

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Wednesday, July 29, 1959.

The **PRESIDENT** (Hon. Sir Walter Duncan) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**RESPONSIBILITIES OF MOTORISTS AT PEDESTRIAN CROSSINGS.**

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I understand that the Minister of Roads has further information on the question I asked yesterday regarding the responsibilities of motorists at pedestrian crossings, so I again ask whether there is any Act which makes it the responsibility of motorists to stop at pedestrian crossings?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—Since the honourable member inquired yesterday I have checked up with Sir Edgar Bean who, as members know, is engaged at the moment on the Road Traffic Act. Pedestrian crossings that have been approved by the Commissioner are controlled by regulations which determine the type of lights and the markings on the road, but in order to legalize crossings where there is no intersection it may be necessary to introduce legislation and members may expect it this session.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—Then I understand that at present there is no law to make motorists stop.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—No, the honourable member is wrong. Pedestrians and motorists are fully controlled at the Grote Street crossing and the one at the railway station.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I am not happy or satisfied with the answer given by the Minister and therefore ask leave to make a statement prior to asking another question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD—I am fully aware that where traffic lights exist at pedestrian crossings motorists are by law compelled to stop, but I cannot follow from the Minister's reply whether at crossings where there is only a light to denote the crossing, such as the one at Grote Street and the one near the Nailsworth School, it is the legal responsibility of motorists to stop, and I ask specifically whether there is any Act which compels them to do so.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I would confirm the fact, as I said just now, that motorists are required to stop at the Grote Street crossing; Sir Edgar Bean is quite satisfied in that respect. With regard to the one near the

Nailsworth School I am not quite certain whether it was commenced by the News and Mail signs which are only cautionary signs. If such crossings are drawn up on the lines of the regulations setting out the required markings on the road and so forth they also control motorists and pedestrians fully. If they are not I would want to look into it further.

HILTON BRIDGE.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH—During the last Parliament I raised the question with regard to the provision of guard rails on the Hilton Bridge just after a fatal accident occurred when a small car went over the guard rails to the railway beneath. I ask the Minister of Railways whether more substantial guard rails will be erected on both sides of the bridge in the interests of public safety?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE—I was under the impression that satisfactory repairs had been effected, but in view of the honourable member's request I will get a further report.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 28. Page 179.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern)—I rise to support the motion. At the outset of this, my maiden speech, I would like to take the opportunity of thanking all members and others who have helped to make my path as a new member relatively simple in the circumstances. I am very grateful for all the help I have received and am pleased with the chance to say so. I gather that Sir Collier Cudmore is again unwell, and I should like briefly to remark that although I have been a member of this place for such a short time it is quite obvious to me that this one man has made a tremendous impact on the functions and the working of this Chamber. No doubt many members are on terms of personal friendship with him and miss Sir Collier a great deal, and I am sure that we all wish him a speedy recovery. I should also like to refer to the Hons. John Cowan and John Bice, whose places Mr. Hookings and myself have taken. By virtue of environment I rather feel that I have taken Mr. Bice's position and I would like to refer to the great regard in which the people of the Southern district hold Mr. Bice, and to his very great popularity in the district. It is quite a challenge to younger members to step into the shoes of men such as these.

I also associate myself with the remarks of other members who have referred to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Robert George, and I also subscribe to the view that we have been very fortunate over the years in the choice of the direct representative of Her Majesty the Queen in this State. I am certain that the interest displayed by our Governors in the welfare of South Australia is a very real one. I am sure I speak for all honourable members when I say that we were all perturbed regarding the recent sickness of Her Majesty the Queen in Canada. These arduous tours undertaken by her are a great source of good in the free-thinking world—the cementing of friendships on either side of the Atlantic, and in fact in all countries of the free world. The value of such tours is very great and real. We in Australia are very proud of Her Majesty's great zeal for duty, and we wish her a period of peace and contentment on her return home.

Although I represent primarily an agricultural area, I should like to digress for a minute and refer to remarks made by other honourable members in their speeches. May I first congratulate Mrs. Cooper very heartily on several historic feats: first and foremost, on her particularly capable speech in this House and secondly on the fact that she is the first woman to have addressed this Chamber. I was particularly interested in her summing up of the State's educational pattern. We are all well aware of the crowded conditions existing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and at the Adelaide University. After studying the latest designs and hospital trends overseas, the Minister of Health has acted to provide a magnificent new alternative to the Royal Adelaide Hospital in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. It is a building of which South Australians should be extremely proud, and I congratulate the Government and the Minister on the achievement. Is it not equally logical that an additional site must be found for a second University? Perhaps the powers that be may decide that it should be situated in a town like Gawler or at the foothills overlooking Elizabeth, but I am rather inclined to the view that it would be better situated at an even more central point. May I refer to the Government's very thorough attitude in tackling tuberculosis. I have gathered that its action has had the effect of decreasing the numbers in the tubercular ward at Northfield, and also at Bedford Park Sanatorium, where the number of patients some months ago was about 27. For that, credit is

due to the Government for its campaign. It has adopted the attitude that prevention is better than cure. This is a very great and right step. The Bedford Park Sanatorium is surrounded by about 400 acres of farming land. What a magnificent site it would be for a second University! I gather that there is the line of thought that in about 1966 the Adelaide University accommodation will be under some strain, and I imagine that consideration will be given in higher places to this most urgent problem. I am rather surprised to find such a bad feeling existing in some higher circles in the Government today in reference to higher education. I was very interested in Mr. Wilson's reference yesterday to the Urrbrae Agricultural High School. I completely subscribe to his views, and consider that this school fulfils a very real and urgent need in our agricultural educational programme. I also believe that the Roseworthy Agricultural College does the same thing. I am certain that in this technical age the ability of a country to turn out degreed men of University level is a real necessity for the future of the State.

Reverting to the speeches of Mr. Condon and Mr. Bardolph, I was interested in their statements concerning governmental aid to privately-run schools. Frankly, my first thought on the subject—and I have yet to be shifted from this opinion—was that in South Australia we have a very excellent system of State education, one that is free for everybody to take advantage of. People can take their children away from such schools for various voluntary reasons. It may be because of religion, the locality or environment, or that the children are friendly with other children who attend school elsewhere, and so people should be able to, and do, transfer their children from a State school to a private school. This appeals to me as a matter of freedom of choice, and I am rather keen on that view.

In the Parliamentary Library the other day I came across an article which included remarks made by my great-great-grandfather, Mr. William Giles, who sat in this Chamber in the days when the Governor in Council governed South Australia. When he retired as representative of the district of Yatala he made this remark:—

I trust that no man will be permitted to represent Yatala who is favourable to State support for religion, and who will not contend for responsible government in its full integrity of meaning, with two Houses of legislature,

universal suffrage, short Parliaments, election by ballot, and who will not promise solemnly never to sacrifice principle for expediency.

