

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, May 26, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

SAVINGS BANK HOUSE LOANS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some years ago Parliament passed the Homes Act, the purpose of which was to make available a guaranteed bank advance to persons with limited means. It was possible to get an advance up to 95 per cent to build a house. That money was made available to the State Bank, Savings Bank, and certain building societies. The Treasurer announced yesterday that the Savings Bank's present policy was to lend money only to persons who already had substantial deposits. That decision was first made in about November last year and, at the time it was made, certain questions were asked in the House. I remember one from the member for Burnside in which was suggested a direct repudiation of an agreement by the bank that it should provide money for loans. Certain correspondence passed between myself, as Treasurer, and the bank, but no conclusion was reached. Will the Treasurer consult with bank officials about the position that now arises as a result of the decision, which means that the purposes of the Homes Act have, to a great extent, been nullified by the conditions that they are placing on a person's getting a loan from the Savings Bank? Will he also consult with the trustees of the bank to see whether they will, at least, provide a substantial part of the loans that they are making to persons who would qualify under the Homes Act and who, incidentally, would be the type of person that I believe Parliament would be most anxious to assist?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Whilst I am prepared to consult further with the Manager and the Chairman of the bank, I think I stated yesterday that a previous arrangement had been arrived at in 1963. If the Leader wishes to look at yesterday's *Hansard* I think he will also find that I said that, because of competition from other banks, people with deposits in the Savings Bank of South Australia were withdrawing those deposits and placing them in some other bank, with a view to receiving immediate assistance from that bank. I believe that was occurring in 1963. When I heard of this matter I immediately called for a complete report from the bank on its policy. I doubt

whether the Leader is strictly correct in his statement concerning the Homes Act, but I shall obtain a further report from the bank on the matter.

GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: Following statements made in the House yesterday concerning the wine industry, has the Premier any further information regarding surplus grapes from the 1965 vintage?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia reported to the Government at the end of last month that a surplus of wine grapes would occur. The council had negotiated with a winery, and had made arrangements for the grapes to be processed, provided that the Government would finance an emergency co-operative to handle the matter. The arrangements with the winery were to process from 2,000 to 3,000 tons. The Government forthwith arranged with the State Bank of South Australia to provide finance under the Loans to Producers Act for processing up to 3,000 tons of grapes. It was then considered that the total surplus grapes would be accommodated under these arrangements.

On May 24, 1965, I received a letter from the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia informing me that the intake was proceeding smoothly and according to schedule, although the original estimate of 3,000 tons would be exceeded. Quite independently of the emergency pool operation the council was sponsoring the intake of 1,000 tons of gordo grapes into another winery at Morphett Vale. The Secretary of the council further stated that, at that stage, a further 500 tons of grapes appeared to be unplaced. He added that some sporadic buying and cancellations by winemakers made accurate assessment difficult, but he had endeavoured to present the situation as faithfully as possible. Inquiries had been made at the two wineries processing the grapes under arrangements with the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia to see whether they could extend their intake but the companies were non-committal at that stage.

The statements of the honourable member for Burra concerning arrangements for the processing of surplus grapes are remarkable for their inaccuracy, and indicate an almost complete lack of knowledge on his part about the matter. The honourable member referred to a contract which the Government had entered into for the disposal of the surplus crop and described it as being "cock-eyed", and said it should be tabled in the House for examination. The

plain facts of the matter are that the Government has not entered into any contract. What the Government has done is to arrange through the State Bank the provision of finance to enable the processing of up to 3,000 tons of grapes. The Wine Grape Growers' Emergency Co-operative Ltd. has completed the necessary arrangements with the State Bank and the grapes are now being processed.

If, as the honourable member asserts, some growers are unaware of the terms and conditions under which their grapes are being accepted, it can only be because they have neglected to obtain this information from their own organization which is operating the emergency co-operative. I point out that the arrangements made by the Government with the State Bank are exactly the same as those made by the previous Government (of which the honourable member was a Minister) for the surplus grapes of the 1964 vintage, except of course that the surplus tonnage in 1964 was a lesser amount than the 3,000 tons in 1965. I also point out that 3,000 tons was the figure supplied to the Government by the Wine Grape Growers' Council of South Australia as being the estimated surplus for this season. I should add that official correspondence from the Wine Grape Growers' Council indicates complete satisfaction with the arrangements that the Government and the State Bank have made to deal with this matter.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Premier say what will be the Government's attitude to the provision of further finance to process an additional 500 tons of surplus grapes in the current year?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am prepared to say that the Government will consider this matter. I point out, however, that the resources available for assistance to all primary producers are not unlimited. It will be necessary for the Government to consider priorities within the limits of the resources available. At this stage I can only say that the problems of the wine grape growers have been very favourably considered by the Government up to the present.

Mr. CURREN: Yesterday I received a letter from the Secretary of the Upper Murray Grape Growers' Association pointing out the various difficulties being experienced by the industry now. As it is a rather lengthy letter, I shall summarize it as follows:

During the 1964 vintage, 19,000 tons of sultanas were processed into wine and brandy. This resulted in about 1,600 tons of wine-grapes being surplus at the end of the normal vintage. An emergency co-operative pool was formed to

process this tonnage. A similar situation has arisen again this year. Proprietary winemakers have taken advantage of this situation and have bought a considerable tonnage of sultanas and wine-grapes at £15 a ton. This figure is several pounds a ton below the cost of production figure established by the Prices Commissioner. Published accounts and balance-sheets of several winemakers show that dividends vary between 18 and 27 per cent on capital. The price of wine to the consuming public has been steadily increased in recent years.

Can the Premier say whether the Government is prepared to permit the exploitation of the growers and the consuming public by the winemakers, bearing in mind the prices paid to growers for grapes of the 1965 vintage? Also, can he say whether the Government is prepared to legislate for minimum prices to be paid for grapes by the winemakers for the 1966 vintage and future vintages?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: In reply to the honourable member's first question, the Government does not propose to permit any section of the community to be exploited. In reply to his second question, the present Government, having taken office as recently as March of this year, has examined the situation and ascertained that there is no legal authority to enable it to enforce payment of prices recommended by the South Australian Prices Commissioner for the 1965 vintage. An amendment to the Prices Act would be necessary to give the Government this power. I point out however that even if the Government secured authority to fix minimum prices obviously no winery could be forced to buy grapes against its will.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: With a view to ameliorating the grape surplus position in future years, can the Premier say whether consideration has been given by the Government to taking appropriate action to divert to the drying racks sound grapes suitable for drying, which would otherwise go to the wineries?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I think I have given a reasonable reply on this matter. Even if the Government secured authority to fix prices, no winery could be forced to buy grapes against its will. We can attempt to introduce all types of legislation and we can attempt to make suggestions along certain lines about what should be done, but there is no law in this land to compel any responsible grower to dry his grapes. There is no law in the land that I know of that will instruct a grower how to dispose of his grapes any more than there is

a law that tells certain people they must purchase the dried grapes. I should mention in passing that however good an organization may be and however desirable it may be for growers, in many cases, to recondition their equipment for drying purposes, there is still a dependence, in this State, on weather conditions. However good the Government's intentions may be it cannot alter that situation.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: What if the grapes are sound?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: However sound they may be they have to be dried and growers must wait for the appropriate weather. It should be realized that there have been grizzles from the industry for three years and that we have been in office only three months. We have not completed our investigations into the industry. However, when it is necessary I believe that the Government will be able to say what it has in mind. Before much longer (and, I hope, even before the next pruning season is completed) the Government will be able to make a real approach to this all-important matter.

MURRAY TOWN TO BOOLEROO ROAD.

Mr. HEASLIP: Prior to the defeat of the Playford Government I was assured that the road between Murray Town and Booleroo would be sealed. This road carries many school buses and is the road to the only hospital in the area. Because of its importance I had been promised that it would be sealed. However, following the Government's deferment of some projects and its complete dropping of others, and bearing in mind its policy—

Mr. Ryan: You wouldn't know what the policy was.

Mr. HEASLIP: Quite frankly I don't; I wish I did. Can the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether that road will be sealed in conformity with the promise made by the previous Government?

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

POORAKA SEWERS.

Mr. JENNINGS: During the term of office of the former Minister of Works I raised with him on innumerable occasions the question of the extension of sewers at Pooraka, and I have since raised the matter with the present Minister of Works. Has the Minister further information on the subject?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It gives me pleasure to inform the honourable member that Cabinet has given approval for the provision

of sewers for the Pooraka area at an estimated cost of £72,000. On the financial side the revenue to accrue from this rapidly developing area does not meet the return required, but there are still about 230 vacant allotments and, with full building development, the department expects that the ultimate revenue will soon reach a satisfactory figure. Water is at present available to all properties within the area, which can be briefly described as situated between Bridge and Montague Roads and Dry Creek. Financial provision for this work will be sought on the 1965-66 Loan Estimates, and the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department expects that it will be possible to commence the work about April, 1966.

RELIANCE SHIPPING COMPANY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Premier request the Commissioner of Police to investigate the activities of a firm or company known as Reliance Shipping Company? In about February of last year a person purporting to be employed by this company called on a constituent of mine in the Barossa Valley and intimated to her that he understood she was the owner of some shares in New Zealand Products Limited. He pointed out to her that this was a very poor investment, and he induced her to sign a document enabling the Reliance Shipping Company to dispose of the shares and to invest the proceeds in Reliance Shipping Company. The person who called on her pointed out that the proceeds from the sale, which would be at the face value, namely, £237, would bear interest at the rate of 8 per cent a year with the company which would be paid half-yearly. The first interest payment was made on July 1, 1964, namely, £7 2s. 6d. The next interest payment fell due at the end of the year, but prior to the end of the year my constituent received a letter from the Reliance Shipping Company dated October 30, 1964, as follows:

Dear Sir or Madam, This letter is sent to advise that from this half-yearly period the interest payable on your investment with us will be approximately six weeks late. This position is brought about by the period of time it takes to complete accounts from the closing of the books. Hoping you will bear with us in this instance. Yours truly, Reliance Shipping Company, L. T. Lee.

