

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, August 17, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS**EVIDENCE ACT.**

Mr. HALL: I understand that yesterday, for the first time, the powers given by Parliament last session to exclude the press from juvenile courts were exercised. As this has caused disquiet in some circles, and as both the morning and afternoon newspapers have made a feature of the exclusion, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to re-introduce the Bill to amend the Evidence Act that was allowed to lapse last session, in regard to the suppression of the publication of reports of court proceedings?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government can prohibit the publication of reports of preliminary hearings that take place in this State when the newspaper containing the report comes from another State? If the paper is published in another State is there anything to stop its circulating in South Australia, or will the law apply only to South Australian papers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is every likelihood that we could prohibit the paper from circulating in South Australia, but we could not prohibit the publication in another State of a newspaper which produced reports that were forbidden to be printed in South Australia. For instance, certain reports of a recent South Australian divorce case were printed in another State, whereas the publication of those details was prohibited in South Australia under the Police Offences Act. So far as I am aware, none of those newspapers circulated in South Australia, but had we found any we would have prosecuted.

BUILDING INDUSTRY.

Mr. LANGLEY: Publicity having recently been given to problems confronting builders in this State, last evening on television the President of the Master Builders' Association (Mr. Bob O'Neill) congratulated the State Government on its efforts to assist South Australia's building industry. However, as Mr. O'Neill said that he believed the Commonwealth Government should provide greater assistance to stimulate the building industry,

can the Premier say whether an approach has been made to the Prime Minister in an attempt to help the building industry in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Earlier this month I informed the Prime Minister that the State's finances were a little run down, and asked whether we could obtain further assistance to provide more employment. I have not yet received a reply, other than an acknowledgement of my letter.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

Mr. QUIRKE: Although I did not see it myself, I understand that a telecast last night showed what was called a wastage of oranges on the Murray River. Being disturbed about the matter, I inquired this morning, and I believe that the wastage is not as great as the television story would indicate. Renmark has about 15 tons, Loxton about three tons, Berri about 15 tons and Waikerie about 14 tons of fruit probably suitable for juice, although it is not suitable for the market. Of course, as honourable members know, some wastage always occurs in the packing, processing and handling of fruit. Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited could be concerned in this matter and, although I have not had time to inquire, it could be that this company has the capacity to absorb the fruit but has not the necessary finance, as it could have used all the finance it has available for the time being. Will the Minister of Lands consult the Minister of Agriculture to see whether something cannot be done to help this company process the fruit, if the reason it is not doing so is that it is short of money? If this is not the position, can action be taken to see whether the organizations handling fruit can help so that this waste of fruit can be avoided? I suggest that, failing direct help from the State Bank, the packing companies might help with finance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This is the first I have heard of the matter as I did not see the television programme last night, nor has it been drawn to my attention. However, as I am anxious (as I believe are all members) to avoid any waste of fruit in this industry, I shall be happy to investigate the matter as a matter of urgency and see what can be done if, as the honourable member suggests, Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative Limited is short of finance, which may not necessarily be the case.

FORESTS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of August 9 concerning councils that had taken advantage

of the provisions of the Local Government (Forestry Reserves) Act to establish local government forestry reserves, and the acreages that had been planted with trees pursuant to that Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The following information has been supplied:

Councils which have had forest reserves proclaimed under the Act are: Beachport, Onkaparinga, Clare, Encounter Bay, Barmera, Naracoorte (Corporation), Gumeracha, and Balaklava. Apart from the forest reserves vested in Encounter Bay and Barmera District Councils, which are natural hardwood areas, 227 acres of forest have been established by the other six councils. The District Councils of Clare, Beachport, Balaklava and the Corporation of Naracoorte have received financial assistance amounting in all to \$6,230.

GUM TREES.

Mrs. STEELE: The Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads, has told me that he has a reply to my recent question concerning the removal of gum trees on Montacute Road. Will he now give that reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not the complete answer that the honourable member would like. I have virtually what is an interim report, as a result of questions yesterday in the House. The Minister of Roads told me this morning that on Monday last he issued instructions to prevent any further progress on the works or the removal of trees in the area referred to by the honourable member, and that he would personally inspect the area and decide for himself the question of retaining or removing these trees.

TORRENS RIVER.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on August 11 regarding how long the Torrens River is likely to remain empty?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's question I wrote to the Adelaide City Council, and I have now received the following reply from the Town Clerk:

In reply to your letter of August 12 concerning the height of Torrens Lake during the period when reconstruction work is being carried out at the Morphett Street and Victoria bridges, the tentative bridge construction programme provides for the lake level to be returned to near crest level towards the end of September, 1966, and to be maintained at this level to the end of May, 1967, when it will be emptied for approximately three months. It will then revert to normal level, to be lowered in July, 1968, for a period of some two weeks. It is wished to emphasize that these times are tentative and depend upon the rate of progress of the bridge works. In addition, this programme

will be affected if the level of the lake is lowered to permit work to be carried out on the river bank adjacent to Botanic Park to prevent further erosion of the bank in this area. For this purpose the lake level may be lowered three or four feet for about two months late this year.

PARILLA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to a question I asked last week relating to the Parilla water supply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am informed that the Mines Department is currently engaged in trying to redevelop a satisfactory water supply at Parilla township bore. Results of these efforts will not be known for about two weeks.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education obtain from the Minister of Mines a departmental report on its intentions regarding Parilla, immediately a decision has been made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

HOPE VALLEY INTERSECTION.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked on August 10 concerning the Engineering and Water Supply Department's plans for further improving safety measures at the dangerous four-way intersection of Grand Junction Road and Reservoir Road, Hope Valley?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the honourable member's question, I took the matter up with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who has now reported that this intersection was recently inspected by the department's Regional Engineer and a police officer. The department's property is on the south-western corner and, to improve the situation some time ago, the reserve was cleared for a distance of 100ft. from the intersection except for one tree from which all branches within 10ft. of the ground have been removed. As there are "give way" signs at both entrances from Reservoir Road on to Grand Junction Road, the intersection should not present any problems if reasonable care normally associated with any road junction was exercised by motorists. However, as a result of the discussion with the police officer, it was decided that visibility could be further improved if the departmental property were cleared of all low bushes and undergrowth for a distance of 200ft. from the corner. I am pleased to advise that this work is now in progress.

BRANDING OIL.

Mr. RODDA: I understand that all branding oil held by stock agents has been recalled by the manufacturers, and that there are many unbranded sheep in the South-East. As it is unsatisfactory to have unbranded sheep and as obvious impurities have been found in the oil, will the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, ascertain what the trouble is, and when branding oil will be available to be used to brand unshorn animals?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because of the situation outlined by the honourable member, I shall be pleased to investigate this matter and obtain a report, if not by tomorrow, certainly by Tuesday.

GROUP CERTIFICATES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the non-receipt of a group certificate by a former employee of the department?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A group certificate for the lady mentioned by the honourable member has been posted to her today at the address which he supplied to me. Group certificates for former teachers who have left the department's employ are sent to a forwarding address if one is available. Where no forwarding address is held, and this was the case with the honourable member's constituent, the certificate is held in the office until a request for it is made. I find it hard to understand why the lady could not have inquired of the Education Department directly or, for that matter, why the honourable member could not have done so himself.

MUSGRAVE PARK.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a further question of the Minister of Education, and I trust that it meets with his approval as a matter that should be raised in this House. In the last few weeks, and particularly in the last few days, there has been a controversy about the provision of a school at Musgrave Park. Will the Minister say what peculiar difficulties have been in the way of the Education Department's providing a school there?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not know that there are any particular difficulties except the ordinary difficulties of getting schools built. In view of the shortage of funds for this work, this difficulty is common everywhere. I have asked the Public Buildings Department to expedite the provision of this school, and that department is examining the question of pro-

viding a special type of school having regard to the distance that it has to be taken, the nature of the climate in the area, and other aspects. We hope to provide a school that is particularly suitable for the area, and we also have the problem of providing suitable and adequate accommodation for the teachers (I believe there will be four) in this very remote part of the State.

PARAFIELD GARDENS SEWERAGE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the installation of sewerage at Parafield Gardens?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Plans were prepared last year for the sewerage of Parafield Gardens and, as it was intended to seek approval for this work, applications for sewer construction and the appropriate sewer connection fees were accepted from two property owners. A third application was received, but the fee was not paid. In view of the heavy demands upon the Loan funds available to the department, approval was not sought for this work, and the fees should have been refunded to the applicants. Provision has been made on the department's draft estimates for this year to carry out some of this work, and I have approved the undertaking on this basis.

A commencement will be made on sewer construction next month, and sufficient work will be done to provide drainage facilities for the three applicants. However, it may be necessary to defer the laying of some of the other sewers until the following financial year. I assure the Leader that the delay in this case was dictated by circumstances and is not a "typical delay". The objective is to spend available funds to the best advantage, but as these funds are limited it is not always possible to provide sewerage facilities as early as householders would like to receive them. If any promise was given in regard to the provision of sewerage by any particular date, it was given by someone who was not *au fait* with the situation and who should not have given an undertaking of any kind.

LYNDOCH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of August 5 about the installation of heaters at the Lyndoch Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director, Public Buildings Department, reports that three new oil heaters were installed in the Lyndoch Primary School on May 12 this year and that these heaters have performed satisfactorily since their installation.

FERTILIZERS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Lands obtained a reply from the Agriculture Department to a question I asked on August 4 about whether tests had been made of the use of ammonium based fertilizers on wine grape vines?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Director of Agriculture reports:

Trials with ammonium based fertilizers on grape vines have been carried out in various districts over a long period, generally with inconclusive results. Trials on irrigated vines have shown no economic advantage from the use of sulphate of ammonia. Differences in yield have been small and in some years there appeared to be increased breakdown of bunches under high levels of sulphate of ammonia. Similarly inconclusive results from fertilizer trials under irrigation have also been reported from experimental stations along the Murray River in other States. A trial on non-irrigated vines at the viticultural research station in the Barossa Valley receiving sulphate of ammonia showed a depression of yield and vine growth after 12 years. Over the past 10 seasons both crop and vine growth have been 20 per cent lower than on unfertilized vines. The sulphate of ammonia plots show that soil acidity has increased, and it is suspected that this is responsible for the decline in yields. Experimental work is now going on to check this point. A new series of fertilizer treatments is now being tested on irrigated grape vines at Loxton, and treatments to counteract the acidifying effect of sulphate of ammonia are being used. No results are available yet. In the light of these trial results, the Agriculture Department does not at present make definite recommendations on the use of nitrogenous fertilizers on irrigated grape vines. The department does suggest that, if these fertilizers are used, they be used in conjunction with phosphate fertilizers, and emphasizes that the liability of sulphate of ammonia in particular to acidify soil should be borne in mind. In non-irrigated areas, the use of any artificial nitrogenous fertilizer on grape vines is considered to be uneconomic. The use of acidic nitrogenous fertilizers such as sulphate of ammonia is discouraged.

BOOL LAGOON ROADS.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands an answer to the question I asked yesterday about the roads adjacent to Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Following the honourable member's question, I had inquiries made in my department this morning, and have been informed that no proposals to close the roads in the area referred to by the honourable member have been lodged with my department, although they may have been misdirected and lodged elsewhere.

UNEMPLOYMENT.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Yesterday the Premier, in answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition relating to South Australia's unemployment position, said:

Although I do not wish to make a forecast, I hope that something good will come out of the Budget to be introduced in the Commonwealth Parliament tonight—

that is, last night. He then referred to the motor car industry in South Australia, and, after pointing out that cars were awaiting sale, added:

Unless encouragement is given in this regard, the State's position will further deteriorate.

As the Commonwealth Budget was introduced last night, can the Premier say whether he considers the position in this State will further deteriorate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although, again, I would not make a forecast, I sincerely trust that the people of Australia will be able to adjust themselves to the Budget delivered last night. We should then be able to obtain a better picture of the general position in Australia. I certainly hope that the unemployment position will not deteriorate further.

OMBUDSMAN.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the desirability of establishing in this State the office of Ombudsman.

In support of the motion, I point out that an ombudsman is defined as an officer appointed by the Legislature to receive and investigate complaints from citizens against unjust administrative action. That, I think, is a fair description, if it is not strictly the definition of the word "ombudsman". It is a Scandinavian word in its origin, but it looks as though it has now been taken into the English language, because it is frequently used both in this country and in oversea English-speaking countries to describe the office with which I am about to deal. I understand that, literally, the word means "agent", and it has been translated as "procurator for civil affairs" or, more usually nowadays, as "Parliamentary commissioner". It is interesting to note that the Act in New Zealand under which this office has been established is known as the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act. The office originated, as one might guess from the derivation of the word, in Sweden in 1809, and it was adopted by Finland, when it became an independent country after the First World

War, in 1919. The office has since been established in Denmark and Norway.

The examples that are particularly pertinent for South Australia, I suggest, are New Zealand, where the office was established in 1962, and in the United Kingdom, where it is intended to establish the office soon, if it has not already been established. The question of establishing the office has been considered in many other countries. I believe that it should be considered here in South Australia, too. Because the ombudsman is an officer of Parliament (and the analogy one draws is to the office of Auditor-General, that officer being an officer of Parliament, not an officer of the Government), I believe that Parliament itself should investigate whether or not it is desirable in this State for the office to be set up. I join issue here with the honourable and learned Attorney-General who is reported as having said at the last Australian Labor Party Conference that the Government would inquire how things were going in New Zealand. The *Advertiser* of June 14 last stated:

The State A.L.P. Conference yesterday decided to ask the State Government to investigate the possibility of appointing an ombudsman to examine grievances against Government departments. The Attorney-General, supporting the resolution, said, "Before we rush into appointing an ombudsman we must see what the situation is in New Zealand where one has been working."

I do not believe that this inquiry should be left either to the Government or to an outside body such as the Australian Labor Party. I am fortified in my belief by the answers that I have had to questions I have asked on this matter both this session and last session. Last session I asked the Premier whether the Government intended to set up the office and his first reply was that I should put the question on notice. When I did so he gave me a reply in the negative, and merely pointed out that members of this Chamber have an opportunity, in the interests of their constituents, to bring forward matters in this House. After the apparent change of front as expressed by the Attorney-General at the last Australian Labor Party conference, I asked the Premier a further question about the matter and, after beating around the bush for a while, he concluded by saying:

My colleague (that is, the Attorney-General) is not here today but if he has inquired I should think that the results of his inquiry could be taken as evidence of whether the policy I announced previously should be altered. That is as far as I am prepared to go on the matter.

I am sure members on both sides will agree that that was an entirely unsatisfactory answer because, amongst other things, it did not mean anything. I believe this matter is too important to be left to some unknown, haphazard inquiry. I believe the appropriate method of investigation and examination of the whole concept is through a Select Committee to be appointed by this House. Because I believe that the matter should be handled by a Select Committee, I do not desire to canvass—certainly not in detail—the arguments for and against the setting up of the office in this State. The inquiry into those arguments is the proper function of a Select Committee.

Although I do not intend to go into the arguments in detail, for the benefit (I hope) of members I shall refer to some of the better known arguments for and against. The principal argument in favour of the establishment of this office is that, as the power of Government increases, so does the danger that an individual may not get a "fair go", to use an Australian expression, and that the traditional methods of seeing that he does get a fair go (that is, through the courts of law and through the activities of members in this place and in the Legislative Council) are no longer sufficient to ensure that everyone gets fair treatment at all times. Personally (and I make no bones about this) I accept that argument. I know from my own experience that in many instances our courts are just not equipped to carry out this task—and that, I think, is conceded by most people. In this State we do not have (nor is there anything in any common law country of which I know) a system of administrative courts such as one finds in many continental countries, notably in France, which system is, of course, a safeguard to the rights of the individual against abuses by the Government. We do not have that system: that is not the way our system of courts has developed.

Speaking as a member of this House, I also realize the difficulty of getting justice or being satisfied that justice has been done in every case. I hope members will allow me to say that I try as hard as any member to see that constituents who come to me get a fair deal. However, I must admit that during my time as a member of this House (and this is irrespective of which Government has been in office) I have not been at all satisfied, in every case, that justice has been done, and I have been unable to get to the bottom of things to make sure that it is done. I venture to say that other members would say they have

had similar experiences. That is the great argument in favour of the establishment of this office. Many arguments are commonly raised against the concept, but I shall mention only four of them: first, that the office of ombudsman would conflict with the doctrine of Ministerial responsibility, the doctrine pursuant to which Ministers of the Crown make the decisions of Government without interference; secondly, that an ombudsman would diminish the rights and functions of members of Parliament to take up grievances on behalf of their constituents; thirdly, that a better solution would be to do something about our system of law and to provide for all serious complaints against the Administration to be left to be decided by the courts; and fourthly, that civil servants would not be able to do their work properly if they had the threat of outside investigation hanging over them all the time.

There may be something in these arguments against the establishment of the office of ombudsman but, as I am at present informed, I believe that there is overwhelmingly greater weight in the argument to which I have referred in favour of the establishment of the office. However, I emphasize again that this is merely my personal opinion. I do not, at this moment, seek to persuade any other member either for or against. All I am trying to do by moving this motion is to persuade the House to agree that the matter should be investigated by us as members of Parliament. To emphasize the importance of the question, I should say that the Gallup poll results show a heavy majority of people in Australia in favour of the establishment of the office. I have here the published results for February-March, 1965, in which this particular matter is discussed. The heading is "Public Sees Need for Ombudsman", and the results state:

Every State should have an ombudsman in the opinion of two out of three people with opinions on the subject.

That is a very high proportion. Apparently the interview was held in November, 1964, and the following question was asked of people:

Judging by your own experience and what you have heard, would you say an ombudsman is needed or not needed in this State?

The results continue:

Of every 100 people interviewed, 56 said an ombudsman is needed, 27 said not needed, and 17 were undecided.

It is interesting that men and women as separate groups gave similar answers and so did Liberal and Country League and Australian

Labor Party voters, so there is no question of Party politics or of a difference of opinion between men and women on the subject. I emphasize that in no State was the vote for having an ombudsman less than five to three. The usual comments in favour of an ombudsman were as follows:

Could help us all; grievances would be looked into better; a lot of people are now ignored.

The usual comments of those who said an ombudsman was not needed were as follows:

We have our representatives in Parliament; things are pretty well run now; people should be able to look after themselves.

So this is a matter about which there is a strong feeling (and I put it no more strongly than that) in the community. That is why I believe this Parliament should no longer ignore the matter but should inquire into it in the way I suggest. All I ask now is that no member should commit himself or herself without finding out what an ombudsman is, how he works, the experience in other countries, and without weighing up the arguments for and against. If I may, without going much further into the matter, merely give members some references that are freely available in the Parliamentary Library, I hope that members will avail themselves of the opportunity of looking at them.

The first book I mention (it is only a pamphlet, really), is by Professor Geoffrey Sawyer, is entitled *Ombudsmen*, and it was written and published in 1964. This deals in six chapters with the problem, with the history of the office in other countries, and with the question of administrative law. He deals with the "new despotism" as defined by Lord Hewart, the former Chief Justice of England. He then deals with the position in New Zealand, and this is a chapter that I particularly recommend to members. Then he canvasses the arguments that have been advanced in this country.

The next book that I mention is *The Ombudsman*, sub-titled the *Citizen's Defender*. It is a collection of 29 essays both for and against the office and edited by Donald C. Rowat. This is an even more recent book, having come into the library, I notice, only in March of this year, and having been published first in 1965. Apart from those two books there is, for those members who do not have the time to look at them, a good article in the September, 1964, issue of the *Australian Quarterly*, entitled *The Ombudsman and the Rights of the Citizens*, by N. J. Caiden, and that in a few pages

sets out the whole position. Also, of course, there are a number of articles in newspapers and periodicals which are freely available to members.

However, as I said, from our point of view easily the most instructive example is New Zealand, and, even more recently, the proposals in the United Kingdom. I will say just a few words about the New Zealand officer and the proposals in the U.K., for the benefit of members. I preface my remarks about New Zealand by saying that in the past we have, on two occasions at least, borrowed from New Zealand or adopted legislative provisions worked out first of all in New Zealand. I think the Attorney-General knows (I hope he is not going to disagree with me on this) that the testator's family maintenance legislation originated in New Zealand. This applies also to the question of workmen's compensation. Getting back to the point of the ombudsman, I understand that the way in which ideas came to New Zealand was via the Attorney-General in the last Labor Government. He and one of his senior officers attended in 1959 a conference in Ceylon at which they met the Danish Ombudsman, and they brought the idea back from that conference. The then Government did not immediately take any steps to set up the office in New Zealand. However, a hint of it appeared in the manifesto or platform of the Nationalist Party at the next election, and the idea put forward was for a citizens' appeal authority. Members may know that the Nationalist Party won the general election in 1961, and when it came to office it introduced legislation to establish not a citizens' appeal authority, as it had suggested in its policy, but the office of ombudsman. A Bill was introduced in 1961 and allowed to stay merely on the Notice Paper until 1962, when it was passed. This Act was called the Parliamentary Commissioner (Ombudsman) Act.