I appreciate that some of those remarks are not completely relevant but nevertheless I am proud of their sentiment. What may amuse members of the Opposition is that he fought for the seat of Port Adelaide prior to his election to this House and was defeated primarily on the question of State aid to religion. When he was defeated he came out with the classical statement that in his opinion it was the complete and utter triumph of the power of beer over brains.

Getting back to the references in His Excellency's Speech to the agricultural scene, primary producers are today operating under several difficulties that I feel I should bring forward. The first of these, naturally enough, are the difficulties associated with a bad season. All honourable members will realize that, apart from the lifesaving rain of last week, the position in terms of primary production for this year is still very shaky. Farm incomes must fall this year, which gives rise to several interesting lines of thought.

One that appeals to me is that in times of bad trouble for the whole farming community, or even sections of it, is it not right that we should look after the assets of the country in terms of the land? Honourable members will remember last year that in many wool-producing areas of this State, in view of the low wool prices, various owners of farms insinuated that they could not afford to pay for the superphosphate needed to continue fertilizing the soil. I am frightened, because of other figures I intend to quote later on, that the position could be further aggravated this year.

Australia and New Zealand have one great asset in terms of agriculture, and that is the one-man farming unit, which is unique in the world today, with the possible exception of the United States, where one-man farming units are also in vogue, with one big difference, in my opinion: in the United States the over-capitalization entailed in the one-man farming enterprise makes it an unworkable comparison with our unit here. The particular asset of the one-man farming unit, as I see it, is this, that our primary products are capable of meeting export competition today.

To give some figures on this, there are 36,000 farm operators, including working owners, in South Australia today. Of these, approximately 28,000 are one-man farming

units. So the big impact can be appreciated, when one thinks of farmers having perhaps one, two or three employees, that that is still a great proportion—28,000 out of 36,000. I think that of all the words I have heard spoken here by honourable members since I joined this House such a short time ago, there was only one stage at which I got a little terse and perhaps angry, and that was in terms of honourable members of the Opposition referring blithely to the workers they represent. I congratulate the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill on his forthright statement yesterday when dealing with the support of South Australians generally for the Government. I fully subscribe to that point of view and should like to deal further in terms of figures in this matter. A total of 75,000 males, including working proprietors, are employed in factories in the metropolitan area. Compare that with the 36,000 agricultural workers. I have no axe to grind in this matter except that I believe the average wage of such people in the metropolitan area is about £18 a week, giving an income per annum of £940.

If I may give a comparison, on the latest statistical survey that I have looked at, the average investment in a dairy farm in the Adelaide Hills is £7,650. From that investment—there is no investment at all in the previous example I gave—the average wage for the operator is £491. Let us be fair about the question. If honourable members want to get up and talk about workers, as far as I am concerned they should deal with people who do the work. There is no comparison with someone living in a city environment and working 40 hours a week who gets a good wage with all the comforts and environment of the city around him, and all its conveniences. It is a very poor attitude under the generalized use of the word "worker"—there is a big section completely ignored. There are 36,000 in particular who work anything up to 70 hours a week for a bare living wage, and often live in a sub-standard home.

To get quickly to the remarks made by my great friend and political partner, the Honourable Mr. Hookings, I am sure over the years that his modest and sensible approach to many matters will be a great asset to this House. I congratulate him on his contribution to the motion for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. Understandably so, I am particularly interested in his remarks about the export meat trade. I had by airmail from London.

three days ago notification of sale prices for a parcel of lambs that had been sent over from the previous season's drop. This had been held for over nine months awaiting sale on a falling market. However, this is the frightening part—dealing with future indications—which I will read:—

Early indications in Britain suggest that prices will be even lower this season, possibly about 1s. 3d. to 1s. 4d. lb. sterling, which when calculated in terms of growers' returns is about 10.63 pence per pound.

A price of 10.6 pence per pound of top quality export fat lamb weighing 33 lbs. will mean slightly under 30s. per lamb in terms of the growers' return. Last year I do not know what the average was, but I imagine something in excess of 40s. per lamb. I think that many fat lamb growers were in fairly serious trouble at that price. I stress this point because this report has come through from stock dealers whose business it is to attract parcels of export lamb to go direct to them in London. They are not likely to exaggerate the situation if they can help it. I have here the various costs taken out to achieve that return of 10.6. There are several ways in which this fat lamb problem can be approached and I will now briefly attempt to give some facts which throw this matter into relief. In Great Britain today there is a trend towards leaner meat. People today do not want the fat on their joint which they used to require. If you look at the sources of supply of fat lambs to Great Britain you find some fairly interesting facts. In regard to this inadequate supply of lean lamb, Great Britain is not at present in a position to bridge the gap caused by this trend. With the extra premium they gain, by values sometimes up to 6s. and 7s. a lamb for fresh lamb, as against frozen and chilled, it is profitable to carry the lambs to a later stage. In fact, they are often not sold as suckers, but carried through to a larger lamb.

Many honourable members opposite will know better than I that a Southdown or a Romney ewe is not very likely to give a lean lamb. The whole of the New Zealand lamb industry is geared to this mating. If a lamb of this breeding is anything like finished it will possess a certain amount of loin fat, and unless pedigree breeders in New Zealand can alter the inherent features of the two breeds concerned this must continue to be the case. The question is, can we produce this leaner type of lamb, and I think theoretically the answer is "Yes." We can beat the

New Zealand market in Australia and particularly in South Australia by up to four months, which is important in getting a good export price. In fact South Australia this year can produce a particularly lean type of lamb! But joking aside, if a worth-while demand can be established and a method of grading geared to a leaner type than at present, the best lambs of this year and the leaner types from good seasons could possibly produce a better continuity than we can offer now.

I intend to leave any agricultural comments on wheat, on the dried fruit industry, and on the fruit industry generally to other members who may wish to comment and who are better qualified to do so than I am. I should, however, like to get on to the dairying industry. I am proud that I am one of the few people actively engaged in the dairying industry who have been elected either to this House or to another place. No doubt that will produce its complications in due course, but I hope that honourable members will bear with me when I sometimes have to delve into dairying matters.

Quite frankly, I say the pricing of dairy industry products today very nearly involves a case of higher mathematics completely beyond the head of the average dairy farmer. That is a bad state of affairs and I trust a lesson that will not be lost on the woolgrowers of this country. It seems to me to be essential that producers should have a clear and full understanding of the position, but that is not achieved in the dairying industry today. The week before last a letter appeared in the *Advertiser* written by a gentleman from Manum. I do not know whether he had his tongue in his cheek, or whether it was his idea of a joke, or whether he was completely serious in writing the letter, but he stated that a dairyman, for three hours' work a day, succeeded in putting aside a pretty tidy fortune. I cannot imagine anything further from the truth than that remark, but I would like to confine my remarks this afternoon purely to those dealing with the human angle of the dairying industry.