No interest payment, however, has been received. The constituent wrote to the company on March 13 this year and again on April 13, but received no reply. She also telephoned the office in Adelaide on April 1, and again on April 8, and was informed by the person who answered

the telephone that no assistance or information could be given to her. The solicitor for my constituent called at the office of the company in Adelaide on Monday of this week and was informed by a girl at that address that there was nobody there who could give any information, and that somebody called at the address periodically to pick up any mail left there. The letterhead of this company indicates that its head office is at 49, Lime Avenue, Mildura, and the branch office is at Lower Ground Floor, 49-51, Flinders Street, Adelaide. Because of the gravity of this matter will the Premier discuss it with the Commissioner of Police?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I shall confer with the Chief Secretary and will make a report available to the House when it has been prepared.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES.

Mr. RYAN: On numerous occasions I raised with the previous Government the question of building in the Port Adelaide district a Government block to house the various Government departments operating in that district. Port Adelaide district has the most Government offices of any city or town in this State outside the city of Adelaide. Apparently the previous Government was not interested, as my request fell on deaf ears. Because of its importance will the Minister of Works consider this matter to see whether something can be done soon?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member can be assured that much attention is being given to this problem. I am as much concerned as he is with conditions of public servants, including those at Port Adelaide. At present investigations are being made, but the decision now rests with others and I cannot anticipate it. I shall be pleased to give a considered reply on this matter soon.

LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSES.

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Housing say what is the average building cost of a house built under the £50-deposit scheme? If he cannot, will he obtain this information?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I will obtain that information.

MOUNT GAMBIER LAND.

Mr. BURDON: I have been told that some time ago at Mount Gambier land was purchased on which to build a workshop and office for the Public Buildings Department. Can the Minister of Works say whether this

information is correct and, if it is, when he expects this work to commence?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will call for a report and inform the honourable member of its contents.

STURT GORGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last year I suggested to the then Minister of Lands that the Sturt Gorge be made a national reserve because of its beauty. The former Minister (the honourable member for Burra) was kind enough to visit the area with me and climb part of the gorge. I think he was impressed but, unfortunately, he went out of office all too soon to take positive action in this matter. Will the Minister of Lands consider the request I made, and perhaps visit the gorge, because I am sure that, if he did, he would take whatever steps were in his power to make this gorge a national reserve?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be happy to consider this matter. I have, in common with the former Minister of Lands, a concern for reserves and the conserving of land for reserve purposes. I shall be happy to consider the situation and, if given the opportunity, I shall be pleased to climb over the rugged terrain referred to by the honourable member.

SALISBURY SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the new toilet block at the Salisbury Consolidated School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Education Department has been notified that the new toilet block at the Salisbury Consolidated School may be used from today. The keys for the toilet have been delivered to the headmaster.

STIRLING HIGHWAY.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Education obtained a report from the Minister of Roads about the construction of the Stirling Highway between Aldgate and Crafers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed by my colleague that construction of the Crafers-Stirling section of the freeway will commence when acquisition of land has been finalized. Construction of this section of the freeway will give relief to the portion of the section referred to. In regard to the Stirling-Aldgate section, investigations are in hand with a view to widening the existing pavement to 32ft. as far as practicable. This work will be carried out independently of the freeway section, to provide interim relief.

MILLICENT SOUTH PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Education any further information about tenders being called for the construction of the Millicent South Primary School?

The Hon. R. E. LOVEDAY: Yes. The Director, Public Buildings Department, informs me that tenders will close on June 22, 1965, and plans have been available for inspection since May 24.

RESEARCH CENTRES.

Mr. RODDA: I am concerned about the provision of hourly paid personnel staffing the research centres in the South-East, because great difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the necessary manpower for these centres. No doubt this position applies at these centres throughout the State. I understand that the position has been caused by the wages paid to employees not working in the department compared with those who are. The outside employees receive many fringe benefits whereas the Government employee has to pay rent and other charges. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider this difficult problem to see whether anything can be done?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be pleased to consider this matter. As the honourable member is aware, money was placed on the Supplementary Estimates for service payments, but I do not know whether this applies to employees to whom he referred.

TEA TREE GULLY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: On April 21 I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Works from the Tea Tree Gully council seeking the consideration of the Engineering and Water Supply Department in laying trunk mains to connect the various common effluent drains in the district. Has the Minister a reply to this request by the deputation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The deputation won my sincere admiration for the magnificent way it has applied itself to a difficult problem, that is, disposing of effluent to a ponding basin. I discussed this matter this morning with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the department, who told me that he would soon seek a conference with the council concerned and that he would make certain proposals, the details of which I do not think I should reveal now. However, I am sure the honourable member and the council will be satisfied with those proposals, which will, indeed, fairly completely meet their request.

LANGHORNE CREEK ROAD.

Mr. McANANEY: The previous Minister of Roads gave an assurance that the Langhorne Creek Road would be sealed by the end of 1966. Much work on the road has already taken place, but it has stopped at present. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain whether work will recommence on that road, and whether it will be sealed, as promised?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to ask my colleague for that information.

LAND TENURE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the land settlement scheme for returned soldiers was being planned with the Commonwealth Government, much discussion took place as to the terms under which soldier settlers would have their blocks allotted: whether the blocks would be allotted under a perpetual lease, or whether the people concerned would be allowed to have the freehold of those blocks. At the time, after much discussion, a compromise agreement was reached, which provided that the blocks would be allotted under a perpetual lease, with the soldier settler having the right to convert it to a freeholding after a period of 10 years had elapsed. Since the new Government has assumed office the Minister of Lands has announced that it is not the policy of the Government to allow any perpetual lease to become freehold. The returned soldiers under this scheme are concerned whether that will apply to the agreements already made containing the provision that I have mentioned. Honourable members will know that better prices are obtained on the sale of freehold properties than on leasehold properties, which have certain restrictions placed on them. Will the Minister of Lands inform me whether those soldier settlers will be able to convert their leasehold properties to freeholdings?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not entirely agree that freehold land has a higher resale value than leasehold land. I could name some leasehold properties that have been brought to my notice recently, the prices for which were far more than their actual values. I know the figures were much higher than they were a few years ago. However, the situation that has been outlined by the Leader will not affect soldier settlers who have entered into those agreements, and they will be adhered to.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I was pleased to hear the Minister say that the agreement that had been entered into would be honoured and that the policy regarding freeholding blocks would not be altered. However, I should like clarification on one or two points. Can the Minister say whether the freeholding will be under the same conditions and at the same price as previously? Secondly, in the event of a block being sold to some other person, will that block carry with it the right of freehold?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Regarding the first question, the Leader knows that the price fixed for these blocks is a matter that concerns not only the State Government but the Commonwealth Government, and I think this matter will be considered on the same basis as previously. The second question is one which I have not yet had time to look at, and on that matter I shall bring down a considered reply.

Mr. McANANEY: My experience with the Lands Department is that when applications have been made to have leasehold land subject to revaluation made freehold the values placed on it have been 20 times the rental value or at the rate of 5 per cent. I know of a case in July last year in which a departmental officer spent three days, travelled about 120 miles, assessed the rental value of leasehold land, and arrived at a figure of £57. An application was made to freehold that land before the present Government took office. The Government is to be congratulated because the applications already lodged have been dealt with. In this case, with a rental of £57, the department now asks £2,569 for that land and this is worked out on a rate of 2.2 per cent. This value was placed on unimproved land, the valuation of which is many times the valuation placed on similar unimproved land through the fence by the Land Tax Department. Can the Minister of Lands say whether there has been any change of Government policy with regard to the valuations being placed on land to be made freehold and, if so, what are the reasons?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It would be impossible for there to be a change of policy on this matter because our policy distinctly states that we would not freehold leasehold land. Therefore, it would be impossible to have a policy based on the situation outlined by the honourable member. If the honourable member will give me a specific case, I shall certainly have it investigated.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has any immediate plans for sewerage the Highbury-Dernancourt area near Hope Valley reservoir?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter is now before the Public Works Committee, which will be tendering a report soon.

WATER RATES.

Mr. COUMBE: Numerous requests have been made to me by pensioners and people on fixed incomes, who would prefer the method of frequent billing of water rates at regular intervals to the present system. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Works recently that he was prepared to reconsider a new method of assessment and of rendering accounts for water supplies, will he see whether it is possible to introduce a scheme, especially into the metropolitan area, to provide for more frequent readings of meters and rendering of accounts to users of water, somewhat along the lines of the system used by the electricity and gas supply authorities, which regularly bill their consumers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This matter is at present being considered, and it is hoped that with the installation of computers, which are under order by the Government and which would enable the Engineering and Water Supply Department to render accounts quarterly.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the reply given by the Minister of Works, the Government has under active consideration a scheme where payments for water rates will be made at more frequent intervals than at present, when the rates are paid after the period for which the water has been supplied. The Government of the day, the defeated Playford Government, considered this question closely to see whether there was any fair and equitable way of providing water accounts more quickly so as to enable people on fixed budgets to benefit from making small payments at intervals rather than one lump-sum payment. The Government found that the present system could not be changed to the system now suggested by the Minister. The new system would cause grave injustice to the people paying the bills, because two years' accounts would be brought in in one year. I hope that no action will be taken under the guise of making it easier, so that instead of the payments being as they are now at the end of the period, they would be paid at the

end of the period plus the new payment which would come immediately after. If the normal period for payment was June 30, a person would receive at that date his account for a full year's rating and then three months later would receive another account. That would cause a grave injustice to the consumer and I hope the Government will not lightly change the present system. I know that the suggested scheme would be attractive to the Treasury and bring in much more money. However, the change would mean that the consumer would be making a duplicated payment in the year in which the scheme was introduced.

Mr. Jennings: Where is the question?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I assure the Leader that the Government is well aware of the problems, and I assure him also that the one desire of this Government is to treat people fairly. There will be no doubling up when the alteration of rendering accounts is introduced, and there will be no duplication of payments. Details which have been carefully and skilfully worked out are at present being considered by Cabinet. It would be wrong for me to anticipate any decision, but I assure all members that if the change is made this will be done with justice.

