting from irrigation is seepage. With any irrigation scheme the first step is putting the water on, but this is comparatively simple. The bigger problem is taking the water off and in the Loxton area, the underground contours bear no relation to the surface contours. Ridges of clay and marl limestone lie at depth and because the water cannot be drained from these ridges, it stagnates and then kills the plants when it reaches the roots.

Although there has been insistence that spray irrigation is an answer to seepage, it has been found that such is not the case. It merely delays the seepage and water pocketed below ground cannot evaporate or escape. Consequently, there is a gradual build-up until it reaches the surface, when it kills everything that is planted. Another mistake there was in the overhead spray irrigation itself. It is admitted now that the pattern of the sprays is wrong; it does not give adequate coverage, and as a result there are areas which are not adequately watered in any one area of trees, and there you can get the salt rise. Where the ground is dry, when you are only just wetting the surface and there are no leaching waters to take it away, you get a salt rise and out go your trees again.

These problems are caused not by any laxity on the part of the settlers but by failure to take the necessary precautions to install adequate drainage. A comprehensive drainage scheme has been applied to Loxton. The arterial mains are down, and the job is now to put in the capillary drains. Tiled drains have to be put down at intervals to take the water off and drain it away. The third problem is what to do with the drainage water when it is taken off. It cannot be put back into the river, nor can it be put on any ground where it can have subterranean access to the river, because if that were done with this type of water the irrigation properties of the river itself would be destroyed. Therefore, there are big problems. Settlers knew nothing of those problems, nor could they be expected to know anything of them. Some settlers have worked magnificently to overcome the problems, and now they are being aided by the programme that has been put in. There are three trenching machines there now, and the tiled trenches and tiled drains have been laid at $1\frac{1}{2}$ times to $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the rate of last year, so some progress is being made. In the interim, because it is so slow, it is having an adverse effect on increasing areas of land.

I know that the Minister of Irrigation knows of these things, that he is entirely sympathetic, and that he will do what he can in order to obviate the disabilities confronting these settlers. The settlers can see no improvement in their position in the immediate future. What should be done is to take off the financial encumbrance which now unjustly sits on their shoulders. When oranges fetched a big price some years ago these settlers were put out on their own. That was after 10 years, after which time they had to make their own way, with no further advance from the Government. The bottom then fell out of the orange market, and with a reduction in price the settlers were unable to meet their commitments. They were put on their own too early. Even when the orange price was high they still had a backlog, and because of insufficient fruit as a result of this inferior irrigation system, plus of course the low prices that have obtained, it has all added to the build-up of the backlog.

Many of the settlers are now in an impossible position. I do not have to tell the Minister that: I am just saving him the necessity of having to say it himself. I applaud the Minister for the efforts he is making. He will have extreme difficulty in extracting the necessary money from the Commonwealth sources. Perhaps the constant pressure exerted some time ago may have some effect and the Commonwealth Government will recognize this problem, but this cannot happen too soon. Because of physical conditions and factors outside their control, these settlers are in a difficult position. I emphatically deny that all these people have failed because of their own shortcomings, although I know that one or two have not done their job. I urge the continuation of whatever pressure can be put on the Commonwealth Government to do what after all is its job.

Mr. Casey: You said that the Commonwealth Government was behind in its payments. What did you mean?

Mr. QUIRKE: I did not say that. The agreement is that we pay two-fifths and the Commonwealth Government pays three-fifths of the cost of development. After that, charges for restoration are the responsibility of the Commonwealth, but it is a bit tardy.

Mr. Lawn: How far behind is it?