Mr. Nankivell: That was to assess public reaction.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and it is a very proper device which has been adopted by the present Government in this State from time to time. I refer very briefly to section 11 of the Act because this sets out the functions of the Commissioner. Subsection (1) is as follows:

The principal function of the Commissioner shall be to investigate any decision or recommendation made, including any recommendation made to a Minister of the Crown, or any act done or omitted relating to a matter of administration and affecting any person or

body of persons in his or its personal capacity in or by any of the departments or organizations named in the schedule to this Act, or by any officer, employee or member thereof, in the exercise of any power or function conferred on him by any enactment.

Subsection (2) provides that any such investigation may be made either on complaint to him or on his motion. Subsection (3) provides that Parliament itself may refer any matter to the ombudsman for investigation if it sees fit. Although the other subsections are also relevant, I shall not go through them one by one. Subsections (5) and (6) contain exceptions to his jurisdiction, where there is a right of appeal through the courts, where any action of the Crown Law Office is at issue, or on any matter concerning the terms and conditions of service in the armed forces, or any order, command, decision, penalty or punishment given to or affecting a soldier in that capacity. Those things are excluded. Apart from that, section 11 sets out the jurisdiction of the ombudsman. Section 14 gives the ombudsman power to decline to act if he thinks it would not be proper for him to do so.

I have already mentioned that the ombudsman is normally an officer of Parliament, and his term of office in New Zealand is from Parliament to Parliament. There is a provision (I think section 6 in the Act) which lays it down that he shall be appointed in the first or second session after the general election, so he is, in effect, appointed by the Party in power at the time, the object being that he will have the confidence of the ruling Party and therefore the Government during his term of office. The ombudsman may be re-appointed for a further term. The first ombudsman in New Zealand is Sir Guy Powles, a soldier, lawyer and administrator, and so far as one can discover (and this is one of the things, of course, which would have to be looked into) he has been a very great success. In the Parliamentary Library we have, as yet, only two of his reports, the more recent one not having been received. His first report covers the first six months of his office to March 31, 1963. I shall quote the number of cases given to him, the way in which he dealt with them, and the results he has found. Under the heading "Cases Handled" he states:

Of these 334 complaints, 143 were not, after preliminary study, proceeded with. Seventy-six of these 143 did not relate to matters of governmental administration and were consequently outside my jurisdiction under section 11 (1) many being against local bodies. Nineteen were declined as being

outside my jurisdiction under section 11 (5) and (6) of the Act as concerning matters for which there were existing rights of appeal, decisions of trustees, or conditions of service as a member of the Armed Forces. Twenty-one were declined as failing to qualify for further investigation for one of the reasons specified in section 14 (1) and (2). Fifteen remained obscure after further inquiry from the complainants. Twelve were withdrawn by the complainants.

Of the remainder, 117 cases were fully investigated during the period, and 74 were still under investigation at the end of the period. Of the 117 complaints investigated, 91 were determined to be not justified, and the complainants were informed accordingly. Many of those whose complaints were rejected subsequently replied expressing appreciation of the investigation. A number of the rejected complaints arose from the failure of individuals to understand the reasons for the official action concerned. I think departments are showing an increased awareness of the needs for publicising their administrative procedures, and any changes therein, but the nature of some complaints underscores the importance of this aspect of departmental responsibility. This leaves 26 cases in which the complaint was found, in some way or other to be justified. He then sets out the departments concerned in the 26 complaints, and then states:

The proportion of "justified" complaints (26) to those investigated (117) seems rather high. From a report I have received it appears that for the full year 1961 the Danish Ombudsman found 64 complaints to be justified out of 414 investigated.

That was his first report as ombudsman.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: What is the annual cost of this office in New Zealand?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is under £NZ10,000.

Mr. Nankivell: He receives £NZ4,100 a year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a trifling Government expense compared with other things. The other report we have is for the year ended March 31, 1964, in which we find that his work load had increased. He had received 760 complaints during the 12 months and 369 were not fully investigated mainly because of lack of jurisdiction. His report continues:

In most cases lack of jurisdiction was apparent on the face of the complaint, but there were several in respect of which substantial investigation was carried out before I was able to determine that I had no jurisdiction to proceed further. Two hundred and twenty-six of these 369 complaints did not relate to matters of governmental administration within the meaning of the main operative section. Under the heading "Cases Investigated" he states:

Three hundred and eighty-nine complaints were fully investigated during the year, this total including uncompleted cases carried over from the previous period. Of these 389 com-

plaints investigated, 308 were considered to be not justified and the complainants were informed accordingly. . . . There were 81 cases in which I found the complaint to be justified.

The report continues to show how he dealt with the justified complaints and what the outcome was, as follows:

In 52 of these cases the department or organization itself rectified the matter before it was necessary to complete a full investigation. In some of the remaining 29 cases the complaints were justified, but I made no specific recommendation because, for various reasons, it was not possible to remedy the particular matter which formed the subject of the complaint. These cases revealed the existence of a departmental decision or practice which was legitimately subject to criticism, and I made recommendations with the object of ensuring that such matters would be more appropriately dealt with in the future. In the remaining cases, after a full investigation, I made specific recommendations aimed at remedying the complaint. All my recommendations, whether general or specific, have in due course been accepted by the departments or organizations concerned and, consequently, no case has occurred where it has been necessary for me to report to the House that a recommendation has not been complied with.

There is provision that, if he is not satisfied that justice has been done by the department, he may report direct to Parliament. That is the situation to March, 1964, and for the information of the member for Angas, the annual all-inclusive cost of running the office on the present basis is about £NZ11,500, which would be about \$A30,000 and that is not a big factor. I am quoting these figures to show that in a significant number of cases in New Zealand it was found that the complaints made were not justified. My experience suggests that there is nothing to show that in this State about the same proportion of cases would not be found to be justified. I believe our situation and circumstances would be about the same as those in New Zealand. With the significant number of cases that are justified on investigation, surely this is something that we should consider adopting in the interests of the people of this State.

I now turn to the United Kingdom. For the benefit of members opposite, I remind them that the Labor Party's 1964 election manifesto in the United Kingdom pledged the Labor Party to set up the new office of Parliamentary Commissioner, with the right to investigate grievances of the citizens, and legislation to that end was subsequently promised in the Queen's Speech at the opening of the new session of Parliament in November, 1965.

A White Paper was published by the Government of the United Kingdom, and my reference to it is in *Keesing's Contemporary Archives*, which sets out *in extenso* the White Paper. The main difference between the proposals in the United Kingdom and those in New Zealand is that in the United Kingdom references to the ombudsman must come through a member of Parliament: it is not competent for members of the public to approach the ombudsman; they must first go to a member of Parliament (in the same way as they come to us now) and it is for the member to decide whether there are appropriate cases for reference to the ombudsman.

I do not think it is necessary for me to say any more about the United Kingdom's proposal. The power is in substance set out at page 21060 of *Keesing* of November 6-13, 1965. Members can see set out there the proposals and the arguments for and against, and make up their own minds. I have pointed out what is happening in two other English-speaking common law countries: New Zealand and the United Kingdom. In one case the Bill was introduced when a Nationalist Government was in office, and in the other the proposals stemmed from a Labor Government in office, so there need be no question of Party politics in this matter. As I have said, I think the results of the Gallup poll in Australia show that this is so.

My aim in moving this motion is to enable the matter to be properly considered by this House in the most convenient way, which is by the establishment of a Select Committee. When that is done (as I hope it will be) it will then be for members of both sides to make up their minds one way or the other and, I hope, for the Government to act accordingly. I hope I have said sufficient to persuade members that the idea is important, and that it should be studied. If they are persuaded of this, I am confident that they will support the motion.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I second the motion, Mr. Speaker. I shall approach the subject in a different way from that adopted by the mover, and I hope my research into the history of this matter will benefit members. I think the history is pertinent to a decision whether a Select Committee should be appointed to consider having such an office. In Sweden, this office was first set up in 1809. We must remember that in that country from 1766 every person had access to papers other than secret and personal papers. The democracy that has prevailed in that country is different from

that in common law countries or countries under the British constitutional system. The ombudsman, or procurator of justice, was appointed in Sweden as a guardian of the people: he had fairly wide powers and the duty of seeing that judges and officials followed the law and of prosecuting any who acted illegally or neglected their duties. He had right of access to all documents, including secret documents, and the right to be present at all deliberations of judges and administrative officials. He also had the power to co-opt assistance, including that of prosecuting attorneys, if he considered that some action should be taken against an official whom he considered had improperly carried out his functions. He has never been able to alter decisions or judgments: his powers, although wide, are restricted to public reprimand or criticism.

He reports annually to the Parliament (as the Auditor-General does in this State) and he is a servant of the Parliament (as is our Auditor-General) but he is nevertheless independent of Parliament and its decisions. Further, he has the right of supervision over municipal bodies and their officials, other than elected officials such as councillors, and all public servants come under his supervision. Although he receives over 1,000 complaints a year, many of these are the result of the person's not understanding exactly what the administrative decision implies. This is why, as stated by the member for Mitcham, many cases can be quickly resolved without further inquiry. Complaints can be submitted in writing or orally and, having received the complaint, he calls for the necessary documents. If the matter is still not clear to him, he can call for a written report from the official concerned, and, if still unsatisfied, he can ask the police to investigate. It can be seen that he has wide powers of inquiry. If it is a very complicated issue, he can also call in expert advice to help him decide.

Apart from investigating complaints lodged with him in writing or orally, he may on his own behalf initiate inquiries into various departments or into the administration of gaols and mental institutions. He has free access to all Government institutions, and I understand that usually they are visited and that anyone in them who considers he has been improperly placed there has the right to approach him. He visits these institutions to ascertain whether any person has been wrongfully detained or is being improperly treated.

Another function of this officer in Sweden is to inquire into administrative procedures.

If the ombudsman finds that the procedure adopted by a department is inefficient and a long time is taken to arrive at a decision, he can and does recommend changes in the practices employed. When he finds a breach in departmental administration, he does not have powers to change the decision but he has the power to reprimand or warn an official. If the official does not like the warning or the penalty that can be imposed on him for a breach of his responsibilities, the matter can be resolved in the court.

Mr. Shannon: What penalty can the ombudsman impose on an official?

Mr. NANKIVELL: He can impose a fine. However, the system of Government is different in Sweden, where the Government makes laws and the official interprets them. The interpretation by officials varies from district to district, so anomalies may occur.

Mr. Shannon: If a person is incorrectly penalized, does it cost him anything to obtain redress?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I do not think he has to pay for any damages occasioned by mismanagement on his part.

Mr. Quirke: What redress has the individual?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Principally through the court, and that ensures uniformity in decision. The official functions independently and, as a consequence, differences of opinion in interpretations can exist. I do not believe that the individual can obtain redress from the official in the case of a grievance, but I shall not be so dogmatic as to say that he cannot. The principal function has been to protect the right of the individual and to try to prevent faults, by directing attention to any improvement in the law that may ensure this. The office has a positive character.

Sweden's officer is elected on behalf of Parliament within 15 days of a Parliamentary election, for a term of four years. He is usually a judge from the Court of Appeal or one of the lower courts and, on assuming this office, he is paid the salary of a Supreme Court judge. It is not usual for such an officer to hold office for long (I think about 12 years is the longest period established), because it is considered, first, that it is exacting work and, secondly, that new thinking must continually be injected into the job. In Finland (which broke away from Sweden in 1809) a similar office was set up in 1919. Prior to that year Finland had a Chancellor of Justice, but set up an ombudsman in that year with power to supervise Parliament

(including Ministers) on behalf of the President and Council of State. Since 1961 he has had independent powers and a department under his control. Again, he is elected by Parliament for a four-year period and cannot be dismissed during his term of office.

However, if he is unsuitable, he may not be re-elected. It has been normal in Finland to elect one of the leading young jurists rather than a court official, and his function is to supervise all public officials, courts, municipal and church organizations of self-government, in addition to the State's highest officials. He can bring charges against any person in office, if he wishes. He can supervise the courts by studying cases and verdicts, together with court statistics. In other words, he is vitally concerned to safeguard the rights of those subject to any official acts. He can even check Cabinet Ministers for any misdemeanours and report to Parliament if misdemeanours occur. The office is varied. I can see Government members opposite, like members on this side, immediately rising up in their seats in protest at the thought of somebody acting in the capacity of a servant of Parliament and criticizing their decisions.

Mr. Quirke: I do not think all the dubious faces are on the Government side.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No, I include members on this side who have previously occupied Ministerial positions. Denmark's Minister is in a different position from his counterparts in Sweden and Finland, and is responsible for his department. When the office was first created in that country there was a certain reluctance on the part of the Parliament to accept the office as being one of any value, because it was said that the Minister could hear cases (which he does every Thursday morning). Anyone has the right of access to a Minister to present his grievance. A grievance is expressed through Parliament, and Parliament has the right to censure a Minister as the responsible head of the department. Denmark's office was set up in 1956, its function being chiefly discretionary and intercedary. Danish experience has conclusively proved that the ombudsman does not hamper the efficiency of the administration, as he cannot order either the Minister or official to change any decision; he examines the file, has a conference with officials or the Minister, and if he can see no error in their judgment, the matter is closed.

Indeed, in Denmark it has been proved that the office is supplementary to the office of Parliament; it does not hamper the independence

or the efficiency of the administration and, further, it has improved the development of administrative law, by creating interest and allowing discussion on vital problems, enabling the establishment of a more detailed control of executive authority. Norway established a similar office in 1961, the idea of the appointment being to help anybody who believed he had been subjected to abuse of power by administrative authority; who might find it too expensive to take legal action in the case of a wrong having been done; who might not be able to have his case debated in Parliament; or who might not wish to give details to a newspaper, in order that public hue and cry may be raised to any injustice. Such a person can have the ombudsman examine his case.

This has helped the Public Service by ensuring that any complaints are well founded and are not specious. It may also lessen the work of individual members of Parliament who, in this State (as we know), under our Parliamentary system, usually fulfil the function of inquiring into complaints, concerning any injustice that may have been done by any department administering the law under the Government in this State. In Norway, the ombudsman is not given the power to review administrative discretion, except where it has been used unlawfully or is clearly unreasonable. He cannot take action, but he can inquire on behalf of Parliament. Unlike Sweden's officer, he has no powers over municipal bodies or the judiciary. He can also be discharged from office by a two-thirds majority of the Lower House of Parliament. In Norway also, he has the oversight of Government administration not only regarding private individuals but also the internal administration of personnel in the Public Service; for example, appointments and dismissals, or disciplinary action.

He can also exercise wide power for commending alterations of procedure, and point out any deficiencies that may occur in Governmental and departmental procedure. He has the power, too, to act on his own initiative, and widespread powers to demand documents and evidence. If necessary, he can order courts to take evidence on his behalf; he also has access to official departmental papers, and to all official establishments. He reports annually to Parliament. As has been stated by the member for Mitcham, the first British Commonwealth country to introduce such a system was New Zealand, the office being established there because the Government had

become convinced that the means available to the citizen for ventilating his grievances against officials and gaining redress from administrative injuries were inadequate. New Zealand's practice in regard to obtaining redress is similar to ours; a complaint can be taken to the member, directly to a Minister, or, if it is desired, Parliament may be petitioned, which is the right of all individuals. If the individual still is not satisfied, he can take court action for redress of any grievance. Nevertheless, it has been found that the office of ombudsman does fit into this type of system because, as many members know, when we ask a Minister a question he often refers it back to its source and we still receive a departmental answer.

Sometimes, if the Minister feels justified, he will override the departmental answer. This difficulty becomes even more acute when the particular case is embarrassing to the Government. The member wishing to ask a question may be a member of the Government and he may not wish to pursue his request for redress through the normal Parliamentary channel of asking a question or raising the matter in a debate. The ombudsman provides a convenient way of overcoming this problem. The matter can then be referred to the ombudsman who can have the inquiry carried out effectively and discreetly without involving departments or the Government in embarrassment. This is a convenient way of circumventing the normal channels.

Mr. Clark: You're suggesting we should do that rather than embarrass the Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not suggesting that the honourable member should do it, but he knows that this situation can arise and is one of the weaknesses in our system that could be overcome by the office of an ombudsman. The New Zealand ombudsman is appointed for the term of Parliament and must be re-appointed during the second or third session of the Parliament. He has powers to investigate any complaint or investigate on his own initiative. The New Zealand Act provides:

Any decision, recommendation or any act done or omitted relating to a matter of administration affecting any person or body of persons in his or its personal capacity in or by any of the departments or organizations or by any officer, employee or member thereof in the exercise of any power or function conferred on him by any enactment.

However, he does not have these powers in the case of a legal adviser to the Crown; he cannot take action against somebody advising the Crown on a legal matter nor can he take

action on matters where the Act provides the right of appeal to boards, tribunals or a court, whether or not this right of appeal has been exercised. He has no power over Ministers except those exercised by the Auditor-General, that is, powers of criticism and recommendation.

Provision is also made in New Zealand to enable departments or individuals to be heard before any adverse report is issued. Petitions are heard on the lodgement of a fee of \$3 and the Parliamentary Commissioner, as he is there, has the power to call witnesses and summon necessary documents, examine officers and complainants on oath, and also examine other persons with the approval of the Attorney-General. This is a completely new case, as I said, under the British system of Parliamentary democracy, and under such a system we have the usual complaints brought forward. I shall quote from an extract from a memorandum issued in 1962 by *Justice* on the Whyatt Report. The first criticism usually brought is that the office of Parliamentary Commissioner will conflict with the doctrine of Ministerial responsibility. However, it can be shown that the Commissioner would help to make Ministerial responsibility more effective. The extract states:

No-one suggests that the functions of the Comptroller and Auditor-General conflict with Ministerial responsibility. The Comptroller and Auditor-General has a far wider network of agents in the departments than the Commissioner would ever have. Their function is to supply factual information for the use of Parliament. The Commissioner's functions would essentially be similar, the only difference being that they would extend to administrative standards generally and not merely to expenditure. The truth is, we think, that the Commissioner would help to make Ministerial responsibility more effective. He would penetrate the screen which Ministers interpose between members of Parliament and Government departments, and he would keep Parliament informed about administrative practices which were open to criticism. . . . The only possibility of conflict would be if the Commissioner criticized something which the Minister wanted to defend. In that case the Minister could perfectly well make his defence in Parliament in the ordinary way. It would be quite wrong to suggest that the responsibility of the Minister for what is done in his department would be reduced if a Commissioner investigated complaints. . . . It is difficult to see what is in the minds of those who make an objection out of Ministerial responsibility. If they feel that a Minister must have exclusive responsibility for investigating errors in his department, the answer is that the doctrine has never required this, as the Comptroller and Auditor-General and the Crichton Down inquiry show.

In the Crichton Down case a certain gentleman was a bit objectionable and his land was taken by the department because they took exception to the man himself. This case was not revealed by the Auditor-General's inquiry and was a case where an ombudsman would certainly have been useful to see that fair play was done. Another question asked is whether the office of Parliamentary Commissioner would diminish the rights and functions of members of Parliament in the taking up of grievances on behalf of their constituents. The extract states:

They would still receive and deal with the complaints and would, as at present, settle most of them satisfactorily with the Minister. But there is a residue of complaints, some of them important, where the member and/or his complainant is not satisfied that justice has been done. Sometimes, for reasons which in no way reflect on him, it may be embarrassing for the member to attack the Minister or to try to probe the matter further. . . . Parliamentary questions and adjournment debates can deal only with a small number of cases, and are most effective where the case has political appeal. One of the main arguments for the Commissioner is that he will be able to handle the flow of complaints for which Parliamentary procedure is less suitable, and so strengthen the present system at its weak point. We would further point out that the Parliamentary Commissioner would be the servant of Parliament and answerable only to Parliament.