RAILWAY FREIGHTS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was one of the Liberal and Country League members who had the privilege of hearing the Premier deliver his policy speech in the Westbourne Park Memorial Hall.

Mr. Ryan: I bet it was a good one.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Certainly it was. On that occasion the Premier said that railway freights must be increased and that railway freight tonnages had been relatively static at about 4,500,000 tons for the years 1955 to 1963 inclusive. He added that this state of affairs could not continue. Can he inform the House of his plans for an increase in railway freight patronage?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Railway freights and railway administration are in the very capable hands of the Minister of Transport in another place. He has a difficult task ahead of him and, for the information of honourable members, I believe that he is doing a good job in that capacity. With regard to an increase in railway freight, I understand that he intends to submit further legislation to the Parliament during this session. I am not sure of what that legislation will be because the Bill has not yet been drawn up. However, I shall endeavour to obtain as much information as I can about this

matter and give it to the honourable member when it is prepared.

MOUNT GAMBIER COURTHOUSE.

Mr. BURDON: About 2½ years ago the former Attorney-General indicated that it was the intention of the then Government to build new police courts at Mount Gambier. Because of the rapid development and congestion in the courts there, it was suggested that it was necessary to build two courts. Can the Attorney-General indicate whether this necessary rebuilding is likely to take place and, if it is, when?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that the Mount Gambier courthouse is old and inadequate for present purposes. I have seen the sketch plans for the new courthouse building which were referred to me to satisfy me and members of my department that the new building would meet the policy of the department. It is part of a building scheme that provides for a complete rebuilding of a considerable block at Mount Gambier involving other departments than the courts department. The Master of the Supreme Court, the Magistrate in charge of the Country and Suburban Courts Department and I have all indicated that we approve the sketch plans, which are now back in the hands of the Public Buildings Department. I understand that a submission will be made to Cabinet shortly.

MAITLAND AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last week I asked the Minister of Education some questions about the construction of a new area school at Maitland. Has he any information for me on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that tenders are expected to be called for the erection of a new area school at Maitland towards the end of July or in early August.

NAILSWORTH EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Education investigate the present overcrowding that is occurring at the Nailsworth Education Centre where three schools (an infant school, primary school and girls technical high school) are situated on the same small block of three acres with no playing ground? Will he ascertain whether it is possible to arrange for extensions to this property by acquiring adjoining properties, or to erect new buildings of solid construction to replace the complex of wooden buildings now on this site?

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

PONDALOWIE BAY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Lands inform me what progress has been made in respect of the resumption of portion of lease held by the Waratah Gypsum Company in the hundred of Warrambo in order that the District Council of Warooka may develop Pondalowie Bay as a tourist resort?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall be happy to get a report for the honourable member.

INDUSTRIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask this question in response to an invitation the Premier gave me during the debate last night when I raised the matter by way of interjection. Can the Premier tell me who are the members of the Industrial Advisory Committee referred to in his policy speech; by whom were they appointed and when; what are the duties of the committee; and to whom does the committee report?

The SPEAKER: It appears to me that there is no Government responsibility in the matter raised by the honourable member: it is entirely in the hands of the Premier. Does the Premier desire to reply?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I am prepared to indicate to this House, and to repeat outside the House, that the committee comprises two representatives from the Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, two members from the South Australian Labor Party, and two members from the Labor Party in this Parliament.

Mr. Ryan: That is a very good committee.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Those six representatives meet when necessary in the interests of industrial harmony in this State. Over the years it has been a most effective body in preserving the continuance of that industrial harmony, something which I believe can be acclaimed as an outstanding credit to any State.

Mr. Lawn: The previous Premier said that.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: The representation from the organizations I have mentioned is the same as that which prevailed over a number of years when the present Opposition was in Government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to the Premier for the information he has given, but I wonder whether he is prepared to disclose

(if he knows them) the names of the six members of the Industrial Advisory Committee, and, if he is so prepared, whether he will name them now?

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier desire to reply?

Mr. Millhouse: We don't want them to be faceless men.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I accept your earlier ruling on this matter. I have always attempted to refrain from naming people in Parliament under the privilege that is afforded, and I am unable to break faith in that matter. From time to time the committee has proved most valuable in its operation. The committee does not have a permanent chairman, the chairmanship being held under a rotating system: for instance, one representative from the Trades and Labor Council would preside at one meeting; at the next meeting probably a member of Parliament would preside; and at the following meeting a representative from the Labor Party would be chairman. The committee is responsible for examining all industrial matters necessary for legislative purposes, and it has been a most valuable consultative committee on all occasions. I believe that if the honourable backbencher from the Opposition was to ask his Leader about the value of the committee (not necessarily today but at the next Party meeting) he would get all the necessary information regarding the value of this committee to the previous Government.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the names?

Mr. LAWN: Opposition members are obviously trying to make out that advisory committees have sinister associations. Can the Premier say whether the previous Government, of which the Premier was the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, appointed a Workmen's Compensation Advisory Committee? Also, how was that committee constituted, and who appointed the representatives on it?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: To the best of my knowledge, on the Workmen's Compensation Advisory Committee, appointed by the Leader of the Opposition when he was in Government, was a representative of the Chamber of Manufactures and a representative of the Trades and Labor Council. I understand that the practice of the Trades and Labor Council was not to appoint a delegate of the council but that a representative was selected by ballot to represent the council on the committee. I recommend to the person who has been concerned about the other matter

that he should consider, in his little weak-minded way, whether there is any real value in trying to obtain names by a type of question that is of no importance to this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is obvious that in spite of his invitation to me last night, the Premier is not prepared to disclose the names of the members of the Industrial Advisory Committee. Will he give his reasons for his refusal to disclose these names?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I referred to two representatives of the Trades and Labor Council who, I believe, had held the positions of President and Secretary at various times. In addition, I believe that the two members representing the South Australian branch of the Australian Labor Party are the President and Secretary, whoever they may be. A further provision includes the Leaders of the Party in each House but, because of the complications that have arisen since my elevation to this important position, I have sought the assistance of my colleague the Minister of Works. Further, because of changes in another place, my colleague the Minister of Transport is also concerned. If any further information is necessary, I would ask the honourable member to consult the Parliamentary Library.

POLICE FORCE.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I ask leave to make a statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yesterday the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, in the course of a speech to the House suggested that an instruction had been given to the Police Force in South Australia concerning its working of section 63 of the Lottery and Gaming Act, a section of the Act which it is the policy of this Government eventually to put legislation before the House to repeal. No instruction whatever has been given either by the Chief Secretary or by me to the Police Force in relation to its working of section 63 of the Lottery and Gaming Act or of any allied section. In fact, the policy of the Government is that it is the responsibility of the police to keep law and order, and that has always been the policy of members on this side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition in raising this matter has seen fit to quote from a letter in the press which was written anonymously, and that letter suggests that police officers are not carrying out their duty to keep due law and order. A section of the letter states:

The Vice Squad cars have appeared to sit and watch. Is this considered constructive? There are no incidents known to the Government of police officers failing to do their duty, to fulfil their statutory obligation to keep law and order. If any member of this House has any specific case where he can complain that a police officer has not done his duty, that will be properly investigated, but in the meantime, the Government bitterly resents the suggestion that members of the Police Force are not doing their duty, on the basis of an unspecified instance in an anonymous letter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I understand the Police Department is under the control of the Chief Secretary, on what authority did the Attorney-General say he had not issued an instruction to the Police Department? Yesterday I asked the Premier to say whether the Government would make it clear to the police that it would support them in any action they might take under the loitering section of the Lottery and Gaming Act. I have not yet received an assurance on that matter, so will the Premier now give the assurance that the police have the Government's support in acting under that section of the Act?

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have nothing further to add, other than repeat what my colleague has already said today. The Attorney-General was involved yesterday in listening to grievances that arose in what I should call a sort of Address in Reply debate.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: It was an "insinuation debate".

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Yes. I shall be well and truly amongst the police officers in my new office.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You will get good protection.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: I have all the protection necessary, but I still cannot stop certain invaders who take up my time. I see no reason for panic in this matter. I believe police officers are doing a splendid job, in the interests of the people of this State. Indeed, I have never had occasion to attempt to censure their actions although, if I have considered it necessary for police officers to improve their public relations, I have never hesitated to make certain suggestions to either the Deputy Commissioner or the Commissioner of Police himself. I regret that it was necessary for the Leader of the Opposition, by virtue of certain Standing

Orders provided to enable honourable members to raise grievances, to quote from an unsigned letter that appeared in the press. This does not count for much in my view. If anything further needs to be added, I shall endeavour to bring the matter forward at a future date. However, I point out that if the type of larrikinism instanced by the Leader continues, and if the Police Force needs to be increased in any way, the force and the general public can be assured that this Government will co-operate in every possible way.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT, LAND SETTLEMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS STANDING COMMITTEES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from May 19. Page 105.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): When this matter was last before the House I raised some constitutional questions. I know that the Premier has now examined these questions and I have no doubt that, when he replies, he will deal with it. I do not think it is necessary for me to labour the point that I raised so that he could get some information on it, except to say that if the Premier, in reply, can say that this matter has been examined by the Government's legal authorities and that he is satisfied that it meets the requirements that the Government set out to meet, then that is the only point that arises in it.

I said previously that the Opposition did not oppose this matter being promptly cleared up and it should be cleared up. The only matter I wanted to raise on the Bill was whether the amendments that were proposed to be made did clear up the position that arose. I have no doubt that during the time that has passed since this Bill was last before the House the Premier has had a chance to examine it and consider the point I raised. If he can deal with that point then I do not think it necessary for me to go through it. It is a question only of whether the amendments proposed completely clear up what is in doubt at the moment. I believe considerable doubt exists about that part of the Bill. Having examined it I believe it is a point that should be cleared up and my reason for mentioning it when the Premier introduced the Bill was to make sure that it would be completely cleared up.