Mr. QUIRKE: Thousands of miles! The Minister appreciates the problems of the River districts and knows that the remedy that has to be applied is expensive. At some time the whole of the overhead spray system at Loxton

must be revised to bring about uniform watering, and underground drainage will have to be carried out to cope with it.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I assure the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) that the delay in zone 5 is not the fault of the Government. We would like to have the matter cleared up as quickly as possible. I appreciate the sentiments expressed by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) and the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), who are both conscious of the problem that exists, particularly in the River areas. Mistakes have been made, and possibly more on the River than anywhere else. A large expenditure will be necessary to solve these problems. The Auditor-General referred to the money spent by the State and Commonwealth Governments when he said:

The capital loss on this scheme is now estimated to be £4,486,000, of which the State's share would be £1,794,000. The State has already contributed £1,620,000 towards its share of the capital loss. In addition, the administrative costs borne by the State to June 30, 1965, have amounted to £1,512,000. Thus the cost to the State of the estimated capital contribution and the cost of administration to date totals £3,306,000, which represents approximately £3,300 per holding.

The Commonwealth Government must realize the present situation. As the settlers are older, frustrations and difficulties have caused some concern. The human element is the main factor to be considered. Many difficulties are associated with the Loxton area, which was an agricultural district. Ways have to be found to get rid of the excess water and much money will be needed to overcome the problems. Seepage is also becoming a problem at Cooltong. The sooner the Commonwealth Government decides what it is going to do, the better it will be for all.

Mr. HALL: Why has the Photogrammetric Section's provision been reduced by £3,555, as this section is doing a good job in mapping the State?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is not intended to cut down on this work. Two lines further down there is an increase of £15,501 in the provision for purchase of office machines and equipment associated with this branch. That is how the money has been allocated. I cannot give the honourable member the exact reason for this reduction, but the importance of this work is well known. It is widely acknowledged that the aerial surveys and photography have streamlined map-making in South Australia. This work will continue to assist not only the Lands Department but also other departments and councils.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Under "Surveyor General" there is an increase of £7,117. Does this indicate that the shortage of surveyors is being overcome?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: There have been some improvements, although there is a long way still to go. Surveyors are not the easiest of people to come by, and we cannot at present meet all the department's requirements.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, £380,400.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: About 10 years ago the then Government bought land as an annexe to the Botanic Garden, to have a suitable area developed in the hills. Substantial sums of money have been voted for the maintenance and development of that land ever since. How far has the development been successful? Is it likely that these gardens will soon be thrown open to the public?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I cannot say exactly when these areas will be thrown open to the public, but I shall obtain that information for the Leader. The Board of Governors desires to encourage people to use as much of these areas as they can.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister obtain a full report on the development that has taken place in this regard? Will he also say what is covered by the provision of fodder for drought areas (£10,000)? Further, what is the reason for the substantial increase in relation to payments for improvements under section 46a of the Pastoral Act? Does that mean the Government is resuming considerable areas of pastoral lands?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: First, I believe it would be better if specific reference were made to freight charges for fodder. This concerns fodder given by people to those suffering from the drought in the North. In relation to payments for improvements under section 46a of the Pastoral Act, the Act provides that the lessee shall be entitled to be paid by the Minister the value of improvements on any land surrendered by him and not included in the new lease to be granted under section 46. Some people at present have no access to water, and the pastoralists concerned have agreed to allocate an area to provide for such access. The sum thus expended will be recouped at a later stage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Is it Government policy to allot lands for control by Aborigines in certain parts of the State?

Some time ago the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs said that substantial allocations of land would be controlled by boards of Aborigines. Will the Minister ensure that that will be his Government's policy?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I assure the Leader that this line has nothing whatever to do with that matter.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In relation to the destruction of rabbits on Crown lands, will the Minister say whether his department is still prepared to provide powder to spread myxomatosis, which has been the custom in past years? This practice may have been abandoned because of the apparent diminution of the rabbit problem. There is a widespread belief that myxomatosis has become ineffective. I assure the Minister that this is not true in my district. If it has become ineffective in small pockets that is because no rabbits have been left to pass on the disease. I am sure that where rabbits are building up in pockets it would be wise to make serum available.