Another question is whether a far better solution of the problem would be to make provision for all serious complaints against the Administration to be dealt with by the courts. There are administrative courts in Sweden, Finland, Italy, Austria and West Germany. The French Conseil D'Etat, which was set up by Napoleon, is an administrative court for the hearing purely and simply of complaints by private citizens against the Administration. The courts and the ombudsman work together harmoniously in Sweden and France. It has been suggested that administrative courts would be a far better way of dealing with these matters than to have the office of ombudsman, but the extract states:

It is certainly desirable to extend and complete the courts' control over excess and abuse of power, and to preserve their control over points of law. But the courts dislike passing judgment on the merits of administrative action and on questions of administrative technique. A formal legal process is a wrong method for dealing with most complaints, and of course it is also open to serious objection on grounds of expense. . . . The courts have an important part to play, but they cannot carry out informal investigations as the Commissioner could do. The fundamental point is that the courts can deal only

with illegalities. They could have said nothing, for example, in the Crichel Down case. Further, the majority of complainants do not want to bring legal actions, or to claim damages or to win victories. They merely want a fair and impartial adjudication of the complaint, to feel that their point of view has been properly explained to them.

Another question that has been posed is that civil servants will not be able to do their work properly with the threat of an outside investigation always hanging over them, and they will be even more frightened of making decisions. In answer to that, the notes state:

On the contrary, the Danish Ombudsman has come to be regarded by civil servants as a valuable and impartial defence against unjustified attacks to which the individual civil servant cannot himself respond. He has brought about a new relation of confidence between the civil service and members of the public. The Parliamentary Commissioner is not simply a watch-dog for the public, or an apologist for the administration, but the independent upholder of the highest standards of efficiency and fair administration.

Those are replies to some of the questions that were raised in Britain during the Whyatt inquiry into this question of whether or not the office of ombudsman should be set up under the British House of Commons and under the British Constitution. The alternatives to an ombudsman are those that I have outlined, those that are available to all members of the Parliament under the British Constitution. There are the administrative courts, as I said, that function in Italy, West Germany, Austria, Sweden and Finland where a private citizen's case against the administration is heard by and is in the hands of administrative judges whose function it is to protect the citizens' right. It is said that under the French system this protection is as follows: The complainant has easy access to the court, the court has wide powers of investigation, and the court can hear appeals, and as a consequence, if it determines such, can squash administrative decisions or provide financial compensation for the damage received through the legal or arbitrary actions of officials. However, such courts have no power to initiate inquiries; they have no power to recommend reforms, as does an ombudsman, and they are slow in practice, like most courts, because of the build-up of hearings and the time involved in the legal procedure of hearing cases. So they are not necessarily alternatives, but they are or can be (as in Sweden and Finland) complementary to the system of administrative supervision, ensuring justice to individuals in the case of administrative decisions which are

unfavourable towards them or cause them any harm or result in any loss or damage to them personally.

Having given the House a long historical survey of the establishment of the office of ombudsman, and having briefly looked at the alternatives that are offering, I suppose that although normal Parliamentary practice under our system seems to provide all the avenues of redress that are possible, there are cases where this does not apply, as has been shown in New Zealand; and there appears to be sufficient evidence, as the result of inquiries in Britain, for it to be thought a suitable appointment to make. In Britain itself the office of Parliamentary Commissioner (as the member for Mitcham has said) is one that Mr. Wilson committed himself to and one which it is expected will be established. Of course, there the restrictive power is that there will be no direct approach to the ombudsman by the individual: the approach will come through the member of Parliament, who will refer the matter to an ombudsman where he cannot deal with it himself. I think this provision is designed to break down the reservations of certain members to this office, and it might well be (as has been suggested) that ultimately, if the office works satisfactorily, the private individual will be given direct right of approach to the ombudsman, as applies in New Zealand and in other countries.

Although I admit that there appears little cause for such an appointment in South Australia at present (because all of us as members have experienced favourable consideration by Ministers and very attentive receptions by departmental officers; and frequently we have had the facility of having dockets made available to us by Ministers in cases where we have wanted the full facts), the volume of legislation is increasing, and also the volume of legislation impinging upon the rights of the individual will tend to increase, and consequently it may not be very long before the situation arises where the necessity for the appointment of an ombudsman is more obvious than it is now. Therefore, it would not be an inopportune time to have an inquiry made by a Select Committee into whether or not such an appointment should be made in South Australia.

Mr. Clark: Are you suggesting that we go overseas to take evidence?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It would be up to Parliament to recommend that. However, I

think Parliament would consider it necessary to take evidence from New Zealand.

Mr. Clark: I do not think it would be necessary to go farther than the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As I pointed out, a tremendous volume of evidence is now available to us, and comprehensive works have been produced on this matter. Therefore, I think most members would be able to find all the information they required in the Parliamentary Library, as the member for Gawler has suggested.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

GREYHOUND RACING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. McKee:

(For wording of motion, see page 830.)

(Continued from August 10. Page 970.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I do not claim (nor have I ever claimed) to be any authority on dogs, or greyhounds, or greyhound racing. I remember that when I was a boy my family had a little dog, but that dog was certainly no greyhound. He was a "bitzer", and if he had seen a hare he would be more likely to run than would the hare. No member has to be an authority on greyhounds or greyhound racing to realize that the present system is completely absurd. For that reason, I support, in the main, the motion so ably moved by the member for Port Pirie. Much play was made by the Leader of the Opposition, and to a lesser extent by the member for Victoria, that a Bill should have been introduced rather than a motion. In the past Bills have been introduced by Government and Opposition members with similar aims to this motion. In 1951, the member for Burra (then the member for Stanley and an Independent member) introduced a Bill to provide totalizator facilities for greyhound racing. The then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) described it as "crook". Members have heard that expression from the member for Gumeracha as recently as last year, but his use of the word must have had more influence in 1951 as the Bill was defeated 21 votes to 13.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The word is expressive.

Mr. CLARK: I was tickled when I read the debate of that Bill to see that the member for Burra, in his second reading speech, said that he was not keen on racing or gambling but that he believed if a big enough body was

interested, whether racing horses, dogs or blue-tongued lizards, they should be able to do it, and there is much to be said for that point of view. In 1951 the member for Onkaparinga introduced a Bill to provide for a mechanical quarry to be used and licensed through the National Coursing Association. After several amendments, this Bill passed the second reading, but was defeated in another place.

Both these Bills were connected with greyhound racing but the scope and purpose were different from the present motion. In 1956, the late Bill Jenkins (member for Stirling) attacked the problem in a different way, as his Bill provided for greyhounds to be raced after the issue by the Chief Secretary of a licence or permit. After being amended many times, the Bill passed this Chamber but was defeated in another place. This Bill had nothing to do with wagering, totalizators, or anything of that nature. When the member for Port Pirie considered doing something about this issue he was well aware of the fate of the Bills that had been introduced previously. The honourable member knew that the Bill he wanted to see introduced as a result of this motion would be much wider in scope, and he considered it virtually impossible for a private member to introduce a Bill on this issue that contained everything he thought should be necessary.

Mr. Rodda: You are answering my query.

Mr. CLARK: I do not know about that. The member for Port Pirie realized that expenditure, and certainly some Government expenditure, would be involved, and that a private member's Bill would be ruled out of order. He has, therefore, sought an expression of opinion from the House on the three matters specifically referred to in his motion. At present, the Coursing Restriction Act, 1927, prevents the use of mechanical or electrical lures to entice dogs to race, although that practice is carried on all over the world where greyhound racing takes place. Secondly, the Lottery and Gaming Act would have to be amended to provide totalizator wagering on greyhound racing. Thirdly, greyhound racing (and this is important) would have to be specifically controlled and regulated by the National Coursing Association, which would be the governing body. The member for Port Pirie envisaged these three specific matters being included in a future Bill.

If members think that these matters should be fully discussed in a Bill, they should vote for the motion. Even if a member violently opposed these points he should still support

this motion for a Bill to be introduced. He will then have the best opportunity to voice his disapproval of the measure and defeat or amend it if he can obtain the necessary support. Members are entitled to disagree with me, but supporting this motion does not necessarily mean supporting the Bill. If the Bill were introduced members could do what they wanted to do with it, provided they received the necessary support. This would be a task in which we should all share as this motion requests that a Bill should be introduced.

I refer now to the peculiar remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition about this motion. He said:

I understand the member for Port Pirie has been deputed by his Party to raise the matter in this House in this way.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens interjected by saying, "That is not correct." I strongly assert that the Leader's statement is completely untrue. He went on to say that he had been told that this was a fact, and I asked who had told him. However, he did not wish to betray a confidence. I sincerely suggest to the Leader that if he makes such an innuendo, which he later withdraws, the innuendo remains. If such suggestions cannot be substantiated, they should not be made because, after all, the "if" invariably remains. I am inclined to think that the Leader must have been writing letters to himself. He said he would like to see a Bill on the matter introduced into the House, and here is his chance. He can support this motion after which, if it receives sufficient support, a Bill will be introduced. The Leader asked, "Am I voting for the abolition of live hare coursing?" to which the member for Port Pirie said, "Of course not." The Leader then said, "But how do I know?" I am suggesting that he knows now, because I understand he has received a letter under the signature of Mr. Alsop (Chairman of the Greyhound Racing Subcommittee, and Chairman of the National Coursing Association), which states:

This subcommittee has been formed by the National Coursing Association with the task of presenting a case for the motion mentioned. All actions taken and changes requested have been made with the full approval of the National Coursing Association. Therefore there are no grounds for fears that open coursing may be affected by the action of a body whose sole function is to ensure its welfare.

I hope the Leader will now be satisfied on that score, and that he will forgive me for reading some of his correspondence (but, as I

have a copy of it, I take it to mean that it was not personal correspondence). Later, the Leader said:

Therefore, if I support the motion, that support can be taken by the Government as an indication of approval of whatever its thoughts may be on coursing in South Australia.

That is nonsense. If a member desires to introduce a Bill, the House will have the right to debate the Bill on its merits, and the Leader can support or violently oppose the measure, whichever he wishes, for it is entirely up to him. No-one would attempt (nor would he have the right) to stop the Leader from doing as he wished. Being rather amused to hear those remarks by the Leader, I checked the speech and found that he used the word "public" during the course of it. He seems to be worrying about his public, but I suppose that the higher one rises in this place, the more attention one has to pay to his public. The Leader said, "How can we as an Opposition be sure what will be included in the Bill?" If and when the Bill is introduced, surely, we can freely debate it, amend it, and move to include anything we desire. At the end of his speech the Leader said, "I will not commit myself in the eyes of the public." Here, again, he is worrying about his fans, apparently with the idea that his public image is steadily growing.

I think he will find that it will continue to grow. Surely, he has been here long enough to know that the people in his district (his public) expect that when they elect him he has an opinion of his own, and that the opinion he voices in this place will represent that of his public. He said earlier that he would impartially consider a Bill but, when one studies his speech carefully, one finds that he does not say whether he desires a Bill, or not. I know that the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) would be disappointed if I did not refer to him. Early in his speech he said, "I don't like this idea of motions from the Government getting members on this side to commit themselves," but he did not seem to mind last year when a motion concerning a totalizator agency board was introduced. Apparently one's thoughts can change in 12 months. I suggest that the motion merely points to the need for a Bill, and not to the need for the details. The honourable member also said, "If I indicate that I support this motion, I am committed," but I suggest that he is committed only to the extent that, if he votes in favour of the motion, he votes for the need for a Bill and not for its details.

When the Bill may be introduced, the honourable member will be able (and I think he probably will) to support it wholeheartedly, or, if not, at least attempt to amend it or try to render it as near perfect as he may wish it to be. Indeed, if he wishes, he may vote against the measure. I was pleased to hear him say, "To set the mind of the member for Port Pirie at rest" (and one could see the pleased expression on the face of the member for Port Pirie when he said that) "I will say I am not at all opposed to people racing or coursing dogs." I was indeed pleased to hear that, for it was rather in contrast to the remarks of the Leader. The Leader seems to me to be sitting on the fence with both ears to the ground, listening to the voice of his public, which, as most people will know, is a difficult gymnastic to sustain. Anybody who has followed the fortunes of Humpty Dumpty will know what happens to anybody who tries to do what the Leader seemed to be doing. Finally, the member for Victoria said, "I will give the honourable member the opportunity to bring in a Bill," to which the Deputy Speaker at the time ruled that the honourable member might be in trouble if he tried to introduce a Bill, himself. Indeed, I believe he might be in trouble, because I think that the scope of the matters he attempted to raise in this debate was beyond the resources of a private member. I believe that if I went along to a meeting (unfortunately, I was unable to accept a previous invitation from some of my constituents in the Elizabeth area to do so), I should probably find greyhound racing an interesting sport. However, I am not particularly interested in gambling (my taste takes me to other sports, and I proudly wear my Central Districts football badge to prove that).

Mr. Quirke: What is the badge for?

Mr. CLARK: Not for greyhound racing! I believe that I am entitled to follow a particular sport (and actually to participate in it, if I am good enough), without being restricted in any way. Indeed, that view applies also to greyhound racing.

Mr. Quirke: I'll give you a game of marbles!

Mr. CLARK: If the honourable member wishes to play marbles, and if he enjoys that particular sport, I should be the last one in the world to try to deter him. There are places where a marbles championship is played and where marbles is considered to be a highly skilled sport for adults, and no doubt it could

be. The member for Port Pirie has told me (and I have read information about this) that throughout the world in places where greyhounds are kept and bred there is no question that greyhound racing is one of the most popular forms of sport. Thousands of people in my district, who have come from overseas where they kept and bred dogs, have told me that this could be done cheaply and they are anxious to take part in this sport in this country. It is their favourite sport; they wish to enjoy it; and I can see no reason why they should not. I do not see why we should not amend legislation which, to most of us, is silly legislation. If a Bill is introduced, members can oppose it, support it, amend it, or do what they will. I hope that the final result will be that good legislation will be passed in this Chamber that will benefit those interested in greyhound racing. I support the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I am opposed to motions like this one. A similar motion on a totalizer agency board system of off-course betting was introduced last year to provide for a system similar to that operating in Victoria. However, now that a Bill has been introduced on that matter, we can see how similar the scheme will be to that operating in Victoria! It is as similar as Brigitte Bardot is to *Dobel's Country Woman*: they have a lot in common but the similarity is doubtful. I believe that it is wrong to approach matters by way of motions similar to this. The Labor Party says that it has a system whereby ideas come from the bottom, move through the movement, and, after much consideration in the Party, result ultimately in good legislation being introduced in this House. Apparently, if there is to be common thought in the Party, this is the way it must introduce legislation. I do not like this way of initiating a Bill. Nevertheless, if members of the Labor Party cannot make up their minds on these matters, members on this side who have ideas on these subjects will have to put a bit of backbone into members opposite and perhaps help them bring a Bill before the House.

I am not interested in dog racing, although I think it is a fine sport. I understand that certain things have happened in the sport, such as a dog's being given a pound of sausages before it races. However, I understand that matters like this have been cleaned up and such practices are not indulged in now. I do not believe in standing against anybody indulging the hobby of his choice. As book-makers bet now on open coursing in this State,

how can we be consistent and say that it is wrong for people to bet at a closed course where a mechanical lure operates? I prefer the totalizer system of betting to betting with bookmakers because I think it is much fairer and, where it is used, there is cleaner racing. I understand a wide section of the community, particularly British migrants, likes to go to dog racing. Who am I to say that such people should not be able to participate in this sport? Nevertheless, I do not like this type of motion, because members must commit themselves to a certain extent without knowing how a scheme will work in practice.

Many members on this side crossed the floor of the House on the T.A.B. motion. We tried to give the Government enough backbone to introduce a Bill. Now that the Bill has been introduced, if the Labor Party runs true to form its members will stick together like glue. If Ministers conform to normal Cabinet procedure, they will support the Bill. Perhaps one of the Labor Party back-benchers might cross the floor but the voting would still be 20 to 19 in favour of it. This is the position we can get ourselves into by supporting a motion like this. The Government should have enough courage to introduce a Bill itself. However, I will support the motion so that something can be brought before the Parliament, and in this I follow in the footsteps of the previous member for Stirling who introduced a Bill on this matter.

Greyhound racing is followed actively in my district but, because of certain factors, hares are not available to the same extent in the open country. Probably increased motor traffic has resulted in the smaller hare population. At times of the year, one can see dozens of hares dead along the side of the road. Because of the lack of hares, open greyhound racing is doomed and we should now substitute racing in closed areas, although I do not know that this is a particularly good way to conduct this sport.

Mr. Hudson: You're down on your "hair" population. You should use hair restorer.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Acting Speaker, I like to slaughter the honourable member for Glenelg when he interjects. I welcome his interjections because I can come back with a suitable rejoinder.

Mr. Hudson: I said you should use hair restorer.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Acting Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think I should draw the attention of honourable members to the correct way of addressing the

Chair. Although this is the second session of this Parliament, some members have not bothered to ascertain the correct way to address the Chair. Many members, including the members for Angus and Ridley (former Speakers), know the correct way to address the Chair, and I suggest that other members refer to Standing Orders Nos. 25 and 26 to ascertain the difference between Mr. Speaker, Deputy Speaker, and Acting Deputy Speaker.

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, actually I had finished my remarks. Summarizing, I object to the form in which this matter was put before us. However, I believe that grown-up people should be able to make their own choice whether they go to the dogs or anywhere else, and that is why I support the motion. I consider it is ridiculous to allow bookmakers to operate on one form of coursing and yet on another form to have no betting facilities. If any member objects to betting on greyhound races, he should move an amendment designed to eliminate any form of betting. I think we must be fair in everything we do, and I maintain that to discriminate in this matter would not be fair.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I cannot help wondering why it is that the Government in matters of social welfare and matters of interest to the public in this field always resort to this method of sounding out members of this place on how they feel about the introduction of certain legislation. I cannot help wondering, too, why the Government cannot stand on its own feet (and it has, in all, 42 of them, I think) and why, if it believes that the public wants legislation of this kind, it does not introduce it as a piece of Government legislation. I am not opposed to coursing or to any kind of sport. This does not happen to be my kind of sport, and perhaps that is because I have never gone to the dogs. I was rather hoping that somebody on the other side of the House might extend an invitation to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, so that I could be better informed. However, as I said, it is certainly not my form of recreation, and in fact racing in any shape or form is not of any great interest to me.

However, I certainly would not think of depriving anybody else of a form of sport that person likes to follow. I understand, from reading the previous speeches, and from listening to speakers who have contributed to this debate, that there are areas of the State in which there are many people who are interested in this form of sport. I believe this applies in the South-East. Also, we have heard from the

honourable member who has just resumed his seat that there are people in the Stirling District who are interested in greyhound racing. I know, too, that a big proportion of the population in Elizabeth is interested in this sport, for this is something that they followed in England. Therefore, I consider that those people are entitled to promote this kind of recreation in their areas.

I am opposed, as I think I have indicated, to this method of introducing legislation. This Government is always telling us that it has a mandate to do certain things, although I have noticed in recent months that it has not been saying that quite so strongly. These motions for this type of thing are obviously introduced with the approval of the Government to get some feeling about legislation which it might introduce if the climate in this House is favourable. As I said, this is usually applied to subjects of social import, and it gives the impression that the Government Party is not sure of its popularity in legislation on social matters.

As other speakers have pointed out, two measures of this type were introduced last year. One, introduced by a private member, referred to a totalizator agency board system of off-course betting and sought the introduction of a system based on the method being used with success in Victoria. However, we now find that the legislation introduced here is in many respects dissimilar to the Victorian legislation, so something we were asked last year to vote on in a private member's motion bears no resemblance at all to the Bill finally introduced in this House. Again, on the question of lotteries, a Bill was introduced for the purpose of instituting a referendum. Members on this side of the House opposed that Bill on principle because they considered they were being asked to sign a blank cheque—a dangerous practice at any time.