Having said that, I turn now to the second part of the Bill, which gives me very much more room for comment, for it provides some matters which I do not believe are of easy solution. As I understand the present law, no Minister of the Crown in another place can be a member of the Public Works Committee, the Land Settlement Committee, or the Industries Development Committee: he is barred by the Statute from being a member of any of those three committees. I do not have the Act before me, and I do not propose to quote the specific provision, but my understanding is that no member who holds any other office of profit may become a member of the Public Works Committee or be permitted to continue as a member of that committee.

I think the Premier will agree that this Bill has really been introduced to correct a problem that has arisen in another place. The Government has all of its members in that House allocated to positions which do not allow them to take a position upon either the Land Settlement Committee or the Industries Development Committee if they are to continue to hold a position upon the Public Works Committee. The amendment has been introduced to remove the statutory bar to a member's occupying both Public Works Committee membership and another position.

The Opposition would vigorously oppose having one member upon a number of committees of this importance. I do not believe it is physically possible for a person to be a member of both the Public Works Committee and the Land Settlement Committee. I leave for the moment the consideration of the Industries Development Committee, which meets only when there is a special reference to it. The Land Settlement Committee has references before it almost continuously, and I believe that in the future (as the provisions of the plan, for the administration of which they are chiefly responsible, become more known and more used) it will be extremely busy. Every honourable member knows that the Public Works Committee is always in difficulty handling the amount of business the Government sends up to it. The Opposition does not object at all in principle to the proposals regarding the amendments to remove the problem that may arise in connection with the occupation of an office of profit, but it would strenuously oppose the suggestion that one member could be effectively taking on the work of the three main committees which operate in connection with the administration of this Parliament.

Having said that, I confess that the Bill contains a matter of some difficulty. I was responsible for the legislation setting up the Industries Development Committee, in which I provided that the Opposition Party would have the right to appoint two members, one from each House, that the Government would have the same right of appointment, and that the fifth member would be appointed by the Government from the Treasury. Therefore, unless something is done it will deny to the Government the right to have a member appointed from the Legislative Council. I have never argued the question of the Government's having a majority upon a committee. If the two persons to be appointed to the Land Settlement Committee were to be appointed from the Liberal Party in another place, it would mean that the Government would not have a majority on that committee. I offer some suggestions to the Premier on this matter. I have not prepared any amendments, and I merely offer these suggestions believing that they are a fair compromise in the difficulty.

I do not believe it is practicable to get an amendment that would permanently deny the Legislative Council the opportunity of having two members upon the committees. However, I suggest that in the dilemma that has arisen over the fact that most of the members of the Legislative Council are in one Party and that the Premier's Party does not have the members available, amendments be drawn up to provide that the Government's proposal regarding the Public Works Committee be not accepted but in its place amendments should be prepared to provide that where the Leader of the Government in another place satisfies the President of that Chamber that he does not have members of his Party available to fill one of the positions on the Land Settlement Committee and one of the positions on the Industries Development Committee, the Government should have the right to appoint a member in each case from this place to fill those positions, the appointments to be valid for the period of the appointment, which in normal events would be three years.

To give that proposal practical effect, it would be for the Honourable the Chief Secretary in another place to submit to the President of the Chamber the information which would enable the President to determine that there were not members available in the Government Party there to fill the positions. The President would then write to the Speaker and to the Premier and inform them

of the position; thereupon it would be competent for an additional member of the Land Settlement Committee and of the Industries Development Committee to be appointed by the Government from its side of the House. This suggestion would have advantages over the Government's proposal. First, one member in another place would not be asked to undertake the impossible task of sitting on three committees as well as doing his normal duties in the House. Secondly, it does not permanently take away from another place the representation of two members on committees. The suggestion to do this would be strongly opposed in another place. Any amendment denying to another place representation on committees when people were available would be strongly opposed. Thirdly, my suggestion would probably appeal to another place as being a fair compromise of a difficult position. I suggest that the debate could be adjourned so that the matter could be discussed by the Parliamentary Draftsman, a Government nominee and myself.

Mr. Hughes: Have you discussed this matter with the President?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I can only voice an opinion on this matter, but I believe the suggestion would be acceptable. I cannot take it further than that, because I have no right to interfere with decisions or debates of another place. The President must be consulted and shown that no person is available to fill the vacancy. However, obviously there is a statutory limitation to the person occupying several positions. If, at the end of the term, it were desired to fill the position from this House, the President would have to be satisfied that the limitation still existed. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, rather than close the debate at this stage, I inform the Leader that, if he had taken any notice of the second reading explanation, he should have been prepared to discuss this measure on the firm understanding that this Government would introduce further legislation on related matters. I believe that we should follow the present course, because other legislation will be introduced that will ratify the whole position.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I understand from that that the Treasurer is not prepared to consider the suggestions I have put forward.

The Hon. F. H. WALSH: Not at this stage. We should dispose of this measure, and then we will go along with honourable members opposite when another Bill is introduced.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I suggest that a quicker way of doing this (and the proper way) is to deal with amendments that I should hope to move in relation to the matters that I have raised. That would dispense with any necessity for another Bill.

Mr. Jennings: The President of the Legislative Council has probably gone home.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from May 20. Page 138.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): In rising to speak to the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech on opening the 38th Parliament, I wish to say that the Speech is an historic document—

Mr. McKee: It is the best Speech he ever made; do you agree with that?

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is certainly the shortest I have ever seen, and the only one of its kind in the past 33 years. I have looked at it carefully, but I have found no reference to agriculture in it, although paragraph 10 states:

My Government will pursue policies designed to make full use of the productive potential in the State in agriculture, mining . . . However, that is the only reference to agriculture.

Mr. McKee: I think you will find that agriculture is referred to.

Mr. NANKIVELL: No other mention is made of it. Some reference was made to the Tailm Bend water scheme, which has some application to agriculture, and I shall mention that later. Although we in this House may appear to represent an opposing section of the community, we cannot afford to overlook any section of the community, in the interests of good government in this State. Taking 1963 figures, which are the latest figures that I have been able to obtain, primary production in this State represents a total net value of £140,000,000, and secondary industries £189,000,000, so that agriculture is at least as important to this State as any other type of industry.

I congratulate the Speaker on his appointment to his high office. People in the district that I represent are proud that he should come to occupy that office. Indeed, sitting in the gallery only a short time ago was Mrs. Saxon, the Speaker's former schoolmistress from the

days when he was a boy at Bordertown. It is 30 years since he left that town in my district, but many people are still living there who are proud that he has been appointed to his high office. On behalf of those people I congratulate him on his election. Mr. Acting Speaker, I congratulate you, too, on your appointment as Chairman of Committees. I assure you that I shall be as orderly as I can, under your rulings in this House.

I was one of those persons who attended the meeting when the Premier opened his election campaign. I notice—

Mr. McKee: I have just found that paragraph on agriculture!

Mr. NANKIVELL: The member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) was chairman of the meeting, and he warned my colleagues and me that he did not wish us to interrupt the proceedings on that occasion. However, it was a great performance. The Premier is a great stage manager and there is no-one in this House whom we would sooner see leading the Government. I congratulate the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), too, on being appointed Government Whip. He has already been of great assistance to the House, and in my short period here nobody has done more to assist the Speaker in maintaining the order of the House than he. In fact, it is only two days since he drew my attention to Standing Orders and reminded me that I should address the Chair and not speak directly to Ministers. I know that the honourable member will perhaps humble me in his usual style at a later stage, but may I say that *Hansard* has not done him justice, for he has made more speeches in this House than *Hansard* has ever recorded under his name.

I congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. Theirs were both interesting contributions to this debate, and I hope the honourable member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) maintains the high standard she set when she moved the adoption of the Address in Reply. I am sorry that she is not here at present, because I should like to point out that many of us are a little alarmed at her desire to regiment and departmentalize so many matters. I was sorry, too, that she did not further pursue an interesting observation she made concerning housing agreements. I should say no-one was better equipped to comment on housing than she. Indeed, she must have been one of the most active house inspectors one could have wished to meet, during her campaign. In fact, it is said that she won a game of housie-housie

but I do not know whether that is correct. The honourable member said, in her speech, that when private mortgages were arranged through solicitors a certificate of structural soundness was obtained from an architect. I suggest that this matter could be pursued further. It is an interesting observation and one to which the Government should pay attention. It is not necessary to have an extensive inspectorial service in these matters. Surely there must be a simpler way in which housing problems can be solved. The honourable member made another interesting observation that conflicted with a statement by the honourable member for Glenelg. She talked about the Labor Party's proposed policy for merging the two State banking instrumentalities. The honourable member for Barossa said:

The Government's proposal to merge the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia should help to solve this problem because the appropriate departments of both banks would be merged, thereby leading to the increased availability of funds and to increased efficiency.

I do not think that that could be done and I do not think it would be strictly the intention of the Government to implement its proposals in this way. However, I do not intend, at this stage, to anticipate the Government. The honourable member for Glenelg, an authority on these matters, said the Labor Party's policy was to harness the financial resources of the State and to develop a vigorous banking system while at the same time fully protecting the interests of depositors.

I do not know whether the interests of depositors would be protected if it were attempted to merge the two banks as suggested by the member for Barossa. The member for Glenelg also said:

The legislation would provide that only certain kinds of assets could be purchased with savings bank funds, and could well provide also that the savings bank should maintain an asset structure which was variable only within certain limits.

That is what is laid down in the Commonwealth Banking Act but the State Savings Bank is not in any way bound to the Commonwealth Banking Act. It only adopts the principles laid down in that Act as a matter of procedure: it is not bound to the Act. The point I want to make is this: the success or otherwise of any State banking instrumentality depends entirely on the confidence of the people in its Savings Bank. Two Governments at various times have meddled with Savings Banks and they have not both been Labor Govern-

ments. I refer to Sir James Mitchell, who was a Liberal in Western Australia and got into hot water playing around with the Savings Bank in Western Australia. The State Savings Bank had to be taken over by the Commonwealth Savings Bank. All members know of the calamity that followed the Lang move in New South Wales.