Mr. Casey: It pays to trap rabbits today.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As far as I am concerned any means that gets rid of rabbits is good enough. Will the Minister inquire about the availability of this serum? Last year nothing was spent on the purchase of town lands and this year £18,600 is provided. Will the Minister give an explanation of that item?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is generally accepted that myxomatosis has, to some extent, lost its effectiveness, and that rabbits have been able to build up immunity against it. The Lands Department has an officer who is recognized as being possibly the best man on rabbit control in Australia. The Tatiara council is carrying out a plan that is proving effective. It is doing the whole of the work under a contract system with two specialists who are trained in the mixing and laying of the poison 1080. This has had wonderful results. I visited the area recently and the effect this has had on the eradication of rabbits has to be seen to be believed. I believe this innovation will more than take the place of myxomatosis, and that other councils will fall in line with the Tatiara council. I believe this will have more effect in the long run on rabbits than any other method known. Myxomatosis had a great effect but, despite the experience in the district of the member for Flinders, I think it has lost its potency. Had a programme of 1080 poisoning been carried out in the past I am sure we would not have the rabbit problem we have today.

Although some people believe there is money in trapping rabbits I think that their total eradication would be of greater benefit than the money received through trapping. Last year £400 was placed on the Estimates for rabbit control on Crown lands and none was spent; this year £400 is provided and the facility is there if required. The purchase of town lands is mainly in relation to the Whyalla Commission where a property has been offered to the Government, and most of this money will be expended there.

Mr. NANKIVELL: With regard to National Park Commissioners, can the Minister say whether his department is still following the principle outlined by the previous Minister of Lands that a certain allocation be made each year towards the fencing of wild life reserves? Country members who have these areas in their districts are becoming accustomed to the complaints of adjoining landholders and the previous Minister of Lands said that the policy would be to fence these areas progressively. Can the Minister say how much of the £32,000 allocated to improvements and additions to national parks and wild life reserves is provided for fences?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I could not say exactly what amount is provided for this purpose but I assure the honourable member that this work will be carried out as previously. It has proved successful and adjoining landholders are co-operating and are looking forward to extension of this work.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On the matter of eradication of rabbits, while I am not discounting the ability of the appropriate officer, I do not have a problem in my immediate area of the magnitude that would warrant the services of such an officer. Many people in my district have had good results from the use of the dry myxomatosis powder usually supplied in small phials. The cost is low and the people can go out at night and, with the aid of a spotlight, trap a few rabbits and let them go after injecting the serum into them. These scrub rabbits cannot be ripped out because they wander along the roadside in getting a living. As the method adopted has been successful, will the Minister make inquiries with a view to its further use?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall refer this matter to the officer concerned and am sure he will co-operate.

Mr. McANANEY: Last year the payment for scalps from the Wild Dog Fund was £6,000, compared with a payment of £3,000 in the

previous year. Can the Minister say whether there has been an increase in the number of wild dogs or whether the fence has been in need of repair?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The amount allocated this year is the same as that provided last year. The point is that all the money allocated has not been spent. The same procedure applies with all the lines, in that in some cases more than is placed on the Estimates is spent and in others less is spent. However, the fence is patrolled regularly and there is no lack of attention by doggers to keeping this menace down.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am fairly familiar with some of the properties controlled as national parks and wild life reserves and am pleased with the way the reserves are being conducted. However, the authorities would be the first to acknowledge that they have a serious problem with South African daisy, which is one of the worst enemies on scrub reserves of this type. This weed, unlike many others, spreads extremely quickly, particularly after a fire. It tackles the scrub land more than pasture land, and the cost of eradicating it without destroying the scrub would be enormous. Can the Minister arrange for something to be done in this matter? I realize that it is not a job that can be done within a short time. The fact is that without some measure to stop its spread I fear that the occasional fire, which in itself does not permanently destroy scrub reserves, can actually result in almost total take-over by South African daisy in some of these inaccessible but valuable scrub reserves.