Honourable members will well know that most dairymen in the Adelaide hills in particular get up about 5 o'clock in the morning and go out in all weathers and, because they are not on irrigated country, they have correspondingly further to walk to bring in the cattle. In these days when cattle are treated in a highly humane fashion one does not have the use of a dog to bring them in. Every gate has to be opened and cleared, and about half an hour later the cattle are ready for the

milking machine. I have heard many city people remark that machine milking is in vogue. That is so, but it takes about 20 minutes to make up the machine and half an hour to clean it after milking so that it is sterile and clean and ready for the next milking. The dairy farmer still has his other farming jobs to do, such as supering and fencing and feeding calves. I think the market gardener in the Adelaide hills and the dairy farmer are the hardest worked section of our community in proportion to what they get in return. I have already quoted the return from the £7,600 invested in the Adelaide hills area which amounted to £491. It is hard to realize that this state of affairs can exist. I point that out fairly forcibly for the purposes of this debate.

The Hon. Mr. Wilson, during his speech yesterday, mentioned the margin between the producer and the vendor. In the city milk area 38d. is the margin to the producer, 13d. to the wholesaler and 18d. to the retailer I support the Hon. Mr. Wilson's view, and I think an inquiry is a possibility. It seems to me that in all the industries we are concerned with the margin between the producer and the consumer varies greatly.

I thank all honourable members for their great patience in listening to me. Might I assure them that my own attitude is, and I trust always will be, to put forward my views fairly bluntly and plainly before this House. No doubt I will also hear views handed out in the same manner, but the point as I see it is that we are elected to do our job and advocate the views of our areas and our electors. I am very pleased to know that in this House the feeling between members outside of business is on such a friendly basis, and I hope my attitude in this regard will always be in line. Mr. President, may I say that I am very honoured to be sitting in this House under you. Your reputation far exceeds the boundaries of this State, and I am sure from the point of view of myself and other new members in this Chamber that we are very pleased to know that your experience and wisdom is always available to smarten us up on any small blunders we may make through inexperience. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1)—I rise to support the motion so ably moved by Mrs. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Hookings, and take the opportunity of congratulating

them upon their excellent contributions to the debate; indeed, one can go further and include all speakers who have so far participated. I would also like to associate myself with remarks concerning those members who no longer grace this Chamber with their presence. I know that we all feel regret that the time had arrived for their departure, although I feel certain that the newly elected members will be worthy successors. I offer my congratulations to the Chief Secretary on the splendid services he has rendered to the State. Without wishing to appear to be back-scratching I sincerely say that all members of this Chamber and of another place, as well as citizens of the State generally, are most appreciative of the excellent work he has done over such a long period. I am exceedingly sorry that the Attorney-General is not with us during these proceedings and I join with others in expressing a wish for his speedy recovery and trust that he will be with us again in the very near future.

Naturally, I cannot subscribe to everything that has been said during this debate, as will be evidenced by my remarks today, but I assure members that anything I may say should not be taken personally. If I agreed to all that had been said I would not be running true to form, and undoubtedly some of my remarks will be somewhat provocative; under no circumstances, however, will they be personal. I join with others in their tributes to His Excellency's Speech on the occasion of the opening of this the Thirty-Sixth Parliament of this State. We are indeed fortunate in having such representation of Her Majesty in the persons of Sir Robert and Lady George.

At the time of the opening of Parliament the seasonal outlook appeared very grim, but the recent rains have considerably brightened the outlook and, conditionally upon good follow-on rains, the season should again be a reasonably good one. They have dispelled the gloom that was hanging over the State following the unprecedented dry period when the future looked black indeed.

Frequent reference is made to the excellent work the Government is doing in managing the affairs of the State and to the wonderful progress of State instrumentalities. I agree that these undertakings have proved profitable to the State and it is now apparent that Government members are anxious to claim the full credit for their success. However, I point out that without the full support of Labor members these undertakings would not be under State control today. Allow me to instance a

few. Firstly, our afforestation undertaking was inaugurated by a Labor Government, and we all know what an asset to the State it is today. The opening up of the Leigh Creek coalfield was first advocated by Labor, but in those days we were told that the brown coal deposits were useless and that it would be foolhardy to attempt to exploit them. Ultimately, the field was opened up by a Liberal Government, but it is interesting to note that when the sum of £200,000 was placed on the Estimates for this purpose it was strongly opposed by leaders of the Liberal Party and it was carried only with the support of Labor members. Our minds go back to the taking over of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company, which occurred in November, 1945. It is interesting to note that this measure also was strongly opposed by some Government members.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Including a present Minister.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Yes. A division on the second reading resulted in 13 votes for and five against. Later an amendment moved by Sir Collier Cudmore in Committee regarding the control of the trust was defeated by 10 votes to seven. On the third reading the voting was equal and the measure was defeated on the casting vote of the President, following the customary practice in all British Parliaments in similar circumstances. On that occasion again all the Labor members in this Chamber supported the Bill.

A similar measure was introduced on April 3, 1946, and again, on a division on the third reading, the Bill was carried by only one vote, all Labor members once more supporting it. A Succession Duties Bill was introduced on November 19, 1952, designed to provide additional revenue for the Government. During its passage through the Legislative Council an amendment was introduced that would have weakened it, but once more the Labor members rallied to the Government and the move was defeated by one vote. These are but a few instances of Labor coming to the rescue of the Government for the benefit of the State, so when we hear talk about the good job the Government is doing it is well to remember these things. I feel that full credit should be given to Parliament and not to the Government. As I have pointed out, but for Labor members of this Chamber, in the instances I have quoted, the measures would not have been passed and undoubtedly would not be in operation today.