I now wish to deal with matters concerning the parish pump. I am pleased that the Minister of Works is in the Chamber because I am beginning to think that people in my district, who are waiting for the completion of the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme, might need the parish pump before the scheme is finished. I do not want to anticipate the deputation that I have arranged with the Minister for tomorrow but I wish to make a few remarks now that will save time tomorrow and give the Minister further information on this important works programme.

This water scheme has a lengthy history. It was started as a result of two petitions: one from the people of Keith for a township water supply, and one from the intermediate districts for a stock and domestic water supply. About 10 years ago a joint committee was appointed of people from local government bodies, stock associations and, I think, the Agricultural Bureau. These people formed a committee that has done much work in preparing evidence for this scheme. During the whole time that I have been in this House there has been a line on the Estimates that states "Tailem Bend-Keith Water Scheme". It was mostly talk until last year but then, in the Loan Estimates, £509,000 was allocated to commence this work. This scheme involved the laying of 89 miles of pipeline and the construction of the necessary pumping station and storage tanks, estimated to cost £4,000,000. In addition to providing reticulated water for Keith and Tintinara, the scheme was also designed to provide eventually a stock and domestic supply sufficient to allow the full development of 2,800 square miles of farming and grazing land along the route.

I wish to refer to two aspects in more detail. First, I wish to say something about the position of the water supply at Keith. Keith does have a limited water supply of shallow water of quality which ranges up to 200 grains, but which is mostly about 100 grains to 150 grains. It is not good water for any purpose. The principal problem is the shallow water table.

But when it comes to drainage in a town like Keith, which is in a flat area, it is necessary to virtually put the drainage water back

into the supply water and this is what has been happening for a long time in Keith. Admittedly, the situation has probably improved since the compulsory acceptance of septic tanks, and the problem of effluent has been overcome. Doctor Clarke, who was a doctor in Keith and also the health officer, stated in a report to the Public Works Committee:

One hundred per cent of people would have either enteritis or gastro-enteritis and in that area last year 100 per cent of the school children missed at some time through some of these gastric troubles that have been created.

Subsequently hepatitis broke out in the town, although I believe that the figures may not have been so comprehensive as those stated here by the health officer. Many people in the township of Keith suffered from hepatitis and its recurrence, not because they did not have a water supply but principally because they could not keep the water supply from becoming contaminated. That is the position in Keith. About nine years ago the Minister of Agriculture introduced a deputation from Cooke Plains, which is an area that is very divided and the main street is the boundary line between the Minister's district and mine. I have the store and the hall and he has the railway cottages. I believe that he thinks that is a fair division and I will not argue about it. The people in this area have been suffering a disability for a long time because they have insufficient stock water supplies.

Mr. Ryan: What is the Parliamentary representation like?

Mr. NANKIVELL: My predecessor was a former Minister of Works, and he did everything possible to assist the district. I have merely endeavoured to do my utmost to carry on the good work, and I trust I have maintained the quality of the representation.

Mr. Freebairn: The representation has improved from good to outstanding.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I can say that my district has not had more than its fair share of consideration from the previous Government. Actually, nothing less than 100 per cent is considered a fair share, for every member wants everything he can get for the people he represents. I now return to the question of the Taillem Bend to Keith water supply being necessary for the development of agricultural lands. We have heard many remarks from the Minister of Lands on the development of land and the provision of additional land for settlement. I point out that possibly the biggest area of Crown lands still left to be developed

in the State is in the district of Albert. Those lands are in two areas, to one of which I shall refer later. That area comprises the counties of Chandos, Buckingham and Buecleuch. There is also an area of 30,000 acres in the hundred of Colebatch.

Mr. Quirke: Do you think that would be useful land for aboriginal settlement?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am not going to be invited to do battle with the honourable member for Burra on that topic. Altogether, this 30,000 acres cannot be developed because no water supply is available in that area. When these investigations took place prior to the inquiry by the Public Works Committee, the report from the agricultural officers on this land indicated that 2,500 square miles within 40 miles of the Taillem Bend to Keith railway line was poorly supplied with water. It was stated that, if adequate water supplies for domestic purposes and for stock were available, it would be reasonable to expect that another 400 to 500 settlers would eventually become established within that district. I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that that is not an over-estimate of what could ultimately happen in this area. It is in an area which has a 15 to 22in. rainfall, and 80 per cent of it would have 17in. or more a year.

The report goes on to say further that the area cleared and developed to pasture would be increased by 1,000,000 acres, and that is not an insignificant area when we are looking for further development. The new pasture would support 1,500,000 sheep, capable of producing wool worth some £3,000,000. I point out that that was based on the values prevailing at that time. In addition, it would produce well over 600,000 lambs, worth another £1,500,000. It was also thought that, with some of this country being suitable for agricultural purposes and pasture renovation, an additional 100,000 acres a year could be cropped, yielding about 2,000,000 bushels of grain worth £1,000,000. Therefore, we have some £5,500,000 of estimated revenue a year that would come from this country through the provision of a water scheme. The estimated cost of the scheme is not known, but the provisional cost of the main trunk line is about £4,000,000. I hope the Minister will be able to provide information on this, but I understand that the question of the costs of this scheme has been reconsidered and that it may be possible to construct it more cheaply than originally estimated. If that is so, it is all to the good.

The thing about which I am anxious to convince the Minister is the need for this

scheme. It is not just a scheme that has been put there for the sake of spending Government money or keeping people employed, and that is why I was a little concerned when I received a reply from the Minister to my question on the subject. I appreciate the information the Minister gave me concerning the construction already undertaken on this scheme, but the point that worried me was that he suggested that it might be stopped temporarily. I do not know at this stage whether the contracts have been let for the tanks, but the work must not be stopped.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Would you like to have the completion date?

Mr. NANKIVELL: I should be most happy to have the completion date. I was hoping the Minister would say that; I knew it was his intention to give a completion date, but I could not extract that from him by way of question. I am happy to have his answer by way of interjection. I should not like to anticipate what the completion date might be, because I should not like to get the good news in advance of the people I am taking to him as a deputation. I point out the importance of this scheme, not only the construction of the work already agreed upon but the further extension and reticulation of water from this scheme to those areas of country that have been either recently taken up or taken up over a long period of time, in either case areas that cannot be developed to their full capacity without the provision of an adequate water supply.

Only a week ago I had a visit from a person from Victoria looking for land. He came to me and he said, "What is happening with that land east of the Coorong in from Salt Creek and Cantara? It seems to be held in big parcels, and nothing is being done with it. Do you agree with this policy?" I said I did not agree with the policy of doing nothing with the land, but I went on to say that nothing could be done with it until there was an adequate water supply. I went on to say, "Don't be fooled into being told that this country is in any way safe; it is not." The geological reports show that most of the country west of the Tailem Bend to Bordertown railway line (the main Adelaide-Melbourne line) until you get down to an area south of Keith in a line with Padthaway, is in an area where there is no adequate water supply. It has plenty of water there, but the water is of a quality which is of no use whatsoever for stock or domestic purposes.

This leads me to what might be considered a hobby-horse of mine, because I remember

that when I first spoke in an Address in Reply debate I mentioned this very same thing. I have been fortunate, Sir, in my capacity as Chairman of the Land Settlement Committee to have a little more direct association with this problem. I refer to drainage in the South-East, which was started off in about 1884, when I think the first drain was constructed. The principal drain, the Bakers Range drain, was constructed in 1897 in an effort to try to remove surplus water from that area. As a result of petitions (and as you know, Sir, it is usually as a result of petitions that the Government acts on these things) the Moncrieff Plan was prepared in 1908. This plan, drawn up by the then Acting Chief Engineer, aimed to remove surplus waters from certain South-Eastern areas of the State. Because this was too costly it was modified in 1910 by the then Chief Engineer (Mr. Stewart), and the Stewart plan is still being used. The idea was to drain land for agricultural purposes and to make it suitable for growing cereal crops. This was achieved in the Millicent area. This was the concept on which drainage proposals for the South-East were based. In 1923 a Royal Commission was set up on South-Eastern drainage to see whether the 1910 Stewart scheme was a reasonable substitute for the original scheme set out in the 1908 Act. The Commission supported the modified plan and recommended accordingly.

Subsequently all drainage work done in the South-East has been based on the plan and on the concept of draining land for cultivation and agricultural purposes. However, that is not the function of this land. Some cultivation and cereal growing is done, but the principal usage is for pasturage. The average rainfall of the South-East is about 22in. and that is about the amount of water that would be transpired by a good pasture that could be established on that country. There is a balance between the rainfall and pasture usage, with one exception, that most rain falls in the winter with a consequent problem of surface flooding. Only surface water should be removed, but many people feel that the spring water table is being lowered. With the systems of draining adopted in this State, the tragedy is that water cannot be put back once it is taken away. What has been done in the South-East is a good exercise in engineering as there is a 200ft. fall from east to west over 50 miles, but some water could have been, and still could be, put to better use. Drop weirs have been placed in the drains running through the ranges, but no

comprehensive system of weirs has been placed in the channels to retard the movement of water and maintain the spring water level.

If the level is maintained at about 18in. during the summer that is ideal for strawberry clover, but if it is reduced and the roots of the plant cannot extract water from the soil, the country is over-drained. I do not intend to enter the controversy of whether the country is over-drained. I consider that more thought should be given to providing drop weirs in drains and to making an orderly attempt to retain water levels in the areas drained at the highest optimum level at the end of springtime going into summer. More efficient use should be made of the water. The normal drainage of the area is from south-east to north-west. Although the ranges stop the water getting away to the sea there is an extensive natural drainage system which we have assisted and interfered with by providing the drains. Bakers Range drain was constructed to drain all the water to the north. At the northern end of the drain the country I referred to is at present suffering from an inadequate water supply. Evidence was given to the Public Works Committee by Mr. E. P. D. O'Driscoll, a senior geologist, who introduced the Mines Department publication (*Bulletion No. 35, The Hydrology of the Murray Basin Province in South Australia*) in which he drew attention to the need to drain water to the north. He said:

This is typical of conditions in the western part of counties Macdonnell and Cardwell where the occurrence of usable groundwater is dependent on the existence of swamps fed by surface flows from the drainage system to the south. It follows that any large-scale diversion of these drainage waters by cutting direct channels westward to the sea will deprive the swamps of their fresh water, and the groundwaters of their local recharge. Ultimately they may then be expected to become saline, and the district would be without stock water.