I hope the Minister agrees with me that as much land as possible that becomes available at a reasonable price along the frontage of the Adelaide Hills should be purchased for reserves. I have heard these western slopes of the hills described as Adelaide's natural green belt. We know that much of the land has been used for residential purposes, for pasture development and for other things, but there are still large areas of scrub available. I hope the Minister agrees with me that natural scrub is far more attractive than anything we can plant. As much of these big scrub areas are hard up against the metropolitan area and are not easy to develop and use economically, it seems to me that the ideal thing is to reserve them. Probably the major objection to scrub is the fire danger, and it must be acknowledged that wherever there is scrub and therefore natural beauty there is something inflammable. However, there are plenty of precautions that can

be taken. For instance, there is a good system of access tracks in the Obelisk Estate now that has made that area much safer than previously. Does the Minister agree that as much land as possible (within the limit of the Government's finances) should be purchased along the Adelaide foothills? Also, is he fully cognizant of the dangers of South African daisy to our natural scrub reserves, particularly after fires have passed through them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Agriculture Department and I fully appreciate that South African daisy is a problem. Much research is now taking place into eradication methods, but it is not easy to get rid of this weed. The most likely method is pulling it by hand, placing it in a container and burning it, but this is tedious. It is particularly difficult to get at this weed on rocky slopes. For the purchase of land, this year's provision is £11,696 more than last year's. I agree with the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) that the conservation of certain areas is important. The Government has had offers of attractive land in many parts of the State, but as it is not cheap the matter is presenting difficulties. However, I am sympathetic to the honourable member's attitude.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Some months ago Parliament carried a motion congratulating the Government on its prompt action in providing assistance to pastoralists in the drought-stricken areas of this State. When speaking on that motion, the Minister explained that he had arranged for assistance and, I think, free transport of gift fodder. Provision is made for an expenditure of £10,000 in respect of fodder for drought-stricken areas, and I believe that little has been spent yet. How much has been spent on transporting fodder? Remission of rentals was also considered, but I understand that it is to apply only to properties from which stock has been removed. A few days ago the Minister said that stock had been removed from at least three properties. I know of only three, and I believe that the total remission amounts to a little over £500.

A further request was made for assistance in transporting store stock. Some time after his return from his northern tour, the Minister said that he was confident that Cabinet would grant rent remissions in needy cases, and that one suggestion was that the Government might help with freight concessions for fodder for working horses and for stock in transport, but he said that this would involve the Commonwealth Railways. The Minister also said that

the Commonwealth Government had been asked for assistance, but I have not heard of any result from this request. It seems that assistance to the drought-stricken Far North has been minimal. After the Minister's visit to the Far North some good rains occurred over parts of the area, but it is apparent that some areas in the Far North-East are still suffering a severe drought. They are the properties from which stock has to be removed, but there are many problems associated with moving stock. Feed has to be provided at many points so that the losses can be kept to a minimum. It may not be fair for properties from which stock has been removed to be given rent remissions. What is the future allocation of the £10,000 expected to be? What has been the reaction of the Commonwealth to the Minister's approaches? Will the Minister reconsider the decision that there shall be no rent remission for properties not totally devoid of stock? Will the Minister consider some concessions in the transporting of store stock? Whilst it is good advice to a lessee that, if he is in trouble with his stock, he should sell at whatever cost, the cost of removing the stock from his property can be as high as £9 or £10. Many of the stock can be lost in transit, so there is not much incentive to move them. Some lessees have been selling stock as fast as they can get them to market, but it takes weeks and sometimes months to do that; it cannot be done at a moment's notice.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I cannot tell the honourable member the exact sum involved, but I will get that information for him. Only a week or so ago a consignment of fodder for which the Government paid was sent to a station whose claims the honourable member had been pushing.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: But there was a hold-up.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not aware of that. All I know is that I agreed to pay the freight; I couldn't be fairer than that. When the honourable member says that the amount provided is minimal, whatever the amount it is far more than was provided by the former Government.