It is interesting to notice in the Governor's Speech that "funds being available" the Government intends to spend £10,000,000 on road work this year compared with £8,000,000 last year. This is money well spent. Because of the increased volume of traffic some of our main and arterial roads are badly in need of repair, apart from other roads that come under the jurisdiction of councils. I consider there was no need for the proviso in the Governor's Speech, because I have always been under the impression that money collected by the Government from motorists in the form of registration fees was to be used on road work. It is interesting to compare the money actually collected by the Government from road users with that spent on roads. In 1950-51 the amount of taxation collected was £1,458,854, the per capita collection amounting to £2 0s. 5d. In 1956-57 the respective figures were £3,670,249 and £4 5s. 3d. In the same years the respective expenditures on roads were £1,941,429 and £3,198,705. For the financial year ended June 30 last the revenue in the form of motor taxation amounted to £3,940,000, an all-time record. The Commonwealth Government has been called upon for financial assistance to help build and maintain main roads. There has been a further imposition on road users in the form of a Commonwealth petrol tax to make money available to the States for the maintenance and building of roads. The States had to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth and plead for their just dues for money to be spent on road work. Approximately one-third of the amount collected by the Commonwealth was handed back to the States, and the remainder went into Commonwealth general revenue. A new formula has been adopted by the Commonwealth Government and apparently accepted by the States providing for an increase of approximately 4.8 per cent in the amount provided to the States, but the increase in petrol consumption over the last five years has been 8.5 per cent. Under the new formula the Commonwealth Government will now pay the States a basic amount of £220,000,000, and matching grants to the States of £30,000,000 over the next five years. Under the old formula the Commonwealth would have paid to the States about £235,000,000. The new set-up is actually depriving the States of an extra £15,000,000, and they will be called upon to find another £30,000,000. I feel that the time has arrived when the Commonwealth Government should be told that it should honour its obligation to the States in regard to the

imposition placed on motorists in the form of a petrol tax to raise money for State road works. Otherwise, it is collecting revenue under false pretences. The States should be more aggressive and insist that they receive a fair and equitable share of the money collected—perhaps on a road or an area basis. All the money collected from petrol tax, less perhaps an amount to meet equitable Commonwealth needs, should be paid to the States. Unless the States are more aggressive they will not get fair treatment from the Commonwealth and will have to go cap in hand for funds to put their main roads in a proper condition.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—In their approach the States have not been very lamb-like to date.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The State Ministers controlling road construction have attended conferences on the question and there has been the feeling that the States must not embarrass the Commonwealth Government; and apparently they have accepted the basis fixed by the Commonwealth. How many States objected to the new formula and told the Commonwealth that they would not accept it? I feel that they would have been justified in telling the Commonwealth Government that they would not.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The Senators on both sides have not been very noisy on the question.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am not concerned about that, but the lack of aggression of the States in their approach to the Commonwealth. The money was originally collected from motorists to provide money for roads, and should have been made available to the States. There was no necessity for the proviso in the Governor's Speech about "funds being available." Sufficient funds would be available if the Commonwealth did the fair thing.

Under the Town Planning Act, if land is subdivided into building blocks the owner must build roads before selling the land. This is done at a cost of 30s. a lineal foot, and of course the purchasers have to pay for this work. If there is a block on each side of a road each purchaser pays the amount of 30s. and therefore, the amount paid for the frontage amounts to £3 a lineal foot. To me that seems wrong. Section 319 of the Local Government Act provides that the total amount payable for road work to the local governing authority shall not exceed 10s. a lineal foot, which means that a council would be recouped £1 a foot for two blocks opposite each other.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—Footpaths and water tables have to be provided.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—That would be in addition to the 10s., but no footpaths and water tables would be provided in the circumstances I have mentioned. Afterwards the local council may come along and build water tables, kerbing and footpaths, for which the owner of the land must pay. This makes it rather expensive. In a new subdivision roads are built first and after building activities have started along come the various Government departments to provide services. The Engineering and Water Supply Department digs a trench along the road for water pipes and later another trench for sewers, and yet another department will dig another trench for some other service. Thus the road is considerably disturbed, and once a road is so disturbed it can never be put in its original condition, and eventually may have to be rebuilt.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—If he goes to Elizabeth the honourable member will see that the road is not dug up for these services. They all go down the back gardens of the houses.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The set-up at Elizabeth is governmental. The Government can do what it likes within its own area. I refer to the areas for new subdivisions where, under the Town Planning Act, the subdivider is compelled to make up the road before he can sell a block. The Minister cannot refer me to what goes on at Elizabeth. What I stated is a fact, that these services go along the roads in these areas, and the roads are all dug up. Then the local governing body itself has finally to rebuild the road.

I make this constructive suggestion, that consideration be given to amending the Act to provide that the subdivider shall pay into a fund the cost of building those roads; and that fund should be administered by either the local governing authority or some other authority appointed by the Government. Then, when the services have been put in in the area, with co-operation between the various departments in what is to be done, the road need not again be disturbed. It would be a considerable saving to everybody including the purchaser of the block in the first instance. If the money was paid into this fund, it would be there paid by the person responsible for making the road. The services could be put down, the road completed, and that money would be earning interest until such time as it was used. My suggestion would be a progressive, not a retrograde, step.

Rent control has been mentioned in this debate. At least one member has said that the time has come for its discontinuance. He is not a lone wolf in saying that: it has been said many times before in this Chamber. Naturally, I do not favour the idea—at least not until such time as the demand for homes has been met to a greater extent in this State. In the course of his remarks the honourable member said:—

Of course, the Labor Party pictures a typical landlord as a type of grasping Shylock who wants to take his money at the price of human happiness.

He continued by saying:—

Of course, like Shylock, you do not really find these people in real life.

The first statement only shows either a complete ignorance of the policy of the Labor Party or a deliberate intention on his part to have a shot at the Labor members in this Chamber. The position is quite clear: the honourable member has not had the experience of attempting to assist the many people who have been served with eviction orders so that a landlord can take advantage of the present Act and enter into an agreement or a lease with a prospective tenant for the purpose of getting considerably higher rent than he is getting under the Act.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—Then the honourable member admits that the statement is correct?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—Undoubtedly the honourable member who has interjected has had experience himself. He has probably experienced somebody in his constituency coming to him for his assistance because he was about to be evicted from his own home.

The Hon. N. L. Jude—The honourable member says “evicted from his own home.” How does rent control come in?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The honourable member knows perfectly well that I am referring to a rental home.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph—The honourable the Minister is getting too technical.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—The Labor Party does not regard the modern landlord as any Shylock at all, and never has. The Labour Party believes in protecting the people from the considerable exploitation which has been going on with rental homes in this State. That cannot be denied, either, because we know what happened when the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act was amended to its present form. We had to come back

and look at the Act again because of what was going on. We are attempting to protect unfortunate people from exploitation.

Let us examine the position. The Housing Trust is doing a fine job in attempting to meet the great demands made upon it today for homes. Its officers are always helpful when applications for assistance are made to them by people who have been evicted from their homes or from people who have had no opportunity of even renting a home. They do everything possible to try to find a home for them but, naturally, their efforts and activity are limited. The Housing Trust cannot do the impossible; it can only make available completed homes.