As I said, this was a matter of principle, and I consider that if one has a principle it is worth standing up for. At the risk of being misinterpreted by people outside, I will say that if one feels strongly about these matters one should state quite clearly one's attitude to them. It would appear that the honourable member for Port Pirie has the blessing of Cabinet (if, indeed, he has not been instructed to bring in this motion) to take steps to test the reaction of members on this side of the House on this subject. In view of what I have just said about the reaction of the public to what members on this side of the House say, I sug-

gest that although this is a pretty shrewd move it is one that does not reflect greatly to the credit of Government members. Members of the public are not familiar with the practices and procedures of Parliament, and no doubt they will interpret my comments and the comments of some other Opposition members as being anti the sport of greyhound racing. I will have to take a chance on their believing this, because in any case it is not true: I am not opposed to greyhound racing. However, I would not be honest if I did not reject the motion on the grounds that I do not know what the honourable member's suggested Bill will contain, and to me it constitutes giving the Party opposite a blank cheque to legislate on wide and general terms. I oppose the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): Mr. Deputy Speaker, although I support this motion I would have much preferred a Bill on the subject. However, the fact that there is no Bill does not deter me in the slightest, because if the Bill, when it comes in, is no good I will send it downwind. I attempted this sort of action myself many years ago, and my ignominious defeat is duly recorded in *Hansard*. However, I hope it will not be used in evidence against me now. This motion specifically provides certain things. The previous Act forbade the racing of dogs with a mechanical lure, but dog racing is unlike open coursing. Why should not people race dogs? When I moved a similar motion many years ago I realized that many members, although calling horse-racing the sport of kings, thought dog racing was completely beneath contempt. They thought there was something about people who raced dogs that excluded them from the top bracket of society; but I strongly refute that idea.

I am patron of a coursing club and I like open coursing, but this motion deals with dog racing. If people wish to race dogs, and if they want to bet on those races, let them do so. I have no fixed ideas about the system of betting they use, either totalizator or book-maker. I have seen many a good coursing meeting end up in the most brilliantly conducted swy school. I have never understood why that sport is illegal, but apparently many people have the idea of repressing things that in themselves are harmless. I was in the Army and we knew what a relief from tension it was to be able to do these things. A good swy school was a lifesaver and built up the morale of the army, so that any commanding officer who tried to stop it not only did not succeed.

but lowered the morale of the troops. There is nothing lowly about racing dogs: the dog is just as noble an animal as is the horse.

Mr. Hall: He has more sense.

Mr. QUIRKE: The dog has been the friend of man for many centuries. Dog racing is conducted on a circular or straight course with a mechanical lure. I am sure the lure does not have much to do with it if the dogs are trained properly. In the old-time whippet races the owner stood at the end of the track and the whippet ran because it wanted to get to its boss. Let us not be nonsensical about this motion. Good people want to race dogs and bet on such races, in the same way as good people bet on horses. What is the difference? The member for Port Pirie moved this motion to ascertain whether it was safe to introduce a Bill. I did the same thing, but it was unsafe in my case.

Mr. Clark: You were told the Bill was crook.

Mr. QUIRKE: We do not know what the Bill will contain, but my vote will give the member for Port Pirie the opportunity to introduce it: if it is "crook" it will not be passed. If the Bill suits me I shall vote for it, and if it does not I shall vote against it. If the Bill is passed, I hope that the dog-racing people will give the member for Port Pirie and me a life membership, as I should be pleased to go to the dogs with him. I support this intention to find out whether it will be worthwhile to introduce a Bill, and I hope the motion succeeds.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Although I did not intend to speak to the motion, I wish to address myself to one aspect. With the exception of the previous speaker (the member for Burra) members opposite, one after the other, have deliberately misrepresented the position. They have gone so far as to say that the member for Port Pirie has moved the motion at the Government's instigation—"This is done with the Government's blessing"—implying, of course, that the Government has instructed or asked the honourable member to move the motion. The Party I have the honour to represent had a policy on lotteries, which we announced at the election, and to which we gave effect in the House, namely, a motion that sought to hold a referendum so that the people could decide whether or not they desired a lottery.

Mr. Ryan: The Opposition said it was crook.

Mr. LAWN: It said it was putting poison in the hands of children, it was crook, and

everything else! However, a totalizator agency board and greyhound racing are social questions in which members of my Party have a free hand. They will indicate that when a vote is taken, just as they indicated it last year in a regard to the motion on T.A.B., moved by the member for Frome. Opposition members can and, in fact, have moved similar motions to the one now before the House. The Notice Paper contains a motion in the name of the member for Albert to establish a public accounts committee. Other motions have been moved for the Government to take certain action, but members opposite cannot reserve this right for themselves and say that private members on this side cannot do likewise. The Opposition knows full well that this is not a Government-sponsored motion, and it cannot say that members on this side who move a motion are doing the Government's work, thereby relieving it of its responsibility. Last year, the Opposition said that the member for Frome's motion on T.A.B. came as a great surprise to Government members.

Mr. Clark: It did, too.

Mr. LAWN: The people are now being told that the motion was moved at the Government's instigation. Last year a certain member of the Opposition said:

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

Mr. Ryan: Who said that?

Mr. LAWN: The member for Mitcham, who is one of the Opposition's leading lights. The Opposition attempts to misrepresent the position in respect of this motion, and in respect of any other motion that members on this side may move. It says we are acting at the Government's behest, but this motion has not been discussed at any Party meeting.

Mr. Ryan: You'll admit that we have Party meetings, though.

Mr. LAWN: I intended to support a Bill introduced by the former member for Stirling (the late Mr. W. W. Jenkins) in 1956, until the member for Enfield, who was sitting alongside me, convinced me that I should not.

Mr. Clark: I remember your saying that in the House at the time.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. My Party has no policy on coursing, for it is a social question that will be left to our members to vote on, just as they voted on the T.A.B. motion last year. The

Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Works and the member for Wallaroo all voted against the member for Frome's motion on T.A.B.

Mr. Nankivell: And the honourable member for Norwood went outside.

Mr. LAWN: I thank the honourable member for his interjection but, nevertheless, whether the same members will adopt the same attitude on this motion, or not, they can please themselves. The matter has not been determined by the Government, by the Party, or at a Party meeting.

Mr. McAnaney: How will those members vote on the Bill?

Mr. LAWN: How should I know! We have no policy on this. Honourable members opposite have no policy on it, either; they have had no policy right throughout this session. The Liberal and Country League rule book is priceless; it refers to the Party's policy and platform on the front page but, inside, contains plenty of rules but no policy. Members opposite, particularly this session, have shown that they wish to revive their spirits, but I suggest the best way to do that would be for them to take a walk through a graveyard at midnight and sing, in chorus, "I'll never be as good a ghost as you". I am not debating the merits of the motion; I shall make up my mind when the time comes; I am not bound to do anything. I merely wished to clear up the misrepresentation indulged in by members opposite, who claimed that this was a Government-sponsored motion. It is not.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I do not doubt that the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda), who writes an article for a widely-circulating newspaper in the South-East, will quote the member for Adelaide as saying that the Australian Labor Party has no policy.

Mr. Curren: On these questions!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have been waiting for 12 months to speak in this debate, for, by an unfortunate chain of circumstances, I was denied the opportunity to speak to a similar motion when it was before the House last year. I agree with the member for Burnside when she says that the moving of this motion by the member for Port Pirie was a shrewd move by the Australian Labor Party to try to get the Opposition involved in the motion. The Labor Party thought that by having such a popular and widely respected member (he is respected by members on both sides) to move the motion, the Opposition would be lulled into a sense of false security and perhaps tricked into voting for the Government's own motion. I

deplore the fact that the Government has not had sufficient courage to take the initiative to introduce a Bill to provide, in substance anyway, what is included in the motion moved by the member for Port Pirie. I looked up the debate on the Coursing Restriction Bill when it was first introduced in 1927. This gives an idea of the thinking of members of the State Parliament when they passed the second reading without a division: Labor, Liberal and Independent members voted to pass the Bill. I shall read short extracts of speeches on that occasion to indicate the thinking of members in 1927. When he introduced the Bill, the Attorney-General of that time said:

I introduce this Bill with some degree of regret, for I realize that there may be quite a number of people who look upon tin hare racing as an innocent form of amusement, and whose pleasure may be curtailed by the passage of the Bill.

After that apology, he continued:

This Bill, therefore, is introduced, not for the purpose of suppressing a form of racing, but to suppress a possible new form of gambling.

The Parliament of the day thought it was forward-looking to introduce legislation to prevent a type of gambling that could be initiated. The Attorney-General continued:

In taking this step the Government may be breaking new ground, but if we are making a mistake then it is better, in the interests of the community, to err on the side of caution than permit something which, although no evil in itself, may develop into one, grow out of control, and become a menace to the community.

I now turn to what one of the Australian Labor Party members said about the Bill, although he may have been a Parliamentary Labor Party member. I do not know exactly what the difference was at that time, but I understand there was much contention between Parliamentary Labor Party members and Australian Labor Party members. He said:

I have been present on bowling greens, and have heard members of bowling clubs talking to each other and betting which of them would get in a certain position. Why not be consistent and prohibit bowls?

That is a gem.

Mr. Quirke: Well, why not?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not agree that bowls should be prohibited, but that is what a Parliamentary Labor Party member said in 1927. He was the Leader of the Opposition at that time and no doubt he was speaking for his Party. He described dogs as "those scraggy, useless Godforsaken animals, no good to anyone". He continued:

The only effect of the ignoble performance of chasing tin hares around a railway line is to depress the moral feelings of the dog.

That is what the Labor Party felt in 1927, so we can understand why the Coursing Restriction Act was accepted with so much alacrity by members at that time. It is interesting that they were so keen to debate the matter at that time that the debate did not end until 2 a.m. The second part of the member for Port Pirie's motion would allow the licensing of totalizators at greyhound race meetings. I support that aspect wholeheartedly.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What did Gladstone say in 1861?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I intend to speak on a public accounts committee at another time, and, if the Minister cares to listen, he will hear me quote what Gladstone said in 1861. I cannot understand why the control of greyhound racing in South Australia should have been included in the honourable member's motion. This has caused much concern in my district. Representations have been made to me by members of the several coursing clubs in my district protesting that this would be most unfair. Like the member for Burra, I am a patron of a coursing club and I am not uninterested in its welfare. All that these clubs want to do is to carry on quietly and enjoy the sport of greyhound coursing. They do not want to be interfered with by any controlling body in Adelaide. There is no doubt from the press publicity given to this motion that the tin hare enthusiasts in Adelaide are seeking to deprive country coursing enthusiasts of their sport.

Mr. McKee: That's not so.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Why did the honourable member not state that in his motion? He did not speak about it in his speech, either.

Mr. McKee: You didn't read it.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I read it and I read the speech the honourable member made on his ill-fated motion last year.

Mr. Quirke: This would have to be contained in the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes.

Mr. McKee: That is not the intention at all.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I will have to accept the word of the honourable member that he will not interfere with greyhound racing in my district. If I accept his word and the Government introduces a Bill that deprives people in my district of their sport, then the honourable member's word will be worth

nothing in this matter. I strongly suggest that the Government accept its responsibility and introduce a Bill to provide for tin hare racing, so that we can assess and study that Bill properly.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

GAS.

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

(For wording of motion, see page 832.)

(Continued from August 10. Page 985.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I oppose the motion and later I will give my reasons for doing so. When moving the motion, the member for Gumeracha said:

This motion deals with a matter that was before the House last year. At that time the Government opposed further action on the grounds that a report was being obtained from the Bechtel Pacific Corporation upon the practicability of a pipeline. Following discussion last year the Premier decided he would go overseas and obtain first-hand information. Therefore, when the Premier said he was going abroad to look into the matter, the Opposition did not object.

What a cheek it was for the honourable member for Gumeracha to make such a statement! Several Ministers of the previous Government (from both Houses) have gone overseas during their terms of office; it has always been accepted that they did this in the course of their duties, and there was never any objection on the part of the present Government Party when it was in Opposition. Apparently the present Opposition had a meeting and considered whether it would object to the Premier and the Minister of Mines going overseas to investigate natural gas.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Is that a fact?

Mr. LAWN: Well, I do not know how the Opposition could decide whether or not to object if it did not hold a meeting. Members opposite can tell me whether the member for Gumeracha spoke for the Opposition and decided himself not to object, or whether they had a meeting to decide this matter. I remember the occasion when the former Premier, who made this statement, went to America on a secret mission. This Parliament has never been told why he went to America.

Mr. Clark: It's still a secret.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I said after he came back that I thought the whole thing had been a white elephant, or something like that. However, he approached the then Opposition before he went away, and he told the Opposition that

he was going away on a secret mission but that he was not prepared to tell us what it was about. He asked us whether we would object, and we said we would not.

Mr. Clark: We gave him our blessing.

Mr. LAWN: We said that if he as Premier of the State was going overseas on a mission that he thought could be of some benefit to the State but he could not divulge the nature of it, we would accept it in good faith and raise no objection. However, Parliament to this day has not been told what that mission was. Then he has the audacity to stand up in this place and tell the people of South Australia, on the all-important question of the provision of a pipeline to provide natural gas to Adelaide and to cities in between Gidgealpa and Adelaide, that the Opposition considered whether or not it would object to the Premier and Minister of Mines going overseas to make an investigation into this matter. He said that the Opposition decided not to object. He also said:

Unfortunately, we have marked time for a year on this matter.

The honourable member meant, of course, since last year to the present time. We could have said that we also marked time for more than 12 months while his Government was in office. The honourable member did not tell the House what his then Government had been advised to do. However, I will tell the House shortly how quickly the present Government acted upon assuming office. In 1964, when the gas was first discovered, the Mines Department recommended to the Playford Government that a Minister go overseas to gain knowledge of gas pipe lining, and that the Government appoint a pipeline engineer and a petroleum engineer. However, no action was taken on any of those recommendations. I understand that the honourable member for Gumeracha actually asked this Government to send a Minister overseas to investigate this matter, yet in this House he criticized the Premier and the Minister of Mines when they went overseas. The honourable member can reply and deny that statement if it is untrue. The honourable member said:

I remind the Premier that when natural gas was first discovered at Gidgealpa I extended to him an invitation to visit that place.

I happened to be here at the time to which the honourable member referred. I checked the minutes of the meeting of my Party on this, because my recollection of what happened does not conform with the statement made by the honourable member the other day, and to make

sure that I do not mislead this House I have had the minutes copied word for word. Those minutes disclose that on July 29, 1964, the Leader of our Party reported that the then Premier had advised him that a party of international oil experts would be arriving in Adelaide on the following Tuesday and would be visiting Gidgealpa, and that the Premier had been requested to accompany the party. The then Premier asked our Leader whether he (the Premier) could be granted a pair. That was the report from one of our meetings. The decision our Party made was as follows:

That the Leader advise the Premier a pair would be rendered, but this Party is also very strongly of the opinion that the Leader of the Opposition should also accompany the party. We decided to give the then Premier a pair because he thought the matter was of some importance or value to the State. This enabled him to go up there and do the job, yet now he has the cheek to say that his Party considered whether or not it would object to our Premier going overseas to study natural gas developments. We said we would grant the pair but that the then Premier should also extend an invitation to our Leader to accompany him. The former Premier claims the credit for extending an invitation to our Leader, but I point out that the invitation was extended only after our Party had strongly urged that this be done.

Mr. Broomhill: It was under pressure?

Mr. LAWN: Well, not really; we offered the then Premier a pair, and he was not obliged to extend the invitation. However, we may have shamed him into it. The member for Gumeracha also said that the Opposition was not satisfied with the progress being made in this matter. I have already pointed out that in 1964 the then Government had recommendations before it to send a Minister overseas to gain knowledge and to appoint a pipeline engineer and a petroleum engineer, yet it did nothing.

Mr. Ryan: As usual.

Mr. LAWN: I will tell the House presently what this Government has done and how quickly it has done it. The member for Gumeracha continued:

The Opposition is not satisfied with the progress being made in this matter. It believes that the Government is paying attention to many matters (both inside and outside the House), less important than this topic.

I suggest that he was not speaking for the Opposition. The Leader did not move this motion: it was moved by a back-bencher who claims to be speaking on behalf of the

Opposition. The member for Mitcham believes that road traffic is the most important matter before this Parliament, and he was waiting for the House to meet to be able to introduce a Bill on road traffic.

Mr. Ryan: He wanted a special session.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but he introduced the Bill as soon as possible. The Leader of the Opposition believes that reduced Government income, which has already been spent, is the most important item before the House; the member for Burra believes that social credit is important; the member for Stirling believes it is more important to balance the Budget than to keep people employed; the member for Alexandra believes that water conservation on Kangaroo Island is the most important matter before the House, but this project has already been commenced by this Government, although the previous Government distributed mains all around the countryside of Kangaroo Island and even put some underground, without first providing for water conservation.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: You are displaying complete ignorance.

Mr. LAWN: The people of Kangaroo Island know what the previous Government did before the last election. The member for Onkaparinga believes that keeping the date off milk bottle tops is the most important item; the member for Light believes the main topic is to remove "stop" signs from country railway crossings.

Mr. Freebairn: Fair enough, too; but it was only one specific crossing.

Mr. LAWN: It must be a most important question to be limited to one railway crossing. The member for Gumeracha said that a Parliamentary committee would not be costly. I am not concerned about the cost, but cost and time are linked in the appointment of these committees. The member for Gumeracha, as Premier, appointed the Industries Development Committee as a Royal Commission on August 24, 1960, to investigate decentralization, but its report was not tabled until February 18, 1964.

Mr. Coumbe: It was not a Select Committee.

Mr. LAWN: The member for Gumeracha, referring to Leigh Creek coal in 1942, said:

In the first place, the Leigh Creek field is already the most reported upon project in Australia. There are cartloads of reports on it, and if members perused them they would find that they are not detrimental to the field, but that everyone has recommended that some future action be taken. The proposal has always fallen down because the Government of

the day called upon a Select Committee or other body to report, and by the time the report was presented the opportunity for further action had been lost. Then, after two or three years, or perhaps five or six years, the Government, again faced with a fuel problem, bestirs itself, and proceeds to get another report. These reports inevitably begin by giving a resume of previous reports and then conclude with something to the effect, "We are in agreement with all of them." Therefore, we get no further.

If "Leigh Creek" was deleted and "gas pipeline" inserted, it would relate to what he said the other day, and would show the different attitude of the honourable member.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't he say he could give the answer to the Royal Commission and tell it what to do?

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member said that when he was Premier he could always write the report of any committee he appointed. I do not want a committee appointed so that the present Premier can write the report. Apparently, the necessity for a Royal Commission or a Select Committee on this matter became apparent to the member for Gumeracha after the electors of the State decided on a change of Government, because last year he moved a motion to set up a Royal Commission, and this year a motion to set up a Select Committee. The member for Burra, when speaking of the method of financing this project, referred to the Royal Commission on Banking that was appointed on November 15, 1935, and gave its report on July 16, 1937. I referred to this report in last year's Address in Reply debate, but I do not want to wait three-and-a-half years or even 20 months for a report on the establishment of a pipeline for natural gas. The relevant paragraphs of the Commission's report are Nos. 503 and 504. Immediately on the Government's election, the Premier, the Minister of Mines, and other Ministers visited Gidgealpa, and also met the directors and management of the Delhi-Taylor and Santos companies as well as the French representatives interested in exploration over some areas of the State with Delhi-Taylor and Santos. Cabinet Ministers were addressed by the companies' senior geologists and informed of the plans that the companies had formulated to continue their search for natural gas in South Australia, particularly of their efforts to find more gas to augment the reserves already found in the Gidgealpa area.

This meeting was attended by every Minister in the Cabinet. If the previous Government had discussed in Cabinet the recommendations made to it, every Minister would have known

the recommendation made in regard to sending the Minister overseas and about the appointment of the two engineers, to which I have referred. On this occasion in 1965, every Minister attended the meeting with the representatives I have mentioned, with the result that the representatives of the companies thanked Cabinet for the opportunity of being able to put their plans before the Government in a manner never afforded them before. The Minister of Mines has visited natural gas areas outside the State, from which gas may be available to this State in the future. At least on one occasion the member for Gumeracha accompanied the Minister to the sites of all the gas finds, crossing the border into Queensland. The first discovery of gas was made in the Gidgealpa area in January, 1964, and was followed by an intensive drilling and testing programme that was completed in January, 1965, which enabled the calculation of gas reserves amounting to 454,000,000,000 cub. ft. This reserve was known by June, 1965. A study of South Australian market requirements, including requirements of the Electricity Trust, showed that deliverable gas from Gidgealpa would be adequate for less than 10 years, and it was apparent that a pipeline scheme would not be an economic proposition unless the reserves could be considerably augmented. This study was undertaken by the present Government.

The Mines Department was confident that the Gidgealpa discovery would lead to other discoveries in the area, but in spite of an intensive effort by the company, and the drilling of eight more wells on new structures, it was not until April, 1966, that success at Moomba was achieved. However, because of the confidence of this Government in ultimate further discoveries, one of its early actions on taking office was the appointment of the Bechtel-Pacific Corporation to undertake a feasibility study of constructing a pipeline from the Gidgealpa area to Adelaide, which included in its terms of reference a study of alternative sources of gas, for example, at Mereenie and Gilmore. This study showed that a pipeline from the Gidgealpa area was economically attractive, provided that sufficient reserves could be established. The Minister of Mines and the Premier visited Mereenie and Palm Valley to investigate the possibility of bringing in gas. Simultaneously with the appointment of the Bechtel organization, the Government further showed its confidence in the outcome of the continuing exploration by appointing to the staff of the Mines Department a

pipeline engineer, and, after he had participated with Bechtel in its project, sent him to the United States and Canada for three months' intensive study and training.