Mr. RODDA: I refer to the line "National Parks and Wild Life Reserves". In the hundred of Spence there is an area known as the Big Heath. Has this area been proclaimed a wild life reserve? Will the Minister look at it now that the drainage has been completed? There are 6,000 acres in this area. This has become a discharge basin for water that has been allowed to run from the old Bool Lagoon

outlet into the scrub. It consisted of many hundreds of acres of water, but the drainage will take that water away. It does not seem to me to be an ideal area for a wild life reserve, and adjoining landholders are concerned that, if the area is not fenced, vermin will encroach on to their land. Is this land to be retained as a reserve, and will it be adequately fenced? Further, will the Minister ascertain whether a large portion of this valuable country, which is adequately drained, could be used for closer settlement, and whether another portion of it could still be used as a wild life reserve? In addition, I understand that the present lessees of Bool Lagoon have been notified that their leases will be terminated when they expire next year. In relation to the purchase of land for reserves, is any provision made to purchase the portion of land necessary to provide the ponding encompassed in the drainage proposals associated with this area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr. HEASLIP: Over 10,000 acres has been purchased at Alligator Gorge as a national park. I do not know who will make use of this land, but I point out that it is a long way from any sizeable town. That land had been in production, and was keeping a family, but it is now a national park. I understand, too, that the Government is negotiating to purchase about 800 or 1,000 acres of adjoining land. This will also be brought out of production, which seems to be a waste, because I cannot see that it will ever be widely used as a national park. I understand a part-time caretaker is supervising this land, but such a huge area cannot receive the necessary attention, and noxious weeds and vermin will therefore spread. Does the Government intend to purchase this additional land?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not sure to which piece of land the honourable member is referring, but I know a piece of land is under consideration. Whether a reserve is worthwhile is a matter of opinion. Many requests have been made for a reserve because of its value as a tourist attraction. I will not debate this question now, but I have noted the honourable member's remarks.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that the lessees of the land to which I referred earlier had to get their own hay and, in desperation, consign it themselves because of some hold-up in the movement of drought relief fodder. In reply to my questions, the Minister contented himself by saying that he

had done more than the previous Government had done. When the previous Government was in office the place to which I referred enjoyed a good season. Approaches for drought relief were not recommended by the Pastoral Board. I do not know what the Pastoral Board recommended on this occasion; I can say only that it is incontestable that the drought is unfortunately worse in the Far North of the State than it has been for at least 40 years, and that it is no good harking back to what happened in the past. As the position is serious, Will the Minister find out if the hay was held up as I contended, and will he obtain the exact details of what has been done?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON: I understand that approaches have been initiated for the creation of a wild life reserve in the south-western part of Yorke Peninsula. I believe this is a desirable portion of Yorke Peninsula for a reserve and contains some of the best coastal scenery in the State. It is now leased by Waratah Gypsum Proprietary Limited. Can the Minister say whether any provision is being made for a wild life reserve in this area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter has been considered but so far negotiations have taken place without success.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS.

Public Works Department, £9,880—passed.

Engineering and Water Supply Department, £5,248,850.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Opposition emphatically protests at the way this accounting has been done. It is something that has never been put to the House in this way in my experience. I am not blaming the Minister, because he is in the hands of the people responsible for the accounting. However, it is impossible for this Committee to assess intelligently what is meant by these particular items.

I refer to the item "Wages for construction, reimbursement and other works", which shows that £4 650,000 was voted last year, of which £4,465,013 was spent, and that the provision for this year is £4,200,000. Anyone who looks at last year's Estimates will see that there was no item in this particular department for which a provision resembling £4,000,000 was made. The provision last year for wages and salaries was £1,430,531, which was £207,180 more than had been spent in the previous year, when £1,081,025 had been voted.