Again consideration must be given to the applications before it, the length of time that they have been in, and how the homes should be allocated. The job of the Housing Trust has been considerably aggravated today by a tendency towards the demolition of perfect homes. In most instances this demolition occurs in order to erect a service station. I say “perfect homes.” If the Hon. Mr. Potter goes along the Henley Beach Road and takes notice of the homes demolished there to make room for something else, probably for the purpose of establishing a service station, he will see that a perfect home has been sold which would house at least two families.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—Reasonably substantial homes, but not perfect homes.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—There are many more substantial homes than my own. I would willingly exchange my own for one of them. These homes should not be allowed to be demolished. This is going on in Fisher Terrace, Mile End, and in practically any suburb. People have been living in these homes. Whether they rent them or own them does not make much difference as far as I am concerned.

The Hon. F. J. Potter—It does to the housing problem.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It does, because it makes a greater demand on the Housing Trust to supply homes to these people who have been deprived of them to make way for service stations, and we have any amount of them today. The proprietors of the service stations are trying to induce custom so that they themselves can make a decent livelihood. Observe what happened over the weekend. The press reported the case of a woman getting £10,000 for a home for which she paid only £300. She thought that nobody would be foolish enough to pay £10,000, but an oil company jumped at it so

that it could buy it and knock it down for a service station. With this present acute shortage of homes, the Government itself should say that all habitable homes should be made available to tenants to live in until the housing demand in the State has been considerably eased.

It has been stated that the oil companies have honoured an undertaking that apparently they gave to the Government that they would not increase the number of service stations. We now know that the number of these stations is to be increased in this State. There is another company coming in, the Atlantic Company, and sanction has been given for it to establish a certain number of stations within the metropolitan area and in country districts. That led immediately to another company bobbing up, an all-Australian company called the Kangaroo Distributing Company, which will erect service stations. Over will go more homes and up will go more service stations. All the petrol pumps will at all times remain the property of the oil companies. This sort of thing is going on all the time and it should be controlled by the Government because until such time as housing catches up with the demand for homes it should not be allowed to continue. If the house to be demolished has been condemned that is all right, but if it is a good habitable home the oil companies should be stopped from doing this sort of thing.

Regarding the Landlord and Tenant (Control of Rents) Act, we have heard the plea for the landlord. I sympathize with what I call the ordinary landlord as I visualize him. In my view he is a person who has been very careful over his working years and has bought a little home for himself and has then found himself in a position to buy another home for renting. That particular landlord would now be having a rough deal in many instances. The Honourable Mr. Potter gave us some of his experiences in the local court and he mentioned cases of smart tenants, but we can also turn around and take the case of the other person who has numerous homes for renting purposes, and there are also the agents. All that the agent is concerned with—because his income depends on commission—is the collection of money, and the more money he can collect in rent the greater his commission, and I believe agents rather than the little landlord are the people who are doing the damage. That sort of thing is going on, and we all know it is. They are the people the tenants must be protected against.

Many tenants have asked the Housing Trust to fix rents, and the landlords have been faced with reductions in the rent charged. I refer honourable members to the fixation of the basic wage. Some years ago in the fixation of the basic wage the court took into consideration that one-sixth of the weekly wage was for house rent for a five-roomed brick home. If we apply that principle today we find that for a five-roomed brick house the rent would be £2 5s. 2d. I wonder whether the Honourable Mr. Potter would agree with that formula?

The Hon. F. J. Potter—What about the capital cost of homes?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—If the honourable member is going on to the capital cost of the homes where do we get? Where can any person get a five-roomed brick home today for £2 5s. a week? If we act on capital expenditure we find today the rent is fixed on that basis, but when we come to a house which was built 60 to 70 years ago and consider the capital cost we find, as often as not, that the rental charged is £6 to £7 a week, and I say in cases like that landlords are not doing too badly.

If this legislation were discontinued I am quite sure that there would be wholesale increases in rents everywhere. We experience numerous people coming to ask us to obtain homes for them, and on questioning them we often find that they are renting a little flat for £8 to £10 a week or they are living in rooms. It is obvious what would happen if we did not have some form of restrictive legislation. This point is adequately illustrated by what happens on each occasion when there is an increase in the basic wage. Though there is some semblance of price control, immediately the basic wage rises or immediately margins are increased, prices of everyday commodities go up. I am not referring to luxury goods, but to the price of ordinary commodities. Let us analyse this position. What has forced an increase in the basic wage? There is something wrong with our system at the moment. It is like the proverbial dog chasing its tail. The Arbitration Court has taken into account the trend over the last 12 months along with the ability of industry to pay and the trend of our overseas trade balances. The recent 15s. increase in the basic wage was to compensate the worker in industry for the prices he had been paying over the last 12 months, and he has to wait another 12 months when, we suppose, the same thing will happen again, and then on we go again. Our present legislation on price control cannot be effective

because State price control can never be effective. In order to make this control effective it would have to be Commonwealth wide and would have to control not only commodities but many goods which are not controlled or which have been de-controlled.

Despite our gloomy seasonal outlook and the fact that farmers have had to send stock into the abattoirs we find that the price of meat increased considerably before the basic wage increase. Our beef prices at the local abattoirs were such that interstate buyers came here because they found it cheaper to buy beef here and ship it to their own States than to buy similar meat in their own States. Yet we find that the Government had to take action, because of what was happening, and it intimidated if butchers did not do something about reducing the price of meat that price control on that item would have to be re-imposed. Despite this, we find that whenever there is an application for an increase in the basic wage or in margins the State Government has a representative in court to oppose the move, and the last occasion was no exception. The Honourable Mr. Shard and I have had the experience of being told that these are matters for arbitration and not for the Government to decide, and the cry is that fixation of wages is a matter for arbitration and not for the Government.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—The Government has a right to state its case.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—It is not a matter for the Government to interfere in when the Arbitration Court is dealing with the basic wage. We find the same thing applying when there is an application for marginal increases. There is opposition to the advocacy of equal pay for equal work performed by the different sexes. The Government's view on this point has been one of total opposition but now we have women members of Parliament. I wonder what the policy of the Government will be. Is the Government going to tell the women members that they will receive 75 per cent only of the members' rates, or will it say it now believes in equal pay for the different sexes for members of Parliament?