However, pending further discoveries, it was not possible to initiate a firm project; although the Bechtel study showed that Gidgealpa gas could be augmented from other gas fields outside the State, such gas would not be economically attractive to the main immediate consumer, namely, the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

Nevertheless the Government pressed on with its intention to prepare the way for action as soon as adequate reserves could be established and, in order to study administrative legislation and other aspects of natural gas development, the Premier and the Minister of Mines undertook an extensive and exhaustive overseas mission. The discovery at Moomba came soon after the party left Australia, and fully justified the Government's confidence and early action. Within a few days of returning to Australia in June last the Premier submitted to the Commonwealth Government a proposal under which the Commonwealth Government would make funds available to enable a pipeline project to proceed. This proposal is now being refined as to financial and technical details, market studies, including long-range forecasts of market trends and peaks, and will be re-submitted for detailed Commonwealth consideration shortly.

Mr. Coumbe: Whose report is that?

Mr. LAWN: It is the report of the committee appointed by the Government (including the people I have mentioned, together with representatives of the Mines Department and the Electricity Trust). The Government has again obtained the services of Bechtel-Pacific Corporation, and at present the capital and cost of service estimates are being considered. In the meantime, the Government is enjoying the confidence and assistance of the potential producers, and is confident that a satisfactory form of authority and an equitable price structure will be developed, which will provide both an attractive economic fuel for the Adelaide market and an incentive to the producers to expand the reserves and to press on with greater discoveries. I sincerely hope that those responsible for producing the gas will not be too greedy and that an agreement for submission to the Commonwealth Government will be reached between themselves and the Government.

Mr. Coumbe: Who are the members of the committee?

Mr. LAWN: Representatives of the oil interests, together with representatives of the Electricity Trust and the Mines Department, and the Under-Treasurer. One particular officer does not represent the Electricity Trust or the Mines Department because, as various aspects such as pipes, route, and users of the gas, are being investigated, different personnel are naturally participating in the conferences being held. However, I believe that within a few weeks a final report should be submitted to the Government and that an agreement on all matters can be reached so that it can be submitted to the Prime Minister. The Government is presently preparing legislation for submission to the House, in relation to the construction of petroleum pipelines, the proper development and conservation of petroleum, and it is also examining necessary amendments to the Mining (Petroleum) Act, itself.

I do not see the necessity for such a committee as suggested by the motion. The present Government has been constantly moving for the use of the natural gas resources in South Australia, ever since it took office. Within almost three months of taking office, on Friday, June 25, 1965, a top-level meeting was arranged with the Delhi-Santos group to discuss the problems likely to be encountered in using the gas at the Gidgealpa field. I understand that at that meeting the Government told the Delhi-Santos people that it was planning to set up an inquiry into the demands for natural gas and the potential users of this gas. At that meeting it also undertook to have certain information supplied by the Mines Department to the persons concerned, and a close association between the Delhi-Santos group and the Government has followed these discussions. The discussions were continued with French Petroleum regarding its prospects in the Simpson Desert area (where that organization was then drilling) to see how this would fit into the overall picture. As members know, since then the Government, in conjunction with the Mines and other departments, has never let up. This desire to use these resources as quickly as possible was high-lighted by the oversea trip made by the Premier, the Minister of Mines, the Director and the Deputy Director of the Mines Department, so that they could fully investigate the latest methods and applications in regard to natural gas.

In addition, the Government, through the Premier's and Mines Departments, has been on the constant lookout for possible additional large scale consumers of natural gas. As early as July 15, 1965, a discussion was held by

officers of these departments with a principal oversea company regarding the possibility of using the Gidgealpa-Mereenie gas for the production of nitrogenous fertilizer in a factory located in a country area. Honourable members should bear in mind that at this time the Moomba field had not been proven and there were doubts whether Gidgealpa alone could supply sufficient quantities. Contact is being maintained with this concern to ensure that it is aware of the latest developments in the pipeline project. Also, I understand that there has been a constant check on developments in the other States to see that organizations interested in setting up petro-chemical works in Australia, using natural gas, are made fully aware of the proposed pipeline in South Australia, and (this is important) how the recent discovery of additional gas at the Moomba field has altered the situation. We can now emphatically say that sufficient supplies are available in South Australia to support industries of this nature.

In this connection, early in July this year contact was made with an organization undertaking feasibility studies in the Eastern States, to point out to that organization the desirability of including South Australia in its calculations. An assurance has now been received that an evaluation of the possibility of establishment in South Australia will be carried out. We could provide the names of these organizations, but this would be unwise as we must respect their confidence. The member for Gumeracha, as an ex-Minister and ex-Premier, would understand it would be unwise to give the names. We cannot bandy the names of firms around in Parliament. These things must not become political. I have heard the member for Gumeracha speak along those lines before, so we are sure to have his agreement in that respect.

I cannot see how the establishment of a Select Committee can accelerate what is already being done. It would have the opposite effect. As we all know, by their very nature these committees can at times become bogged down, and in this case, where speed is essential, I fear that much could be lost if this motion were adopted. At present, there is close co-operation between all parties concerned with the use of the natural gas resources of South Australia. Considerable preparatory work has been carried out not only by our own departments but also by other organizations, such as the Bechtel Pacific Corporation Limited and the Delhi-Santos group. Let us assist these people and not place any stumbling blocks in their

way. Government members are most anxious to have this pipeline constructed as soon as possible as they, together with the members of the Opposition, recognize the important part it will play in the continued growth of South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you make the report from which you've just read available to the Opposition?

Mr. LAWN: I have not read from any report.

Mr. Coumbe: It sounded like it.

Mr. LAWN: What I have said this afternoon will be in *Hansard* tomorrow morning.

Mr. Coumbe: Yes, but you said you were reading from the report of a committee.

Mr. LAWN: I did not. When am I supposed to have said that?

Mr. Coumbe: In reply to my earlier interjection.

Mr. LAWN: Have a look at *Hansard* tomorrow morning. The honourable member can see my notes if he wishes.

The Hon D. N. Brookman: Who prepared your speech?

Mr. LAWN: It was prepared on behalf of the Government. That is a stupid interjection. It is obvious that, as a rank and file member of the Government Party, I would not have access to the information that I gave to the House this afternoon. For instance, I could not know that the member for Gumeracha approached the Government and asked it to send a Minister overseas. In fact, that information was handed to me this afternoon by a rank and file member of my Party. Members opposite can ask the member for Gumeracha if it is true. The member for Torrens can have the notes from which I quoted. If he reads *Hansard* tomorrow morning he will find no reference to my using the report of a committee. I referred to the report of the committee that will be available to the Government shortly. What this Government has done and what the previous Government did not do is on record, and I placed this information before the House this afternoon. The next move by the Government will depend on the reaction of the Commonwealth Government. When the data is available, approaches will be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance to establish a pipeline. I cannot even hazard a guess where we will go from there. The Opposition has blamed the Government for a deficit of \$8,000,000. However, the Liberal Party in Canberra announced last night that it expected a deficit of \$270,000,000. It said that this was merely a bookkeeping deficit.

Mr. Ryan: It didn't criticize the deficit.

Mr. LAWN: It did not criticize or complain about it, but Opposition members here think that the deficit is a national calamity. I know that the former Premier believes he is a geologist, an engineer and a miner. Some members of his Party used to believe that he even put the coal into the ground at Leigh Creek. Recently I read an article in the *Bulletin* (which is not pro-Labor) referring to the former Premier and headed "Premier in a Tin Hat". He used to wear a tin hat to the inspections he made. I suggest that the next issue of the *Bulletin* could publish an article headed "Leader of the Opposition—Tin Shed", referring to Mr. Steele Hall. I move to amend the Leader's motion as follows:

By striking out "a Select Committee should be appointed" and inserting "the Government should be congratulated upon the action it has already taken in appointing a committee".

I commend my amendment to the House.

The Hon G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): While I was overseas earlier this year, I had the good fortune to visit one or two countries where natural gas was an important part of the economy. From contacts I had obtained before leaving here and from one or two other people, I was able to glean some interesting information about the subject available in the United States of America and in Great Britain. I was not sponsored by the State or the Government, but with the resources I had available to me I did my best to gather what information I could. I did this because I thought this was something of a new undertaking in Australia, that we were not very well versed in the techniques or the economics of gas transmission pipelines (as they are called overseas), and that we probably had a good deal to learn and were naturally cautious in our approach to this sort of exercise.

I support the motion because I believe that it has become a matter of real urgency in South Australia to get on with the business of utilizing the resources that now have been proved. I suggest that one of the first things the Select Committee should do (or, if we are not to have a Select Committee, that the Government should do) is to set up an organization in South Australia similar to what has been set up in the United Kingdom. I was very interested to listen to the latter part of the honourable member for Adelaide's remarks and the very well prepared statement that had been put in his hands to present to the House on behalf of

the Government. The U.K. has recently discovered some enormous resources of natural gas out in the middle of the North Sea. This appears to be somewhat similar in size and in resources to the very big natural gas field at Schlochteren Field in Holland. When I was in the U.K. about 10 different drills were working in the North Sea and a number of discoveries had been made and more were imminent. In fact, the *Sunday Times* of June 26 published a diagram of the North Sea area, and on it were placed the identification marks of various drilling rigs and various companies operating in that area. On looking at that diagram, one would think that a very large part of the North Sea was occupied with this activity..

The authorities in the U.K., recognizing the potential that was available for industry and for domestic use, the vast opportunities that it afforded, and the proximity of the gas strikes to the eastern shores of that country, set up what they call the Gas Council, the function of which is an interesting one, covering a wide ambit of authorities. In brief, its purpose was to co-ordinate, correlate and control the whole of the operation of getting the gas ashore and getting it into use for industry and for domestic purposes. I should have liked to develop this aspect a little more, but I wanted to take what little time was available to me this afternoon to indicate that I believe the proper thing to be done in South Australia (and to be done at once) is to establish something similar to that organization.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation, and I am sure this must be as disconcerting to the speaker as it is to the Chair. I ask honourable members for their co-operation.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is late in the afternoon and the debate has been lengthy, so I can understand members being a little inattentive. Although this does not worry me, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your help. As I was saying, I believe that what should be done in this State at the earliest possible moment is to set up by legislation an organization similar to the one that has been set up in the United Kingdom, perhaps with not such wide powers (because such wide powers are not required in this case) but at least to undertake the responsibility of transmitting natural gas from the known fields in this State, and from other fields that might be discovered, whether they be inside South

Australia, in the Northern Territory, in States adjacent to South Australia or on the continental shelf to the south and in the sea bed. I point out that this problem should not properly be regarded in the narrow context of Gidgealpa and Moomba, or even within the wider context of Mereenie: we should have an authority charged with the responsibility of transmitting to points of consumption any resources of gas that have been discovered or that may be discovered at any time in the future. It should be a continuing operation.

Mr. Shannon: There is a possibility of gas being found much closer to here.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; what the honourable member says emphasizes my point. Some years ago we set up the Electricity Trust, and we gave it a charter to undertake the generation and reticulation of electricity throughout the State. Although one could praise the trust's operations in glowing terms, I will merely say at this stage that the trust has operated very well, and I think we might take this as a pattern for the setting up of what I would term a gas trust in South Australia. I would suggest that the structure, the duties and the responsibilities of this organization should be as follows: first, for the purposes of a name I would call it "The South Australian Gas Trust". It should be set up by Act of Parliament on similar lines to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, and comprise representatives of E.T.S.A., the South Australian Gas Company, the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures. At least that group of people should be represented, and possibly some others. However, at least those bodies should be included. Naturally, they would be appointed by the Governor, and the chairman would also be a Government appointee. The duties of the trust as I see it at present would be these: it should be given an exclusive franchise:

- (1) to purchase gas at the well sites;
- (2) to build, maintain and operate all gas transmission pipelines for conveyance of gas from producing wells or groups of wells to distribution points as required at centres of consumption;

(I use the term "groups of wells" advisedly, because in the United States of America and Canada it is the practice to group together producing wells to a central point from which the transmission company takes up the supply and conducts it to more remote areas of consumption. It is the same system as we use in our underground water basins, where a number of small bores are put down and these are connected to a main pipeline which conducts the water away for use up country.)

(3) to fix standards of gas quality and calorific value at each point of purchase from producing wells.

(4) to raise funds for capital works by:

- (a) Public loan as a semi-governmental instrumentality within the normal or any specific provision under the Financial Agreement.
- (b) Participation in the State Government Loan programme.
- (c) By such other means and on such terms as may be approved by the Treasurer.
- (d) By being registered as a trust investment.

It has been fairly canvassed that there would be, perhaps, some advantage and a degree of equity if this project were open to finance from private sources either wholly or in part, to give the private sector of business an interest in this instrumentality. I believe that finance is available from within this State, and if the trust were to go on the market for a loan it will be widely supported by many people in this State. By so participating, citizens of this State, large and small financially, will have an interest in this new and important undertaking. Apart from that, I believe that there are other sources of finance outside the State and maybe overseas that would be prepared to participate in financing such a capital undertaking. This provision is for the specific purpose of inviting other than Government capital to be subscribed on such terms as may be approved by the Treasurer. The powers of the proposed trust would be to purchase gas by negotiating prices or by arbitrated price in the event of a dispute arising. This would give owners of the gas the opportunity to negotiate with the trust for the purchase of gas at the well.

Mr. Hudson: How long do you think these negotiations may take?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: They have to be negotiated in any case. What I propose would not take any longer than it would take the Government to negotiate.

Mr. Hudson: That has been a problem before.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall develop this argument next week. The second power would be to enter into contracts with private industry and/or Government departments for building and maintaining pipelines, booster stations and equipment, storages, and matters incidental to gas transmission lines. Thirdly, to acquire essential easements and land for purposes of its charter. Fourthly, to sell gas in bulk to chartered consumers (Electricity Trust, South Australian Gas Company and

others that may be created), to individual large industrial concerns (Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Ltd. and Broken Hill Proprietary Company and similar organizations), and to groups of consumers that are or may be outside the operation and scope of existing chartered distributors, at such maximum prices as will cover the cost of its operations, including capital charges, amortization, and administration.

I have carefully avoided any infringement by the proposed trust into the rights and activities of existing chartered organizations, particularly the distribution of gas that is undertaken by the South Australian Gas Company. That company could buy in bulk from the trust. The responsibilities of the trust would be, first, to provide a safe, reliable and sufficient supply to its customers within the resources of producing wells now known or which may be discovered within South Australia, the Northern Territory, or any other State or off-shore point of production within economic distance of areas of consumption. Secondly, to conform to world standards of safety in all its operations. Thirdly, to report annually to the Minister of Works on all its operations, the report to contain a properly audited statement of accounts and to be laid on the table of both Houses not later than September 30 in any year. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BANK OF ADELAIDE'S REGISTRATION UNDER THE COMPANIES ACT 1892 ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRIVATE).

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Bank of Adelaide's Registration under the Companies Act 1892 Act Amendment Bill (Private), 1966, has the honour to report:

1. Your committee has considered the Bill and has heard evidence thereon from the following persons:

Mr. J. N. McEwin—Parliamentary Agent for the Bill.

Mr. W. P. Wright—General Manager of the Bank of Adelaide.

Mr. J. A. Manning—President, Adelaide Stock Exchange.

Mr. H. G. Harris—Deputy Registrar of Companies.

Dr. W. A. Wynes—Parliamentary Draftsman.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the *Advertiser* and *News*, inviting persons who wished to give evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee; to this invitation there was no response.

3. Your committee finds that the allegations contained in the Preamble of the Bill have been proved.

4. Your committee has not been made aware of any opposition to the Bill.

5. Your committee has amended the Bill in minor respects, as indicated in the annexed schedule.

6. Your committee approves and reports the Bill as amended, and recommends that it be passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATERWORKS AND SEWERAGE) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.*]

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 16. Page 1104.)

Grand total, \$77,459,000.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I support the first line of the Loan Estimates. In doing so, I wish first to refer to last year's Loan Estimates, in which a programme was worked out that was to be \$288,000 better than the previous year, with an estimated final deficit of \$34,000. However, at the end of this financial year we find a deficit on the Loan Account of \$2,465,000, with an aggregated deficit of Revenue and Loan Funds of \$8,077,000. The Treasurer has been honest about this in his statement on the Loan Estimates and admits freely that this deficit has been met temporarily out of funds representing trust accounts, deposit accounts and special appropriation accounts. In fact, we are left only with fixed deposits lodged with the Reserve Bank and the State Bank of \$18,000,000, whereas there was an aggregate of \$27,300,000 previously entrusted to trust and deposit accounts at June 30. This is a very simple and honest statement. It is an

honest admission of over-expenditure. What a dismal sort of estimate it is in a year like this when everything needs stimulating!

Admittedly, there has to be a balancing but this is a balancing done almost entirely in one year. During last year it was easy for Ministers to say, "What does it matter how much we spend so long as we are carrying out the necessary functions? What does it matter if we spend a little more on this, that or the other?" It has happened in some departments, but the Minister of Works is not an offender in this regard. Ministers could say, "What does it matter, so long as we do a better job than originally planned? In some cases I have been thankful for their attitude. Unfortunately, however, it has proved to be the case that the Government has done it on credit, and now we have the reckoning—and this at a time when we should be trying to find additional money for public works and housing to stimulate our programme.

The reasons for this situation are set out clearly and concisely at the beginning of the statement on the Loan Estimates. Four reasons are given, but none of them has been convincingly demonstrated. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition made a special point of revealing weaknesses in the arguments put up in defence of this deficit. Whether the arguments put up by the Treasurer at that time in defence were convincing is questionable, but there is no question that the remedy applied is most convincing. It demonstrates clearly that the Government through over-spending has increased its Loan deficit.

It also states clearly that the trust and deposit funds were used to find bridging finance to the extent of \$8,000,000 in order to avoid funding the deficit with Loan funds. This has been avoided in this instance by a skilful manoeuvre—by transferring from Revenue Account to Loan Account the responsibility for providing funds for the construction of assets that are not State assets, such as the building of universities, and other places of tertiary education, and also to assist in subsidizing non-Government hospitals.

The money paid out on this basis is paid out without any possibility of recovery; it is money on which the State will have to pay interest. Therefore, I am wondering whether it is a fact that it is the practice in other States or whether this expenditure is something we have resorted to in this State as a means of solving this problem.