I have feared that we were considering drainage before considering the replacement of this water from another source, which is the Tailern Bend to Keith water scheme. I have been alarmed at the water diverted from the old Bakers Range drain, and concerned that the further extension of this drain has not been considered to ensure an adequate supply of water is always moving into this area. The salinity of the water does not interfere with its usefulness for stock and domestic water supplies. An area of about 30,000 acres, which the member for Burra when Minister of Lands made into a wild life reserve, is situated in this area, about 120 miles from

Adelaide. A portion of it forms Alfs Flat. It has been a wet winter this year, but little water has been flowing into Alfs Flat because some has been diverted through Drain M at Beachport. This area could be developed to advantage as a national park, because it carries much varied wild life, and at present a large colony of wombats inhabits the area. However, this wild life needs water, and one way to ensure this would be to move water along the natural drainage system into this area annually, and to pond it there.

Such a reserve would be appreciated not only by city people but also ultimately by the local people who, of course, tend to look on such reserves at present as fire and vermin hazards. I have some sympathy for them, because the land has not been developed in any shape or form, but we should attempt to make it something less of a hazard and more of a public utility.

I refer once again to the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement on the development of the Counties Buckingham and Chandos. The member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) will probably be interested to know that only about seven or eight days ago his successor and I travelled along a new road being constructed by the Lameroo council south of Lameroo, leading towards Keith, which took us through country we had never traversed before. I was agreeably surprised by what I saw; it could never be called dingo country and, indeed, I did not know it existed. The familiar mountainous sandhills are altogether absent in places and rolling country stretches over great distances. One area of about eight or 10 square miles in the centre of this country contains outcrops of limestone, but over most of the area clay is reasonably close to the surface. Consequently, some of my fears for this country have been allayed, because I am now certain that, whereas previously development of this country might have involved risk, large areas of unalienated Crown lands could systematically be developed.

Mr. Quirke: It has all been aerial-mapped.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes, but those maps do not disclose these features. I believe that the Minister of Lands, having seen this area in a different light, and possibly having formed a different opinion from the one he might have previously conceived, will investigate the possibility of opening up portions of this country for development. I believe certain portions of this country will not need such restrictive leases as proposed at present; it has

been the view that a restrictive lease over such land was necessary, because of fears associated with management, but there could well be areas where management problems would not exist.

I was disappointed to receive a letter from the Minister of Transport, which virtually signed an end to correspondence that I had entered into with him on behalf of the principal officers at the Keith railway station. The letter stated that the department would carry out a certain programme as "expeditiously as possible", which was really fobbing me off. If staffing problems occur, and if we need to make service payments to keep people in the Railways Department, how can we expect to obtain senior officers, such as stationmasters, to go to places such as Keith, where they have to bury their own soil, and where there is no deep drainage? We use the term "earth closets", but the fact remains that the chief ganger, assistant ganger, the clerk, and station-master are now in the invidious position of having to handle their own soil. I drew attention to this in the correspondence in an effort to have this situation remedied. I know there was talk of installing septic systems there, but this should have been insisted on and proceeded with far more strongly than it was. Further, I personally do not have a high opinion of the dry well system that is provided for the gangers in the group of houses belonging to the railways at Keith. It is primitive and little better than the previously existing systems. These people are at a disadvantage, and are not provided with the facilities available to most other people in the town. To end on a happy note, I express my gratitude to the Minister of Health for his co-operation concerning certain alterations to the Keith Hospital, and for the way he has been prepared to assist the hospital. The hospital board, too, is grateful to him. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I support the motion, and in making my maiden speech I am conscious of the high standard that has been set by earlier speakers. I join with other members in expressing gratitude to His Excellency and Lady Bastyan for their devoted service to South Australia. They can be assured that the people of this State are appreciative of the keen interest that they show in the development of South Australia. I associate myself with the expressions of regret by other members on the recent deaths of former members.

My congratulations are extended to you, Mr. Speaker, to the Chairman of Committees and to the Honourable the Premier, who led the Government to such a magnificent victory. I congratulate Mrs. Byrne and Mr. Hudson, the mover and seconder of the motion, on their excellent maiden speeches. After hearing these contributions, one is not surprised at the remarkable victories that they achieved during the recent elections.

His Excellency in his Speech has outlined proposed amendments to many Acts in the interests of present-day developments and needs. These proposals have received widespread acclaim as sound and positive actions intended to develop fully the State's resources, and their consideration will provide a most interesting session.

I pay a tribute to my predecessor, Mr. Fred Walsh, who represented West Torrens in this House for some 22 years. Mr. Walsh, whom I am pleased to regard as a personal friend, holds one of the best records of achievement among South Australian Labor members. His association with the Australian Council of Trade Unions dates back to the formation of that organization and, on a State level, his judgment and moderation within the Labor movement have served as an inspiration to others. Members of the Opposition have freely expressed to me the high esteem in which they have always held Mr. Walsh, and I am constantly reminded by the residents of West Torrens of his achievements on their behalf as their member for the district.

Unfortunately, during his long period of service in this House, Mr. Walsh was never a member of a Government, and the people of South Australia were accordingly denied the greatest benefit of his ability and experience. Members will be pleased to know that Mr. Walsh continues to enjoy good health, and has made it clear that he intends to continue his close association with the Labor movement in this State. I thank the electors of West Torrens for the confidence they have placed in me by selecting me as their Parliamentary representative. As other members are aware, it is a source of considerable pleasure to hold the privilege of being the youngest member in the House, and the fact that I enjoyed a record majority, coupled with the observation that the other two new Government members are under 40 years of age, is perhaps significant.

Paragraph 22 of His Excellency's Speech referred to the Government's intention to increase the membership of the House of

Assembly, and some reference in particular should be made to the District of West Torrens. Prior to 1956, the present district was known as Thebarton, and when boundaries were altered and West Torrens was created in March, 1956, 22,900 voters were on the roll. At March, 1965, this number had increased to over 35,000, an increase in 9 years of over 13,000 electors. These new residents, moving into new houses, are mainly families with young children, and the difficulties resulting in respect of schools, playing areas, drainage, sewerage and transport are enormous. It is certain that this rapid development will continue, and the construction of 400 houses at Hughes Estate, together with the building activities at Grange, Kidman Park, Seaton and Henley Beach, in particular, is sufficient evidence that this growth will continue. As a result, if there is no change in the electoral boundaries, West Torrens will contain over 40,000 voters within three years, clearly demonstrating the urgent need to be given to this subject as proposed by the Government. It is not in the best interests of the residents of West Torrens to have only one Parliamentary representative to act on their behalf. It would be bad enough if the area were fully developed, but the expansion I have referred to has created serious problems, most of which are greatly affected by Government action or inaction. It will be of interest to members that my district contains 20 schools, and four councils have an interest in the area.

Paragraph 22, in addition to its reference to increasing the membership in the Assembly, refers to amendments affecting the Legislative Council and other possible alterations to the Constitution. A full debate will take place later, but I suggest now that when constitutional matters are considered attention should be given to one item that clearly demonstrates the out-dated provisions that now exist. This is the restriction on persons under 30 years of age who are not eligible to hold a seat in the Legislative Council. To restrict persons under 30 years of age from election on the grounds that they are not mature enough is a situation that cannot be tolerated. That persons of the calibre of the Attorney-General and others in this House, who were elected when under 30 years of age, can be debarred from election to another place is incredible. With respect, Mr. Speaker, you would be fully aware of this injustice, for I am informed that the residents of your district elected you at the age of 28 years as their member in this House. Voters at 21 years of age are considered fit to elect our Legislative Council, yet unfit to nomin-

ate, and I trust this anomaly will be corrected at an early date. The honourable member for Glenelg has adequately dealt with the question of electoral reform, and the criticisms made against him by the Leader of the Opposition are surprising.

Two main arguments were used by the Leader of the Opposition against the member for Glenelg. The first was a quotation from *Hansard* of remarks made by an elderly gentleman in the year 1900. I suspect that the Leader of the Opposition ended his quotation a little earlier than he should have. The other was a reference to the fact that some Labor members did not oppose the present boundaries in 1955. The public of South Australia indicated last March that they were not satisfied with standards set in 1900, and the Government, unlike the Opposition, is aware that electoral boundaries of 1955 are not satisfactory in 1965. South Australia's population in 1955 was 830,000 but today it exceeds 1,000,000. The present Government is prepared to recognize that changes have occurred, and to act accordingly. I suggest that this is the reason why we are the Government today.

I intend to refer briefly to some matters affecting my district, and most important is the long-delayed implementation of sewerage facilities for a large section of it. Late last year, the Public Works Committee approved of a sewerage system affecting Grange, Henley Beach, Seaton, Fulham Gardens and Kidman Park. The Engineer for Sewerage reported to that committee:

In all areas proposed to be sewered, great difficulty has been and is being encountered by the householders in disposing of the septic tank and sullage effluents. The ground is mostly river silt with ground water close to the surface and, except in summer when there is high evaporation, the backyards, front gardens and streets are saturated with effluents. This has greatly aggravated the residents in every area—Shandon, Seaton (South), Grange (East), Fulham Gardens, Marlborough Street and Mitton Avenue areas, Kidman Park (South) and Flinders Park, with the result that the department is inundated with requests for sewerage every winter.

The report also indicates that 19½ miles of sewerage mains are included in this project. Since this report was submitted, building development has continued, and the position has become worse each day. Residents and councils are repeatedly asking when this scheme will be commenced, and my inquiries fail to reveal that early action is probable. Because of the low-lying character of the ground in these areas, considerable technical difficulties are expected during the course of

the work, and trenches will be required to be timbered. In addition, the drainage difficulties will restrict the project during winter months.