The Hon. C. R. Story—But this is Parliament.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN—I am always open to learn something and I have learnt this afternoon that we have a Parliament. There are many things in the Speech of His Excellency the Governor to which reference should be made. Employer-employee relations in this

State and the freedom of this State from industrial strife were mentioned. I could comment at length on that sort of thing but feel that I have taken up enough time of the Council this afternoon. I conclude by saying once again that the contribution to this debate by the new members augurs well for future debates. They have emerged with flying colours and from the manner in which they have presented their views I am sure that the State will benefit by their presence here. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern)—In supporting the motion I would like to express at the outset my pleasure at the standard of the debate and very heartily congratulate the mover, Mrs. Cooper, and the seconder, Mr. Hookings, on the excellence of their speeches. I also welcome other new members to this Chamber and congratulate them also on their contributions to the debate. I feel sure that their initial effort augurs well for a period of successful service in this Chamber. While welcoming new members we cannot but regret the absence of others who served in this Chamber for many years and rendered valuable and much appreciated service to the community. I regret very much to learn that Sir Collier Cudmore is again indisposed, and I trust that he will soon be restored to good health and that other members who have vacated their seats will live long to enjoy their voluntary retirement. I also express sympathy with the Attorney-General, Mr. Rowe, who is laid aside with sickness and would pay a tribute to his work as Minister, particularly during the time when the Chief Secretary was absent abroad when he led this Chamber with great distinction. I am sure that all members hope that he will soon be with us again.

Mrs. Cooper spoke upon the value of education and we all agree that the nation which trains its people best must go to the forefront. This can best be achieved by a liberal education, with ample bursaries and scholarships for those who show the greatest promise. In the commercial world we find that those who go to the Leaving standard at school and then continue their studies after commencing work make the most practical and effective employees. The number of pupils in our primary and secondary schools has reached 150,000—double the number 10 years ago—and it is pleasing to note that greater advantage is now being taken of secondary education, the number of secondary schools being three times that of 10

years ago. That is very important indeed, for during that period of over-employment many students left school too early and were not equipped to take their place in the world as they should have been. To meet this expansion in numbers we are building some 40 schools a year and we are coping, with some difficulty, in staffing them. I am sure members will agree with the policy of the Government in its proposed new Teachers College. Some may be critical of the Public Works Committee's recommendation that a 13-storey building should be built at a cost of £67,000 more than the 11-storey building but it was felt that the requirements of the State, particularly if our children are to stay longer at school, will soon over-tax even the larger building. The extra cost of £67,000 in providing the additional storeys now compares very favourably with the estimated cost of £270,000 if the work were done at a later period.

Judging by reports in the newspapers, some reference has been made during the course of this debate to the Public Works Committee in relation to the Magill Reformatory and some scathing criticism has been levelled. I do not intend to debate this question at length now, but I assure members that the committee visited that institution yesterday, and although they found it out-of-date and too small, a tribute must be paid to the work that is being carried on by the responsible authorities. I was really astonished at the standard of the work under such difficult conditions. Whether the new building will be erected on the site of the old will depend on a very full investigation by the committee, and every step will be taken to examine the question to the fullest extent. I have also been struck in the last week or two, since having the privilege of being a member of the Public Works Standing Committee—and I thank Mr. Wilson for his remarks yesterday—with the vast and intricate network of water mains servicing the metropolitan area and the State. Those responsible for the planning and provision of such an efficient service are to be highly commended. Some little trouble has arisen in as much as 60 per cent of the people are served from Mount Bold, south of the city. The draw on this reservoir is such that today Mount Bold contains only about 130,000,000 gallons, but a few more million gallons than Thorndon Park, so it has become necessary to link up at another level so that water can come in from South Para to supply

Woodville and the western districts. However, I pay a tribute to our engineers of the Water Supply Department and of the Highways Department for the planning that is taking place in providing services for the community.

The Electricity Trust has done a wonderful job in the extension of services practically throughout the length and breadth of the State. A few places still do not enjoy this service, but it is very pleasing indeed to find electricity available in such places as Ungarra, Tumby Bay and places in the mid-north, and we cannot but be grateful for this. I was also pleased to note in His Excellency's Speech that it is proposed to establish an agricultural research centre at Northfield to investigate problems of the cereal, pasture, fruit, vegetable, and livestock industries. Science plays a very important part in our agricultural practices today and I am very pleased to know that this provision is being made. Also, the teaching of agricultural science at the Penola high school is proposed. I regard it as very important that country people should gain the greatest knowledge of science in agriculture and I have no doubt that some of these country students will become some of our best research officers and will fill many of the positions in our agricultural services. I heartily commend this forward step.

I was very interested to hear the figures quoted by Mr. Potter in the course of his excellent speech. He said that with 13.5 per cent of the work force in the State the primary industries were producing some 75 per cent of our exportable surplus, and he deplored the fact that more were not employed in the agricultural industries. Great strides have been made in the development of land. I need not enumerate all that has been done in the South-East, at Bordertown and Keith, by the A.M.P. Society, nor the development on Kangaroo Island and at Wanilla on Eyre Peninsula; that is history. A very large area has been developed, but there is also a tremendous amount of development still going on by private persons. When one flies from Minnipa to Port Lincoln one cannot help but be impressed by the work that is being done.

The Hon. E. H. Edmonds—There is still a very large area to be developed.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON—That is true and we hope that more people will be placed on the land, although I would deplore the establishment of people on areas that were not self-sufficient. In my younger days I was a

keen advocate of greater numbers of people being established in country areas, but having travelled through some of the Continental countries and seen the results of peasant farming, I never want to see our standard of living sacrificed to numbers. Agriculture is very highly mechanized today and one person can do what it took two or three to do two or three decades ago. We should encourage the practice of producing by mechanization at a reasonable economic level.

Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Hookings referred to roads, the latter saying that he was pleased that everything possible had been done in the construction of roads in the South-East. Many people in my district say in jest they are happy that the roads in the South-East have been finished so that attention can be given to the roads in their area. I congratulate the Government on the important road works undertaken throughout the State. I believe it is planning for the future. In my district a percentage of the roads have been sealed, but others are crying out for attention. As regards the Booleroo Centre to Murraytown road, I have been told that its sealing was promised by the late Mr. Blesing many years ago. I believe the time has arrived when some attention should be given to this work. I also have in mind the road from Jamestown to Mannanarie and on to Peterborough, but particularly the first-mentioned section. I express appreciation for what has been done in the sealing of roads through country townships. This is important from the point of view of health and convenience to storekeepers in the area. With heavy transports passing through, dust is stirred up and penetrates articles in the shops, and this must be a great inconvenience to shopkeepers. Also, there is the road through Yongala. I understand that work at Booborowie is provided for on the Estimates. I should also like attention given to the roads through Carrieton and Eureka. Some may say that these are only small townships, but if attention were given to these roads the tendency would be for these towns to retain life instead of just dying away.

For several years an endeavour has been made to permit people living in north-eastern districts to travel to Adelaide on the bus service that comes from Broken Hill every day and passes through these towns, but they are not permitted to do so. I am a great believer in people using Government instrumentalities and services where possible. On days when trains are not running to Adelaide, many people

suffer a distinct hardship in not being able to use this bus service. The present train service is inadequate and I consider that these people should have the privilege of travelling on the bus service on days when the train is not running. That would not be in competition with the trains.