Having carried out this technical manoeuvre (these "gymnastics", as my Leader called them) of juggling Loan and Revenue debits and borrowing from trust and deposit accounts (which is legitimate provided one can repay them) the Government hopes by this measure to avoid funding last year's Revenue deficit so as to avoid any reaction that may result in the long term to our present redistribution from the Loan Fund pool, of which at present we get 13.71 per cent with a population of 9.3 per cent—a far better percentage distribution than has any other State. It is a figure in excess of our population entitlement; it had been developed by the previous Treasurer through diverting Revenue surpluses to Loan Account and not adopting this policy we are adopting now, of the reverse procedure—transferring Loan Account to Revenue Account. This year, by transferring \$6,400,000 revenue expenditure (which is actually a gross revenue expenditure of \$4,500,000, because there is an anticipated recovery from the Commonwealth Government of \$1,900,000) the Government has avoided having to fund this deficit. The actual amount that would have been provided on the Revenue Account for these purposes is \$7,500,000, according to the Treasurer's statement. Therefore, what has happened is that, in order to transfer grants for tertiary education and hospitals from Revenue Account to Loan Account, we have reduced the amount required from Revenue to \$3,000,000 instead of an actual amount of \$7,500,000. This amount of \$4,500,000 has been taken from Revenue Account and transferred to Loan Account, together with the \$6,500,000 estimated increase in our taxation reimbursement from the Commonwealth Government for the year 1966-67. This means that there could be a net increase in the Revenue Funds of \$11,000,000. It remains to be seen how much of this \$11,000,000 will be used to refund the borrowings from the trust deposit account to remedy the run-down that occurred during last year's bad housekeeping. We have also to take into account that from this \$11,000,000 an estimated \$6,000,000 has to be provided for the basic wage increase. This year's programme, after reducing the deficit by \$2,021,000, is \$2,292,000 greater than last year's. This takes into account the fact that there will still be an estimated deficit at the end of this financial year of \$144,000. Therefore, although there was an increase of \$5,481,000 in the Loan allocation to the State this year, if we take from this the deficit deduction provided for in these Estimates we find that there is a decrease

of \$3,160,000 on the sum that could have been provided for Loan works if this deficit had not to be provided for. The total expenditure provided for in these Estimates is \$77,459,000, whereas it could have been \$84,280,000, made up as follows: \$67,680,000 of new borrowing, an estimated \$12,100,000 of recoveries, and a transfer of \$4,500,000 from revenue to Loan Account. This is the sum that we should have had available to spend this year on capital works. An article that appeared in the *Financial Review* of July 28 was, strangely enough, written by a Mr. Maximilian Walsh. I do not know if he is related to the Treasurer but, if he is, he is not much of a friend of the Treasurer, as he says:

The Premier's Conference and the Loan Council meeting in June were conducted with a full appreciation of the fact that the basic wage would rise, and probably by \$2. Even with this knowledge, the Premiers, by and large, returned to their home States claiming that they had been successful in all their negotiations. Nor is the New South Wales Premier, Mr. Askin, likely to receive much satisfaction from his demands for drought relief.—

However, he has received this under the present Budget. The Commonwealth Government apparently made new proposals to the Premiers. I should like to have the Treasurer's comments on this article and on whether these proposals were as claimed. The article continues:

When the Premiers' Conference was held last year the system of financial assistance grants was up for review. The Commonwealth then proposed that the time lag incorporated in the old formula should be reduced. Under that system the formula of grants for any one financial year was calculated on wage and population increases recorded in the previous financial year. The Commonwealth proposed that the increases in average wages used to determine the grant for a financial year should be that for the year ending March of that financial year instead of for the preceding year. Had this been adopted, the current basic wage increase would be taken into account in the current year's reimbursements. More importantly, however, any inflationary pressure caused by this increase or stimulatory action in the Federal Budget on upward pressure on wages arising from the improved circumstances of the rural sector, which manifested itself before March, would also be taken into account in this financial year. As it is, the States will have to wait until 1967-68 to pick up the full benefits of the increased wages they are now having to pay to their own employees. The refusal to eliminate the time lag arises from the possibility of their missing out on the large rise that occurred in average wages in 1964-65. However, rather than insisting on their due increase from this source as well as the elimination of the time lag they plumped for the continuation of the old system. Consequently, they perpetuated the system which

operates to their disadvantage. . . . Unfortunately, the economic arguments of the Federal Treasurer were either unappreciated or not understood by the Premiers last year.

If this statement is correct (and I seek clarification on whether it would have been advantageous) surely this would have been one means whereby the situation in which we have found ourselves could have been relieved, if not entirely at least partially. Instead, we have a total increase in overall revenues about 10 per cent greater than last year's figure and greater than the 7 per cent increase estimated by the present Treasurer in his policy speech. The increase is \$11,981,000, of which little, if any, is to be spent either in additional capital works or in improving services and amenities provided under the Revenue Account for various departments of the State.

I turn now to certain items mentioned by the Treasurer, the first of which is the Roseworthy Agricultural College, about which the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) commented last night. The sum of \$200,000 is provided, and this is a contra account: in other words, it will be provided by the State, but I presume will be recovered from the Commonwealth Government from money to be provided under a tertiary education grant for improvements to be made to the college, and I believe these improvements are well warranted. I agree with the member for Alexandra, who is the previous Minister of Agriculture, who had a long association with the college as Minister and who, like me, is a diplomat. We have had much personal association with the college and I am in sympathy with the present Principal in his attempts to raise the standard of education at that college. On the area provided and with the present systems of agriculture, it is impossible to teach the fundamentals of farming practice to people who have no background in agriculture. During the time I was there, when we worked horse teams, it was just as difficult. We did our operations at a much slower rate than that at which they can be done now by mechanical means. I think that, in the three years I was there, I spent half a day on a drill and, if I had not had background experience, I would have known little about a drill or about sowing a paddock after three years at the college.

This is not what I consider should be the function of the college in future. At present there is a strong demand and need for well trained technical officers. We must have skilled technical officers to assist scientists. I should

like to see another year in extension training work added to the course. This work is becoming vital in all forms of agriculture.

However, I think it is time the college ceased to be looked upon as being a school for training farmers, except that it could possibly provide, in addition to its technical course, a short course similar to that provided at private institutions in Victoria and New South Wales. At those institutions, only applicants who satisfy the Principal that they have a fundamental background in agriculture and that they have worked for at least two or three years on a recognized property are accepted. They can undertake either a one-year or a two-year course, which is more or less a high pressure course in agriculture and management principles that can be applied when they return to their farms. The present concept of trying to conduct a college as an agricultural school at a time when we need an institute of technology in agriculture requires examination. I heartily support what has been said by the member for Alexandra and I also support the attempts being made by the Principal to bring this about.

One other matter of general interest to which I desire to refer is electricity. It would seem that this year the Electricity Trust is being asked to find from its own resources, for the completion of capital works, a greater percentage of funds than it has been called upon to find in the past. I refer particularly to the Torrens Island power station, the first stage of which is to be in operation within, I think, two years. When the present Treasurer spoke as Leader of the Opposition in the debate on the 1964-65 Loan Estimates, he said:

The Electricity Trust of South Australia is to receive £3,000,000. It is noted that the Port Augusta power station, costing approximately £35,000,000 took about 15 years to complete; in other words, an expenditure of about £2,500,000 per year. A similar picture is becoming apparent with the Torrens Island project, where an expenditure of £2,806,000 is proposed for this year, but I have already mentioned that at this rate of progress it will be 50 years before this proposition becomes a practical reality.

That was said in 1964: we are now in 1966 and we hope that there will be something to show from the station within two years. However, what concerns me is that the trust is obviously having to draw more on its own resources to complete this work because of the curtailments of rural expansion. This matter is close to the quick as far as people in my country district are concerned. There is certain jealousy about the rights and privileges of

having electricity. The people look upon it as a service to which they are entitled, but we find the single wire earth return system working out in circles to various areas and, when two of a man's neighbours have it and he is told that it will be two years before he has it, that man gets itchy. He becomes even more concerned when he is told that the works are to be deferred.

It seems that only one of the projected works in my district will be started this year. Perhaps certain preliminary work will be done on two projects. However, although work on the Parilla s.w.e.r. was to have been completed by December next, the work will not be commenced until January next year. Again, regarding the Coonalpyn s.w.e.r., although the consumers were told at the meeting at which they signed their contracts that work would be commenced in this financial year, it would appear that no work will be done. I can only suggest that this is one of the things we have had to suffer indirectly as a curtailment in expenditure of Loan moneys this year in order to balance the Budget.

I do not say that there should not be a balance. I do not say that the actions taken have not been skilfully manoeuvred in order to achieve this, but I deplore that it has had to be done in such a broad manner at a time when we should be looking for expansion.

Mr. Hughes: Has the work force of the Electricity Trust been reduced?

Mr. NANKIVELL: None of this work is effected by the working staff of the trust in my district, because it is all done by contract. Even survey work is done by contract and there seems to be no difficulty at present in getting efficient and competent contractors. Some of those working in my district are extremely efficient and they, unfortunately, like other contractors, are running right up to or a little ahead of schedule. Again, this might have some bearing on the sum available for new work.

I shall now refer to matters more specifically related to my own district in connection with this curtailment of Loan expenditure. I know that the Minister of Works will bear with me when I refer to the Tailem Bend to Keith main. Last year \$870,000 was voted for this work, but the vote this year is back to \$390,000. I was dismayed, and I think perhaps the Minister was honestly dismayed, by the comment made in this year's Loan Estimate that further main laying will be resumed when funds permit.

The Minister has shown his concern about this, but I tell the Government that this is a matter of national development: I am not pressing it because it is one of the capital works in my district. The agricultural survey required before this work was undertaken and the evidence submitted to the Public Works Committee showed that about 2,000,000 acres was affected in sure rainfall country estimated to be capable of carrying an average of two sheep to the acre, but this was impossible without reticulated water.

The development of a large area is being handicapped. The Minister wonders why I keep asking what the Government intends to do, but the point is that much of this country is newly developed. If a person intends to invest money in developing land in the area he wants some idea of when he can expect to get a return, and to get a return he must have water. People who go ahead on the assumption that they will get water in three years' time and find later that they will not get it for five or six years are placed in the position of having made an investment on which they can get little return. This is one of the things that is concerning people in the area. They are not concerned only that the people are not coming to the area: they are concerned also with the lack of water, which can be provided only from the source to which I referred. This is upsetting their planning, and it can financially embarrass some people.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: We are making every effort to finish the project.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but even so these people will not get water until reticulation is possible. I should like the Minister to say whether special provision will be made for reticulation in this area. I notice that an extra allocation is made for extension works but I point out that nearly all those now drawing water from the scheme and paying rates have properties adjacent to it. Other people, who do not have properties adjacent to the scheme and are not ratable, are drawing water from the scheme by various means, as the Minister knows. They are getting water at their own expense. I would like the Minister's considered opinion whether the Financial Agreement would be broken if people were allowed to finance surveyed mains to an approved standard and recover their capital by some rebate, as I suggested previously. This would enable them to obtain a proper supply sooner than they could have it provided by the department. This is a pressing problem for many people.

I believe this matter has always been interwoven with South-East drainage, and I have expressed the opinion since I have been a member that the drainage in the South-East has become an engineering problem rather than an agricultural problem. The original proposals for drainage were made at a time when agricultural land was wanted for the growing of cereals. In other words, considerable drainage had to be undertaken to get the land dry enough to sow crops. This was the thinking in 1924 when the Royal Commission brought in its findings, which are now being carried out by this Government, and have been followed by all Governments since 1924.

No change in thinking has taken place as a result of what has happened in this country whereby people are no longer interested in agriculture but are interested in providing pastures that can use every drop of water that falls on the ground. The only problem is to get the land dry enough initially to get it established; once it is established it can use all of the 22in. of rain that falls.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When you were chairman of the Land Settlement Committee and investigated these matters, did you come up with any answer?

Mr. McKee: Apparently he didn't.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Port Pirie seems to think that any debate is in the nature of a hate session against the Government, but I am making constructive comments. I am trying to show there has been a change of thinking and, if the new principles were put into effect, they might result in considerable savings. On this work large sums are being spent and further large sums will be spent. I am concerned (as I know the Minister is concerned) that we are not putting any of the drainage water to use. The bulk of it goes out through Drain M into Lake George, which is a salt lake. Only one or two people living near the drain can use that water. It seems to be the intention to divert nearly all of this water out to sea as quickly as possible. If any drain needs extension work in the South-East it is the Baker Range drain. Some work has been recommended and some work has been undertaken in widening the old section of the drain. It terminates a few miles north of Lucindale, but meanders on with the help of cuttings and banks. There are no channels beyond a point north of Lucindale. This water is vitally important to the area which is now not receiving (and which is not likely to receive for many years) a source of reticulated water, because there is substantial proof to show that

the water available in the area north of Kingston is obtained purely and simply from soakage waters.

The Minister will be interested to hear that at the northern end of Alf Flat, at the termination of Baker Range, there is a wonderful 30,000-acre reserve. It does not have the bulk of the permanent water on Alf Flat in it but there could be a permanent lake of about 3,000 acres. In planning the future of this reserve the aim should be to put water into it rather than to divert water from it.

The present lessee of this section has received much publicity lately because of his interest in wombats. He is extremely interested in fauna and flora. Recently he told me he would consider making over the whole of the lake to the Government as a reserve if water could be put into it and he could be assured that it would remain a permanent lake. I report this to the Minister for his consideration, because I think something could be done there in providing a national park of some value. The area is only 115 miles from Adelaide; it is large, but it needs permanent water. By giving more thought to the Baker Range drain this could be developed as a national park and be of value to the people of the State.

Mr. Quirke: Baker Range has been tapped.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It was tapped near Bool Lagoon. At present most of the water getting to Alf Flat is from Naracoorte Creek or local drainage.

Yesterday, the member for Rocky River asked a question about Government policy regarding medical practitioners in South Australia. He was concerned about the situation at Orroroo. In reply, the Treasurer said the Government was looking into the matter, and that he was thinking of writing to the Agent-General in London to see whether British doctors could be influenced to come to South Australia.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member the line with which he is going to link this.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The provision of medical training centres. I hope I can link this up with the line in the Estimates.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may proceed, and we will see.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I think that what I have to say will be of some value to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that the subject of medical training facilities is not necessarily connected with the line "Hospitals".

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Victorian Government took certain action last year. I have here minutes of the report on the facilities for training medical practitioners in South Australia, and there is a statement of supplementary information on this question. It reveals that attempts were made to obtain doctors from England, but that following advertisements in three successive issues of the *British Medical Journal* and the receipt of more than 200 replies the result was that only one doctor arrived; the others appeared to be waiting for better conditions in England.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is out of order in pursuing that line of argument. These are the Loan Estimates regarding hospital buildings.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I bow to your direction, Mr. Chairman. I will link this up with "Universities". I tie this in with the fact that I am trying to establish that we need medical practitioners. The honourable member for Rocky River has shown that there is such a need in his area. I know that there is a need in my area and, in fact, throughout the whole State, and I am satisfied (as would anybody be who has read this comprehensive report) that the only way to get them is to train them. The only way we will train them is by getting facilities.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order. The Committee is discussing Loan Estimates for hospital buildings, not training facilities.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am talking about university buildings.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. Millhouse: He is. It's under "University Buildings".

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham also to respect the Chair.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I shall be more specific, Mr. Chairman, in these circumstances. I refer now to hospital buildings and university facilities for medical training as provided for in these Estimates. Am I in order in speaking on that?

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member can prove that these Loan Estimates provide for medical training, as distinct from buildings, he will be in order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: A line on page 17 covers universities, Mr. Chairman; may I talk to that line?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is in order in speaking to the Loan Estimates.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I come back specifically to the point I wish to discuss. The report I referred to shows that the only way we can get additional practitioners is to train them. The present hospital provisions at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will not be adequate, and they cannot be increased; in fact, we lose two training units. Consequently, it has become essential to make extensions to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I think they are referred to, Mr. Chairman. This extension is necessary to enable the present University of Adelaide medical school to train an estimated 95 graduates a year, and this is nowhere near the number required. At present we have an average of 15 people coming from other States and 30 people coming from overseas each year, making a total of 45, and in order to retain the ratio of general practitioners to patients it will become necessary to build a school at Flinders university, which it is estimated will train 45 doctors at year. I understood this was looked upon as an important issue, and I still believe that is so.

In reply to a question I asked him the other day, the Minister told me that there was some difficulty with the present site and that alternative arrangements would have to be sought. I believe that is being done. However, I point out that it is vital that we extend our medical training facilities in order that we can train the maximum number of doctors possible in South Australia. This can be done only by providing Loan Estimates to provide such training hospitals. I hope that when we build these training hospitals we will try to have the emphasis in training placed not on medical science but on general medical practice, because at present the figures show that five times as many are going in for specialized work as there were 10 years ago. They show, conversely, that 10 times as many went into general practice 10 years ago as are entering this field today.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How can you stop a person wanting to specialize?

Mr. NANKIVELL: Various ways have been suggested to me, one being to give the general training a different twist. The old school training was done by honoraries who were nearly all general practitioners, many of whom had had experience in the country, and the training they gave their students was in general practice. However, today we have a faculty wherein most of those in charge are not general practitioners, nor have they had a general

practitioner background: they are medical scientists, and they are tending to place the emphasis on medicine as a medical science, with the result that many of the doctors (and they have told me this) do not have the confidence to go out and tackle this work in general practice. I think something is being done to provide for preceptorships, as is done in Queensland.

The Medical Practitioners Act should be amended to correct a current anomaly, because at present we have the ludicrous situation in which a doctor who has finished his examination can do a locum anywhere in the State until he graduates, but as soon as he graduates he can no longer do a general practice locum. He is then confined to an internship in one of the training hospitals. It has been suggested that some of these internes might well spend three months with general practitioners getting experience and gaining confidence in general practice in the country. It is only by giving them this bias and this confidence to undertake general practice in the country, and by giving them an opportunity to find out that the country is not such a bad place, that we will get the number of doctors we require. We will not import them, so we must train them; we will not train them without facilities, and we will not provide the facilities unless we can provide the money for the work.

I again draw the Government's attention to the fact that this report envisages the necessity for this school to be completed and to accept its first intake of second-year students in 1975; everything in the report is applicable to that. If this cannot take place until 1978, the run-down will be even greater than it is now, because the number of deregistrations as a result of retirement and death is such that we are barely keeping up with our present needs. Therefore, in supporting the second line I strongly ask the Government to consider this matter and to see whether anything can be done to expedite this work.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I rise to make a few brief comments on these Loan Estimates. I recall that last year I was pleased to be able to say that the Loan Estimates had treated my district reasonably well. However, I regret to say that this year the District of Light has been almost completely neglected. I do not begrudge any other member's district from having its turn. Many capital works need to be done in the District of Light but the Estimates this year do not provide for them. One bright aspect for this year is the

\$24,000 provided to complete the drainage works at Cadell. I do not blame the Government or the Minister because this work has been held up for some time, but the sheer physical difficulty of restoring the drainage of a settlement as old as Cadell creates problems. The Cadell irrigation settlement, one of the earliest in South Australian history, was established after the First World War, and several original settlers are still on their blocks.

In 1920 and 1921 difficulties of irrigation schemes and projects were not as much appreciated as they are now, so that some mistakes of the 1920's are not mistakes that irrigation planners make today. The Cadell settlement, with its difficulties, is a fact of life and, although it is an expensive business for the Treasurer to meet the cost of the rejuvenation works, it is an expense that the Treasurer has to provide for. It may interest members opposite to know that New Era, near Cadell, is the site of one of the original river village settlements, where in about 1890 the Government of the day thought it would be a good idea to establish settlements to employ some of Adelaide's unemployed people. Each village settlement was established as a self-help settlement on communistic principles. However, without exception these settlements have failed.

Mr. Hughes: How do you mean that this is interesting to members' opposite?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Members opposite, having socialistic philosophies, will be interested to know that Socialism and activities in the Murray River irrigation settlements did not work together. The member for Chaffey will find this out.

Mr. Hughes: Here he goes again.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If members opposite spur me on by interjection I am happy to co-operate.

Mr. Curren: Didn't the co-operatives work?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No doubt the member for Chaffey will explain how Socialism affects his district.

Mr. Curren: The co-operative system works, and that is the basis of the district.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: They have been built up on private enterprise, not on Socialism.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall leave it to the member for Chaffey to tell us about Socialism as it applies in his district. It is interesting to note that the New South Wales Labor Government, which over the years set up various

State socialistic enterprises, was forced to sell them because they were in danger of becoming bankrupt.

Mr. Langley: What about your Government?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall listen to the contribution by the member for Chaffey, particularly when he speaks about Socialism.

Mr. Curren: If you sit here long enough you will hear me speak.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am happy to sit in the Chamber to hear the honourable member speak. He speaks so rarely, and is so rarely in the Chamber when I am speaking, that I shall be pleased to sit and hear his contribution.

Mr. Clark: Have you a personal detestation of the member for Chaffey?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No, I like him personally.

Mr. Clark: You make it obvious!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I like the member for Gawler too.

Mr. Clark: Who could help it!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not want to waste the time of the Committee in answering irresponsible interjections from members on the other side. The sum of \$829,000 has been provided for the Railways Department to continue the construction of 16 suburban railcars, and \$17,000 to build 13 motor body transport waggons. Several times I have complained about the inferior quality of railway vehicles plying on the Adelaide-Eudunda rail service, as they are probably 40 years old and were introduced in the time of Premier Barwell.

Mr. Curren: They have got old quickly in the last 18 months!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One of my friends on this side tells me that Premier Barwell was in power in 1922 and 1923, so we can date the railcars back to that time. If the Railways Department is to attract its share of business (and this can be done) it must provide modern railcars equipped and attuned to the needs of present-day travellers. In the past, when praising the Bluebird cars used on some country services, I have suggested that the new car now on the drawing board at Islington should incorporate all the attractive features of the Bluebird car. Once I criticized the railwaymen's union leaders for not taking a lead in this matter, but now rejoice that my advice was taken by one trade union official who calls himself the Divisional Manager for South Australia of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen. He has a powerful political position because, I understand, at least two members of the

Government Party rely for their endorsement on his favour. In giving evidence to the Royal Commission on Transport Services a few weeks ago, he indicated that he had finally seen the light, and that the Railways Department had to offer first-class services to attract business. He said:

We have seen the long-term results of protective legislation and of real competition and are convinced that protection can never be anything but limited in its benefits because of the natural tendency of humans to shelter behind any protection in preference to getting out and meeting problems head on.