However, in these Estimates, the whole thing has been lumped together. I take it that the term "construction" means Loan money and, if that is so, it should not be in these Revenue Estimates at all. In my opinion, it cannot be anything but Loan money. The whole set-up of the Estimates has been completely altered in such a way that it is impossible for any member to follow what is proposed, what is the policy of the department, or what is the continuity of expenditure. It is an intolerable position as far as I am concerned. I do not know whether, with the new computer, it is proposed to put everything in one line, but, on behalf of the Opposition, I enter an emphatic protest.

If we take, as an example, the item "Adelaide Sewers" on page 69 of the Estimates, we find that two items relating to wages are set out. One is for foremen, mechanics, storemen, maintenance men and other employees, for which £258,195 is provided. Then £453-794 is provided as "Portion of salaries and wages shown under General". We find two items concerning Adelaide sewers on page 71, so to get the items fully identifiable we have to go from one place to another and then to yet another. That is not in accordance with the Estimates provided last year, and therefore it is a complete alteration of the whole set-up of the department. Is the Minister going to explain that salaries for Loan works are included in these Revenue Estimates? If they are being included, how on earth can we ever separate what is current Revenue expenditure and what is long-term investment expenditure? What is the reason for this drastic change in the setting out of the accounts? It is difficult to identify any item with last year's expenditure.

This line to which I am referring amounts to one enormous reduction. Assuming that the items that are set out are a computation of all the items that were similarly voted last year in a number of departments (and that is the only explanation I can give to it), it still means that on actual expenditure there is a reduction of about £265,000. I assume that some of this relates to Loan Account, although it does not say so. That is a substantial decrease in this department, especially when there has been an increase in salaries and wages and many of the employees have been granted service pay. Therefore, there must be a great reduction in the work force of the department at a time when everyone is screaming out for sewer connections and other works. This large fluctuation in expenditure is completely undesirable,

as men will have to be put off. I do not think any Government likes men to be retrenched but, if my interpretation of this line is correct, the Minister will have to employ about 200 fewer people on sewers, water supply and other things undertaken by this department. Can the Minister explain why there has been such a big alteration in the accounting methods of the department? Will he say whether this line includes some Loan expenditure, and, if it does, why Loan expenditure is lumped in with Expenditure Estimates? Will he take up this matter with his accounting officers so that there will be no repetition of this violent change in the financial control of the department, and will he say whether there will be a reduction in the work force of his department?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): The wages of weekly paid employees are charged to Loan and reimbursement works, so it appears that the Leader's assumption that the Revenue and Loan moneys have been lumped together is correct. I regret the variation between last year's figure and this year's provision, and I appreciate that this matter is difficult to follow. I will get a full explanation and make it available to the Leader at an appropriate time, because I think the Estimates should be prepared in a manner that is easy to follow and I do not think they are easy to follow. The £265,000 referred to by the Leader is obviously money from the Loan Fund.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I have added up the amounts I can follow, and it appears that there is also a reduction in the Revenue Account.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not as skilled as the Leader in adding up these figures, but I know the department has suffered a fairly substantial reduction in the Loan Estimates. It is regrettable, but it appears that the department will not be able to employ as many men this year as it has in previous years. I am continually discussing with my officers the best ways of getting as much as possible done with the money available. I will obtain a full explanation of the accounting and let the Leader have a report at the appropriate time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like an explanation, and also an assurance that in future Revenue and Loan accounts will not be mixed in the same item on the Estimates. I know of no other department that has done this. It is a practice that

is inherently wrong, and it is hopeless for the Committee to try to get any explanation of what is happening. It is obviously an almost futile exercise because of the way the items are set out.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Does the Government intend to construct the Middle River reservoir on Kangaroo Island partly by contract, or will it do the work itself? Many young people on Kangaroo Island have to find employment, and I hope that the Minister will consider their position when the construction of this reservoir is undertaken. It is desirable to use local labour, if available, for the construction of the reservoir.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall take up the matter of the lumping together of the Loan and Revenue Accounts. It is desirable that they should be separate. I assure the Leader of the Opposition that I shall ascertain the reason for their being lumped together this time. It will have to be a good reason for our not returning to the old system of keeping them separate. Wherever possible, the department employs local labour, as it naturally takes pride in the work being done locally. I will get a report for the honourable member about the department's intention as regards a contract and let him have the information as soon as possible.