I pay a tribute to the Premier for his action in lodging an injunction to restrain the New South Wales, Victorian and Commonwealth Governments from diverting water from the Murray, to which South Australia is entitled under the Murray Waters Agreement. He was able to secure for South Australia better conditions than operated under the previous agreement. I believe that as South Australia is a dry country, adequate water supplies are vital to our progress. Had we not secured an amendment to the agreement, our progress would have been limited, but under the new arrangement provision is made for a stipulated quantity of water to be provided during a drought period, and that is the vital time. No-one worries about the water question when the Murray is flowing in volume, but during a time of low rainfall it is vital that South Australia should have available the quantity of water stipulated under the new agreement. This will enable the State to progress. I agree with the remarks of Mrs. Cooper regarding the rainfall received this year. We must express our great pleasure at the improved seasonal prospects. I believe that the rain received will be substantially useful, and with more hopeful conditions prevailing and with good government, as envisaged in the Governor's Speech, we can look forward with reasonable prospects to prosperity during the coming year. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland)—I join with other honourable members first in congratulating the new members upon being elected, and secondly upon their speeches. Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Hookings, in moving and seconding the motion, indicated that they will be very useful members and will assist a great deal in their contributions. As Mr. Hookings said, it was an historical occasion, because it was the first time a lady member has sat in this Chamber, and she was the first to make a speech in the South Australian Parliament, and this in 102 years of responsible Government. Two other new members, Mr. Potter and Mr. Giles, also made impressive contributions. It is significant that both Mr. Hookings and Mr. Giles are Nuffield scholars. It is the first time in the history of the South Australian Parliament that there

have been two Nuffield scholar members. After all, they were the No. 1 farmers in the State in their respective years, and we are extremely fortunate to have the services of men of their calibre to represent their electorates and the State. I join with other members in their reference to my colleague, the Honourable C. D. Rowe. I regret that he is unable to be present because of illness. Since my election to this Chamber I have had close association with him and know the worth of his work. I sincerely trust that before long he will return to health and to this Chamber.

I also regret that the term of His Excellency the Governor is drawing to a close. I thought when he delivered his Speech at the opening of Parliament how well he looked, and it is a great pity that a man of his calibre is to leave us in the very near future, when I feel that he is just getting used to us.

The Governor's Speech clearly enunciated the Government's policy; I can sum up by saying that its policy has always been, and I think always will be, to give an incentive to those who are prepared to help themselves. It also seeks to assist industry where industry has the opportunity to succeed. It is also prepared to undertake research into all phases of rural and secondary industry problems. That is very clearly shown by the amount of work it is prepared to do in research into both agricultural and horticultural spheres. I was most interested the other day to inspect the research station at Loxton, which is just getting under way; and also interested to notice that the Government intends to do much work on artificial insemination at Northfield. It is encouraging to know that the Government intends to give assistance in the clearing of Crown lands for settlement. To clear virgin country is beyond the resources of the average farmer. Time does not wait for us these days to go out with a pick and axe to clear land. Things move much faster than they used to. The Government intends to use heavy mechanical equipment to assist those who are prepared to pioneer new country. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Wilson about war service land settlement. I am sorry that the Commonwealth Government has decided at this time to sever the partnership that had existed with the States since about 1945. A few more years would have done two useful things: in the first place, it would have enabled us to develop many more thousand acres of land in South Australia and, in the second place, it would have honoured a promise made to ex-

service men when they returned. In the 1944 debate that promise was given. Had the Federal Government delayed its withdrawal a little longer, it would have been beneficial to the States and the people who were entitled to be settled.

There is still good country about. I cannot believe there is no good country left. In the Upper Murray area in the Hundred of Gordon the Bookpurnong scheme was put forward by the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee. It covers an excellent piece of ground and I am sorry that we have not been able to go on with it. We shall now have to rely on the assurance of the Premier that he, with the assistance of his Government and Parliament, will most certainly do something for those who have not been settled. I should also like to see that scheme extended to civilian land settlers.

I was interested also to observe that the Electricity Trust intends taking power to the Murray Mallee areas—Karoonda, Pinnaroo, Lameroo and other places—because those people have persevered as well as any others in the State under difficult conditions from the days of the depression.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Has the honourable member looked at the division in the Electricity Trust Act?

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I am not interested. The result is that we are providing electricity to Karoonda, Pinnaroo and Lameroo, and those who voted for the Bill must have their reward and gratification by seeing what a wonderful thing it has turned out to be. I do not know whether we need pay any more tribute to those people than that.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—Let those who voted against it keep quiet and not take all the credit.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—Fortunately, the Government which I have the honour to support was the one which brought down the enabling legislation. Therefore, I am quite pleased.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—You are the people who kicked it out.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—We are able to bask in the reflected glory.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—We will have a division before it is all over.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—I feel that this State is poorly endowed with natural water supplies. For a short time I want to discuss them because they are essential to the progress of this State. I strongly believe that

the development of the State will be influenced more by water than by any other single factor. The ability to provide an assured supply of water for primary and secondary industry is, in my opinion, most essential.

In this State, as I have said, we are particularly poorly endowed with natural water storages and supplies. It is true that 75 per cent of the State is outside the 10-inch rainfall area. Although I agree that good crops can be grown in many parts of that area, where good sheep country prevails, that happens only in the best of conditions. Without the required rainfall, they are very much marginal lands. They are certainly not secure.

In the 10-inch to 15-inch zone, much the same thing occurs with regard to the conservation of surface water. The natural resources of the Mount Lofty Ranges with their 30 to 35 inches of rain are, I believe, utilized to good effect. Much work has been done and much money expended on reservoirs. A good job is being done in that direction. Nevertheless, that supply still has to be augmented by the Mannum pipeline and bores situated on the Adelaide plains.

Adelaide has expanded considerably in the last few years and I can see no reason why it will not continue to expand. If not Adelaide itself, then the two towns adjacent to it—Elizabeth and the town visualized where the oil refinery will be—will require a great amount of water. Enlarging the capacity of Mount Bold will assist, of course.

The other two sources are the Murray water and the ground water supplies. Dealing first with the Murray water supply, the river and its tributaries cover about one-fifth of this Continent and pass through four States. It is fed by the melting snows on the Australian Alps, by the tropical rains in the sandstone creeks of the Warrego and Condamine Ranges of Queensland, by the Great Dividing Range near Sydney, and by the muddy water courses of West Queensland and New South Wales by way of the Darling. It is very much like an international crook who travels under several aliases. It starts as the Swampy Plain, then it becomes the Indi, then the Bringenbrong and finally the Murray.