Not only are we required to consider the comforts of the people affected with continued flooding of yards and streets with effluent, but a serious health hazard confronts the State. Health authorities are particularly disturbed at the increasing danger of a typhoid epidemic occurring. I am informed that the simple act of a child falling in a gutter, or a young child playing in a gutter and then placing his fingers in the mouth, could result in such an outbreak. During last year, five cases of salmonella occurred in these areas, and were attributed solely to the pumping of effluent into open gutters. This year once again it is left to chance that nothing more serious occurs. Some people would try to reassure the residents that the risks of disease are limited, due to the septic tank treatment, but this advice is 10 years too late. The houses in areas most badly affected were constructed between seven and 10 years ago, and during this time the housing blocks have become completely saturated. As a result, the effluent being pumped into the streets is not properly treated by septic tank systems, and is of a most objectionable nature. One authority has informed me that the open sewers of India are less of a risk than some of these unsewered areas.

Large areas of valuable land cannot be developed at present until they are sewerred, and the South Australian Housing Trust is also embarrassed. The intention of the trust to build 400 houses at Hughes Estate was recently announced, and while about 100 of these can be built on existing facilities the remainder must wait until the new system is completed. Paragraph 16 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the intention of the Government to generally improve the State's sewerage conditions, and it is apparent that the present resources of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be severely strained. It could well be that the department, recognizing that 10 houses can be sewerred in other areas in the time that three or four can be serviced in Henley and Grange, will continue to postpone this project. I earnestly suggest that if this does occur, private enterprise be contracted to complete this project, or, alternatively, that greater assistance be provided to the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

My complaint should not be taken as a criticism of this department, for I am aware that it is performing a valuable service and maintaining the highest possible standards.

However, as indicated by the member for Barossa and other members in this House, delays with sewerage works are occurring as a result of the building development taking place. In addition, evidence was recently given to the Public Works Committee for renewal work in the vicinity of General Motors-Holden's at Woodville, and near Torrens Road, at an estimated expenditure of £600,000. The evidence of the Engineering and Water Supply Department emphasized the need for an early completion of these projects. It would appear that this department has not sufficient staff or plant to cater for the demands of the State, and with some thought to the future I hope that my remarks are noted.

I am particularly pleased to note reference in His Excellency's Speech to the activity intended on matters under the control of the Minister of Social Welfare. The creation of this new Ministry will enable the Government to consider the many problems of youth in our community, in line with the requirements of today. It is my view that this new Ministry should seriously consider the lack of suitably developed playing areas for young children. I refer to the child who is not old enough to travel long distances to the main ovals and playing fields that exist in most districts. In areas where new houses are built, land is put aside for the purpose of playing areas for young children. However, the development of these areas is the responsibility of the councils. It is found that, because of financial difficulties, councils are forced to delay the grassing of these grounds, with the result that by the time the playing areas are complete the children in the near vicinity are too old to benefit from them. It is a common sight for children to be seen playing in streets, while a short distance away is a reserved area for a playing field cluttered with rubbish. Perhaps councils could be assisted towards the early development of these areas, and then left with the responsibility of maintenance. A lead by the Housing Trust in this respect would be welcomed and, being aware of the keen interest held by the Minister toward child welfare, I feel confident this matter will receive consideration. Paragraph 20 of His Excellency's Speech reads:

It is the policy of my Government to take early action to give effect to the Town Planning Committee's Report. Any necessary amendments to the Town Planning Act to enable this to be done will be introduced.

The fact that early action is intended by the Government to implement the report of the Town Planning Committee has received the

full support of the community. The committee has considered fully the problems that must be faced in respect of future road and highway requirements, and has made some far reaching recommendations. The use of the old Glenelg train line to provide relief for the Anzac Highway is contemplated, and this proposal can be met without the problem of acquiring land. However, proposals for a freeway affecting my district through Kurralta Park, and another running from Morphetville raccourse to Port Adelaide, have been suggested by the committee. It is recognized that these additional highways are necessary to meet the ever-increasing requirements of our traffic needs, but the failure of the previous Government to take positive action has created serious hardship for many people. The construction of the highways that I have referred to will require the acquisition of many hundreds of houses, and the failure of the Highways Department to be able to advise householders of their possible future is unsatisfactory.

The proposals of the Town Planning Committee have become public, and residents whose homes are in the path of the suggested freeways are aware that their houses are likely to be required. Many of these people have approached the Highways Department with the view that, if this can be confirmed, land in the same area can be purchased for a new house when the acquisition takes place. At present, this advice cannot be given, with the result that the householders are placed in a position where the future holds a great deal of uncertainty; and many of them with retirement years approaching are finding their health affected by this worry.

That a lack of proper administration exists is clear when we consider that in one area of Fulham an area 600ft. wide has been reserved. This, of course, places hundreds of houses in a doubtful position, because, obviously, if the highway is proceeded with, they will not all be required. The residents within these areas, in addition to being deprived of an early opportunity to plan for their future, are unable to improve their present houses by the addition of rooms or garages. In other cases a genuine need to sell their houses exists, but it is found that few people are prepared to buy these houses in reserved areas. It is claimed that if positive notification were given to householders of intended freeways, profiteers would be in a position to purchase land for reasons of gain. However, steps could be taken to prevent this occurring. Lack of co-ordination exists between the Highways Department and coun-

cils, as illustrated recently when a constituent of mine purchased land from a reputable dealer, only to find that the council refused to permit her to build, for the reason that the land was reserved. Other such cases have been brought to my notice, and they show clearly that a positive approach must be made to the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee if we are to avoid serious inconvenience to the public. This problem is not confined to my area, as future plans for new highways affect the complete metropolitan area. No doubt other members are also constantly approached for advice on this matter.

Mr Speaker, I could refer at length to actions that are required to be taken, and in fact, many should have been taken by the previous Government, but I will have other opportunities to express my views. I thank members for their attentive hearing, and the co-operation and friendliness they have extended to me during my short period as a member. This gratitude is also extended to all officials and staff of the House, whose courtesy and assistance have been of considerable value. I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): In supporting the Address in Reply I respectfully join with His Excellency the Governor in the expressions of sympathy set out in paragraph 3 of his Speech. I congratulate you, Sir, upon your election, unopposed, to the office of Speaker in this House, and I say sincerely that this change in the Speaker's Chair is the only change that has given me any pleasure as a result of the election on March 6.

Mr. Jennings: Take a bow, Ridley.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to refer to the maiden speeches of the mover and seconder of this motion, and now I am lucky in being able to refer to the speech just made by the new member for West Torrens. I shall take those three new members—those happy back-benchers on the Government side—in the order in which they spoke. I should like first to make some respectful and, I hope you will agree, Mr. Speaker, relevant comments about what was said by the honourable member for Barossa. I have known that honourable member for nearly 10 years, to the best of my recollection. The first time I can remember the honourable member was on the Commonwealth election day in, I think, 1955. On that stinking hot day in December—for some reason Commonwealth election days are always hot—

Mr. Jennings: Or wet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. Whether it is the Good Lord expressing displeasure on the activities going on or whether it is a Machiavellian plot by the Commonwealth Government to embarrass and inconvenience helpers of both sides, I do not know. However, this was a particularly hot day, and at 8 o'clock in the morning I, with my usual (in those days) youthful vigour and enthusiasm—

Mr. Ryan: Who said you ever had any?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —was arranging to man the polling booth at the Malvern Methodist Church. That is one of the more enlightened areas in my district as it gives a good and sensible Liberal majority, something about 70 or 80 per cent.

Mr. Ryan: Did you say they were enlightened?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is the most enlightened part of the most enlightened district in the State.

Mr. Jennings: You mean benighted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I do not. This is interrupting my story, Mr. Speaker. When I arrived at the Malvern Methodist Church just before 8 o'clock there was Molly McGavisk, as her name was, handing out Australian Labor Party "How to Vote" cards.

Mr. Ryan: That is a real credit to her.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the course of my organizing duties I went back several times that day and she was always there except for a break in the afternoon for a couple of hours. When I went back at 8 o'clock in the evening to collect the cards left over, I found she was still there and, in fact, she told me she had been there for the whole time except for a couple of hours off to play basketball in the afternoon. I must say I admired her keenness on that occasion, but no doubt she had a pleasant time with my electors.

Mr. Clark: You didn't try to convert her, did you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, and apparently she did not convert anyone either. That was my first introduction to her and I respected her for the work she put in on that occasion—a rather thankless task. Later, after she was married she came to live in my district at Clapham and was one of my most valued electors. Not that I think she supported me, but I was delighted to have her and her husband living in the district. My suspicions about the lack of support she gave me were confirmed in 1959 when her husband stood against me as Australian Labor Party candidate for Mitcham. He was a particularly

strong candidate and fought a vigorous and fair campaign. I hope I can regard him, as I regard the honourable member for Barossa, as a friend, and I consider myself lucky that on that occasion I increased my majority.

Mr. McKee: How I love sweet me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Listening in silence, as we all did, to the maiden speech of the honourable member for Barossa, I envied her her first flush of enthusiasm and confidence, in this House. Ah! Sir, if only all her proposals could be put into practice? How happy we should all be if those things we say and put forward when we first come to this House all materialized, not even in the life of one Parliament but in the life of several. We would be well off. I think the honourable member for Barossa will find, after a little time, as most of us who have been here for some time already have found, that it is a far cry from the brave and sensible suggestions we make as new members, to the fulfilment of our plans. I have found that any advantage for the Mitcham District, however small, has to be fought for hard, and I rejoice perhaps out of proportion when I succeed in doing anything. At present, members on the other side of the House are flushed with enthusiasm because of their creditable win on March 6.