This responsible union official admits that his organization has to meet problems head on and not hide behind protective legislation. I rejoice at this change of heart and look forward to more prosperous periods for the South Australian Railways Department now that the leadership of the union involved has become more responsible in its approach. I hope it will carry its responsibility a little further and ensure that any new railcars being built for service in this State will be equipped with all modern facilities and conveniences.

I was disappointed to note that only \$4,000 was provided on the Estimates for water schemes in my district, for that sum will not go far towards providing reticulation schemes for the rural community there. The sum is merely to commence improvements to the Hansborough water supply, and when one considers the vast area in my district still not served by a reticulated supply one realizes how disappointed many of my constituents will be. I refer particularly to a water scheme for the Watervale area which, as members may realize, involves many problems. Over the last two or three years the Government's sinking and testing bores to provide a water supply for this area have proved unsuccessful.

Mr. Rodda: What about Kimba's water supply?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope we shall not be as neglected as Kimba has been because, under the present Socialist Administration, Kimba cannot really expect a water supply until about 1971, which is a gloomy outlook.

Mr. Clark: How long has Kimba been waiting? It has been trying to get a water scheme for 30 years.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It at least expected to find provision made on the Loan Estimates this year. Earlier in the year, the Minister of Works indicated that his engineers were actually working on a scheme to serve the town of Watervale, feeding water from one end (at Clare) and from the other end (at Auburn),

and linking up to serve a total distance of about 15 miles.

Mr. Quirke: It's not the department's fault.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Indeed, it is not the fault of the Engineering and Water Supply Department that Watervale has no water supply; it is only the lack of Loan funds that now stands in the way of the scheme.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: It requires a pipeline to the Treasury.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: It does, indeed. I am particularly disappointed about the matter, as I have passed on information given to me by the Minister that raised the hopes of Watervale residents that provision for the scheme would be made in this year's Estimates. We can only hope that next year the Treasury will be able to finance the scheme. In the past two or three years serious fires have occurred in the area which, because of the lack of a water supply, have not been effectively controlled by the local Emergency Fire Service and other units. Last year, a major fire occurred in Watervale's main street, in which a large garage and private house were completely gutted not only because of the lack of any water supply in the town but also because no provision for fire-fighting existed.

Mr. Hughes: That's not much of an advertisement for the previous Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I tried to explain succinctly for the benefit of the member for Wallaroo the problems involved at Watervale, and said that over the last two or three years the previous Government and, indeed, the present Minister had endeavoured to find an underground water supply for the township. Although water was found, its salinity made it unacceptable. Further, a large area between Manoora and Waterloo, running south to Allendale North, is without a permanent reticulated water supply, another matter on which the Minister led me to believe that his department was actively working. Although departmental engineers have been working in the area, and although the rural community understood that a water supply might become a reality this year, residents have to face up to the fact that progress will now be delayed for at least one more year, because of socialistic mis-spending elsewhere.

Mr. Casey: What is Watervale's population?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I wish the member for Frome would keep up with what I have to say and not hark back to matters with which I have dealt. I was interested to see in Appendix 1 of the Estimates that the final price for the excellent Samecon school at Saddleworth was

\$90,000. Although I have asked about that price several times in this Chamber, the Minister of Education has been able to give me only a broad approximation, apparently because Samecon schools are a new feature of educational planning, which the Public Buildings Department has not precisely costed. The Samecon school in question (one of the early air-conditioned types) is a fine building that gives great satisfaction to the parents and students concerned. I hope that the Government will erect more of these excellent schools elsewhere, although I understand that air-conditioning (an important but, unfortunately, expensive feature of the schools) is not now included. I remind the Committee that Samecon school plans, having been drawn up during the term of the previous Administration, have been admired by visitors from other States, and that a representative of the Tasmanian Government has twice visited this State specifically to examine such schools and has been impressed.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That was at the invitation of this Government.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am glad that Socialist thinking extends to these simple courtesies, for I believe that any advantages offered by this State should be shared with our counterparts in other States. If the invitation to inspect the Samecon school was made through the Minister's courtesy, I commend him for that, and hope that he continues with the good work. I hope he makes positive acknowledgment of the fact that the Samecon school was developed by the previous Government.

I do not wish to speak further on the first line. Although my district is poorly treated, I realize that the Treasury is under great pressure, and I hope my district will not be almost completely ignored when the Loan Estimates are introduced next year. I support the first line.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I do not intend to delay the Committee for long but think I should associate myself with the Loan Estimates on this occasion because the Government has been unduly criticized by members opposite. Anyone would think that this was the first time we had had a deficit but, looking back over the history of previous Loan Estimates, we realize that deficits commonly occur, and this State's deficit is much lower than that of any other State. One has only to refer to the local press to find statements like "The States will need more help"; "New South Wales Budget to lift fares"; and "Victorian price rises".

This is a general Commonwealth trend. Members opposite make great play about the unemployment situation. I agree (and so do members of the Government) that the unemployment situation is serious; but it is serious not only in South Australia but also throughout the Commonwealth. Members opposite are reluctant to place the blame in the right quarter. It is an incompetent Opposition because it knows at heart that the real fault for the overall economic crisis lies with the Commonwealth Government.

The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said that the Government could not blame seasonal conditions. I do not say that seasonal conditions are one of the main reasons for this economic crisis, but they did contribute to it. The honourable member being a farmer and an ex-Minister should know what effect seasonal conditions had on the Government. They affect the car industry and others. It appears to me that members opposite are delighted with the unemployment situation. In fact, from the way they make a great play of it, I think they would like it to get worse.

Mr. McAnaney: No.

Mr. McKEE: I do not think that members opposite in their attack on the Government benches show great concern about this. In fact, I think they are using this as a lever to appeal to the public in their scramble to get back onto the Government benches. Anyhow, I am concerned because, if only one person is unemployed, it is serious. I am concerned for such people. Even if only one breadwinner is unemployed, it is serious. I think (in fact, I am fairly sure) that members opposite in their scramble to get back onto the Government benches would welcome a depression.

Mr. McAnaney: No!

Mr. McKEE: That is the impression given to me and to the public. It is obvious that this is what members opposite would like to bring about. They have instructed their colleagues in another place to defeat every revenue-producing Bill that the Government introduces.

Mr. McAnaney: Did you say "every"?

Mr. McKEE: Practically every one.

Mr. Quirke: Who is the informer who told you that we had so instructed our colleagues?

Mr. McKEE: There is no need to have an informer, after observing the antics that have gone on in another place. It is quite obvious.

Mr. McAnaney: How does taxation make employment?

Mr. McKEE: The member for Stirling is a gem! There is no need for me to stand up and talk on this: he could probably solve the whole problem, and I need not speak. The blame has to be laid in the right place. Unemployment is serious not only in South Australia. We can see from the press every day that it is nation-wide. Instructions were given to another place to defeat Government revenue-producing Bills.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! One honourable member at a time! The honourable member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: Their purpose is to hamstring the Government's finances and retard the development of this State in their mad scramble to get back onto the Government benches. Their main concern is to create unemployment: they have no concern for the people. If they had, they would act responsibly. They would win more favour from the public if they did so during this Commonwealth-wide crisis, as it is. I know it is the Opposition's job to criticize, its job is also to be responsible and try to assist the Government so that the people can enjoy the privileges that the Government can afford to give them, no matter whether or not they are in Opposition.

Mr. Langley: Have you heard one argument on how we can overcome this?

Mr. McKEE: I have heard nothing from them. Members opposite could go to their Commonwealth colleagues in Canberra and say, "We think you ought to assist South Australia. We are responsible members of Parliament and we do not think you are pulling your weight in regard to the finances of South Australia." They could make the situation easier by giving assistance instead of retarding everything by defeating Bills that would help in some way. Although they would not solve the whole problem, they would help to rectify it to some extent. But the Opposition is concerned only with a minority of the people. Its job is to protect its wealthy friends. This is the feeling outside Parliament.

The unemployment problem, about which we hear so much from members opposite, is Commonwealth-wide. If the situation is worse in South Australia, as I have said, the adverse season has had some effect on it. It has had an effect on the motor car industry and the farm implements industry, and the Commonwealth Government is not spending sufficient money in this State even to help alleviate the unemployment situation. This is illustrated

by the Commonwealth's inactivity regarding badly needed extensions at Adelaide Airport. Members opposite are making much capital at the expense of unemployed people but are doing nothing to help remedy the situation. They are hamstringing the Government by retarding the passage of revenue Bills that may assist.

Mr. Heaslip: Don't you think the extension of water in the country may be more important than an airport?

Mr. McKEE: This is one of several Commonwealth projects that has not been proceeded with. The Commonwealth Government has obtained much publicity about the airport, but its attitude is similar to that adopted by the previous Government of this State, which made political promises, including one to provide a deep sea port in the South-East. After promising for years to provide this port, the member for Gumeracha had the audacity to say that the people of Portland were going to give the freedom of that city to the Minister of Works. The people of Portland saw the potential of such a port, beat South Australia to it and obtained the benefit of the freight that would otherwise have been shipped from this State.

Mr. Heaslip: What was the recommendation of the Public Works Committee?

Mr. McKEE: I am not a member of that committee and have not heard many of its recommendations. It is like a secret society. Who killed the proposal for a silo at Appila?

Mr. Heaslip: There is no doubt about that!

Mr. McKEE: Members opposite have made much play about unemployment, but they have carefully avoided the situation in Victoria and other States.

Mr. McAnaney: Victoria has less than half our unemployment.

Mr. McKEE: That State is to have increased prices. The Government has to have more Loan money to solve the problem, and that is why it is appealing to the Commonwealth Government. I suggest that the member read about it. I think the Commonwealth Government has given the least assistance to South Australia, and I do not think I need to tell the House why. The fact that this is the only Labor State on the mainland probably has something to do with it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKEE: Furthermore, we cannot dismiss the Commonwealth Government's financial commitments in Vietnam, but that matter has not been mentioned.

Mr. Heaslip: What line is it on?

Mr. McKEE: It is associated with the economic circumstances of this State and the Loan Estimates. Whence do members think we get Loan money? Money has been allocated for defence, and that has something to do with South Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: My word it has!

Mr. McKEE: If this money had not been allocated for the phoney war in Vietnam but had been allocated in Australia, we would not have the present crisis in Australia. The member for Rocky River knows that no-one can deny that the situation in Vietnam has brought about this Commonwealth crisis. It was announced last night in the Commonwealth Budget speech that the defence expenditure would increase by 34 per cent to \$1,000,000,000. Whether or not the majority of the people support the phoney war in Vietnam, the people have to pay for it.

Mr. Hall: Do you support the Commonwealth's action there?

Mr. McKEE: I do not support the spending of money in Vietnam.

Mr. Rodda: You don't support troops in Vietnam?

Mr. McKEE: Of course I do not.

Mr. Rodda: What is wrong with it?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that we are straying from the Loan Estimates. The member was in order when he was saying that the money being spent on defence could be better spent on Loan works, but he has been taken away into a discussion of the conflict in Vietnam, and that is out of order.

Mr. McKEE: In regard to the Loan Estimates, the longer the conflict in Vietnam goes on, the costlier it will get. If the people accept this expenditure in Vietnam, they must accept the responsibilities and hardships that go hand in glove with war. It is an undeclared war, but there is no doubt that we are at war.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. You said that the member was being taken away into a discussion on Vietnam, but I understood that the member introduced the subject. You ruled that he should not go on talking about it but, since you gave your direction, he has been talking about nothing else but the war in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member introduced the subject, as stated by the member of Alexandra, and emphasized that he thought the amount of money being spent in Vietnam could be better spent in Australia in

providing employment. Members of the Opposition led the honourable member to express an opinion about whether he believed in the war in Vietnam, whether he thought the conflict was right or wrong, etc. I then told the honourable member that the discussion on the war in Vietnam was out of order. He was in order when he first mentioned the subject. I ask the member for Port Pirie to link his remarks with the Loan Estimates before the Committee.

Mr. McKEE: It is nice to know that I have drawn some fire and have put some heat into the subject. I congratulate the Government on its budgeting in these Loan Estimates. Members opposite will be remaining in their quiet seats on the Opposition benches, because what this Government has done will certainly bring relief to the State and to the people. The Opposition has made capital at the expense of people who are not happy about what has been done in another place concerning legislation by which we have tried to raise revenue to alleviate the situation. The actions of members of another place have not gone down well with the people.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): What a useless exercise it is in discussing the Loan Estimates to be side tracked into so many devious paths that have nothing whatever to do with the Estimates! Certain works are vitally necessary in South Australia and the money is not available to complete them, as Government members know. When I say that, I am not apportioning blame to the Government for the deficiency in the money it received on the Loan Account. As finances are worked at present, if the State is to progress it must have more money. If the money can be obtained by any means other than direct taxation on the people of this State, so much the better. However, the Government will not get out of this. It will need to impose extra taxation if it is going to complete the works that must be completed. Therein lies the Government's trouble. It must have the money, but from where is it going to get it? It might have got it from Commonwealth sources on the Loan Account, but it did not. Therefore, important works in South Australia, which should not be held up, are held up. The sum of money the Government has received from its various sources of revenue is not sufficient to meet the full programme of development necessary in this State.

I will not go into the various items of development in detail. However, the Taillem Bend to Keith main, which has been referred to several times, is an important work because upon it is dependent the production that is go-

ing to come from a vast area of country which is at present out of production but which is extremely capable of production. This area does not have local water supplies; therefore it cannot carry to its full capacity for 12 months of the year. Cattle has to be moved, as it cannot drink water as salty as the sea. The main was provided to bring this vast area of country from Taillem Bend to Keith into production. Each year it is kept out of production, a tremendous economic loss is suffered by the people of South Australia because say what you will about it, the basis of South Australia's economy is its primary production. The Government has (and wise Administration brought it into existence) a large industrial economy, which is of only comparatively recent origin. If a State is to get the best results from its primary production it is always best for it to sell its products locally. We have been able to produce vast surpluses and send them overseas. However, in addition to our land production, it was necessary also to have an industrial population. The two are completely compatible and work in the best interests of each other when the primary producer has his products consumed by the population in his State and the surplus is sent away. However, this procedure has broken down.

I want to correct one impression amongst honourable members opposite. They say that the Government's lack of finance is partially the result of a reduction in returns from the land in South Australia. That is not absolutely correct. To a limited degree—to the extent of about 10,000,000 bushels of wheat—it may be. However, the price of wool has increased and prices of various other items are recovering and are fairly stable, although the price of fresh fruit and other products is still too low for producers to receive an adequate return. The drought in New South Wales probably cost the farming community about \$1,000,000,000. That is the figure given in statistics, and I accept it. The part of that sum other than the overdrafts and so necessary to produce it was spending power, and nothing has taken its place. It is a loss and it is what happens when primary production is reduced by drought or other natural visitations causing a reduction in crops. If there were a reduction of \$20,000,000, \$30,000,000 or \$100,000,000 in value in a year it would not be replaced in that year, and the impact would have to be felt throughout the community. However, the reduction in South Australia was not as great as that,

so I advise the Government not to take the line of argument that the reduction was so much in South Australia this year that it had an adverse effect on State finances. It was not severe enough for that.

I am not talking politically, but there is unrest amongst people in the country. I have an illuminating document from a vast primary-producer organization, which intends to hold a meeting on August 22. I shall read only the motion to come before that meeting, which states:

That the United Farmers and Graziers Co-operative Society Limited take the necessary steps to investigate and ascertain the true causes of continually rising costs of the primary producer and to investigate the reason for the inability of the consumer to purchase his needs without having to resort to borrowing by hire-purchase or other means and that the results of this inquiry be brought to the notice of the State and Federal Governments and members of Parliament.

Mr. Hughes: Is that the meeting that the reverend gentleman is going to address?

Mr. QUIRKE: No. On every occasion when, through lack of finance, some major instrumentality has to be stopped, not only that organization is checked but production is prevented. I think it was Adam Smith who said that the wealth of a country was the production of its people. That is true and so is the fact that today we have many extraneous introductions between the producer and the people that have an adverse effect on the economy of Australia. Nevertheless, production of all types is the basis of a country's wealth: there is no other basis of wealth. When a State falls down, even in one year, then at least for that year an element of production is lost. That is why I regret the present position.

Less is provided for education in the Loan Estimates this year than was provided last year. I think all honourable members will regret that. However, I will not criticize it, because I take it that there was a measure of responsibility and a measure of urgency that rendered that necessary. However, like the lack of production, it is also a very backward step not to be able to provide for the increase in the schooling of our children.

We know it is necessary to increase school accommodation. I have an overcrowded primary school at Clare, and we want to use the existing high school (which has about an acre of land attached to it) to take half of the primary school enrolment and so give us two primary schools. We want to build a new high school, but although the land is

there this apparently cannot be done. This matter was investigated, and I was hoping that work could have been started on this school last year. About \$500,000 would be involved to erect the sort of school being built these days, and the money just is not there. In the meantime, we have teachers working under extreme difficulties, with overcrowded classrooms. I was in one of these classrooms not long ago, and I think the only thing that prevented the teacher and the students from falling out of it was keeping the door firmly closed. That position cannot continue. I was thinking and hoping the position at Clare could be alleviated this year by at least a start being made.

Mr. Hughes: You are building up a good case for Commonwealth aid.

Mr. QUIRKE: I think every honourable member knows what I am doing. We must have money for these things, and I think we should concentrate on ways and means of obtaining it. However, in the meantime the State is suffering. I deprecate the attitude of the member for Port Pirie. Everybody likes the honourable member, but I cannot appreciate him when he gets on that hobby horse of his about members on this side representing the wealthy and members of his Party representing the poor and downtrodden workers. If we go down to General Motors-Holden's we see everybody going to work in a Holden car, and those people do not look too downtrodden to me. I have yet to find where the people that I represent are wallowing in filthy wealth, and I assure the honourable member they are not. In fact, there are very few amongst the main body of people in South Australia who can be subject to the criticism of the honourable member that they have too great a surplus of this world's wealth and that they should (according to his idea, I think) be milked of it so that it is spread out amongst the multitude. In my opinion, if it were so spread out it would not buy chewing gum for all of them.

That sort of argument is no good, and I think every honourable member here knows that. We should no longer attempt to divide the haves and have nots, for that idea went out with blade shears, hessian socks, and bow-yangs. If we are to call this community anything at all today we must call it a middle-class community. I want to see everybody getting his due. In my opinion, we can and must have due regard to everybody's needs, but we have lost our vision. Many people say that we must get thousands more people

through the universities, but when we do that what are we going to do with them? There are plenty of opportunities and there is plenty of need for many of those people, but there is also a need for the people who do not want to go to the university but who just want to have the company of their wife and kids, to tend their garden, to have a good job, and to live their life that way. Such people as those are the backbone of any country.

I join with others in deploring the fact that so many people are unemployed today. This need not have happened, and it would not happen if there were some continuity of the supply of money by the Commonwealth to the States according to their needs. Unfortunately, that is not the position. How much progress do honourable members opposite think we will make out of the present Budget? What we are deficient today will have to be made up over the years, and this will be extremely difficult unless a flush comes into the stream of finances. I am not going to discuss the various items of these Estimates. No matter what the Government does, it does not have sufficient money. That is the answer to the whole problem, and until it is realized that the States in this country need this money we will always be on this miserable pittance whereby we are struggling for survival and the progress of the State is constantly retarded.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I should like to say one or two things that are relevant to this debate, and I believe there will be some advantage in studying the matters to which I shall refer. There has been much criticism of these Loan Estimates. This criticism has not been of over-spending; in fact, the total amount of the Estimates is very closely defined by the sum available to the Treasurer. Actually, last year the Estimates were overspent heavily. Although when they were presented to Parliament they provided for a balance, they finished up being overspent, the explanation for this being that the Government did not want to curtail expenditure because that might have some adverse effect on employment. I respect that opinion. However, I point out to honourable members opposite that it is the general policy of the Government that is causing unemployment. It is not a specific matter of whether or not the Government spends \$2,000,000 in Loan funds: it is the general policy that has led to the changed direction of this State.