Mr. HUDSON: I was a little puzzled by the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition because, when I looked at the Estimates of Expenditure for last year, I was puzzled at the way in which the Engineering and Water Supply Department was set out, just as I was this year. I wondered whether a more satisfactory way of setting out the accounts could be found. Under the Engineering and Water Supply Department last year we see the proposed expenditure of £1,551,514 for "Salaries and Wages (General)"; then "Less amounts transferred to districts, £1,111,699", leaving £439,815, which is set against the line "Less charged to other accounts". That £439,815 is taken off and is not considered any more in the Estimates. This year, under the heading "General", what has happened is that "Salaries and wages" appear in the Loan Fund.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: This year the Estimates set out that there was £4,600,000 voted last year, which is not correct.

Mr. HUDSON: It is put on a comparable basis.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was not voted last year at all.

Mr. HUDSON: And that would have been compared with the amount voted last year also under the Loan Fund, if that was included.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: But the Loan Fund was not in the Estimates before.

Mr. HUDSON: There would have been a wages component in "Salaries and wages" under the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the Loan Fund.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: But Loan expenditure should not be in the Revenue Estimates.

Mr. HUDSON: These other accounts should not be in the Expenditure Estimates. Apparently, one of the problems of this department is how to separate those wages and salaries items provided for out of the Loan Fund from those provided for out of Consolidated Revenue Fund. This problem of sorting them out appears, in part, even in last year's Estimates of Expenditure, because we end up under this heading in last year's Estimates of "General" with a zero figure.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You think that we lump them together because we do not know how to separate them?

Mr. HUDSON: There is this separation. It states "Less amounts transferred to districts", and that amount transferred to districts is the only amount under Engineering and Water Supply "General" that goes into the Consolidated Revenue Fund; all the others get charged to other accounts. That separation is shown in that way. I am prepared to agree that it is not particularly satisfactory, but it was not particularly satisfactory last year, either. It may be difficult to say whether a particular person is working all the time on current activities or on work associated with the Loan Fund.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does the provision relating to charges for construction reimbursement arise as a result of a change in departmental policy? Will the Minister also say whether it is now intended to employ more day labourers, as opposed to contractors, and, if it is, has this affected the actual sum allocated for wages where previously Loan works may have been undertaken more by way of contract work?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There has been no change in policy in regard to contract work and the employment of day labour.

Mr. RODDA: In relation to country water districts, and to the Penola water scheme, it was originally intended to erect a large concrete holding tank, but I understand that the ground was not suitable and that the department had to erect two squatters tanks. I believe that at present the system is working off the old railway overhead tank. It was intended to install three 15 h.p. electric motors, but it has been found necessary to install three pumps of 105 h.p. I understand that the water in the mains will be pressurized, and it appears that, at the most, the two tanks will hold 60,000 gallons. Will this system be efficient?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The more we look at these accounts the more confusing they become. The amounts stated in this year's Estimates as being voted last year do not correspond with the amounts set out in the Estimates last year. Will the Minister have an overhaul made of the accounting system so as to provide, in an intelligible way, that the Loan Accounts and Revenue Accounts shall not be shown in the Revenue Estimates, because we have already disposed of the Loan Accounts. We now have a substantial sum which, having been voted here, is recouped or transferred to the Loan Accounts.

I was pleased to hear the Minister say, in reply to the honourable member for Albert, that there would be no change in policy concerning contract work and pay work. Will the Minister obtain a full report and insist that the Revenue Estimates presented by his department provide for revenue expenditure, and that the Loan Estimates provide for Loan expenditure?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As there seems to be a certain amount of confusion on this matter, I will get a report.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.48 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 30, at 2 p.m.