Mr. Ryan: We have every right to be.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not detract from it at all. I think that Government members will find that things are not quite so rosy, and that they are still bound by the harsh realities of life, just as much on that side as they were on this. It will be interesting to see how many of the things with which the member for Barossa dealt in her maiden speech come to pass in the life of this Parliament. Her district is a fair way from mine, but I wish her luck with them.

Now I come to the seconder of the motion, the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). From the honourable member we had an erudite, interesting, and, in some parts, witty speech. The impression that I formed of him in this House on that occasion, and the impression I still have, is that he has perhaps not yet got over his justifiable excitement in winning the seat, and that he still finds being a member of Parliament great fun. Well, good luck to him! I hope he continues to feel that way, if I gauge his feelings correctly, for a long time. I do not detract from his effort, because it was a great effort to win the seat of Glenelg, and to induce a swing, according to my calculations, of about 5 per cent against us. I listened, as all honourable members did, to what he had to say about Charles Cameron

Kingston. I could not but think that the link between him and Kingston was rather too tenuous to sustain such a lengthy exposition; but, whether that be so or not, it was certainly interesting to be reminded of some of the dramatic events in Charlie Kingston's life. I am sure the member for Glenelg would acknowledge that there was a slightly less attractive side to C. C. Kingston than that which he expounded in this House, and I say that not to go into that side or to detract from what the honourable member said.

However, I believe someone should say just a few words in defence of Sir Richard Chaffey Baker, the man with whom he nearly fought a duel. Honourable members may know that Sir Richard Baker's portrait hangs in the eastern corridor of this House, for he was one of those august few to be President of the Legislative Council. He was far more important, though, as the founder of the firm of which I was a partner until I left amalgamated practice last year. He was the founder of Baker and Barlow, and it is interesting to note, for the benefit of the member for Glenelg, that Dr. Barlow was the first Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. They had their offices in Morialta Chambers on the western side of Victoria Square, and at the time of the famous duel Kingston was to stand on the footpath across the road from the entrance to Morialta Chambers, and Sir Richard Baker was to appear out of our front door. That was to be the venue for the duel.

Mr. Ryan: Apparently he was no Cassius Clay.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: They were before his time, I think. The police intervened, as the member for Glenelg told us, before the duel could take place and, so far as I know, no duel ever was fought in or about Morialta Chambers. That building was demolished in 1954, and we now have the imposing edifice of the Mutual Life and Citizens' Insurance Limited on the site. However, I still keep here in my drawer two of Baker's books, which may be of assistance to me, or even to you, Sir, one of these days. They are *Denison's Decisions* and *Brand's Decisions*, as prepared by Edwin Gordon Blackmore, the Clerk Assistant and Sergeant-at-Arms of this House. Both of these books have Baker's name on them. The honourable member having extolled the virtues of a man who, I suppose, from his political point of view deserved all that he said, I believe that his opponent, Sir Richard Baker, deserves just a word. However, all this in the honourable member's speech (and I suppose in mine, too) is pleasant historicity—

Mr. Coumbe: Is that a word?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I looked it up before I used it. The honourable member's remarks on C. C. Kingston, however, are without relevance to the present day. The honourable member, having told us about C. C. Kingston, then dealt with the question of the amalgamation of the two banks, the State Bank and the Savings Bank of South Australia. In this, of course, he did far more than the Government was prepared to do in His Excellency's Speech, because that Speech was noteworthy for not mentioning one word about the question of amalgamating the two banks. Until the honourable member, one of the senior economic advisers to the Government, spoke I had my doubts whether the Government intended to proceed with this measure, because it is a most extraordinary omission from His Excellency's Speech. We all well remember, I suppose, that this was one of the principal points of policy put forward by the present Premier in his policy speech. It received much publicity during the campaign, and it was emphasized and defended by members opposite. It is a pure piece of Socialism (or a piece of pure Socialism, whichever is correct) and yet not one word was mentioned in His Excellency's Speech about it.

One would have thought that this at least would have been emphasized in the Speech. However, that did not deter the honourable member from going into the matter in great detail. He is obviously, from the way in which he spoke on this matter, and from the way in which I have heard him speak before, an enthusiastic doctrinaire Socialist, university lecturer turned politician. I heard him expound the question of amalgamation on another occasion, when he said frankly that the idea of the Labor Party's amalgamating these two banks was to pay for its Socialist plans. I believe that that was a fair summation of what was said. I hope that the member for Glenelg does not think that I have put an unfair gloss on what he said. He spoke to the Finance and Commerce Section of the Adelaide Junior Chamber of Commerce on April 8, 1965. I took notes of what he said and had them typewritten later. I shall quote what he said from my notes. He said:

If one looks around at the community one sees an obvious backlog of things to be done. That is a natural enough comment for a member of a Party that had been out of office for a long time. He continued:

They are mostly in the Government sector—roads, railways, education (on this we lag badly)—

and I emphasize that to the Minister of Education—
electricity, water, and afforestation.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: That is what Mr. Galbraith said.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The honourable member mentioned him, too, and talked about "private splendour, public squalor". The honourable member continued at the meeting:

The greater percentage of these come under the State Government but that Government is very restricted in its ability to provide itself with additional finance.

He then referred to the State Budget and went through it. He concluded from his analysis of the State Budget:

The State therefore has some room for manoeuvre but not much. We are a lightly taxed State and there is some room for improvement.

No doubt the present Government will say that there is some room for improvement as the honourable member does. He continued:

Something has been done about this in the last few years. We announced that we proposed to increase taxation during the campaign yet we still won.

He drew from that a remarkable moral that "it pays to be honest".

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What is remarkable about it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should have thought that it was the sort of thing that went without saying. The member for Glenelg then emphasized the loan position and having done that, said:

This is why Labor places importance on a greater role of the State banking system. If it is to undertake vigorous expansion, then it must have money for development.

He was referring to the State. He then went on to talk about the Savings Bank and the State Bank. I noticed one inaccuracy in the honourable member's maiden speech. He suggested that the Bank of Adelaide did not have a savings bank but it does have. It holds the only account that I have, which is a small one. The honourable member continued:

We had to raise the issue of amalgamation during the campaign even though it was a bit risky. It was important that we should be able to undertake such expansion as was necessary. We had to raise it or the Legislative Council might say, "You haven't got the mandate for it"; and then we would have had difficulty in going ahead with it with the State Bank alone.

However, he made it perfectly clear that the amalgamation of these two banks was to pay for the election promises made by the Labor Party. One thing which he did not say

(and he did not say it in his maiden speech) and which, as far as I am aware, no member from the Government side has said, is how much it is expected will be returned to the Government coffers after the amalgamation of these two banks.

Also, nothing has been said about the method by which that money will find its way into the Government coffers. Many members opposite are still to speak in this debate and, in spite of its absence from His Excellency's Speech, I take it that these members will refer to the matter. Perhaps we shall be told how much profit the Government believes that it will make after the amalgamation of the two banks and how, precisely, that money will find its way into the Treasury. I shall be looking forward with interest to hearing that from some Government member, because the member for Glenelg is remarkably frank, but only up to a point on this matter. However, I shall be looking forward to hearing more from him during this Parliament. I do not know whether he will stay any longer than that—

Mr. Hudson: Speak for yourself.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I will; I will take my chance, as we all must do in this rough and tumble of politics in South Australia, but I have no doubt that, despite the censures, perhaps, mild though they are, that I cast upon him, his presence will be an added strength to debate in this place.

I come now to the honourable member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill) who has just spoken and therefore I have not had as good a chance to croon over his remarks as I have had to consider those of the honourable members for Barossa and Glenelg. However, I congratulate him on his election. He is, as he proudly told us this afternoon, the youngest member of the House, and that is a position which I myself held for some seven years.

Mr. Jennings: It never lasts, does it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, these things never last. All I can claim now (I have worked this out very carefully, and I am very jealous of this) is that I am the youngest married member on the Opposition side, but that is a very far cry from being the baby of the House, as the member for West Torrens is.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: We all have some distinction that makes us unique.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, we probably have. Anyhow, I have worked that one out for myself. I say seriously, Mr. Speaker, that I agree with some of the remarks of the member

for West Torrens on this matter; I think it is a great pity that there are not some members on both sides of the House in their twenties. I think I am right in saying that none of us now are.

Mr. Clark: And in the other place, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, that is a more arguable proposition.

Mr. Clark: Not very arguable.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would be on terribly dangerous ground if I were to include the other place in this, but I do believe that if this place is to be really representative of the community there should be (as there have been in the past) some members in their twenties in this House.

Mr. Ferguson: Will you say that in 20 years' time?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I shall still have a flexible enough mind, but let 20 years' time look after itself. I did hear the member for West Torrens refer to the lack of sewerage in his district, and here I have a fellow feeling with him because this is a matter that I have raised on behalf of parts of my district consistently over the years. Sometimes I have been rapped fairly hard over the knuckles for doing so. I still have not got the sewerage. In fact, I am further away from it now than I was when I first came into the House in 1955, because then I was told it was on the way. However, that changed later.

I did feel that the remarks of the honourable member for West Torrens were a little far-fetched when he suggested that an outbreak of typhoid could result from the unsewered condition of parts of his district. I suggest that that is a rather dangerous thing to say, because it may cause much panic and anxiety

in the community, and I do not think the remark was altogether justified.

He also referred to the Town Planner and (this was one of the few things that the Governor did refer to in his Speech) the resolve of the Government to put into effect the recommendations in the Town Planning Committee's Report. I am all for that and have said so many times. My dying act as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation was to table in this House a report setting out the principles on which the committee conducted itself in dealing with zoning regulations. The last committee did its best, and I hope the new committee will too, to uphold the principles set out in the Town Planning Committee's Report.

One thing I forgot to say about that committee when dealing with West Torrens was that I had the honour to preside over a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation consisting of three members from this Chamber and three members from the other place when I was still too young to qualify to take a seat in the other place. I felt some inward satisfaction at being able to preside over honourable members of the other place even though I was not qualified to sit in it.

Mr. Ryan: You might help us to reform that place!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We shall see. Only time will tell what will happen either to that place or to us, I suppose. However, at this point I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, May 27, at 2 p.m.