We must recognize that as regards natural advantages this State is not in the same position as the other States. The only permanent

river that we have has to be shared with two other States that have a prior right to the water, and we have no great reserves of fuel available to us, although there is a possibility of suitable fuel being found. In those circumstances this State over a long period has had to put developmental projects in the forefront. While we were increasing our production and our development, and while we were getting new industries, there was a high rate of employment, there was overtime for the industrial worker, and there was a high level of business activity. However, when we divert funds to social expenditure or to other sources (desirable as that expenditure might be) when that money should go into developmental expenditure, we immediately see a slowing down of activity. If this social expenditure means an increase in taxation above the level of other States then activities will immediately slow down. If a boom is developing the first thing the Commonwealth Government does is to increase the bank rate and taxation to draw off the surplus spending power of the community. When this Government suggests an increase in taxation because we are below the Australian level, we take away from industrialists the opportunity to recoup the expenses they incur in maintaining sales in other States, and our industries largely depend on these sales. Manufacturers here have added transport and servicing costs and have to compete at a disadvantage with the Eastern States.

Today, the overtime and general employment position has deteriorated to such an extent that instead of South Australia having the lowest number of unemployed people in the Commonwealth (a proud position we held for many years), it is in the unhappy position of being the worst State in the Commonwealth in this regard. We are also losing the opportunity to receive additional Commonwealth funds. I read with some concern the Commonwealth Government's Budget, and noted the assistance being given to other States for special projects. For years the Commonwealth Government has made money available to the States for special projects: all States have shared in these moneys, which have been a tremendous advantage to them. This money has been an important source of decentralization in Australia, as it has been used for every type of development. Assistance has been given to States for the development of ports from which to export commodities; for reticulation of water (Western Australia has had important grants for many years); for developmental roads (the beef roads are a typical example,

but it is not confined to that—it has been used for mineral development roads); special grants have been made for reservoirs and dams; and for railway development. This State did receive some of this money but, at present, it is not receiving any. I believe the fault does not lie with the Commonwealth Government, but that a suitable project for assistance has not been developed by our officers.

If we consider the large sums provided as special grants by the Commonwealth Government for clearing land in Queensland, or for railway construction in New South Wales, or for beef roads and the development of Northern Australia, then I believe we have to take a much more active interest in developing Commonwealth-State relations with the object of receiving suitable financial assistance. The most suitable project at present is supplying gas from Gidgealpa to Adelaide, but, unfortunately, the project submitted to the Commonwealth Government is not adequate. I received a well considered and frank reply from the Treasurer to a question on notice about the gas reserves that are considered to be available at Moomba, but the answer indicated that the reserves are provided on the assumption that certain conditions disclosed by seismic examination are to be maintained. In the Gidgealpa field those conditions were not maintained. It is possible that if another borehole was put down in the Moomba field tomorrow and disclosed oil (and oil and gas are frequently associated) immediately no gas would be available for reticulation to Adelaide, as it would be kept in the field to maintain pressure to extract the oil.

We have submitted a request to the Commonwealth Government for a large sum on the assumption that seismic examination plus two bores is adequate to test this field: frankly, this is not sufficient. It took seven holes to test the Gidgealpa field: the last hole disclosed something which was not expected and which had a bearing on the ultimate quantity of gas available in that field. In this State we have to pay more attention to developmental expenditures. If we raise our productivity everyone benefits. It is not only wages paid to the industrial worker that is important: more important to him is whether he can supplement his weekly wages with overtime payments. Everyone knows that if overtime payments are available there will be an increased business activity in the community. That has all sorts of results in connection with development and prosperity. Many reasons have been given for the slowing down

of the building industry. I do not attach much importance to the criticism of the Government that it commenced its term by partially changing the previous Government's policy, so that, instead of Government money being provided purely for the buying of new houses, a small sum would be made available for the purchase of old houses. Although that was an unwise decision, I do not believe it is the key to the present problem. I believe the key is that the present cost of housing is so high that most intending purchasers (particularly newly married couples) cannot afford to buy houses.

In reply to a recent question asked by the Leader of the Opposition, the Treasurer said that about 370 houses were at present held by the Housing Trust ready for occupation. That immediately raises another question: why are valuable modern houses not being sold? Why are purchasers not waiting to occupy them? For years, people were waiting for houses to be finished. The present problem arises from the general level of prosperity in the community. If intending purchasers had the benefit of the overtime that they have had until recently, they might be able to meet the requirements stipulated by the lending institutions. Although I am not sure, I believe that that requirement represents a net income of \$34 (after allowing for commitments in regard to mortgage repayments, rates and taxes, and hire-purchase instalments). That means that a person must receive an income of probably more than \$46 a week and that, while he was receiving overtime, he might have met the requirement.

I was informed only this week that finance at the Commonwealth Bank was immediately available, involving a waiting period of probably not more than three months. We can therefore see how important it is for the industrial worker to be able to supplement his weekly wage, so that he can purchase a house. South Australia is not paying sufficient attention to development at present. The first general group of lines on the Estimates, under the State Bank, comprises moneys provided for the purposes fairly closely associated with development. Actual payments in this group last year totalled \$3,325,000 (a reduction of last year's estimate), and \$2,140,000 is proposed this year. However, estimated repayments (the drawing back of money previously lent) totals \$2,449,000. The net result is that no money whatsoever is being provided by the Government for an important group of items that affect development work. Actually, the Government is drawing back \$309,000 net.

That clearly illustrates how we have drifted from the policy that has been recognized by all members as being satisfactory for the State's development. Under the previous policy, we were able to attract industry and revenues; we were able to provide full employment, with rising standards; and over many years we were able to have complete budgetary equilibrium. Indeed, if it were not for the fact that substantial sums were left in the Treasury when the last Government went out of office, these Estimates would be a complete dream. They could be forgotten altogether, if it were not for the fact that when the new Government came into office, there was a fixed interest-bearing deposit in the Commonwealth Bank of about \$38,000,000, which represented a complete balancing of trust and deposit accounts, in addition to a surplus of about \$1,200,000. If it were not for that fact, the present Government's position would be extremely desperate. I am not one to say that South Australia has no future; it has a future, and can develop and prosper. However, I say advisedly that we cannot continue to chase butterflies (as we have been doing in much of our public policy), and that we cannot try to maintain a standard of taxation and social expenditure higher than that of the other Australian States.

The Commonwealth taxation reimbursements to this State are remarkably generous. The allocation of Loan moneys to this State is also remarkably generous—over 13.7 per cent, for less than 10 per cent of the nation's population. That is because we have spent a large proportion of our available funds upon Loan works. The moment we do not spend that money upon Loan works, that quota of Loan moneys will gradually but surely decrease. The Treasurer himself was probably involved in this, if not on this occasion on a previous occasion, when he drew attention to the fact that the previous Government, having certain surpluses in the Loan Fund, proceeded to spend them. For what purpose were those Loan funds provided by the Commonwealth? Obviously, they were provided for that very purpose. Why were we paying interest upon this money if we were not going to spend it usefully? If that money had not been spent on public works, the quota of 13.7 per cent would have been reduced. The fact that the quota is so high is because such a large percentage of available moneys has been spent upon Loan works in this State and has not been wasted or pushed around in social expenditure.

So the \$4,000,000 that we had and were able to use for enlarging the programme did not impair the position for the succeeding Government: actually, it has helped protect the position for this Government. However, be that as it may, we as a State shall have to give up the idea that we can incur social expenditures above the Australian average because, if we do not give up that idea, inevitably we shall find ourselves slipping back farther and farther, since in other States today there are able Administrations and good competition for attracting secondary industry. In fact, as honourable members have noticed with some concern, in the last six months some of the other States have been signally successful in establishing industries, some of which could well have been established here. I shall say nothing further on that for the moment.

I want now to say a few words on the implications of spending trust funds. As outlined in the Treasurer's statement, there will be a substantial temporary diversion of trust funds to provide the necessary cash to enable the Government to carry on. It is not necessary for me to say that the use of trust funds is inherently a dangerous policy. In this House we have time and time again passed laws making it illegal for other people to use trust funds for their own purposes. In fact, I think that the Public Finance Act, which at present enables public trust funds to be used for public purposes, may well be examined. Another disability arises from the use of trust funds. For a considerable period we had in the Commonwealth Bank funds to the extent of \$30,000,000 to \$38,000,000. These moneys were suspense account funds and included some \$12,000,000 of trust funds, but, if those moneys were now there standing to our credit, we should be in a position to obtain great support from the Commonwealth Bank in the establishing of the gas pipeline now becoming so necessary. That matter was discussed casually with the Governor of the Commonwealth Bank. He did not commit himself at all in a general discussion, but I was surprised at the extent to which he listened without raising objection. The fact that we are now reducing our deposits in the Commonwealth Bank automatically hinders us in any future negotiations. What will the position be if the pipeline does not materialize? I hope that will not happen. I believe the Commonwealth Government has a direct obligation to assist us with the pipeline which, after all, would be a national project that would place South Australia upon a

sound footing and would overcome one of the great limitations we have suffered for so many years.

True, we have received great assistance from Leigh Creek and at present the Leigh Creek coalfield is a good money-spinner apart from the fact that we are getting cheap fuel from it. However, we all know that that coalfield has a limited life and that in years to come the ratio of overburden to the amount of coal being mined will gradually increase. We also know that the power requirements of this State are bound to increase enormously. This matter is of vital importance to the Government. The Minister of Works will know that every year he will depend to an increasingly greater extent upon power for pumping water. All people settling on this side of the ranges will ultimately have to be served from the River Murray, so we are interested in this project not only from the point of view of making fuel available for industry but also from the point of view of ourselves as consumers. It is important that we get this fuel as soon as possible. The Commonwealth Government cannot escape an obligation to assist us there but, assuming just for the sake of argument that the Commonwealth Government for some reason or other does not come to the party and help us, is the pipeline beyond our capacity to build without Commonwealth assistance? I believe we could not finance it so cheaply without Commonwealth assistance but I would not for one moment agree that the pipeline was beyond our capacity to build without that assistance. At present we are duplicating the Morgan to Whyalla main, and the cost of that will not be much less than the cost of a pipeline from Gidgealpa. We are doing that work within the structure of our normal Loan Estimates. If we had to advance the money ourselves, we would have to make some concessions and go quietly on other public expenditure for the time being, but the ultimate result would justify that course 100 times.

I regret that these Estimates do not measure up to what I consider to be necessities for development. I could give instances of where money was urgently needed. For instance, it is urgently needed in regard to the Murray River salinity problem. We have to give much more impetus to the construction of the Chowilla dam if we are to avert a condition that will otherwise arise in the near future. These matters are scarcely featured in the Estimates.

Other members have mentioned other instances where expenditure of a direct developmental nature would get immediate returns, but I shall not deal with that matter tonight. I support the adoption of the first line. I am sorry that the document before us does not give a more active and direct impetus to the development of the State. It is apparent that we have assumed responsibility for much social expenditure, which will not increase productivity but which will involve us in increased annual interest charges. I hope that the general policies being pursued will be closely examined and that the Government will adopt the traditional principle that development must have a high priority if this State is to succeed economically.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the adoption of the first line and add my compliments to the Treasurer, Cabinet Ministers and senior departmental officers for the excellent manner in which they have equitably allocated the Loan Funds available in order to continue the development of the State, maintain existing services and maintain employment at as high a level as is possible in the existing Australia-wide economic slow down.

The Leader took a varied line of criticism. Apparently he, like other Opposition members, takes different lines of criticism, depending on the subject being discussed. If we are discussing the state of the economy or employment, the Government is criticized for not spending money: if a deficit is being discussed, the Government is criticized for spending too much. It appears to an impartial observer like myself that the Leader and his cohorts are pursuing a policy of selective criticism and thereby chasing headlines in the daily press. Doubtless, they receive those headlines.

The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) yesterday referred to works under construction that had been promised by the former Government and claimed that the present Treasurer, when delivering his policy speech before the last election, had promised that the Labor Party, if returned as a Government, would carry out all the works that were promised by the Playford Administration during the election campaign. To put the member for Torrens and other Opposition members correct about what the Treasurer said on that occasion, I quote from page 36 of his policy speech:

The point I am more concerned to make known to the people of this State is that any public works recommended by the Government which are estimated to cost £100,000 or more

must be referred to the Public Works Standing Committee and any that are already recommended will be proceeded with under the new Administration, and we have the assurance of the industrial organizations that, wherever it is possible to speed up the completion of these works, they will do their utmost to assist.

That puts an entirely different light on the matter from that which the member for Torrens endeavoured to have us believe. Opposition members claim to be quoting from the policy speech delivered by the Treasurer but, unfortunately, on many occasions they misquote and deliberately misinterpret. I am particularly pleased about the part of the Estimates dealing with Loans to Producers, for which the amount has been maintained at a high level. When referring to Loans to Producers in introducing these Estimates, the Treasurer said:

The sum of \$1,359,000 was advanced by the bank under the Loans to Producers Act in 1965-66. This amount was made up of \$826,000 advanced to distilleries, fruit canneries, fruit packing houses, cool stores and other processors of fruit, . . .

The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) said much about the river districts that I have the great honour to represent. Apparently, he has set himself up as an expert in this respect. I notice that he is in the Chamber at the moment, but in a rather restful state. Apparently he sets himself up as an expert not only on political systems but also on the affairs of my district. He made some scathing remarks about Socialism. Apparently, he does not understand what the word means. I realize (as do many others who believe in Socialism) that the co-operative movement is one of the basic steps in Socialism. For the benefit of the member for Light, I point out that co-operatives are owned by the growers concerned and they are the only people who benefit from the operations of the co-operative companies.

Mr. Hurst: Does he favour their abolition?

Mr. CURREN: I am sure that growers in my district would be against the abolition of any of their co-operatives because all the co-operatives function successfully and are of great benefit to the settlers in the area. The profits made by co-operatives are returned to the shareholders in the form of rebates, and these co-operatives are definitely not private enterprise undertakings.

Mr. McAnaney: How do you work that out?

Mr. CURREN: I am concerned with the co-operatives in my district and not with those

with which the member for Stirling is concerned.

Mr. McAnaney: I belong to dozens of co-operatives.

Mr. CURREN: Does the honourable member regard them as private enterprise undertakings? He does not answer. In most cases the co-operatives established in my district have received great assistance from loans to producers not only in their establishment but in the expansion that has taken place in recent years. It is pleasing to see that further funds will be available during the forthcoming 12 months for the extension of the co-operatives, which are of such great benefit to the fruit-growing industry in the Upper Murray districts. In his remarks on Socialism, apparently the member for Light did not take into account the community hotels that also exist in my district and are recognized throughout Australia as the finest group of country hotels in the land. I fail to understand how the member for Light could make the statements he did, but apparently he sets himself up as an expert on political systems. As he failed in a political science course at the Adelaide university I suppose we can grant him the status he claims.

Mr. Nankivell: Who told you he failed?

Mr. CURREN: He did; he likes me. The Loan Estimates refer to undertakings in the District of Chaffey. A sum of \$15,000 has been provided to the Renmark Irrigation Trust for preliminary planning and design for the new pumping station and channel rehabilitation system, and officers of the trust have told me that work is proceeding as quickly as possible. In the section of the Estimates dealing with irrigation, reference is made to a rising main and chlorination plant to be installed for the domestic water supply of the Cooltong settlement, and \$100,000 is provided for the continuation of the work of renewing and resiting the water mains for the Berri North town water supply. A sum of \$70,000 is provided for a branch of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science to be established at Berri, and this work was announced some months ago. No doubt in the general sum allocated for irrigation provision is made for many other minor works to be undertaken in my district. As I do not wish to delay the passage of the Estimates, I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): In the allocation of \$700,000 for advances for homes, \$200,000 is allocated as selective financing for the purchase of older houses. This

evening the member for Port Pirie said that every person unemployed was his concern, and the member for Chaffey said that he was concerned for people unemployed in the State. However, the Treasurer has allocated \$200,000 for the purchase of old houses. He has deliberately allocated this sum not for development or for building new houses (both of which purposes would provide employment) but for the purchase of older houses. This is not inadvertent, but is the deliberate policy of the Treasurer for he referred to it in his explanation of the Estimates. How does the Treasurer justify this expenditure on the purchase of existing assets? Does he intend to continue with this policy of diverting funds that could be used for the erection of new houses?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This is the only speech I can recall in which no reference was made to my policy speech of last year. However, in that speech I said that this Government would provide \$200,000 for this purpose. This sum was made available in last year's Estimates and it will be allocated again this year. From reports I have received from the State Bank, I understand that the money has been used with discretion. The bank has been able to provide money for the purchase of houses in the inner suburbs and, in many cases, couples who have wished to get a smaller type of house have been able to move to their advantage. In addition, much work has been provided for tradesmen in alterations, painting, and maintenance of the houses bought. Although the programme is not as spectacular as would be the case with the building of houses, there is still a section of the community that is dependent upon the repainting, renovation and alteration of houses. In these circumstances, the Government does not intend to make any alteration to the provision made on these Loan Estimates similar to that made last year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disappointed with the Treasurer's explanation. It stands to reason that when money is short, as it is now, and when we are anxious to provide all the employment we can for industry, especially the building industry, it will be more effective to use all our money on the building of new houses rather than using a sum such as this on the financing of already existing houses. I know it was in the Government's policy speech that this would be done. It sounds strange to hear the Treasurer now relying on the policy speech to persist in doing something when there are so many things in that policy speech that he has already abandoned. I ask him to reconsider

this matter. It stands to reason that we will get better value, in the circumstances in which we now find ourselves, if every penny is used for new buildings. This, incidentally, was the policy of the former Government, which always took the view that it was better for the State, and that it would provide for more housing, for employment, and so on, if everything was spent on new housing.

Surely our situation is bad enough now to cause the Government to revise its policy on this matter, to make an exception in the present circumstances, and to get back to the policy that existed before the last election. Even if it is only a temporary thing, it will do something to help, because it will create more employment and provide more housing. That is just what we want at this time, and it is what the Treasurer has said time and time again that we want. Therefore, why he should insist on sticking on this matter to what he said in his rotten policy speech, I do not know, and I ask him with great respect to reconsider the matter and to divert this money to the building of new houses, because that is what we need in South Australia.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The member for Mitcham has accurately expressed what I proposed to say. At the time the Treasurer made his policy speech the circumstances were completely different from now, for then we had a building industry that was more than fully employed. We did not then have the Builders Labourers' Union making nasty remarks publicly about the Government's lack of provisions to keep the building industry occupied, as we have had in the last few weeks, and we did not then have circumstances of a run-down economy such as we are experiencing now. Even if the policy enunciated then by the Treasurer was justified (which I do not admit), it certainly is not justified now. It is idle for the Treasurer to say that some employment is involved in alterations and renovations to existing houses. Indeed, I think that is a rather poor excuse to make for this policy. I venture the opinion that the people who are assisted to buy these older type houses are not people who are able to or who desire to make extensive alterations to the houses they purchase. If the Treasurer can demonstrate to this Committee that when applications are being considered under these provisions they are granted only in those cases where the people vacating the older houses are in fact building a new and smaller house somewhere else, then there may be some justification for his policy. He did not tell us that, and I presume he is not able to tell us that,

although he hinted that in some cases that may be occurring.

However, I think that this Committee would need some assurance from the Treasurer that in fact this is the policy of the lending institution, and that unless it can be demonstrated by the applicant that the outgoing person from the old house being purchased under these provisions can give some firm undertaking that he will soon set to work to build another house, then I submit the Treasurer's contention in this matter is not valid. I agree with the member for Mitcham that there were strong pressures on the previous Government to do something similar to what the present Government is doing in this matter. However, they were resisted because this is essentially a Loan programme for developmental purposes and for no other purposes, not even to bolster the Budget. In the opinion of members on this side, we are not utilizing the funds of this programme for the purpose for which they should be provided.

Mr. McANANEY: I object strongly to the fact that the Government is withdrawing funds

from the State Bank. Much has been said about the Commonwealth Government's action. In the last 18 months the bank's funds have increased considerably as the result of money being provided by the Commonwealth Government for housing loans, yet this Government is taking money out of the State Bank. During that 18 months the State Bank disposed of its Commonwealth Government holdings to the extent of \$3,000,000. The Commonwealth has provided great assistance to the State Bank, yet the State Bank itself is withdrawing funds, and this means, apparently, that the bank can lend less money for housing. Therefore, it is the private sector of the building trade that is being hit. I think this is a great mistake. Perhaps the bank is diverting to the Housing Trust money that could be lent to private people. It is a great mistake to reduce the funds to this extent.

First line—State Bank, \$2,140,000—passed.
Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, August 18, at 2 p.m.