The total length of the Murray and its tributaries is 3,532 miles. I am giving these few facts to illustrate how dependent we are in South Australia on the other States for our water supply. It is our heritage and must be our legacy to posterity. It must be preserved

in every way. We must leave the river as well as we can in the same form as it was when it was discovered. I am afraid that already much damage has been done to the river and the catchment areas by denuding them of vegetation in the first place, thus enabling the river to erode. The building of levee banks and the placing of towns and settlements in the wrong places have contributed to the silting up of the main stream. Much more control must be exercised in the future or we may find ourselves in the same unhappy position that the people of New South Wales, or even the people of China, found themselves in with the constant silting of the river and the building of levee banks higher and higher until finally the river was running along the plains with the levee banks retaining them.

This State has its legal rights under the River Murray Waters Agreement entered into between New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the Commonwealth. One of the greatest dangers facing us in South Australia is insufficient rain falling on the catchment areas in the other States for a long period. At present, as the Honourable Mr. Robinson has said—and I was pleased to hear him say it—South Australia under the amended Agreement is entitled to three-thirteenths of the water entering the Murray after due allowance has been made for evaporation. This is something we did not have under the old Act. The evaporation between the South Australian border and the lakes is simply colossal.

The second important proviso is that the water must be fresh and not have an undue salt content. Those are the two things we really gain from the amended Agreement. The only difficulty is that, if the other States are experiencing drought conditions for a prolonged period, the river level in South Australia could fall well below the present desired level. In that case the salt springs located just below the existing water level can discharge at a much greater rate than at present owing to the volume of water in the river. Numerous springs are discharging up to 5,000 gallons of water an hour. They have a salt content of about 850 grains per gallon, so it is essential that we keep our water level in the Murray at a reasonable level.

I make these points because it is generally assumed in most quarters that the Murray is a limitless supply of water for all time. At the moment South Australia is using about 45 per cent of the water available, but it is estimated that the population of Australia

will, within the next 20 years, increase to 20,000,000. We can expect South Australia to have a large proportion of this increase. If that is the position, we shall have to look more and more to the River Murray as a source of water for secondary industry, and especially for providing the food necessary to feed that increased population. To accomplish this we shall have to look to irrigation, especially in the 10 to 15 inch rainfall areas.

The Hon. F. J. Condon—More reservoirs will have to be built, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY—That is quite probable. We shall have to utilize every gallon of water that falls on or comes through this State. That is my whole point. I am fearful lest we should at some stage handicap the natural development of this State because we cannot provide it with sufficient water. I know that wars have been fought over salt, but I do not want to see a war fought over water in this State in my lifetime. Water is most essential to us.

I feel that the Government, with the full support of Parliament of course, should undertake surveys of the natural storages in South Australia, in those areas that at present are not being utilized as storages for water from the Murray. But extreme care once again must be taken in siting these storages so as to obviate the possibility of banking the river back too far against the existing settlements, because nothing will create and aggravate our drainage and seepage problems more than building up a head of water against the existing settlements. We should go ahead and make a survey, but we should take care that during the survey no banking up of the river takes place. I realize that I have dwelt at some length on this matter of Murray water.

I now wish to deal with three sources of ground water which are the artesian, the sub-artesian and the non-pressure water of this State. We all realize large areas of Australia are fortunate in being provided with ground water supplies which are obtained by medium of bores or wells or soaks, and the relative value of these various deposits of water varies according to the locality, and ranges from stock water, in some parts, to good agricultural water in other parts. I desire to mention one of these basins in South Australia because it is the one I am personally acquainted with, and I am prompted to deal with this subject because of the much greater demand which has been placed in recent years on the basins for irrigation purposes and for industrial purposes and

because one realizes how land on the Adelaide Plains has been cut up—at one time one bore served 400 acres which has recently been cut up into five to ten acre farmlets and the whole area is pepper-potted with bores.

I wish to deal with the Murray artesian basin which extends from the South-East right through Pinnaroo, Lamerloo and nearly up to Loxton. The whole area of this basin occupies about 28,000 square miles in South Australia and certain areas of the basin contain water that is too saline for much use. The southern part, however, provides wonderful water the salt content of which ranges from 30 to 50 grains per gallon. The aquifer for this basin extends into Victoria to the east of Naracoorte and it is there that this basin is charged. Naturally the further the basin extends north and west the more saline becomes the water in the basin. Water may be obtained at varying depths from a few feet below the surface in the South-East up to 300 feet below the surface in the northern areas.

In recent years a considerable amount of interest has been shown by farmers in raising that water for crop production, the availability of the supply ranging from 5,000 gallons an hour to 50,000 gallons an hour depending on the locality. Once again I must issue this word of warning because I am perturbed that this water may be taken from us by people who are not very interested in posterity but in what they can take out for the time being. I believe considerable care must be taken to see that this national asset is preserved. It is an established fact that in some basins irrevocable damage has been done to the water supply because of incorrect drilling methods that have allowed salt water to enter the aquifer, thus rendering it unsuitable for agricultural purposes. Instances have occurred where the water in the basin has been fouled by the disposal of effluent from townships. It is surprising to me that effluent has been disposed of in the basin near a bore used for the town water supply. They would not even do that in Egypt. The good water has in other instances been depleted by over-use and this has allowed the salt water to creep in owing to the reduced pressure in the water-bearing strata.

The Mines Department has undertaken a lot of research into this problem and has prepared a lot of data for the use of farmers and drillers. The Lands Department has made available many thousands of pounds to approved farmers under the Marginal Lands Act. The Marginal Lands Committee has investigated farms

in the areas and is prepared to subsidize farmers who are prepared to undertake certain experiments with cereal growing and lucerne growing. Experimental irrigation pastures have been established in the Meribah, Alawoona and Karoonda areas of this State. These experiments, if successful, will be the forerunner of a general irrigation system throughout all parts where suitable water exists.

In view of the dangers I have mentioned about the misuse of our artesian basins and supplies I urge the Government to introduce legislation during this session of Parliament to give some means of control over the indiscriminate misuse of a natural national asset. I am not one who usually asks the Government or Parliament to impose excessive controls, but I am convinced that unless steps are taken promptly many farmers who are spending up to £10,000 on their property on pumps, bores and spray

irrigation equipment may face severe setbacks from the causes I have mentioned.

I congratulate the Minister of Mines and the Mines Department on their work in connection with the surveys they are doing, but I feel that their work would be even more effective if suitable legislation were enacted to enforce their suggestions. In conclusion I congratulate the speakers who have gone before me. I think that their contributions have been of great value to all of us. I have very much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. E. H. EDMONDS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.48 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, July 30, at 2.15 p.m.